

The University of Edinburgh

**Meeting of Senate Learning and Teaching Committee
to be held at 2.00pm on Wednesday 24 May 2017
in Room 235, Joseph Black Building (Chemistry), Kings Buildings**

A G E N D A

1. **Welcome and Apologies**
2. **Minutes of the Meeting held on 15 March 2017** LTC 16/17 5 A
3. **Matters Arising**
 - 3.1 **Update on Feedback Quality Monitoring (item 6)**
 - 3.2 **Reporting on Feedback Quality and Turnaround Times via the Programme Monitoring Form (item 6)**
 - 3.3 **Report of Higher Education Achievement Record (HEAR) Recommendation Panel (item 8)**
 - 3.4 **Learning and Teaching Strategy Implementation Plan**
- Convener's Communications**
4. **Committee Membership for 2017/18**
 - For Discussion**
 5. **Social Responsibility and Sustainability: Curricular and Co-Curricular Pathways** LTC 16/17 5 B
 6. **Report on Ongoing and Planned Learning Technology Developments** LTC 16/17 5 C
 7. **Report from the Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES) Working Group** LTC 16/17 5 D
 8. **Review of Feedback Standards and Guiding Principles** LTC 16/17 5 E
 - For Information**
 9. **Feedback from Flexible Learning Week 2016/17:**
 - 9.1 **Report on Festival of Creative Learning 2017** LTC 16/17 5 F1
 - 9.2 **School Feedback on Flexible Learning Week 2017** LTC 16/17 5 F2

For Noting and Approval

10. Updates and Reports:

- | | | |
|------|---|---------------|
| 10.1 | Knowledge Strategy Committee (KSC) Report (Meeting held on 24 March 2017) | LTC 16/17 5 G |
| 10.2 | Report from Learning and Teaching Policy Group | LTC 16/17 5 H |
| 10.3 | Task Group to Review the Code of Practice for Tutors and Demonstrators | LTC 16/17 5 I |
| 10.4 | Student Recruitment Strategy: Update on Portfolio Development | Verbal update |
| 10.5 | Update from Lecture Recording Policy Task Group | LTC 16/17 5 J |
| 10.6 | Development of a Policy on Learning Analytics | LTC 16/17 5 K |
| 10.7 | Near Future Teaching: Designing the Future of Digital Education at Edinburgh. Update for LTC | LTC 16/17 5 L |
| 10.8 | Update from Research-Led Learning and Teaching Task Group | LTC 16/17 5 M |
| 10.9 | Update from University-Wide Courses Task Group | LTC 16/17 5 N |

11. Any Other Business

Philippa Ward, Academic Services, May 2017

For approval at meeting of LTC to be held on 24 May 2017

Minutes of the Meeting of the Senatus Learning and Teaching Committee
(LTC) held at 2pm on Wednesday 15 March 2017
in the Cuillin Room, Charles Stewart House

1. Attendance

Present:

Professor Sarah Cunningham-Burley	Assistant Principal (Research-Led Learning)
Mr Patrick Garratt	Vice President (Academic Affairs), Edinburgh University Students' Association (ex officio)
Ms Rebecca Gaukroger	Director of Student Recruitment and Admissions (ex officio)
Ms Shelagh Green	Director, Careers Service (co-opted member)
Professor Judy Hardy	Director of Teaching, School of Physics and Astronomy, CSE
Professor Tina Harrison	Assistant Principal (Academic Standards and Quality Assurance)
Dr Elaine Haycock-Stuart	Director of Learning and Teaching, School of Health in Social Science (co-opted member)
Ms Melissa Highton	Convener of Learning Technologies Advisory Group (ex officio)
Professor Peter Higgins	Representative of Social Responsibility and Sustainability
Professor Charlie Jeffery (Convener)	Senior Vice-Principal
Ms Tanya Lubicz-Nawrocka	Edinburgh University Students' Association, Academic Engagement Co-ordinator (ex officio)
Dr Antony Maciocia	Senior Lecturer, School of Mathematics, CSE (co-opted member)
Professor Anna Meredith	Director for Postgraduate Taught, CMVM
Professor Neil Mulholland	Dean of Postgraduate Studies (CAHSS)
Professor Graeme Reid	Dean of Learning and Teaching, CSE
Professor Neil Turner	Director of Undergraduate Teaching and Learning, CMVM
Mrs Philippa Ward (Secretary)	Academic Services
Mr Tom Ward	University Secretary's Nominee, Director of Academic Services (ex officio)

Apologies:

Professor Sian Bayne	Director of Centre for Research in Digital Education (co-opted member)
Ms Melissa Highton	Director of Learning, Teaching and Web Services Division (ex officio)
Mr John Lowrey	Dean of Undergraduate Studies (CAHSS)
Ms Nichola Kett	Academic Governance Representative, Academic Services
Dr Velda McCune	Deputy Director, Institute for Academic Development (Director's nominee) (ex officio)

In attendance:

Ms Angela Laurins	Library Learning Services Manager
Professor Susan Rhind	Assistant Principal Assessment and Feedback
Ms Theresa Sheppard	Academic Services

Mr Jeremy Upton

Director of Library and University Collections

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 25 January 2017 were approved.

3. Matters Arising

3.1 University Learning and Teaching Strategy

The Strategy had been published and an event to mark its launch would be held after the LTC meeting. Members noted that the next step for the Committee would be to develop an implementation plan for the Strategy.

3.2 Reporting Arrangements for Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) Advisory Group

It was reported that the MOOCs Advisory Group would aim to report annually to the January meeting of LTC.

3.3 PTES 2017: Institutional Questions and Start Date

The Committee was reminded that concerns had been raised at the previous meeting about the number of Library-related questions in the PTES 2017 question set. This had been discussed with the Student Surveys Unit and the Head of Library Academic Support, who had proposed that the questions should remain for 2017 but be reviewed for 2018. LTC had approved the question set and start date by correspondence of 14 February 2017.

For Discussion

4. Task Group to Review the Code of Practice for Tutors and Demonstrators

The paper was presented by Miss Theresa Sheppard, Academic Services, who was providing administrative support for the Researcher Experience Committee (REC) Task Group that was reviewing the Code of Practice for Tutors and Demonstrators. It was noted that the Group had met during Semester 1 2016/17 and had produced a new draft of the Code of Practice to which Schools and Colleges had been invited to make a formal response. LTC's views on the draft, and on the proposal that the document be re-framed as a Policy with the aim of it being implemented more consistently, were being sought.

The following was discussed:

- It was agreed that the document was clear and covered all of the key issues, although there may be benefit in gathering together within the document all information relating to PGR students who are tutors and demonstrators.
- Members were supportive of the proposal that the document be re-framed as a Policy.
- Consistency of implementation was the key priority. Members discussed the potential benefit for Schools of making clearer within the document that which was mandatory and that which was guidance.
- Members recognised the value of the general training for tutors and demonstrators provided by the Institute for Academic Development (IAD) to complement School-specific training and orientation.

The Committee also made the following specific comments regarding the draft:

- 2.1 – there would be benefit in clarifying the terms of employment for those students for whom tutoring or demonstrating was an expectation under the terms of their scholarship.
- 2.4 – more consistency around what tutors and demonstrators were and were not remunerated for was deemed essential.
- 2.7 – it was agreed that additional information should be included about the circumstances under which a principal supervisor might withhold permission for a postgraduate research student to undertake tutoring and demonstrating activities.
- 2.8 - it was agreed that more consistency around the maximum number of hours that tutors and demonstrators were permitted to work, whether or not they were on Tier 4 visas, was essential. While the Committee did not form a view on the appropriate maximum period, Edinburgh University Students' Association representatives indicated that they supported a higher limit than 6 hours per week.
- 5.2 – LTC supported the view that tutoring and demonstrating should be permitted at all taught levels, including taught Masters dissertation. However, the appointment process needed to be sufficiently rigorous to ensure that they were adequately qualified for the required level.
- 6.2 – the Committee was broadly supportive of the concept of providing mentoring for tutors and demonstrators, recognising that this was important both for the tutor's development and because of the significant impact the quality of tutoring and demonstrating could have on the undergraduate student experience. However, there would be considerable resourcing challenges around implementing a mentoring system, and these would require careful consideration.

5. Senate Committee Planning 2017/18

The Director of Academic Services introduced the paper and invited LTC to discuss priorities for the coming academic session. It was noted that steps were being taken to integrate the Senate Committees within the University's planning process more effectively, and that, going forwards, it would be important to be clear about the way in which any priorities identified related to the new Learning and Teaching Strategy.

The Colleges outlined the key learning and teaching priorities for their Schools. These included redesigning the curriculum, assessment (reviewing both the volume and nature of assessment) and feedback on assessment. However, the key concern for all three Colleges was growing student numbers and consequent pressures on suitable teaching accommodation. LTC's view was that there had been underinvestment in the teaching estate over a number of years, impacting on both the student and the staff experience. The Committee strongly endorsed the Senior Vice-Principal highlighting the importance of investment in the teaching estate during forthcoming Planning Round discussions.

Members discussed the potential to make better use of the existing teaching estate by looking again at timetabling and assessment methods. It was agreed that the Assistant Principal Assessment and Feedback would consider the feasibility of establishing a workstream to look at assessment methods and the value of examinations. The potential for this work to feed into the 'Portfolio' strand of the Student Recruitment Strategy implementation work was noted.

It was also agreed that the Director of the Learning, Teaching and Web Services Division of Information Services would be asked to provide details of proposed learning technology developments for 2017/18.

The Committee did not identify any other priorities for 2017-18 beyond those already set out in the paper.

Actions:

1. Assistant Principal Assessment and Feedback to consider the feasibility of establishing a workstream to consider assessment methods and the value of examinations.
2. Director of Learning, Teaching and Web Services Division to provide LTC with a report of proposed learning technology developments for 2017/18.

6. Feedback Quality Monitoring

LTC agreed that it was essential for Schools to be monitoring feedback locally and to be transparent about the way in which this was being done. It was noted that to date only 11 Schools had responded to a request to provide a brief update on plans for monitoring feedback turnaround times.

It was recognised that Course Evaluation Questionnaires (CEQs) would only be of value if participation rates were sufficiently high. Steps were being taken to increase Semester 2 participation.

Members discussed the existing 60% satisfaction target for the CEQ question '*Feedback so far has been helpful and informative*' and suggested that, since average satisfaction is more than 70%, Schools should focus their attention on courses with feedback satisfaction of less than 70% (rather than 60%).

The Assistant Principal (Academic Standards and Quality Assurance) would consider whether there was potential for Schools to report on feedback and turnaround times via the Programme Monitoring Form.

Action:

- 1) Assistant Principal Assessment and Feedback to ask the remaining Schools to provide updates on their plans for monitoring feedback turnaround times.
- 2) Assistant Principal Assessment and Feedback to consider asking Heads of Schools to focus their monitoring of feedback quality on those courses with satisfaction scores of less than 70%.
- 3) Assistant Principal (Academic Standards and Quality Assurance) to consider whether there is potential for Schools to report on feedback and turnaround times via the Programme Monitoring Form.

7. Resource List Service: Service Delivery and Policy

The paper was presented by the Director of Library and University Collections and the Library Learning Services Manager. The Committee was advised that providing all students with resource lists in a standard, accessible format would improve the student experience, make it easier for academic staff to manage the provision of course materials, give the Library greater visibility of the materials required to support learning and teaching, and reduce costs. Good progress had been made in this area, but further support was needed if the Resource List Service was going to be developed further.

In general, LTC was very supportive of the Service, and was keen to see increased uptake by Schools. However, it recognised that since the Service was at an early stage, the focus should be on awareness raising and encouraging staff to utilise the Service, rather than on developing a University-level policy on resource lists.

The following points were raised during the discussion:

- It noted that the Resource List Service supported the implementation of the Accessible and Inclusive Learning Policy (AILP).
- Resource lists were used more widely in some Schools than in others.

- It was good academic practice to ensure that a resource was available before adding it to a course resource list.
- There would be value in reminding Schools about the existence of the Service during the Course Rollover period.
- Awareness of the Service could also continue to be raised through the Teaching Matters website.
- There had been excellent uptake in the Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies, primarily because of the School's very proactive librarian who was a member of the School Learning and Teaching Committee and had promoted the Service.
- Academic staff were concerned about the amount of time involved in setting up resource lists using the Service, and there would therefore be benefit in the Library being clearer in its communications about the high level of support it could offer.
- LTC recognised that there was a lack of clarity over the resources the University would provide, and those that students were expected to provide. It endorsed the Library's proposal that Schools be asked to provide much clearer information about who was responsible for providing specific resources.

For Approval

8. Report of Higher Education Achievement Record (HEAR) Recommendation Panel

The paper would follow and would be considered by correspondence.

Action:

Secretary to circulate the paper for consideration by correspondence.

For Information

9. Student Recruitment Strategy: Update on Portfolio Development, Innovation and Review

Members were reminded that the University's Student Recruitment Strategy had been approved by Court in June 2016. Implementation of the Strategy was now underway, and wherever possible, this was being achieved through existing University groups.

In relation to the implementation of the 'Portfolio Development, Innovation and Review' strand of the Strategy, two key areas had been identified, one more visionary and the other, more operational. The more visionary area aimed to articulate what we understand as the Edinburgh degree experience and how we make the Learning and Teaching Strategy a lived experience for students. As such, it was considering the value of University-wide courses, research-led learning, SLICCs and similar initiatives, how these fit with the curriculum, and how they make the Edinburgh experience unique. Ways in which Edinburgh might be bolder in its offer and take full advantage of its four year undergraduate degree programmes were being considered. Further discussion on this topic would take place at the Senate Committees' Away Day.

The more operational area related to the assessment of the academic credentials of and business case for new degree programmes. LTC agreed that it was essential to have effective methods in place to assess new programmes in the early stages, and to be prepared to discontinue programmes if necessary. It would be possible to gather best practice in this area from those Colleges that already had well-established processes in place for reviewing business cases for new programmes, and the College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences' PGT Sustainability Review had developed a simple rubric for examining PGT programme costs. Members noted the importance of:

- assessing viability not only at programme level, but also at constituent course level;

- measuring success not only the basis of short-term uptake, but taking a broader view (for example, a programme may also be successful from a career destination point of view).

The Committee strongly supported the work that was being undertaken, noting that it related to sector-wide discussions about the value of the four year degree programme and the development of a subject-level Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF).

10. Arrangements for Consulting with Stakeholders on Learning, Teaching and Student Experience Matters

Members were advised that the paper provided some key principles and standard practices that Senate and the Senate Committees should adopt when consulting with Schools, Colleges and stakeholders. These had been approved by Central Management Group (CMG) at its meeting on 1 March 2017.

The Committee noted in particular that, where individuals had been appointed to committees or task groups to represent Colleges or Schools, it was important that they were able to represent the views of their constituencies and to have authority to make decisions on their behalf. It also recognised the importance of obtaining the views of Heads of Schools and Colleges when significant issues were being discussed.

Members agreed that there would be benefit in all proposal projects or initiatives outlining the planned approach to consultation in the proposal documentation. The importance of giving careful consideration to the format of consultation documents with a view to engaging the reader was also discussed.

11. Report from Knowledge Strategy Committee Meeting held on 20 January 2017

LTC noted the report.

12. Report from Learning and Teaching Policy Group

Members noted the report. In relation to the seventh bullet point, the Committee was advised that the handling and use of data regarding staffing would be considered at the next meeting of Academic Strategy Group.

13. Groups Reporting to Senate Learning and Teaching Committee, March 2017

The report was noted. Members were advised that the key changes were the addition of the Student Mental Health Implementation Group (agreed in May 2016) and the Student Disability Committee (agreed in March 2017). Oversight of Enhancement Themes would move to Quality Assurance Committee (QAC). It was noted that it would be important to establish arrangements for reporting to LTC on relevant elements of the Student Recruitment Strategy.

Action:

Director of Academic Services to discuss arrangements for reporting to LTC regarding relevant elements of the Student Recruitment Strategy.

14. Enhancement Themes Update

Members welcomed the 'Transitions Map' tabled which contained a summary of the University's work on the current Enhancement Theme, including plans for ensuring a legacy from the work.

The Committee was also advised that the 'Gearing Up for Transitions' conference had taken place the previous week and had proved extremely successful. Resources from the event were available on the 'Gearing Up 2017' website. It was hoped that resources could be made available

to continue running a similar conference (potentially on broader learning and teaching topics) on an annual basis.

15. Any Other Business

The Assistant Principal (Research-Led Learning) provided members with an update on the first meeting of the University-Wide Courses Task Group. LTC expressed strong support for the work.

DRAFT

The University of Edinburgh

Senate Learning and Teaching Committee

24 May 2017

Social Responsibility and Sustainability: Curricular and Co-Curricular Pathways

Executive Summary

This paper sets out a vision for the further integration of issues related to social responsibility and sustainability (SRS) into the wider cross-University curriculum/co-curriculum. It has been developed in discussion with a range of colleagues across the University with strong research interests in SRS, and builds on the Social Enterprise pathway being developed in 2016/17 as part of the University's Social Impact Pledge¹. A version of this paper was presented to, and endorsed by, the SRS committee at its meeting on 16 March 2017. The paper was also discussed by Learning and Teaching Policy Group on 13 April 2017. LTPG was broadly supportive of the proposals while suggesting some minor clarifications. While it has not proved possible to make these minor changes in time for the Committee's meeting, the presenter will highlight them verbally at the meeting.

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

Leadership in Learning

Action requested

For discussion and approval.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

These arrangements are set out in the paper.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

- 1. Resource implications (including staffing)**
Included in the paper
- 2. Risk**
Included in the paper
- 3. Equality and Diversity**
Included in the Paper
- 4. Freedom of information**
The paper is **open**

Originator of the paper

Professor Lesley McAra, Assistant Principal Community Relations.

¹ <http://www.communityscot.org.uk/social-impact-pledge/who-has-made-pledge/pledges-made-so-far/university-edinburgh/>

Social Responsibility and Sustainability: Curricular and Co-Curricular Pathways

Introduction

This paper sets out a vision for the further integration of issues related to social responsibility and sustainability (SRS) into the wider cross-University curriculum/co-curriculum. It has been developed in discussion with a range of colleagues across the University with strong research interests in SRS (see appended list), and builds on the Social Enterprise pathway being developed in 2016/17 as part of the University's Social Impact Pledge². A version of this paper was presented to, and endorsed by, the SRS committee at its meeting on 16th March 2017.

Background and strategic context

In January 2017, the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee agreed the final version of the *Learning and Teaching Strategy* (led by the Senior Vice-Principal). Two elements of this strategy are to: support a culture of active and engaged students by providing varied opportunities for independent and student-led learning within and beyond students' main programmes of study; and develop opportunities for experiential learning on campus, in the community, and in businesses and other organisations, nationally and internationally³. The University Strategic Plan⁴ (*Delivering Impact for Society*, 2016) highlights the qualities of the engagement that we should be seeking with external groups namely that: engagement should 'empower local communities'; and the 'city's local needs [should] influence our core activities'.

The University's strategic commitments align with those of the Scottish Government, in particular the ambition to build community participatory capacity (as specified in Part 10 of the Community Empowerment [Scotland] Act 2016⁵) and in the delivery of the National Outcomes related to SRS: 'we live in well-designed sustainable places'; 'we have strong resilient and supportive communities'; 'we value and enjoy our built and natural environment'; and 'we reduce the local and global environmental impact of our consumption and production'⁶.

Within the University two working groups have been set up under the aegis of the Assistant Principal Research-Led Learning, which are reviewing curricular wide courses in the University and ways of better embedding research into learning and teaching (with the aim of up-skilling students beyond their core discipline, and enhancing their employability). Additionally these groups are reviewing extant barriers to cross-University delivery of courses including: income attribution models; mechanisms for course approval; and practical issues relating to boards of examiners. The pathways model, however, offers some quick wins to the University, given that it draws on existing courses and modes of pedagogy, and can be mobilised immediately. The Social Enterprise pathway has already resulted in an exponential growth in activity including: new courses to be run by the Business School from 2017/18, led by Winston Kwon (Chancellor's Fellow); new/extended student social entrepreneurial projects (for example ECO-SET – solar hubs in refugee camps, and

² <http://www.communityscot.org.uk/social-impact-pledge/who-has-made-pledge/pledges-made-so-far/university-edinburgh/>

³ <http://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/agendapapers20170125.pdf>

⁴ <http://www.ed.ac.uk/governance-strategic-planning/strategic-planning/strategic-plan>

⁵ http://www.legislation.gov.uk/asp/2015/6/pdfs/asp_20150006_en.pdf

⁶ <http://www.gov.scot/About/Performance/scotPerforms/outcomes>

ETC.2 a partnership between IKEA and ECA fashion students); and strong interest from potential sponsors – currently being nurtured by Development and Alumni.

Stanford University one of our global competitors with a high profile in public service, currently offers a suite of ‘Cardinal Courses’ for students, delivered through its Haas Centre, aimed at contributing to a more ‘just and sustainable world’⁷. Our proposed pathways have been constructed to link more firmly into world leading research programmes. They will give all students across the University (no matter their degree programme) the opportunity to learn more about social responsibility and sustainability and, crucially, build core competencies to enable affirmative action, as part of their Edinburgh experience.

The pathways model: proposal

It is proposed that the pathways model be extended from social enterprise to include four additional themes linked to SRS: sustainability; global citizenship; leadership through innovation; and design for well-being. The stages of the new pathways models are set out in appendix 1 below. As with the social enterprise pathway (also included in appendix 1), the models aim to align extant activities and courses more effectively in support of a truly developmental approach through the student life-cycle. They involve: a series of workshops for students interested in learning more about SRS issues; a curated portfolio of courses building skills and knowledge which can be taken as electives within degree programmes and opportunities to undertake SLICC project work (based on reflective learning and a portfolio mode of assessment, led by Dr Simon Riley – SLICCs Director) linked to thematic activities; a programme of placements and mentoring, with involvement from Alumni; a capstone community-based project (undertaken over one year as part of an Edinburgh Award) supervised by the Assistant Principal Community Relations in collaboration with SRS.

The pathway is intended to be flexible and students can opt in and out at any point. During welcome week the pathways will be showcased at the Academic Fair and via SRS activities. A central register of students engaging with the pathways programme will be held by the community engagement programme manager in the SRS department, who will also help coordinate mentoring and placement opportunities. Participation in the elective courses, including SLICCs, will require the approval of the student’s Personal Tutor. The capstone project will be undertaken as part of the co-curriculum. Accreditation will be as follows:

Table 1: Accreditation for Pathways

Pathway element	Recorded achievement
Individual courses	20 credits level 8 (appears on transcript)
SLICC	20 credits level 7/8 (appears on transcript)
Capstone project	Community Engagement Edinburgh Award (recorded on HEAR)

⁷ <https://haas.stanford.edu>

Pathway in SRS - 1 course (pass) - Mentoring/placement -Capstone project	SRS Edinburgh Award – Pathway in... (recorded on HEAR)
---	--

The students who have completed the capstone project (either as a stand-alone project or as part of an overall pathway) will receive their awards at the annual SRS Awards Ceremony.

Resources

The pathways can be met within existing resources, although they will require articulation between a number of key appointments across the University (including the Assistant Principals Community Relations and Research-Led Learning, the Director of SLICCs and the Course Organisers of the portfolio courses) as well as the mobilisation of support for the models from Schools; the Department for Social Responsibility and Sustainability; and the Careers Service (specifically re the Edinburgh Award components).

The named courses highlighted in appendix 1 are currently open to all students, other than *Learning from the Lives of Others* which is a quota course run under tutelage of the School of Health in Social Science. The Head of that School, however, has indicated a willingness to extend the number of places on this course if needed. SLICCs are currently capped, and these would be available on a first-come-first-served basis (again with PT approval). Given that students will only require to take one named course or SLICC as part of the SRS Edinburgh Pathway Award (see table 1), there will always be at least one of the specified courses available – over time, as new SRS courses are developed across the University, so can they be integrated into the relevant pathway portfolio.

The mentoring and placement components of the pathway will align with Development and Alumni's current project aimed at creating a digital platform to support alumni connections (which will enable Alumni to specify if they would like to offer mentoring to students) and with opportunities available via the Edinburgh Voluntary Organisations' Council (coordinated by Ian Brooke, Deputy Chief Executive).

Risk Management

The University and its distributed communities have much to gain from a campus which nurtures partnership working and student experiential learning. Indeed there could be significant reputational risks should we choose not to develop an integrated support strategy for such activity. Because it builds on existing strengths, the pathways set out below, are low in risk and offer efficiencies in terms of resource deployment. Aligning an Edinburgh education with a wider SRS and community engagement strategy will play a key role in developing a greater sense of identity and purpose amongst our student body, with attendant benefits to the community at large.

Equality & Diversity

An Equality Impact Assessment has been undertaken. Greater support for an integrated programme of SRS learning and teaching accessible to all students will enhance equality of opportunity and make a positive contribution to the wider community.

Next steps/implications

Once final approval is given, advertising and recruitment to the pathways activities will be undertaken during welcome week by the SRS Department in collaboration with the AP Community Relations and the new community engagement programme manager. The Assistant Principal Community Relations will be responsible for overseeing the implementation of the pathways, including consultation with the Schools providing their course-based components and the Careers Service. She will also work closely with EUSA in terms of communicating and supporting the implementation of the pathways.

Consultation

The pathways have been discussed with the following individuals and groups:

Prof Pete Higgins (Moray House)
Prof Andy Kerr (ECCI)
Prof John Lowry (ECA)
Prof Jonathan Silvertown (Biological Sciences)
Prof Karen Forbes (ECA)
Dr Winston Kwon (Business School)
Prof Stephen Osbourne (Business School)
Prof Dave Reay (AP Global Environment and Society)
Dr Liz Grant (AP Global Health)
Prof Fiona McKay HoS School of Social and Political Science)
Prof Charlotte Clark (HoS Health in Social Science)
Dr Simon Riley (Medicine, Director of SLICCs)

Dr James Stewart (School of Social and Political Science)
Prof Ewan Klein (Informatics)
Prof Wendy Loretto (HoS Business School)
Gavin McCabe (Careers Service)
Shelagh Green (Careers Service)
Dr Andy Cross (Geosciences)
Prof Paolo Quattrone (Business School)

CAHSS Employability Network
Global Environmental Academy Management Board
CAHSS KE Network
Edinburgh Public Engagement Forum
Community of Practice (Community Engagement)

Author and presenter

Professor Lesley McAra
Assistant Principal Community Relations
April 2017



Appendix 1: Social Responsibility and Sustainability: Curricular and Co-Curricular Pathways

Key stages	Social Enterprise	Sustainability	Global Citizenship	Leadership through Innovation	Design for Well-being
1. Awareness raising	Annual 'Taster' workshop series in collaboration with SRS and linking to events run by the Business School, ERI and the Global Academies	Annual 'Taster' workshop series in collaboration with SRS and linking to events run by the Global Environment Academy	Annual 'Taster' workshop series in collaboration with SRS and linking to events run by the Global Justice Academy	Annual 'Taster' workshop series in collaboration with SRS and linking to events run by the Business School and Informatics	Annual 'Taster' workshop series in collaboration with SRS and linking to events run by ECA, the Global Academies in Environment, and Health
2. Knowledge, skills development and 'mindset' Students with a strong interest in one of the SRS pathways themes select from a suite of courses as part of electives within their curriculum *, for additional credit*, or on an auditing (attendance	(i) Our Changing World (level 8) * † (ii) SRS online course (level 8) * † (iii) Social enterprise (level 8) * † (iv) Fundamentals of Innovation-Driven Entrepreneurship(level 8) * † (v) Learning from the Lives of Others (level 8) * † (vi) SLICC on social enterprise: reflective research project on a theme linked to SE ; or reflective learning from involvement in EUSA volunteering initiative linked to social enterprise (at level 7/8)* At a more advanced level enable:	(i) Our Changing World (level 8) * † (ii) SRS online course (level 8) * † (iii) Sustainability, Society and Environment (level 8) * † (iv) Sustainable Development 1a: Introducing Sustainable Development (level 8)* * † (v) Sustainable Development 2a: Perspectives on Sustainable Development(level 8) * † (vi) SLICC on sustainability: reflective research project on a theme linked to sustainability ; or reflective learning from involvement in EUSA volunteering initiative linked to sustainability (at level 7/8)* At a more advanced level enable: (vii) Placements with NGOs, with reflective learning as part of dissertation research at UG or PGT level	(i) Our Changing World (level 8) * † (ii) SRS online course (level 8)* † (iii) Introduction to Community Education (level 8) * † (iv) Politics in a Changing World: An Introduction (level 8) * † (v) International Development, Aid and Humanitarianism (level 8) * † (vi) SLICC on citizenship: reflective research project on a theme linked to citizenship; or reflective learning from involvement in EUSA volunteering initiative linked to citizenship (at level 7/8)* At a more advanced level enable: (vii) Placements with NGOs, with reflective learning as part	(i) Our Changing World (level 8)* † (ii) SRS online course (level 8) * † (iii) Fundamentals of Innovation-Driven Entrepreneurship(level 8) * † (iv) Innovation and Entrepreneurship (level 8) * † (v) Introduction to Entrepreneurship (level 8) * † (vi) SLICC on leadership through innovation: reflective research project on a theme linked to innovation ; or reflective learning from involvement in EUSA volunteering initiative linked to innovation (at level 7/8)* At a more advanced level enable: (vii) Placements with NGOs, with reflective learning as	(i) Our Changing World (level 8) * † (ii) SRS online course (level 8) * † (iii) Data, Design and Society(level 8) * † (iv) Contemporary Issues in Health and Wellbeing (level 8) * † (v) Learning from the Lives of Others (level 8) * † (vi) SLICC on design for well-being: reflective research project on a theme linked to design; or reflective learning from involvement in EUSA volunteering initiative linked to design (at level 7/8) At a more advanced level enable: (vii) Placements with NGOs, with reflective learning as part

LTC 16/17 5 B

e only) basis†.	(vii) Placements with NGOs, with reflective learning as part of dissertation research at UG or PGT level Further opportunities: (i) Utilise EUSA's Volunteering database to provide volunteering opportunities linked to SE issues (ii) Reflective learning in the co-curriculum via the Edinburgh award	Further opportunities: (i) Utilise EUSA's Volunteering database to provide volunteering opportunities linked to sustainability issues (ii) Reflective learning in the co-curriculum via the Edinburgh award	of dissertation research at UG or PGT level Further opportunities: (i) Utilise EUSA's Volunteering database to provide volunteering opportunities linked to sustainability issues (ii) Reflective learning in the co-curriculum via the Edinburgh award	part of dissertation research at UG or PGT level Further opportunities: (i) Utilise EUSA's Volunteering database to provide volunteering opportunities linked to sustainability issues (ii) Reflective learning in the co-curriculum via the Edinburgh award	of dissertation research at UG or PGT level Further opportunities: (i) Utilise EUSA's Volunteering database to provide volunteering opportunities linked to sustainability issues (ii) Reflective learning in the co-curriculum via the Edinburgh award
3. Mentoring and placements	Formal scheme based on a mentoring bank from local and global NGOs with possibility of short-term placements and/or shadowing	Formal scheme based on a mentoring bank from local and global NGOs with possibility of short-term placements and/or shadowing	Formal scheme based on a mentoring bank from local and global NGOs with possibility of short-term placements and/or shadowing	Formal scheme based on a mentoring bank from local and global NGOs with possibility of short-term placements and/or shadowing	Formal scheme based on a mentoring bank from local and global NGOs with possibility of short-term placements and/or shadowing
4. Capstone project	Group project co-produced with community groups	Group project co-produced with community groups	Group project co-produced with community groups	Project co-produced with community groups	Group project co-produced with community groups

The University of Edinburgh

Senate Learning and Teaching Committee

24 May 2017

**Report from Director of Learning, Teaching and Web Services Division, Information Services Group
on ongoing and planned learning technology developments**

Executive Summary

This paper provides an update on ongoing work by ISG in the area of Learning, Teaching and the Student Experience and give an indication of planned learning technology developments for 2017/18.

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

Aligns with:

- University Strategic Objective of Leadership in Learning.
- University Development Theme of Digital Transformation and Data.
- University's Learning and Teaching Strategy.
- Information Services Group Strategic Planning theme: Learning, Teaching and the Student Experience

Information Services Group (ISG) proposed a programme of work through the last planning round to deliver a comprehensive portfolio of projects related to Learning, Teaching and Student Experience. This will be achieved through a combination of extending current services and delivering new projects and services. This paper outlines the broad areas of work being undertaken in 2016/17 and highlights key funded projects.

The ISG 10 year programme for this area will transform both digital and physical learning and teaching spaces; providing high quality opportunities for staff and student interactions. We will promote a digital first approach, driving forward the quality and consistency of the student digital experience.

Action requested

For information and discussion.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

n/a

Resource / Risk / Compliance implications

1. Resource implications (including staffing)

There are no additional resource implication not considered within the remit of the projects listed in this paper.

2. Risk assessment

There are no additional risks not considered within the remit of the projects listed in this paper.

3. Equality and Diversity

There are no additional equality and diversity impacts not considered within the remit of the projects listed in this paper.

4. Freedom of information

This paper is **open**

Originator of the paper

Melissa Highton, Director of Learning, Teaching and Web Services Division, Information Services Group

1st May 2017

Update on learning technology developments for 2016-19

Background, Context and Strategic Alignment

1. ISG work with partners from across the University to provide an on-campus student experience where technology enhances and optimises learning and teaching, and to establish and embed a framework for the development of digital literacy. Collectively, these measures ensure we meet student and staff expectations for world class learning. Our services make a key contribution to the University strategic objective of Leadership in Learning, ensuring that students' learning and progress are supported by the latest in learning technologies and that we are at the forefront of digital education. We provide opportunities for students and staff to develop the digital skills needed for work, study and teaching.
2. ISG work aligns with the Digital Transformation development theme within the University's Strategic Plan 2016, by supporting and enabling every educator to be a digital educator and every student to be a digital student. We aim where possible to provide and use systems which integrate with each other to provide a consistent student experience and useful data upon which to make decisions about learning and teaching planning.
3. The ISG planning round includes Learning, Teaching and Student Experience as one of a number of programmes that enable more strategic use of information technology. In 2016/17 a total of £1.5 million was awarded to this programme. The bulk of the investment has been used to deliver significant improvements across the AV estate.
4. ISG aim to align learning technology projects and services with school and college learning and teaching plans where possible. Representatives from our learning and teaching teams are available to attend school learning and teaching committees on request and are able to provide updates on any of our work areas. We invite colleagues to attend monthly Learning Technology Showcase & Networking Events to keep up to date and feed into discussions about new services.
5. In support of the work of the University's Space Strategy Group, ISG enable the delivery of a centralised model for the management and maintenance of the University's "general" teaching space. We target a single support model with a dedicated helpline and technical support staff. We provide regular preventative maintenance and project managed rolling replacement programmes. This enhances the ability to roll out strategic, large scale system changes, such as lecture recording. ISG learning technology work supports the delivery of the University Learning and Teaching Strategy. In particular there are a number of areas in which ISG has identified significant projects and key performance indicators for achievement.

Learning and Teaching Strategy areas	ISG activities
2.5 Committing to the creative use of digital technologies in our teaching and assessment where appropriate whether online, blended or on-campus	ISG provide virtual learning environment platforms (VLEs) , computer aided assessments, in-classroom technologies, media asset management, media production, learning design, web design, interactive content, maker spaces, Wikimedia projects and learning technology consultancy services.

	<p>In 2016/17 critical new demands in such areas as automated assessment, eExams, feedback & assessment and student analytics are high priority.</p> <p>We aim to build communities of practice which encourage innovation and diffuse good ideas across the University. We do this by organizing showcase events, training sessions, facilitated networks, conferences and staff development sessions, and by producing and publishing case studies of innovative teaching practice on our platforms and social media.</p>
<p>2.6 Utilising our world-class libraries and collections in innovative and research-led ways to enrich our curriculum</p>	<p>ISG support the provision of online reading lists and integration of learning technology tools with Library systems to ensure that resources can be easily added to VLEs and playlists.</p> <p>ISG host a growing collection of born-digital diverse teaching and learning resources for sharing and re-use and we aim to support colleagues in being open content literate about the licensing and sharing of these online.</p>
<p>4.2 Building on and growing the University's portfolio of online learning programmes and using them to innovate with new approaches to learning and teaching</p>	<p>In support of on campus and distance learners we are on target to have 30% of the applications available on the Open Labs PCs available online</p> <p>By 2020 we aim to have 90% of all courses using one of two centrally supported VLEs; 70% of fully online courses use learning design model for excellence and 70% of courses producing or using open content or media.</p>
<p>5.6 Reviewing and enhancing the way that our physical and digital estates support high quality learning and teaching and interaction between staff and students</p>	<p>During 2016-17 we prepared for implementation of University lecture recording service from 2017-20. This will bring significant enhancements for students to support revision, study and those most in need of the opportunity to listen again or revisit lecture content.</p> <p>We continue to invest in the student digital experience in line with recommendations following the <i>Headscape</i> review and those under discussion via the Service Excellence Programme.</p> <p>ISG manage 400 teaching spaces across the university. We aim to have 100% of general teaching spaces digital enabled and centrally supported and 100% of general teaching space enabled for lecture recording by 2020.</p>
<p>5.7 Exploring whether learning analytics systems can help Personal Tutors provide effective academic support and enhance learning</p>	<p>ISG deliver pilot projects (2016-18) to understand where learning analytics approaches could be useful within the University. We also include data exchange, retention and management plans for all our new systems.</p>

<p>6.7 Pursuing the aspiration that every educator is a digital educator, and that all teaching staff are supported in the appropriate use of the full breadth of learning technologies</p>	<p>ISG provide staff development programmes and training for professional development for academic staff and professional accreditation for learning technology support staff.</p> <p>All staff and students are supported to develop their skills and know how to be lifelong learners for more skills in the future. Digital skills provision aims to improve the student experience. We provide a rich set of existing online resources for flexible learning. We strive for service excellence: our trainers are trained, our programme is extensive and up to date, our rooms are modern, our delivery is flexible and evaluated. We aim for digital skills training uptake in Schools and planning units of at least 75%</p>
---	--

Projects for Blended Learning, Digital Skills, Online Learning, Teaching Spaces, Assessment and Feedback

VLE consolidation for UG and ODL

6. ISG leverage opportunities to promote the strategic market advantage in being excellent in digital education, distance learning, MOOCs and online CPD, with the aim of developing a sustainable capability in digital education. We work with partners from across the University to establish a framework for digital literacy and the on-campus student experience to be one where technology enhances and optimises learning and teaching, to ensure we meet student and staff expectations for world class learning.
7. In support of growth in ODL and a consistent student digital experience, ISG is undertaking a significant VLE consolidation and resilience project, working with academic programme teams to consolidate a number of the bespoke VLEs that exist within the institution into the two centrally support platforms, Learn and Moodle. This project will address specific improvements in the student experience in key areas such as Undergraduate Medicine, as well as ensuring much of the more general investment being made in VLE resilience, robustness, user experience, learning analytics and other areas are available to all our student community.
8. Simplification in this area should also deliver some efficiency benefits for administration and support of academic programmes in the medium to long term. This work is proceeding with care and through a close working relationship with academic programme teams to ensure that there is no detrimental impact on existing students as part of this transition. Several online distance programmes in particular also have mature processes which inform the process. Consolidating all teaching activities into the two central VLEs will further increase requirements for robustness, resilience and support of these platforms. Options are being scoped for improved resilience, maintenance and availability and funding in future years is likely to be required.

9. Course teams from across the University have been migrating their course content and establishing new, well designed online spaces with enhanced usability for students. After 1.5 years of investment in VLE Consolidation activities, we have reduced the number of VLEs from 15 to 8, and are targeting a reduction down to 2 by the end of 2020.
10. The University is currently distinctive amongst peers in not having guidelines for VLE minimum standards of use. During 2017/18 ISG will begin projects to explore how the student experience can be enhanced by consistent support offered via tools in the VLEs.
11. In order to deliver a consistent student experience we are on target to have 30% of the applications available on the Open Labs PCs made available online through the new 'Apps to User Devices' service.

Lecture Recording

12. The largest learning and teaching project outlined in the ISG plan is to provide a fit for purpose centrally supported lecture recording service and significantly scale up the use of lecture recording across the institution. In addition to the £3.25m Lecture Recording capital spend approved by the University Court in September 2016, ISG will spend a further £0.2m annually in 2016-19 in support of the programme. This system will deliver a new modern and comprehensive service in all 400 University lecture theatres and seminar rooms.
13. The scope of the Lecture Recording programme is significant and complex, with many stakeholders, and consultations to date around policy development have highlighted the strength of appetite for information and reassurance amongst colleagues.

Teaching Spaces

14. Delivering a high quality digital-enabled teaching space estate requires significant continual investment in technology, support and innovation. The AV and IT equipment within our teaching spaces is in constant use due to the increased usage of electronic delivery alongside ever increasing room utilisation. A continued recurrent investment is required to continue the replacement programme and ensure the estate is supported & maintained for the staff and student experience.
15. A responsive support model and regular maintenance is essential to keep disruptions to a minimum. This will provide the necessary on-site support, spares and license costs to ensure quick classroom support and facilitate regular maintenance of what is anticipated to be a heavy use building. This is in keeping with our strategy to centralise as much support as possible to avoid the inconsistencies in service delivery that undermine student and staff experience.
16. Delivering a high quality digital teaching space estate requires significant continual investment in technology, support and innovation. In 2016/17 £1m is being invested in improving our teaching spaces. The timescales for the replacement of audio visual and IT systems across our campuses vary depending on system size and complexity, but an average system is at its best within its first four years. To ensure a high quality user

experience and to make the most of new innovative technology it is a recognised standard that these systems should be upgraded every six years. The age and quality of these systems vary greatly across our campuses due to historic funding restrictions. Over time this has built up a technology rich, highly utilised teaching estate with an overall equipment replacement value of ~£8m.

17. The 2016/17 investment has enabled ISG to take ownership of an additional 103 teaching spaces in 2016, we can now provide management and support of all 316 general teaching spaces across the George Square, the King's Building's and Holyrood campuses. This centralisation project enables us to address a lack of investment in some spaces previously owned by Schools and standardise the level of technical support and maintenance provided. The 2016/17 funding for an additional 2.0 FTE of technical support staff required to support the additional spaces has been met by the three Colleges.

Digital Skills

18. ISG provide an extensive range of digital skills development opportunities for all staff and students. The programme offers over 300 classroom-based events every year, complimented by an extensive catalogue of online learning resources. Events are designed by the Digital Skills & Training team in collaboration with subject experts, and delivered by a pool of over 40 trainers from across ISG.
19. We offer tailored events designed in collaboration with Schools to meet specific requirements. Topic-focused programmes for internal and external audiences (e.g. code sprints and hackathons, Wikipedia editathons, 23 Things for Digital Knowledge, Future Teacher Programme, Using Online Assessment, DIY Film School, Using Open Educational Resources, Writing for the Web); online videos and guides developed in-house and hosted on Media Hopper and Learn, and an extensive video library provided by Lynda.com.
20. In 2015/16 ISG purchased a three-year campus subscription to Lynda.com, an extensive library of high quality video courses in digital, technology, creative and business skills. The investment in Lynda.com has transformed the way we offer digital skills training and hugely increased our capacity for digital skills development, continuously developing the digital culture within the University. It has enabled us to offer flexible learning to both campus and distance students in a broader and deeper range of digital skills subjects than we previously had the capacity and facilities to provide.
21. The Lynda.com digital skills for staff and students programme was rolled out during June 2016 and is fast becoming a huge success. By the end of January 2017 we had 5,000 unique active users across the University and are confident of reaching our initial target of 10,000 digital skills courses taken within 2016/17 well ahead of time.
22. ISG have invested in enabling single sign-on for all staff and students and developing management information reporting using our Business Intelligence reporting tools. This will allow data from Lynda.com to be combined with information in our existing corporate systems to show at relatively granular levels of detail what courses are being used and by which areas of the organisation. Information can also be combined with existing skills training attendance information and it will be possible to benchmark engagement across Schools and Support Groups and deploy resources accordingly. Lynda is also integrated with DiscoverEd.

23. We evaluate our ISG digital skills programme using attendee questionnaires after each event, acting on feedback to make improvements and expanding our programme. The usage metrics available from Lynda.com enable us to identify popular areas for development amongst our users and identify gaps for future development and places where face to face training can really add value. The UK HE User Group provides a platform for universities to influence the Lynda.com product roadmap, and as a result EndNote and Research Methods courses have recently been released.
24. ISG Digital Skills training team also support major projects, managing and delivering high-volume rollout training and online resources underpinning the introduction of new technologies to the University. These have recently included the introduction of the new Media Hopper and Lecture Recording services, as well as comprehensive training and support for the rollout of online marking within CAHSS.
25. ISG have invested three new training rooms opened in October 2016 in Argyle House, offering flexible space for technical training. Two rooms feature desks with dual displays, allowing the user to view both their computer feed and the tutor's feed simultaneously. The third room is a collaborative space, with four group tables with flip down multi-use work stations, allowing for the use of the built-in computers, the user's own mobile device or a clear desk space for writing. In all rooms, users are able to share their work by wirelessly projecting their mobile devices and desktop computers onto any of the large display screens.
26. A maker space in the Main Library opened in spring 2017, providing staff and students with a place to learn through experience with resources to work on innovative ideas and projects related to making, whilst supporting personal development and improving creative and technical skills. A variety of tools such as Arduinos and Raspberry Pis, as well as 3D printers and scanners are offered, with workshops for students and staff interested in making. Branded as 'uCreate Studio', this is a multi-functional space that can be used for in-curriculum teaching as well as extra-curricular activities. Over the next few months we will be installing new technologies in the space to broaden the range of activities that can take place in there. We also continue to invest in the Media Hopper Service which provides colleagues and students with a platform and tools for creative, shared use of media assets.
27. ISG is also promoting the development and recognition of professional skills for key learning technology staff across the institution. All the ISG Digital Skills team members now have training certification, awarded by the British Institute for Learning and Development. We are supporting a first cohort of 20 learning technology staff in achieving their Certified Member of the Association of Learning Technologists (CMALT) award in 2017.

Tools for Assessment and Feedback

28. Online assessment and feedback has been an area of strategic importance for some years and ISG continue to invest in this area. £0.035m has been allocated to support key requirements in the College of Science and Engineering, including the pilot of an online essay-based examination system (ExamOnline) in Biological Sciences and the integration of the open-source 'STACK' assessment tool with the Learn VLE in the School of Maths. Integration of STACK has the potential to save the School £0.014m per year in license fees, and save students money as they will no longer have to buy online content along with their core textbooks. ISG has also invested in additional staffing capacity to support the College

of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences rollout of fully online marking and feedback to students, the College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine for the rollout of the Speedwell assessment system in Veterinary Medicine, and the procurement of a new assessment solution for Undergraduate Medicine.

Enablers – underpinning the strategic funding and projects

29. In our current planning within ISG, we have concentrated on the next three years of our 10 year programme, specifically on adjustments to items already agreed in the 2016/19 planning round and on emerging new areas for investment. We have focused on those items that are critical to the University in order to achieve its strategic goals.
30. The University's strategic target of 10,000 paid distance learners will not be achieved within next 5 years if we continue with the current approach. Our distance learning is not scalable and margins are thin or difficult to determine. Significant investment in distance learning at scale will leverage the geographic scalability of the existing external MOOC platforms to deliver formal paid accredited courses. Continued recurrent investment is also needed to ensure the quality of our AV in teaching spaces across the estate.

Governance

31. Work across the Learning, Teaching and Student Experience area is very broad and there are a number of governance mechanisms in place to guide ISG work:
 - Teaching space priorities are identified through a combination of consultation with Schools, consideration of hardware age and the amount of support calls received. Annual plans are reported to the Estates Committee and the Space Strategy Group.
 - Large strategic projects and services typically have their own boards for governance. For example, the Lecture Recording project is a complex programme containing multiple strands of project work. A project board is in place for the procurement phase and a programme board is being established to govern implementation and rollout.
 - Progress across all projects is reported monthly to the IS Senior Management Team with processes in place to scrutinise projects flagged as having encountered challenges.
 - Progress for specific projects is also reported to Senate Committees as appropriate, including Learning and Teaching Committee and Knowledge Strategy Committee, either as part of larger ISG strategic project updates, or standalone papers.
32. Several of the areas of work in learning technology practice require the creation of new enabling policies. To provide additional capacity within the required timescale, ISG has employed an Educational Technology Policy Officer at 0.5FTE to work in partnership with colleagues in Academic Services.

The University of Edinburgh
Learning and Teaching Committee

24 May 2017

Report from the Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey working group

Executive Summary

This paper is a report from the Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES) working group which discussed how the information from PTES could be used more strategically across the University. The report contains recommendations from the working group.

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

This paper aligns with the University's current strategic goal of Excellence in Education, and the current strategic theme of Outstanding Student Experience

Action requested

The committee is asked to discuss the recommendations, and endorse where appropriate.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

The report indicates which groups / departments across the University will be responsible for different recommendations. Those departments will be responsible for implementation and communication as appropriate.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. Resource implications (including staffing)

Resource implications will depend upon the discussions at LTC

2. Risk assessment

No risks

3. Equality and Diversity

The paper discusses the Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey, and aims to encourage dissemination, and reflection upon PTES which will enhance the experience for all students. The recommendations are not anticipated to raise any negative equality implications. Since the recommendations do not constitute significant changes to policy or procedure, a formal Equality Impact Assessment is not required.

4. Freedom of information

The paper is open

LTC: 24.05.17
H/02/25/02

LTC 16/17 5 D

Key words

PTES; NSS; Postgraduate; student experience

Originator of the paper

Dr Donna Murray. Head of Taught Student Development, Institute for Academic Development

16th May 2017

Report from the Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES) working group

Members:

Chair – Dr Donna Murray (IAD)

College representatives – Dr Andy Hancock; Dr Emma Hunter; Dr Bjoern Franke; Professor Anna Meredith;

Student representative – Georgina Hill

Student Systems and Administration representative – Joshua Stapp

Communications and Marketing representative – Philip Graham

Academic Services representative – Tom Ward

Student Recruitment and Admissions and/or International Office – Liz Dobson-McKittrick

Governance and Strategic Planning (GaSP) representative – Tracey Slaven

IAD support – Julie Daubenspeck

Summary:

The working group was formed by LTC, and asked to review use of the Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES). The group met twice, and has produced recommendations which are outlined in this report.

Remit:

The group comprised College representatives (nominated by the colleges), and representatives from central units such as Academic Services, and Government and Strategic Planning.

The group was asked to make recommendations on the following areas:

- Practicalities of building PTES into School planning processes
- Embedding PTES results in normal QA processes
- Ways to include PTES findings and feedback in arrangements for, and content of, communication with students and staff
- Ways to include PTES in market assessment and promotion
- Promotion of the analysis and use of PTES results (both free text and quantitative results) by programmes; Schools; and support services to better understand and enhance learning, and the student experience

Background:

Work has recently been undertaken across the University in order to understand the Taught PG student voice; highlight some of the key trends; and outline future considerations. The University's PTES results are generally very positive, and compare well to comparable institutions. Although the overall figures for satisfaction are not higher in real terms than the equivalent National Student Survey (NSS) questions, the results do position the University favourably in the area of PGT provision. This success comes despite NSS being the priority for time and resource, and at a time when the PGT landscape is changing rapidly. Overall PGT numbers have risen sharply in the last few years, and the University has made significant progress in development of online programmes. These changes could have been very challenging for the student experience, however our PTES results have been maintained at a high level which indicates that at a PGT level students are responding positively to the learning environment.

Further changes are likely, with increasing student numbers at a PGT level, and suggestions that PTES may be replaced with a sector-wide survey equivalent to the NSS. This may mean PTES becomes mandatory with results being public.

Initial work undertaken by IAD looking at student perceptions of NSS and PTES questions on assessment and feedback indicates that the PTES questions allow students to reflect more thoroughly on their experience, and consider feedback in a broader sense. This is a strength of PTES, and may be a factor in why our results at PGT level are more positive (compared to the sector) than for NSS. Additionally, teaching at PGT level is an experience which is valued by many of the University's staff as a way to implement research-informed teaching, and is vital to supporting students' development as independent researchers. Increasing student numbers at PGT level has the potential to increase the synergy between research and teaching, however students often value the smaller class sizes at PGT level so it will be necessary to manage any changes effectively to maintain student satisfaction, particularly if scaling up ODL programmes.

Finally, the external funding environment for PGT study is changing, and this may have an impact (positive or negative) upon student numbers, and widening participation at a PG level.

The group's discussions are outlined below, with a table of recommendations.

Discussions:

The group had far-ranging discussions, and became aware of the need to retain the focus on PTES in the context of student experience rather than covering the whole of taught postgraduate provision. However, the discussion did raise more general points regarding understanding and managing student expectations which would be worth further consideration by the Learning and Teaching Committee.

The group was concerned that any recommendations do not contravene PTES guidance, this was checked by GaSP who confirmed that if the University's standard procedures for use of data were followed then PTES could be used as outlined in the recommendations.

An email was sent out to Schools asking for information on how PTES was being used in their planning. Response was limited, however from this sample it would appear that Schools are using the data in their discussions. The extent of use varied widely between Schools, and the group feel that it would be helpful for case studies to be developed to show how PTES data could be used. In addition, it would be helpful to run a practise-sharing event in this area.

One theme of discussion was communication of PTES, both to students, and to staff and committees. The group felt that the University could do more to let students know the value of PTES, and update them on any changes which happen at a School or wider-University level in response to PTES results. With regard to staff, the group noted that the guidance staff receive about NSS is very comprehensive, and contains email templates to make it as easy as possible for consistent messages to go out. The group suggests that similar guidance is prepared for PTES.

In terms of general awareness of PTES, the group suggested Schools could promote PTES to students on the following timeline:

- Week 0 – mention PTES (and any relevant changes which have occurred as a result of PTES) at Welcome Week events
- 2 weeks before the survey opens – tell students it will be opening soon
- During the open period – use email templates to promote PTES; encourage dissertation supervisors, programme directors, and personal tutors to remind students about the value the University places on their feedback
- Graduation ceremony – include reference to PTES results in the graduation address, thanking students for participating

This would utilise currently existing communication channels rather than being an administrative burden on Schools.

In terms of timing, the group noted that PTES opens at a point where students have not yet started their dissertations, and this may be reflected in the low response rate for the dissertation questions (NB: this doesn't apply to our part-time and online/distance cohort who will usually have a year to work on their dissertation). The start date for PTES can be moved, although the closing date can't change, and the group suggests moving the start date by one month to bring the main publicity for PTES in alignment to a time when students will be meeting with their dissertation supervisors, or preparing their dissertation proposal.

The group had discussions regarding the use of PTES in School planning and QA processes, and felt that PTES was already part of the normal University processes, although there is scope to give PTES higher profile in University-level planning guidelines.

Overall, the group felt that PTES was a source of positive feedback which could be used to support confidence in academic standards and learning at Edinburgh. The data could also be valuable for defining priorities for strategic planning at every level. The group's recommendations are outlined in the table below.

LTC: 24.05.17
H/02/25/02

LTC 16/17 5 D

Recommendation	Recommendation breakdown	Communication strategy	Transfer of recommendations to University policy/guidance
Practicalities of building PTES into School planning processes			
Schools to be encouraged to utilise PTES in planning.	<p>Anecdotal data from Schools indicates that PTES is considered as part of the planning process, however the way in which it is utilised varies from discussion at general School committees through to analysis at a Programme level</p> <p>Schools should be encouraged to review their PTES data (bearing in mind that for some Schools the number of students involved is low so data is very variable)</p>	<p>LTC to ask Schools to consider how they use PTES</p> <p>LTC to ask Governance and Strategic Planning to work with relevant Vice-Principals to give higher profile to PTES in the Thematic Vice-Principal section of the University planning guidance.</p>	

LTC 16/17 5 D

Recommendation	Recommendation breakdown	Communication strategy	Transfer of recommendations to University policy/guidance
<p>The working group felt that the timing of PTES was not suited to the University's academic cycle.</p>	<p>The closing date for PTES cannot be changed, however the start date can be moved by a month which would put the survey period closer to the time when students are starting their dissertations. The group's recommendation is to change the timing of PTES.</p>	<p>The timing change for PTES will move the active period to a time when students will be in contact with the dissertation supervisor; staff in these roles should be reminded to discuss PTES with their students (complying with PTES guidance)</p> <p>The Surveys Unit would be involved here</p>	
<p>Embedding PTES results in normal QA processes</p>			

LTC 16/17 5 D

<p>PTES is already a part of standard University QA processes:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• PTES 'results and reflection' are a required part of the supporting documentation for Postgraduate Programme Reviews.• PTES is highlighted as one of the data sources for Schools conducting annual quality review (including programme-level review) <p>In these terms, PTES is given equal status to NSS within QA processes</p> <p>In addition, PTES is now included in the Court level of the Strategic Performance Management Framework which will give it a higher profile</p>	<p>Communication of the role of PTES in QA processes will be part of normal University communications</p>	
--	---	---	--

LTC 16/17 5 D

Recommendation	Recommendation breakdown	Communication strategy	Transfer of recommendations to University policy/guidance
Ways to include PTES findings and feedback in arrangements for, and content of, communication with students and staff			
<p>Provide appropriate guidance on promotion, and use of PTES to Schools and Colleges</p>	<p>Guidance for Schools and Colleges regarding promotion of PTES is limited. In contrast the NSS guidance has recently been updated, and is now very comprehensive, and usable</p> <p>Communications and Marketing to update the guidance for Schools to a similar format to the NSS guidance</p>	<p>Communications and Marketing already issue guidance for Schools regarding PTES, the new guidance will be part of this strategy</p> <p>The Surveys Unit would be involved here</p>	
<p>Students need to know why they are asked to complete surveys, and that their feedback is valuable to the University</p>	<p>Schools should be asked to mention PTES at Welcome Week inductions. Outlining what has happened as a result of previous PTES results</p> <p>When asking for completion of PTES it is important to be clear that the University values PTES as a way to hear the student voice</p>	<p>The University's induction team will be asked to remind Schools to mention PTES at Welcome Week events, and it could be included in central University Welcome events</p>	

LTC 16/17 5 D

Recommendation	Recommendation breakdown	Communication strategy	Transfer of recommendations to University policy/guidance
<p>Alumni are an important part of the University community, and should be aware that the University values their opinions</p>	<p>Good news stories from PTES should be mentioned at graduation to let participants know the University has listened, this will build positive relations with our alumni</p>	<p>Surveys Unit to identify positive results, and work with Communications and Marketing to develop publicity around these</p>	
<p>Ways to include PTES in market assessment and promotion</p>			
<p>Schools and central support units should be encouraged to utilise PTES results in promotional activity</p>	<p>The Surveys Unit should produce the PTES data in a format (graphs/tables) which groups involved in recruitment (e.g. SRA; Schools) can use easily in promotional activities. This would also include clear guidance on what can be used under our agreements regarding PTES (for example what we can/cannot say)</p>	<p>The Surveys Unit would be involved here</p>	

LTC 16/17 5 D

Recommendation	Recommendation breakdown	Communication strategy	Transfer of recommendations to University policy/guidance
The external PGT environment is changing, and the University should aim to prepare for this in order to maintain our positive PTES results	There have been concerns about the external environment at a PG level, in particular related to the funding environment for PGT. This would benefit from being considered at a University strategic level.		
Promotion of the analysis and use of PTES results (both free text and quantitative results) by programmes; Schools; and support services to better understand and enhance learning, and the student experience			
Schools and support units should be aware that they can request further information on their PTES results from the Surveys Unit	<p>The Surveys Unit will look at the current data, and decide what might be interesting, and promote this data to Schools and support units</p> <p>Surveys Unit to consider whether PTES could become part of the student dashboards</p>	<p>LTC to advise Schools</p> <p>The Surveys Unit would be involved here</p>	
The University should take a more strategic view of PTES results	The Surveys Unit are currently reviewing the data, and considering how the data would be used to highlight good news stories; identify issues; and prioritise support needs	<p>PTES should be discussed annually at LTC and other relevant committees</p> <p>The Surveys Unit would be involved here</p>	

LTC: 24.05.17
H/02/25/02

LTC 16/17 5 D

Recommendation	Recommendation breakdown	Communication strategy	Transfer of recommendations to University policy/guidance
Schools should be encouraged to utilise their PTES results to enhance learning	<p>Case studies of best practise for using PTES across the University should be produced</p> <p>A 'Learning from PTES' event should be held – this should be hosted by an academic network to encourage participation, possibly the Directors of Teaching network?</p>	<p>LTC to ask one of the academic networks to host an event</p> <p>LTC to ask Communications and Marketing or IAD to develop case studies on PTES</p>	

The University of Edinburgh

Senate Learning & Teaching Committee

24 May 2017

Review of Feedback Standards and Guiding Principles

Executive Summary

As part of developments to support colleagues in feedback (and assessment), a subgroup of the LTC Assessment and Feedback Enhancement Group reviewed the existing Feedback Standards and Guiding Principles document. The group proposes that a more practical guide is developed linked to an interactive set of resources and case studies on the Institute for Academic Development site. The draft is attached and it is proposed that this will replace the existing Feedback Standards and Guiding Principles document.

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

The proposals support the University's Strategic Plan objective of Leadership in Learning.

Action requested

LTC is invited to consider the proposals for formal approval.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

If approved, the new document will be communicated to Colleges/Schools via Academic Services' annual communication on new policies/regulations.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. Resource implications (including staffing)

Production of the next document and web resources is expected to be met from within existing resources.

2. Risk assessment

No risk assessment is included in the paper, however the proposals are intended to enhance support for development of courses by promoting thinking about feedback at the beginning of development.

3. Equality and Diversity

No equality and diversity impacts are anticipated. The proposals are intended to promote consideration of feedback in many forms and therefore it is expected that this will address implications for equality groups.

4. Freedom of information

The paper is **open**.

Originator of the paper

Professor Susan Rhind, Assistant Principal Assessment & Feedback, May 2017

Background

The current Feedback Standards and Guiding Principles document originated in 2012.

In 2016 it was agreed that a review of the document would take place with a view to replacing with a shorter and more interactive resource aligned to material on the IAD website. The review would also be an opportunity to rationalise the IAD web pages relating to assessment and feedback and take into account feedback from colleagues requesting more practical guidance on ideas for enhancement.

A subgroup of the Assessment and Feedback Enhancement Group met to review the documents and have since been developing the new guide with assistance from additional colleagues as the project has evolved (see below).

Review Team

Susan Rhind	Assistant Principal (Assessment and Feedback)
Hazel Marzetti	Research Assistant (IAD)
Kirsty Hughes	Research Assistant (R(D)SVS)
Jill MacKay	Research Assistant (R(D)SVS)
Neil Lent	Lecturer (IAD)
Neil Mullholland	Dean of PG Studies (CAHSS)

Input is currently also being sought from the Directors of Teaching Network.

LTC is asked

1. For any comments on the current draft
2. To approve the approach and for the final document to potentially be a focus for core course organiser staff development.

Feedback and Assessment: Update and Practical Guide

This document is designed to provide a practical guide to feedback on assessment informed by current research and best practice. Whilst it is not the purpose of this document to provide a holistic overview of assessment practice, a few comments are necessary to frame the subsequent discussion of feedback.

Assessment of, for and as Learning

Assessment has traditionally been subdivided into the two (not necessarily mutually exclusive) categories of summative (assessment of learning) and formative (assessment for learning). More recently, the term 'Assessment as Learning' has also been introduced.

Assessment **of** learning (summative assessment): is primarily an evaluative measure of students' learning in a particular context; by definition focussing on the measurement, rather than the process, of learning (Büyükkarcı, 2014; McDowell et al., 2011; Irving et al., 2011; Harlen 2009). Note however that in the context of an effective programmatic approach to assessment, summative assessments can (and should) be designed to be formative and provide useful feedback for subsequent assessments.

Assessment **for** learning (formative assessment): assessing with the main aim of improving students' performance by clarifying goals and standards and helping students enhance their work by identifying where students may have fallen short of intended outcomes and how they can improve in order to meet them in future. Formative assessment often has no marks associated or may have a very small percentage (Büyükkarcı, 2014; López-Pastor & Sicilia-Camacho, 2015; Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006).

Assessment **as** learning: Extends the role of formative assessment by emphasising the role of students as 'active, engaged and critical assessors' (Earl, 2003). Requires support to allow students to develop the metacognitive capacity to assess both their own and others work (Sadler, 1989, Boud and Falchikov, 2006)

Definition	Main Purpose	Decision Maker
Assessment of Learning	Ranking decisions, credentials, competence	Teacher or outside body
Assessment for Learning	Formative feedback	Teacher or peers
Assessment as Learning	Formative feedback, learning to make judgements	Student

Table 1. Key Features of the assessment categories (Adapted from Earle 2003)

In all cases, the following **key principles** should apply:

1. Feedback and assessment must be integral to course design. Every course and programme should be designed to provide opportunities for students to engage with feedback on their on-going performance and achievements; in order to help you do so we would encourage engagement with the [Edinburgh Learning Design Roadmap](#) process.
2. Assessment and feedback expectations, standards, and marking criteria should be clearly communicated to students at the start of each course. It is important that this is not only communicated through a written document articulating assessment aims, but that there are also opportunities for dialogue provided to help students use and understand expectations in context.
3. Feedback is a two-way process and a joint and shared responsibility. It thrives on interaction and *dialogue* between students and their teachers, and where there is a sense of belonging to a vibrant community of learners (see assessment for, and as, learning below). Students should be encouraged from being passive, to active, receivers and seekers of feedback. (Winston et al, 2017)
4. Opportunities for feedback and dialogue arise not only in association with formally assessed work, but within timetabled classes (tutorials, practicals, lectures) as well as more informally in e.g. class discussions, field trips and placements.

Practical Application

Feedback in the Context of Assessment of Learning

Whilst summative marks in themselves are a form of feedback, there are fewer opportunities for rich feedback in association with this type of assessment, but they do exist.

Example: group feedback sessions after high-stakes examinations (either as soon as marked; or as a resource for subsequent cohorts as part of assessment preparation). Provide a time –efficient way to highlight common misconceptions or indeed highlight good examples of responses to be shared. This type of sharing and reflection can help build the metacognitive skills referred to in ‘Assessment as Learning’.

Example: group feedback sessions immediately after summative multiple-choice question (MCQ) assessment; remaining under exam conditions. This is one solution for MCQ examinations where question security is relevant (i.e. the need to protect question banks as questions will be re-used), yet prompt feedback still desirable.

Feedback in the Context of Assessment for Learning

Quality feedback should:

- Identify what the student has done well
- Identify areas for improvement with suggestions for action
- Feed-forward with action for future work on programme
- Provide an opportunity for dialogue

Feedback is often discussed as though it were a product passed from staff to students, whereas to be most effective it is better to conceptualise it as a process. In order for feedback to have an impact on students' work, they need to be actively engaged with the feedback and able to put it to use in their learning practice.

Example: on submission of their assignment, students can be asked to identify what aspects of their assignment they would like feedback on. Would they like the marker to focus on the structure, the strength of the conclusion, the referencing, etc? This encourages students to identify strengths and weaknesses in their own work. Markers can retain the flexibility to comment on other aspects also.

Example: Research shows that students value one to one dialogue above most other forms of feedback. The time taken to mark and provide written comments on pieces of work e.g. projects or lab books can be traded off against an individual 5-10 minute conversation with each student. These feedback conversations can be scheduled into course design from the outset.

Feedback in the Context of Assessment as Learning

An understanding of the quality of pieces of work develops over time with increased exposure to the subject area. For students, this long-term exposure to a wide-range of examples does not exist, instead they require support and activities to help them develop this metacognitive ability. Increasing attention is being given to including activities which help develop students' 'Assessment Literacy'.

Example: Use examples (from previous year's work, or entirely made-up samples) to get students either in a group or individually to mark, rank and give feedback on the assignments. Then discuss as a class the actual grades and feedback that the assignments achieved.

Example: engage students in contributing to an assessment rubric for a given piece of work.

Example: two-stage assessments. Students take an assessment individually, and immediately after, the same test in a small group. Potential for rich, almost instantaneous feedback and learning from peers.

Edinburgh example: <http://edin.ac/2pNRB7k>

More information: <https://blogs.ubc.ca/eoassei/two-stage-exams/>

Assessing at Programme Level

In such a large institution it is easy to think at course level, rather than programme level, however every programme will specify intended programme level outcomes. Therefore it is useful, particularly if organising core or compulsory courses on a programme, to consider the broad range of skills students are expected to develop through the programme, and consider how your course is contributing to this. If you are unclear about how your course fits into your programme, your programme might consider engaging with [the Leading Enhancement in Assessment and Feedback project](#).

Example 1: Find out what assessments are provided by other compulsory and optional courses on the programme to ensure that new types of assessment are not introduced late on in the degree programme e.g. in the honours years that students have not had a previous opportunity to practice and receive feedback on.

Example 2: [the Edinburgh Learning Design Roadmap \(ELDeR\)](#) supports courses that are either being developed or reviewed to think about their course design. It is offered as a two day workshop in which staff are provided with space and facilitation to develop their course design, learning outcomes, assessment and feedback to ensure courses are able to achieve their aims.

Utilising Case Studies

A number of case studies relating to assessment and feedback can be found on the IAD website here: <https://www.wiki.ed.ac.uk/display/casestudies/Assessment+and+Feedback>

References [Move to Resource List]

- Büyükkaracı, K. 2014. Assessment Beliefs and Practices of Language Teachers in Primary Education. *International Journal of Instruction*. 7(1), pp.107-121.
- Boud, D & Sadler, R. 2016. Sustainable assessment revisited. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*. 41(3), pp.400 – 413.
- Earl, L. 2003. *Assessment as Learning: Using Classroom Assessment to Maximise Student Learning*. Thousand Oaks, CA, Corwin Press.
- Harlen, W. 2009. Improve assessment of learning and for learning. *Education 3-13*. 37(3), pp.247-257.
- Harden RM, Crosby JR, Davis MH. AMEE Guide No. 14: Outcome-based education: Part 1-An introduction to outcome-based education. *Med Teach*. 1999;21(1):7-14. doi:10.1080/01421599979969.
- Irving, S. E., Harris, L. R., & Peterson, E. R. 2011. 'One assessment doesn't serve all the purposes' or does it? New Zealand teachers describe assessment and feedback. *Asia Pacific Educational Review*. 12, pp. 413 – 426.
- Lopez-Pastor, V & Sicilia-Camacho, A. 2015. Formative and shared assessment in higher education. Lessons learned and challenges for the future. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*. 42(1), pp. 77-97.
- McDowell, D., Wakelin, D., Montgomery, C. & King, S. 2011. Does assessment for learning make a difference? The development of a questionnaire to explore the student response. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*. 36 (7), pp. 749 – 765.

LTC: 24.05.17
H/02/25/02

LTC 16/17 5 E

Nicol, D & Macfarlane-Dick, D. 2006. Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: a model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education*. 31(2), pp. 199-218.

Sadler, D. R. (1989) Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems, *Instructional Science*, 18, 119-144

Sambell, K. McDowell, L., & Montgomery, C. 2012. *Assessment for Learning in Higher Education*. Routledge: London.

Naomi E. Winstone, Robert A. Nash, Michael Parker & James Rowntree (2017) Supporting Learners' Agentic Engagement With Feedback: A Systematic Review and a Taxonomy of Recipience Processes, *Educational Psychologist*, 52:1, 17-37, DOI: 10.1080/00461520.2016.1207538

The University of Edinburgh

Learning and Teaching Committee

24 May 2017

Report on Festival of Creative Learning 2017

Executive Summary

This paper reports on the successful development and launch of the Festival of Creative Learning, as approved by LTC in May 2016. This includes a focus on the curated programme of events in February 2017, year round support for Festival pop-up events and organisers, and an outline of future plans and goals.

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

Leadership in Learning – providing support for staff and students to experiment and develop new and novel learning events and opportunities.

Action requested

For information and comment.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

Communication via Senate Committees Newsletter, Teaching Matters, University Student Newsletters and via School contacts and Festival network. IAD will lead on planning and implementation throughout academic year.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. Resource implications (including staffing)

IAD will provide university level support for Festival of Creative Learning events, networks, publicity and infrastructure.

2. Risk assessment

Paper does not include a risk assessment. Event leaders are provided with risk assessment guidance. Overall approach to planning and promotion was successful last year – no significant reputational, financial or compliance risks.

3. Equality and Diversity

Not considered in this paper.

4. Freedom of information

The paper is open.

Key words

creative, learning, students, staff, festival, innovation, practice, community

LTC: 24.05.17
H/02/25/02

LTC 16/17 5 F1

Originators of the paper

Jennifer Williams and Jon Turner, Institute for Academic Development

16th May 2017

REPORT ON FESTIVAL OF CREATIVE LEARNING 2017

JENNIFER WILLIAMS AND JON TURNER, INSTITUTE FOR ACADEMIC DEVELOPMENT

INTRODUCTION

In May 2016 Senate Learning & Teaching Committee approved the launch of a new Festival of Creative Learning to secure the legacy of Innovative Learning Week¹. For AY16/17 and AY17/18 this would include events and activities throughout the academic year, along with a curated week-long programme in February. This paper reports on the progress made to date with a focus on the curated programme of Festival of Creative Learning events in February 2017. Included throughout the paper are a selection of comments from event participants and organisers.

The current team at the IAD in charge of coordinating the Festival came into their posts in December 2016, so this first Festival has been an exercise in learning for them as well. It has provided an opportunity to understand what procedures are currently in place and to design and implement improvements – most notably to the communications and administrative systems – to strengthen the overall operations of the Festival and expand its reach and potential impact for the future.

The focus on building a community of practice of staff and students keen to innovate and experiment with creative approaches to learning has, in line with our plans, continued in a voluntary and meaningful way, thus supporting innovation in teaching and learning more widely.



I gained the skills of organising an event: planning months in advance, budgeting, liaising with a broader, Festival-wide set of deadlines. I also learned specifically how one might do this within the University (eg how to use the events site, how to use EdinburghFirst). I further developed my skills in origami teaching, and in mathematics communication. I have developed a relationship with the Mathematics Outreach Officer and through working with them on this project, have become involved in further outreach projects in the School of Mathematics. I have also become friends with another event organiser from my School.

Student Festival Event Organiser

IMPACT SUMMARY

The **Festival of Creative Learning 2017** has successfully made the transition from its previous incarnation, Innovative Learning Week, to a volunteer-led participatory model. It provides a safe space within the University for staff and students to explore innovation, a training platform for

¹ LTC 15/16 5E (<http://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/agendapapers20160525.pdf>)

creativity and collaboration in event design and management, and a community-building festival. It aligns with a number of the aims of the new **Learning & Teaching Strategy**, including:

- Offering an educational experience that is inspiring, challenging, and transformational;
- Providing a supportive environment and rich learning culture;
- Equipping students with the knowledge, skills and experiences to flourish and continue to learn in a complex world and become successful graduates who contribute to society.

Key achievements during AY16/17 have been support for several pop-up events, the development of flexible branding and promotional materials that can be used and re-purposed, new resources and guides for event organisers².

Central to these achievements was the curated programme in February 2017. As expected, the programme was smaller this year with fewer applications, events and participants overall. However the quality of engagement across the Festival was improved by the lack of a mandatory element, which in the past had made some people feel forced into the process rather than being willing participants. The range and scale of the Festival is significant, with over 130 events and more than 2,200 tickets booked (see Table 1 for further details).

TABLE 1 – FESTIVAL STATISTICS (FEBRUARY 2017)

Category	2017
Number of events	132
Number of events open to the public	28
Number of tickets booked	Over 2,200
Social Media Reach	499,244
Number of nominations for awards	131
Number of awards	9
Number of Basecamp users	162
Number of Blog visitors/views Jan – March 24 th	438/712 from 17 countries
Number of Blog visitors/views February	203/344
Number of Storify views	82 (by 24/03/17)
Number of pop-up events	7

² See <http://www.festivalofcreativelearning.ed.ac.uk/>



The most memorable experience was to see with delight that the idea I had in my head also resonated with other people who are doing research on a completely different area but they still found the connections in what I was offering them; that was fascinating and encouraging. I felt I gained so much confidence by delivering this workshop.

I feel that my communication skills and my ability to promote knowledge exchange improved through this experience. I think I promoted my professional profile outside my own academic unit.

Postgraduate Student Festival Event Organiser

Festival Blog and Storify Pages

Numbers only tell part of the story. We have made extensive use of social media and a range of blogging and similar approaches to gather examples of the activities run during February 2017 and the impact they've had.

<https://festivalofcreativelearning.wordpress.com/>

<https://storify.com/CreativeLearn/festival-of-creative-learning>

<https://festivalofcreativelearning.wordpress.com/2017/03/24/the-awards-the-results-are-published/>

Later this year we will produce a more detailed report looking at the longer term legacy and impact of Festival of Creative Learning and Innovative Learning Week events.



“I’m a Perfectionist...Get me out of here”

This event epitomises all that is important about creative learning. It taught the value of high standards, but allowed me to see that this shouldn't come at the detriment of health. Rachel, the organiser, put a lot of time and effort into organising this, and it was something many students had long wanted. Someone, other than our peers, to tell us that it was okay to have fun, sometimes, and not take life seriously every day. I think Rachel's event deserves endless praise purely because it's made me a better learner. I've since been able to stop my perfectionist tendencies getting in the way of my education. And I've at long last been able to appreciate my strengths.

Student Festival Event Participant

ISSUES REPORTED BY ORGANISERS

The main difficulties reported by organisers had to do with various Festival and University systems that are challenging to navigate such as the Festival event booking system and the University room booking system. We are revamping our resources and training to respond to these ongoing complexities. Another problem was a minimal but still perceptible negative perception of the Festival of Creative Learning, which seems to be a hangover from previous negative experiences associated with Innovative Learning Week. One staff organiser reported that the other people in her department made fun of her when she told her colleagues that she was running an event in the Festival, however her event was a huge success and won an award in our Festival Awards Ceremony. She said she would take the award back to share with her colleagues, to show them that hers was a valued event. We would like to continue to work on improving the overall perception of the Festival, via our enhanced offerings of support, training and communications.



Without fail people we encountered in teaching buildings and the sport centre, student union and administration are always polite and kind but so often unable to help or simply didn't know. It was like a massive puzzle, so I did improve my problem solving-skills and

knowledge of the university's often dislocated systems. I think the most disturbing thing I encountered was a lecturer (who I will not name) saying in our last seminar before Festival of Creative Learning week something like: "I'll see you week after next after something called... I dunno (student helpfully says Festival of Creative Learning) ah yes... or what we call a holiday."

Student Festival Event Organiser

FUTURE PLANS & GOALS

We want to strengthen the Festival and raise its profile both within and beyond the University of Edinburgh. We will do this by sharing our positive stories and creating resources of use to staff and students who would like to explore creative learning, innovation, collaborative experiments, events management and more. Our branding, website and social media will be major vehicles for this work, and we are exploring podcasts and video resources to communicate the learning and teaching insights of the Festival and make them more accessible for a diverse and widespread audience.

We will continue to improve the reputation of the Festival within the University by sharing our learning stories, having conversations with and listening to people across the University and responding to what they need in order to engage with and benefit from the Festival. This will include further development of our community of practise based on those who have had positive experiences of working with the Festival and attending Festival events.

We must also support experimentation in ways that mean more typical signposts of success are not our key measures (audience numbers, ticket sales, easy/short-term learning experiences). While we have events that display these successes, we want to make room for those which struggle, attempt the impossible, break new and difficult ground and take risks that might result in what some would call failure, but what we see as a vital component of real innovative learning.

Our year-round programme of Pop-up events will allow us to develop and expand the presence of the Festival in new ways and feed into the curated week in February, while enabling us to work with partners and the University staff and administration. These ground-breaking events and projects will focus on research areas that will feed back into the development of the work of the IAD to improve the understanding and enjoyment of University life.

Ongoing evaluation and exploration of longer term impact studies will allow us to continue to develop and innovate the Festival of Creative Learning.



Really I felt this was a great opportunity for me to create something interesting that could supplement my gender and justice teaching and give the students a sense of how research can apply to issues that they encounter day to day. In terms of motivation, I felt that this was a great opportunity for me as an early career academic to demonstrate that I was capable of engaging the students beyond the classroom. I found the opportunity to show my young female students using research that they should not see themselves as victims or oppressed was genuinely fulfilling and this was a creative way to make this point that I think was

LTC: 24.05.17
H/02/25/02

LTC 16/17 5 F1

meaningful. I also learned how to make a podcast and commission design for a logo, and I developed an academic connection between the law school and divinity that did not previously exist.

Academic Staff Festival Event Organiser

The University of Edinburgh

Learning and Teaching Committee

24 May 2017

School Feedback on Flexible Learning Week 2017

Executive Summary

In May 2016, LTC agreed that the week between Teaching Blocks 3 and 4 (formerly Innovative Learning Week) would be used for a broader range of purposes in Academic Years 2016/17 and 2017/18. Schools were encouraged to use the week in the way that best suited their staff and students, and offering space within the curriculum was emphasised. In April 2017, Schools were asked to evaluate the success of this approach in 2016/17. This paper summarizes the feedback received.

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

Leadership in Learning

Action requested

For information and comment.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

Communication via Senate Committees Newsletter.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

- 1. Resource implications (including staffing)**
None
- 2. Risk assessment**
The paper does not include a risk assessment.
- 3. Equality and Diversity**
Not considered in this paper.
- 4. Freedom of information**
The paper is **open**.

Originators of the paper

Philippa Ward, Academic Services

16th May 2017

School Feedback on Flexible Learning Week 2017

In May 2016, LTC agreed that the week between Teaching Blocks 3 and 4 (formerly Innovative Learning Week) would be used for a broader range of purposes in Academic Years 2016/17 and 2017/18. Schools were encouraged to use the week in the way that best suited their staff and students, and offering space within the curriculum was emphasised.

In April 2017, Schools were asked to evaluate the success of this approach in 2016/17. They were asked to comment on:

- the way in which the February 2017 week was used in their School;
- how well this worked (both successes and things that worked less well);
- and whether they were likely to use the week in the same way in 2017/18 (although it was recognised that it may be too early to say at this stage).

Responses were received from 10 Schools:

Business School

The week was used to accommodate both the undergraduate '#makeyourmark campaign' (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SbcxhdwdeAM&t=2s>) and, across all programmes, Leadership Training with the Redford Army Barracks. Both activities were well received, albeit engagement levels were lower than anticipated. Both will be repeated, in some guise, in academic year 2017/18.

The School plans to bring forward the '#makeyourmark' activities into the October non-teaching week, in order to ensure better student engagement levels (in February 2017, there was approximately a 50% no-show rate). A number of the School's PGT programmes hope to incorporate the Leadership Training activities into their timetabled activities earlier in Semester 1, based on positive feedback from those who took part this year (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QqtnRv_qwow).

The School holds the view that the February non-teaching week could be used constructively to accommodate more genuinely flexible activities, including those which are in direct response to student feedback throughout Semester 1, for example, but not limited to:

- hosting student treks (national and international) during this week, rather than during a timetabled week or waiting until the Easter break.
- delivering 'masterclasses' or tailored sessions based on demand eg. training on the use of a specific database.

The School also welcomes the opportunity for this week to be used for more cross-school, interdisciplinary activities which could attract diverse participation from across the University.

Chemistry

Chemistry has often struggled to achieve good attendance at Innovative Learning Week activities/events, and has sometimes had to cancel events due to insufficient numbers. ILW has

therefore evolved principally into a 'Reading Week', giving students the opportunity to catch up on their courses and lab reports. In this respect it serves a useful purpose.

In addition, the availability of a week at this time of year without timetabled teaching has made it possible to run a series of undergraduate conference style sessions where final year students deliver oral presentations on their research projects. These have been a great success and have provided a valuable means of engaging students with the breadth of research undertaken in these projects, as well as providing students with the opportunity to refine their oral presentation skills.

A number of staff have also continued to use the opportunity to organise activities for students, and a couple of these for Feb 2017 are highlighted below:

- Dr Michael Seery ran a 'Badging Lab Skills' activity. Students were given material to prepare regarding how to use a UV/vis spectrometer, and then had to demonstrate it to each other while being videoed on their mobile phone. The School included some detail and student reaction in a Teaching Matters blog which was co-authored by two students: <http://www.teaching-matters-blog.ed.ac.uk/?p=1432>. The students said they enjoyed the different approach and liked having a video of them in action for applying for internships etc. The School already uses this approach in Year 1 for basic lab skills, and it will be rolled out in later years to teach analytical approaches. Hopefully next year will include Karl Fisher, GC, and GC-MS.
- Dr David Clark was involved in running the School's annual iGEM sandpit event, which takes place in the afternoon on all five days of FLW. The School introduces interested undergraduates (from across all Colleges of the University) to synthetic biology and the iGEM competition (see iGEM.org). Over the course of the week, the team of 8 students to represent Edinburgh for 2017 was selected, and the students outlined the project they were proposing to work on. The team will reassemble in May and work for 10 weeks over the summer. They will then present their project at the iGEM 2017 jamboree in Boston in November.

It is likely that Chemistry will continue to use FLW in a similar way: running a few events and activities that they are confident will attract substantial numbers, and giving students and staff a breathing space mid-semester to catch up.

Divinity

In the School of Divinity, the main activity was a study tour to Israel. This was aimed at a subset of students. There were a couple of smaller activities.

The main difficulty for Divinity is that the majority of students leave Edinburgh during the week in question. (Professor Paul Foster, as a warden at Pollock Halls, noted that approximately three-quarters of students vacated the Halls that week.)

Edinburgh College of Art

ECA engaged with the Festival of Creative Learning in various ways. Subject Areas were asked to consider how the week would be used early in the year, and to plan for activities. Staff and students

were encouraged to submit funding applications to the FoCL central fund, and 12 funded events ran within ECA. These events had generally good uptake, with waiting lists for some popular activities:

1. 'Building Drawing' - Sophia Banou - Tues 21st February, 10:30-17:00
2. 'Colouring the Past' - Stephenie McGucken - Mon 20th and Tues 21st February, 12:00-16:00
3. 'Clad the Wikihouse! Baltic Street Adventure Playground' - Laura Haylock - Mon 20th - Fri 24th February, 09:00-17:00
4. 'Amadinda Xylophone Building Workshop' - Ceylan Hay - Mon 20th February, 10:00-18:00
5. 'DronesCAPES' - Elinor Scarth - Thurs 23rd February, 09:00-19:00
6. 'Expanding Expanded Drawing' - Gemma Leamy - Mon 20th February, 13:30-16:30
7. 'Move with Music' - Una MacGlone - Tues 21st February, 10:00-11:00
8. 'SAFARI' - James Clegg
9. 'PLOPS:2' - Ola Uduku
10. 'UNA Urban Network Analysis' - Cristina Nan
11. 'Digital Honeycomb' - Cristina Nan
12. 'Edinburgh College of Art Collaborates' - Natasha Goldstein

While these events were popular, only a relatively small proportion of ECA students participated. There was a sense that, for the small number that took part, it was interesting and enjoyable, and that staff and students organising the events found it rewarding.

Outside of these funded events, each Subject Area responded to the week in different ways. Some students took part in fieldtrips associated with their courses (eg. 2nd Year Architecture; MSc Advanced Sustainable Design; 3rd Year History of Art). Animation students took part in the annual ECA 10x10 marathon to produce 10 films in 10 days (Animation - BA (Hons), Animation - MFA/MA, and Composition for Screen - MSc programmes).

Many students did not take part in formal activities. Across ECA's five Subject Areas, many students used the time to concentrate on their design/studio work and writing dissertations/essays. This provided an important block of time for students without the pressures of scheduled classes during a busy Semester. This was particularly true for graduating honours students, with the building pressures of final year assessment, and for Design, Art and ESALA students, the Degree Show.

ECA has a curriculum that is founded on the principles of 'Creative Learning', and a FoCL does not therefore provide a vastly different experience for students. However, what the week does provide is a breathing space in a busy curriculum for students and staff.

Edinburgh Medical School

Molecular, Genetic and Population Health Sciences

MGPMS has 7 PGT programmes - 6 ODL and 1 on-campus. The on-campus MPH programme used this week as a mid-term break. Most of the ODL programmes did not mark it in any particular way: it was either a break between 5 week (10 credit) courses, or a reading week within 10 week (20 credit) courses. Family Medicine had teaching during this week, as they follow a different course structure.

Biomedical Sciences

A number of course information events were held, where the School talked to each year group about progression and course choices and options for the next academic year. The School has found

that this is the best time to have these conversations with students as they are starting to think about course choices and specializing in Junior Honours and Senior Honours years. Students prefer to have the conversation around February well before the exam period, and at a time when the School has lots of staff available to help provide advice and guidance.

At postgraduate level, the Science Communication MSc Programme used this week to run various events. Alanah Knibb, one of the School's MSc Science Communication students, and her team were given an award for "Best Sustainability Event" for their Birds and The Bees Card game.

It is worth noting that the School also spends a lot of time embedding skills events into the curriculum during formal teaching time instead of using Flexible Learning week (e.g. workshops on careers and CV writing, communication skills, critical thinking are all organized in Semester 2 teaching time).

The School has not yet come to a final decision about whether anything will be done differently next year, but the February 2017 format worked well, so it is unlikely that significant changes will be made. There will be evaluation over the summer, including collection of feedback from course teams, and possible changes will be considered in light of these discussions.

Education, Moray House

FLW was very low key in Education. Many students used the week as a much-needed reading week. One cohort of students on the MA Primary Education with Gaelic went to Uist on a trip to immerse themselves in Gaelic language and culture. It was organised by the students themselves through the Highland Society.

Health in Social Science

The School did not hold any events this year. There is interest and willingness in the School to hold events (and it has run events in previous years). However, the majority of the School's programmes are for students who are placement-based and/or part-time, so it is impractical for these students to engage in organising or attending events. Fitting teaching around placements also places constraints on the extent to which the week can be protected (at a programme level, when all teaching has been removed from this week, students have not engaged with alternative activities and have gone away or studied instead). Therefore, the School will continue to support staff and students wishing to organise activities for FLW, but this is not a significant priority for the School.

Informatics

Informatics held some official events as part of the Festival of Creative Learning. In addition, the week was used to complement some of its existing courses. For example, for the System Design Project taken by all 3rd year students, the week was used to include some training on transferable (soft) skills, including presentation skills, reflection on team work, and project management. For students in UG4/5 currently working on final year projects and dissertations, a feedback and demo day was run, where students had the opportunity not only to collect data from volunteer participants for user evaluation studies, but also to present their projects and posters to fellow students and staff for feedback. Both events were considered to be highly successful and would not have been possible outside this particular week.

Physics and Astronomy

The week was kept relatively free for reflection / consolidation, as this was considered to be of most benefit for students. There was one exception, namely group presentations for the Senior Honours courses Group Project (taken by all students taking MPhys degrees) and Team Review Project (taken by those on BSc programmes).

The rationale for keeping the presentations in this week was purely practical: these presentations involve all of the Senior Honours students and cannot be timetabled at any other time. (Scheduling during this week gives the added benefit of being able to have a larger attendance from those in Junior Honours in preparation for their own presentations in future courses.)

Overall, the School used the week as planned and believed that this worked well. It therefore intends to use the week in the same, or a similar, way next year.

Veterinary Studies

The Vet School does not have the curriculum flexibility to keep the entire week clear. However, it always tries to schedule the student driven 'student welfare week' for the same week. The School considers this to be in the spirit of FLW.

The School's reflections this year were that the week worked well, but probably less well than last year on account of having a slightly less organised student rep leading it this year. The School's Student Experience Officer will have a little more input/ oversight next year as a result. The School intends to continue using the week in the same way in the future.

KNOWLEDGE STRATEGY COMMITTEE REPORT 24 March 2017

1 Initial Draft Information Services Group Plan 2017/20

An overview of the initial draft Information Services Group plan for the period 2017/20 was reviewed. The context of the University planning round was discussed, with prioritisation of the additional Information Services funding requests important in ensuring overall affordability for the University. Members suggested that the distance learning at scale funding request should closely involve Colleges from an early stage, use the University's research quality as a differentiator to attract students and improve course delivery for both students and academics compared to existing smaller scale courses.

2 Network Replacement Programme

The Director of the IT Infrastructure Division presented a summary of the outcome of the IT Infrastructure review project, with an additional £4M (£9.5M in total) of capital investment sought through the University's Planning Round given the larger than initially expected level of equipment replacement and need to restructure some areas of the network. The Planning Round submission was endorsed.

3 Digital Preservation Policy

A Digital Preservation Policy to aid in managing and preserving digital records that the University aims to retain on a long term basis as a corporate memory and archive was approved. It was noted that no additional funding is requested to implement the policy.

4 Information Services Group Key Performance Indicators

Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for Information Services Group were reviewed, encompassing: quality, learning and teaching, staffing and space utilisation, public engagement, and national and international digital research services measures. It was noted that KPIs without targets set at present would have targets set shortly. The Committee discussed moving from KPIs that are measures of activity to more meaningful strategic performance measures and benchmarking the performance of the library with comparator institutions.

5 Joint item:

- i) Core Systems Strategy Programme – Terms of Reference**
- ii) Digital Transformation Governance Board**

The proposed terms of reference for the Core Systems Strategy Programme Board and for the Digital Transformation Governance Board were noted. Improving academic representation on the boards was discussed, with the Chief Information Officer and Assistant Principal Online Learning to consider approaching individuals.

The University of Edinburgh

Senate Learning and Teaching Committee

24 May 2017

Report from Learning and Teaching Policy Group

Executive Summary

In November 2015, the Senate Committee Convenor's Forum was superseded by a Learning and Teaching Policy Group (LTPG) designed to integrate strategic leadership in L&T across the Senate Committees, the Colleges (via College L&T Deans), thematic areas of priority (via existing and new Vice and Assistant Principals), and key professional services.

This paper updates the Committee on LTPG's 13 April 2017 meeting.

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

LTPG's work supports the University strategic objectives of Leadership in Learning and Leadership in Research.

Action requested

For information

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

N/A

Resource / Risk / Compliance

- 1. Resource implications (including staffing)**
N/A – Committee is not being asked for a decision
- 2. Risk assessment**
N/A – Committee is not being asked for a decision
- 3. Equality and Diversity**
N/A – Committee is not being asked for a decision
- 4. Freedom of information**
Open

Originator of the paper

Tom Ward, Director of Academic Services

Report from Learning and Teaching Policy Group (LTPG)

The main points from the 13 April 2017 meeting is set out below. Some of the issues discussed at LTPG are addressed in more detail elsewhere on LTC's agenda.

Main points

- The group discussed some initial proposals for Social Responsibility and Sustainability: Curricular and Co-Curricular Pathways. The Committee will be discussing these proposals elsewhere on the agenda.
- The group had considered an analysis of Semester One 2016-17 Course Enhancement Questionnaire results broken down by School. The data suggests a broad picture in which staff-level questions are answered more positively than course-level questions, which seems pretty uniform across the University. However, the wide variation in response rates make it difficult to interpret the results.
- The Group received an update on the Student Administration and Support strand of the Service Excellence Programme.
- The Group discussed progress on developing a Student Partnership Agreement.

LTC: 24.05.17
H/02/25/02

LTC 16/17 5 I

The University of Edinburgh

Senatus Learning and Teaching Committee

24 May 2017

Task Group to Review the Code of Practice for Tutors and Demonstrators

Executive Summary

The paper provides an update to LTC on the work of the Task Group appointed to review the Code of Practice for Tutors and Demonstrators.

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

The Task Group's remit supports the University's mission to provide the highest-quality research-led teaching and learning and enable our graduates and staff to be exceptional individuals equipped to address global challenges. It also supports the strategic objective of leadership in learning.

Action requested

LTC is invited formally to note the work of the Task Group, to discuss feedback from the view-seeking exercise, and to agree that the Policy will be approved by electronic business over the summer.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

Not applicable at this stage.

Resource/ Risk/Compliance

1. Resource implications (including staffing)

No resource implications are identified in the paper.

2. Risk assessment

No risk assessment as the Policy is only at draft stage.

3. Equality and Diversity

The Policy has been drafted with the aim of promoting consistency and equality of treatment of Tutors and Demonstrators. The Task Group will finalise its Equality Impact Assessment prior to requesting approval for the Policy.

4. Freedom of information

The paper is **open**.

Originator of the paper

Theresa Sheppard
Academic Policy Officer, May 2017

The University of Edinburgh
Researcher Experience Committee Task Group on the Code of Practice for Tutors and Demonstrators

Update on the draft policy for tutors and demonstrators

Background

The Task Group appointed by the Researcher Experience Committee to review the Code of Practice for Tutors and Demonstrators has completed its task of seeking the views of Schools, Colleges, the University and College Union and the Students' Association on its draft proposed policy for the support and development of tutors and demonstrators.

The draft policy, attached at Annex A, was circulated to those stakeholders in February together with a communication which set out the key points for consideration, along with background information on the Task Group web page which summarised the work of the Group: <http://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/projects/reviewing-the-code-of-practice-for-tutoring-and-de> Stakeholders were given six weeks to respond.

Three Focus Groups to discuss the draft policy were held with tutors and demonstrators from across the University.

Discussions on the draft were held at the March meetings of Researcher Experience Committee and Learning and Teaching Committee.

The Task Group has now had the opportunity to consider the responses from these key stakeholders and has identified a set of key areas that require further consideration before a final draft of the Policy will be produced. A summary of the view-seeking exercise is provided below.

LTC is asked to take action as follows:

- To note the progress of the Task Group and the results of the view-seeking exercise
- To discuss the feedback from the view-seeking exercise
- To agree that the Policy will be approved via electronic business over the summer, to allow additional time to resolve outstanding issues and in order to implement the new Policy in the next session. LTC will be asked to approve the final Policy.

Summary of the view-seeking exercise

Responses received

Comments on the draft policy were received from the following stakeholders:

College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences

The Business School

Edinburgh College of Art

School of Economics

School of Health in Social Science

The Law School

School of Literature, Languages and Culture
School of Social and Political Science
College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine
Edinburgh Medical School
College of Science and Engineering
Biological Sciences
School of Engineering
School of Mathematics
School of Physics and Astronomy
Edinburgh University Students' Association
UCU
Human Resources

All Schools were represented at the Focus Groups for tutors and demonstrators, with the exception of the School of Economics, Edinburgh College of Art, Moray House School of Education and the School of Health in Social Science. Participants included students, researchers and part-time visiting tutors.

Key points for further consideration

The draft Policy elicited a wide range of responses, both overarching comments on the employment of tutors and demonstrators generally and detailed suggestions for amendment to the draft Policy text.

In general, the draft Policy was well received; stakeholders were supportive of the move to create a Policy that would provide greater support and consistency in the recruitment and development of tutors and demonstrators. It was acknowledged that consistency in practice across Schools and Colleges was a priority, but that the Policy should be flexible enough to address the broad range of teaching experience offered by tutors and demonstrators across the University.

On the whole, it was felt that the draft contained all the necessary themes required to set out the support for all aspects of tutors' and demonstrators' work and that the contents were appropriate. In some cases, Schools volunteered information on how they would implement the Policy and how it would complement their current guidance to tutors and demonstrators.

A large number of stakeholders responded to the draft and put forward detailed responses to the text. These included divergent views on a number of issues. The Task Group has welcomed the high level of engagement with the view-seeking exercise, but the process of reviewing the responses and devising solutions which are suitable for all stakeholders will require more time before a final draft will be available to be signed off.

The Task Group is currently considering the following key areas of contention prior to producing a final draft of the Policy.

- a. The extent to which the Policy should be explicit about the individual tasks involved in tutoring and demonstrating and the tasks that should be paid for: these tasks

must be explicit, but it may be preferable to ask Schools to tailor a list to their individual needs and publish it separately.

- b. The University-wide perception of postgraduate students who are tutors and demonstrators: tutoring and demonstrating is viewed as a development opportunity for postgraduate students and this entitles them to a certain amount of training and support. On the other hand, students feel strongly that Schools should view them more professionally and offer them the full range of resources available to other teaching staff.
- c. The role of the supervisor in advising postgraduate students who are tutors and demonstrators: it is felt that there is a potential conflict of interest in asking supervisors to approve students' applications for posts. Some Schools feel, however, that supervisors should be involved in mentoring students who teach.
- d. The potential cap on the number of hours worked by postgraduate students, over which there is disagreement among stakeholders. The Task Group has agreed to seek and analyse further data on how the number of hours worked affects completion rates before reaching agreement on this issue.
- e. The provision by Schools of a mentor: there is both support and opposition to the need for Schools to provide all tutors and demonstrators with a mentor.
- f. Provision of training to tutors and demonstrators teaching at different levels: additional wording may be included on different levels of training in light of comments from stakeholders.
- g. Implementation of the Policy: a key concern for tutors and demonstrators is how the Policy will be implemented and how their treatment at School-level might be monitored. The second phase of the Task Group's work will be to consider a plan for implementation.

Once the Task Group has reached a position on the points above, the Policy will be amended to take account of all feedback and approval of the final version will be sought over the summer.

Theresa Sheppard

Academic Policy Officer

May 2017

DRAFT – for comment, February 2017

University of Edinburgh

Policy for the recruitment, support and development of tutors and demonstrators

Tutors and demonstrators are valued members of the teaching team at the University of Edinburgh and the experience provides them with potential career development benefits. The following framework is designed to ensure that tutors and demonstrators contributing to our on-campus and on-line courses receive appropriate support and guidance for the task and that they are well equipped to deliver excellent quality teaching. Those providing tutoring and demonstrating services include postgraduate research students, post-doctoral research fellows and staff, members of staff on Guaranteed Hours contracts and visiting tutors with specific expertise.

1. Recruitment processes

- 1.1 Recruitment of tutors and demonstrators must be transparent and open in line with the University's recruitment and selection policies. Schools must provide fair and equal opportunities to become tutors or demonstrators to those with the relevant knowledge and skills who may be interested, although the opportunities will vary across Schools.
- 1.2 Recruitment must be timely in order to allow for a formal induction to be undertaken before duties commence (see section 5).
- 1.3 Selection for posts should adhere to the University's [Conflict of Interest policy](#).

2. Contracts and Payment

- 2.1 This section is only relevant to tutors and demonstrators who have a specific contract to provide these services and is not relevant to those for whom tutoring/demonstrating is part of a wider role or those for whom tutoring/demonstrating is an expectation under the terms of their scholarship.
- 2.2 Tutors and demonstrators must be specifically contracted for teaching and assessment duties and paid the rate agreed within that contract. The contract must be approved by the Head of School, or a suitably delegated member of staff,¹ before the tutor or demonstrator assumes duties.
- 2.3 Tutors and demonstrators will be asked to undertake work which is consistent with the grade at which they are paid. [Grade descriptors](#) will set out the work which is appropriate to each grade.
- 2.4 Tutors and demonstrators must be remunerated for contact hours and such time as the School judges is necessary for preparation of teaching material, marking and assessment of work, in line with the relevant work allocation. Tutors and demonstrators must also be paid for their formal induction and mandatory training associated with the contracted teaching/demonstrating (see section 5).
- 2.5 For tutors/demonstrators who are current students, employment is offered for a fixed period of time related to the period of the programme of study. For fuller information

¹ Hereafter, 'Head of School' may refer to the Head of School or suitably delegated member of staff. Schools should identify delegated staff members and communicate these to tutors and demonstrators via the key contacts information (see Appendix).

please see the Appendix in the following guidance:
[http://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/fixed_term_contracts -
_reason_codes_golden_copy_october_2016.pdf](http://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/fixed_term_contracts_-_reason_codes_golden_copy_october_2016.pdf)

- 2.6 Employees are engaged on standard University of Edinburgh conditions of employment and should ensure they familiarise themselves with employee policies relevant to their post.

Maximum Hours' Work

- 2.7 For tutors and demonstrators who are registered as students at the University, teaching must not impede the successful completion of the tutors' and demonstrators' own degrees and must not contravene any conditions of their funding body. Postgraduate research students may only undertake to sign a contract for tutoring/demonstrating activities with the permission of their principal supervisor.
- 2.8 **[We are keen to hear views regarding whether the University should limit the number of hours all full-time students should work, as well as what the limit should be].** For students on Tier 4 visas, additional constraints on employment will apply, and some studentships will also include conditions regarding the number of hours of paid teaching or other work that students can undertake. Heads of School are responsible for keeping an overview of the number of contract hours undertaken by each individual.

3. Roles and responsibilities

- 3.1 Tutors and demonstrators may contribute to a range of activities including the following:
- Seminars and workshops;
 - Tutorials;
 - Laboratory and other practical classes;
 - Field trips.

Allocation of responsibility

- 3.2 It is the responsibility of the Course Organiser to allocate work at an appropriate level to tutors and demonstrators, to provide guidance on what is involved in particular duties, and to supervise all duties undertaken. The Course Organiser is responsible for ensuring that work is allocated that is manageable [and, in the case of tutors and demonstrators who are students, within the prescribed weekly time limit]
- 3.3 Should the Course Organiser deem it appropriate for tutors and demonstrators to undertake work that is not normally applicable to the grade at which they are currently working, but is thought to be useful for development reasons, this work must be supervised and feedback must be provided.

Pastoral support

- 3.4 While tutors and demonstrators can offer a convenient first point of contact for students who wish to discuss personal problems, in practice their role is to direct students to more specialised sources of pastoral support. Formal induction should include guidance about appropriate people within the School (e.g. a Personal Tutor) or University support services to which students can be referred, and about relevant local procedures.

Involvement in assessment and feedback

[The Senate Curriculum and Student Progression Committee is currently undertaking a review of the University's policy on moderation. Sections 3.5 to 3.7 may need to be revised to take account of that review].

- 3.5 The Head of School is responsible for appointing markers who contribute to the assessment process. Where the Head of School appoints tutors or demonstrators to undertake assessment and feedback duties, the Course Organiser has responsibility for allocating their duties and for ensuring that the type of work and the manner in which it is undertaken is accordance with the [University's Taught Assessment Regulations](#).
- 3.6 Where tutors and demonstrators are allocated assessment and feedback duties, the Course Organiser is responsible for supporting and overseeing their work. This will include briefing tutors and demonstrators in advance on how to conduct all relevant aspects of the assessment and feedback process.
- 3.7 The Course Organiser has responsibility for ensuring that appropriate moderation processes are in place and for informing tutors and demonstrators of these arrangements. Typically, Course Organisers will operate more robust moderation processes when marking is undertaken by tutors and demonstrators.

4. Access to facilities and resources

- 4.1 Tutors and demonstrators must be given access to all facilities and resources that the Head of School deems they require to fulfil their duties, and a summary of these must be included in the formal induction (see section 5).

5. Mandatory induction and training

- 5.1 Tutors and demonstrators must not commence their duties until the School has provided them with appropriate formal induction on all core aspects of their role. Recommended content of the formal induction plan is set out in the Appendix.
- 5.2 Mandatory training specific to the courses that the tutors and demonstrators are assigned may, in some circumstances, be delivered separately to the formal induction and may continue after tutoring/demonstrating work has been commenced. Heads of School must recommend an appropriate amount of training.

[We are interested in views regarding whether the University should stipulate the knowledge / skills / training or support required for postgraduate students who are acting as tutors and demonstrators at certain levels, e.g. PGT level]

6. Feedback and Review

- 6.1 It is the responsibility of the Head of School to ensure that tutors and demonstrators are adequately supported in their role and that their work is monitored satisfactorily.
- 6.2 Feedback makes a valuable contribution to tutors' and demonstrators' experience and development. It is important that tutors and demonstrators receive constructive feedback on their performance. This feedback may be received through various channels. Tutors and demonstrators will be mentored by a member of the academic staff appointed by the Head

of School, who will be responsible for helping them reflect on their teaching. **[We are particularly interested in views regarding this proposed mentoring role].**

6.3 Schools are responsible for providing tutors and demonstrators with a formal annual review of their development and progress. For tutors and demonstrators working 0.2 FTE or more this will take the form of an individual meeting, which should be undertaken by the Course Organiser or suitably delegated member of staff. For tutors and demonstrators defined as low-hours employees (working less than 0.2 FTE), alternate arrangements apply, see: www.ed.ac.uk/human-resources/learning-development/annual-review/guidelines/line-managers-reviewers/low-hour-employees. If tutors/demonstrators are currently postgraduate research students, reviews of their development and progress in tutoring and demonstrating must be separate from the postgraduate research annual review process.

7. Non-mandatory training and development

7.1 It is valuable for tutors and demonstrators to be given the opportunity to develop beyond their current tasks and mentors must discuss with them the availability of any optional training which will allow this development. This training might include courses or briefing meetings organised by the Course Organiser, the School or the Institute for Academic Development (IAD). Tutors and demonstrators will not be paid for time spent undertaking non-mandatory training.

8. Resolving problems

8.1 If tutors and demonstrators experience any difficulties, for example, balancing teaching with their studies, they should, in the first instance, speak to the Course Organiser. If this does not resolve the problem, an appointment should be made with the key contact outlined by the Head of School (see Appendix).

Appendix

Formal Induction Plan

Each School must form an induction plan for tutors and demonstrators which should include the following:

Key contacts

- Whom tutors and demonstrators should contact in case of any queries about the course (e.g. Course Organiser), their development (their 'mentor'), their contract or pay (e.g. School office staff) (advise two different people in case of absence or conflict).
- An introduction to all key people in relevant formal roles in the School.

Contracts and pay

- How many hours tutors and demonstrators are expected to work (including detail of preparation time, marking time, teaching time).
- How much tutors and demonstrators will be paid for this work, when they will be paid, and how they will be paid.

Course and subject specific information

- Course content and processes.
- The facilities and resources that are available to tutors and demonstrators.
- Administrative tasks related to teaching (e.g. class allocation).
- Detailed marking criteria

Roles and responsibilities

- The expectation of tutors and demonstrators in terms of teaching and assessment responsibilities
- The role of tutors and demonstrators in relation to pastoral support for students, including information regarding the key staff in the School with a role in providing pastoral support, local procedures for referring students, record keeping and confidentiality issues.

Relevant policies and procedures

- This Policy document.
- Arrangements for making tutors and demonstrators aware of reasonable adjustments that they need to make for students with disabilities.
- Feedback or review arrangements that are in place and when these processes will occur, including how tutors/demonstrators may provide feedback on their experiences.
- Information about any teaching-related accessibility, equality, and diversity policies (e.g. Accessible and Inclusive learning policy).
- Any confidentiality or data rules or processes within the School.
- Relevant health and safety guidance.
- Any School handbooks or other documentation for tutors and demonstrators.
- Any relevant employment policies.

Training and development

- Mandatory training activities.
- Additional development opportunities (e.g. workshops provided by the IAD)

[Links will be provided to relevant resources including HR policies]

The University of Edinburgh

Senate Learning and Teaching Committee

24 May 2017

Update from Lecture Recording Policy Task Group

Executive Summary

This paper provides an update from Learning and Teaching Committee's Lecture Recording Policy Task Group

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

Leadership in learning

Action requested

For information

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

Paper provided for information

Resource / Risk / Compliance

- 1. Resource implications (including staffing)**
None
- 2. Risk assessment**
Not included. Paper is for information
- 3. Equality and Diversity**
Not included. Paper is for information
- 4. Freedom of information**
The paper is open

Originator of the paper

Neil McCormick
Educational Technology Policy Officer, Learning, Teaching and Web Services
May 2017

Update from Lecture Recording Policy Task Group

- The LTC Lecture Recording Policy Task Group met for the first time on 4 May 2017 and considered members' initial views on lecture recording and reports on existing policy and practice both at this University and at a range of other UK HEIs. It will hold at least two further meetings over the summer to develop a draft policy and guidance, with a wider consultation on the draft anticipated in Semester 1 of 2017/2018.
- A supplier has now been chosen and the new lecture recording system will replace existing provision in 114 locations across the University in time for the start of the 2017/2018 academic session. The new policy is expected to be approved in time for the 2018/2019 academic session, to coincide with integration of the lecture recording system with the timetable system. Existing School-level policy arrangements will continue in the meantime.

The University of Edinburgh

Senate Learning and Teaching Committee

24 June 2017

Development of a Policy on Learning Analytics

Executive Summary

This paper updates the Committee regarding the progress of the task group to develop a Learning Analytics Policy, and invites the Committee to approve a set of Principles and Purposes. The Principles and Purposes are also subject to approval by the Knowledge Strategy Committee. The Principles and Purposes will be subject to review in 2019-20.

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

This work supports the University's Strategic Objective of Leadership in Learning.

Action requested

The Committee is invited to:

- Note progress on developing a Learning Analytics Policy; and
- Approve a set of Principles and Purposes.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

The paper summarises the consultation and communication activities undertaken during the preparation of the Principles and Purposes. If the Committee approves the Principles and Purposes, Academic Services will communicate them to Schools as part of the annual 'new policies' publication. It will then coordinate additional communication and implementation activities once the more detailed Policy document is also in place.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. Resource implications (including staffing)

The resources associated with the development of the Principles and Purposes and the more detailed Policy document are associated primarily with the staff time of the members of the task group. Academic Services is providing administrative support for this work. The resource implications of specific learning analytics activities will need to be considered on a case by case basis.

2. Risk assessment

The development of the Policy is designed to assist the University to manage and mitigate risks associated with learning analytics activities.

3. Equality and Diversity

The task group has considered the potential equality and diversity implications (both positive and negative) of learning analytics. The paper summarises these issues. A formal Equality Impact Assessment has also been produced. There are no equality and diversity reasons not to adopt the Principles and Purposes document. It will however be important to consider equality and diversity issues when considering introducing specific learning analytics systems.

4. Freedom of information

Open

Key words

Learning Analytics, Data

Originator of the paper

Prof Sian Bayne, Assistant Principal, Digital Education
Prof Dragan Gasevic, Chair in Learning Analytics and Informatics
Tom Ward, Director of Academic Services

16 May 2017

Development of a Policy on Learning Analytics

1. The Senate Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) and the Knowledge Strategy Committee (KSC) have established a task group to develop an institutional policy on Learning Analytics. The group is convened by Prof Dragan Gasevic (Chair of Learning Analytics and Informatics in Moray House School of Education and School of Informatics). Its remit and membership are available at:

www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/remitmembershipforweb_3.pdf

2. The task group has met twice – on 14 December 2016, and 17 April 2017. It has:
 - Discussed benchmarking information regarding practices at other institutions;
 - Agreed to prepare two documents - a set of student- and staff-facing document Principles and Purposes for Learning Analytics, and a more detailed Policy document setting out the University will handle issues such as data governance, consent and security;
 - Developed the Principles and Purposes;
 - Overseen consultation and engagement activities to raise awareness of learning analytics and to seek views on the Principles and Purposes.
3. The group is now seeking approval from LTC and KSC for the Principles and Purposes. Guided by these Principles and Purposes, the group will then work with the University's new Data Protection Officer to develop the more detailed Policy document during summer 2017, with a view to seeking approval from LTC and KSC in Semester One 2017-18.

Consultation and Engagement

4. The task group has overseen a two stage process of broad and meaningful consultation and engagement:

Stage One: Engagement and initial consultation phase (January to April / May 2017)

Stage Two: Formal consultation on Policy document (late April to May 2017)

5. The first phase involved:
 - A project webpage: www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/projects/learning-analytics-policy
 - An item in the January / February 2017 edition of the Senate Committees' Newsletter;
 - Discussion at a well-attended Senate meeting on 1 February 2017;
 - Discussions at KSC on 20 January 2017 and LTC on 25 January 2017;

- Informing all Schools and Colleges of the planned development of the Policy, and asked whether it would be possible to attend their Learning and Teaching Committees to talk about learning analytics (a total of c. 20 meetings were held with Schools and Colleges);
 - As part of the EU-funded Supporting Higher Education to Integrate Learning Analytics (SHEILA) project, six focus groups with students, and a survey of c. 6700 UG, PGT and PGR students (excluding final year UG students);
 - As part of the SHEILA project, an academic staff survey.
6. The second phased involved inviting Schools / Colleges and other stakeholders (Students' Association, UCU) to provide written feedback on the draft Principles.
 7. The main themes arising from these consultation and engagement activities are set out below. A small minority of consultation and engagement activities have not yet been completed (the staff survey has not yet closed although interim findings have been taken into account, the staff focus groups forming part of the SHEILA project have not yet taken place, and one meeting with a School is outstanding). However, it appears very unlikely that these further activities will raise issues not already highlighted.

Feedback from consultation and engagement processes

8. In general, stakeholders:
 - Have welcomed the broad consultation and engagement exercise;
 - Are content with the idea of developing a Principles and Purposes document and a separate and more detailed policy;
 - Are content with the draft Principles and Purposes document (subject to some minor revisions); and
 - Recognise that, while it is relatively straightforward to set out appropriate Principles and Purposes, it will be more challenging to design the more detailed Policy in order to address the key ethical and legal issues.
9. Some stakeholders had limited awareness of Learning Analytics and found the issue rather abstract in the absence of specific proposals for learning analytics activities. Conversely, a minority of stakeholders expressed reservations regarding some potential uses of learning analytics, seeking further information regarding the evidence on potential benefits to students, the likelihood of learning analytics providing new insights into student learning at the University, the strategic case for investing resources, and the mitigating actions that the University would take to address any potential negative consequences. There is a large field of evidence regarding the use of learning analytics at other

institutions, and the task group has considered some of this information. However, since learning analytics can be used in various different ways, and the impact can depend on institutional context, it is not possible for the University to set out a detailed analysis until it has decided what specific learning analytics system(s) it wishes to implement.

10. Key themes raised during consultations include:

Implications for student learning:

- No evidence of concern regarding the University using student data in anonymised / aggregate form;
- Mixed evidence of student views on the University using individualised student data, suggesting that the University should be cautious and take account of student views when introducing specific learning analytics systems:
 - While EUSA indicates that student representatives have expressed concern about ways that the University could potentially use individualised data to scrutinise students' study habits, the SHEILA student survey suggests that students would have high expectations for the University to act on the basis of their data, as long as appropriate arrangements for data ethics, security and consent are in place.
 - The University should not focus the use of learning analytics solely on 'at risk' students.
 - Learning analytics is more likely to be particularly valuable for supporting individual students when teaching at scale.
 - Providing students with data regarding the achievements and engagement of their peers could have either positive or negative impacts on students, for example, it could lead to either healthy or unhealthy competition among students by revealing data about individual students against their peers, and could induce anxiety among students.
 - It is important to use predictive analytics cautiously to avoid reinforcing negative patterns of engagement.
 - There was some concern that the University should avoid giving the impression that learning analytics would be taking a 'big brother' surveillance role in relation to its students.
- There are potential widening participation benefits to Learning Analytics, for example, it could provide an evidence base for targeted and focussed support for widening participation.

- Students (like staff) may need to develop data skills in order to be able to interpret and use learning analytics data.

Implications for learning and teaching design:

- Learning analytics has the potential to provide valuable insights into how students learn which may be useful for course design, for example there was interest in exploring how data on use of lecture recordings could highlight the types of topics that students are particularly interested in (or struggling with).

Staffing dimensions:

- Appropriate staff training and support for any large learning analytics system rollout is vital.
- There is broad support for making it explicit that data generated from learning analytics (by which we mean the linkage of different datasets for the purposes of generating learning analytics, rather than individual datasets, such as Course Enhancement Questionnaire data) will not be used to monitor staff performance. However, it is also important to make it clear that individual teaching staff may voluntarily use data from learning analytics as evidence of their teaching practice, and to share insights about course quality and best teaching practices.
- The introduction of learning analytics could displace existing practices and change roles, as can often happen when new technologies are introduced. For example, if the University has rich data regarding student engagement there may be less need to run student surveys, and certain uses of Learning Analytics could change the roles of certain groups of staff, eg Personal Tutors.
- Initial findings from the staff survey suggest that teaching staff have concerns that the introduction of learning analytics systems could increase their workload.
- Some staff would find it useful to have a richer set of data to draw upon – primarily performance and attendance data – when writing professional references for students.

Transparency, data protection and consent:

- It is important to be transparent about the way in which data would be used, for example regarding any arrangements for sharing data with third parties.
- While securing student consent for the use of their data will be a crucial issue, the issue of consent seeking depends on what types of data we intend to use for Learning Analytics purposes.

Data governance issues:

- It is crucial for the University to have sound governance for learning analytics activities, to ensure that activities were ethically sound.
- The policy should create opportunities to unlock the capacity in data science in the University to advance learning analytics, by providing a streamlined process for getting access to data, involving researchers and students to analyse data, and inform institutional/school decision making.
- The University will need to clarify some of the procedures for data access, including determining who should have access rights.
- The University will need to explain when learning analytics approaches will need to be subject to normal research ethics frameworks.

Relationship with UK Visas and Immigration requirements:

- It will be necessary to clarify whether, if the University took a more systematic approach to analysing student engagement data for learning analytics purposes, the University may have some obligations to use the learning analytics data, for Tier 4 attendance and engagement monitoring purposes (and, if so, how those obligations may interact with the obligations regarding student consent for the use of their data).

Equality and diversity dimensions

11. The task group has considered the potential equality and diversity implications of learning analytics, and some stakeholders have also recognised that the use of Learning Analytics has the potential to raise some equality and diversity issues. A formal Equality Impact Assessment has been produced.
12. Learning analytics can have potential negative equality impacts. For example, if the underlying data or the algorithms used contain bias, then any individual interventions based on that learning analytics could favour some groups over others, and where it is used by institutional managers to explore the effectiveness of different types of student support service this could lead them to design services that do not meet the needs of all student groups. A range of mitigating actions include:
 - Recognising (including in the Principles and Purposes document) that data and algorithms can contain and perpetuate bias, and working to build awareness of this and addressing it where it occurs.

- Developing strong institutional governance arrangements for learning analytics to avoid inappropriate and unethical use of learning analytics.
- Developing capacity of staff to interpret data and to recognise the potential for data and algorithms to contain bias.
- Ensuring that learning analytics does not inform significant action at an individual level without human intervention.

13. Learning analytics also has a range of potential positive equality and diversity implications. For example, it can allow us to see more nuanced views of our highly diverse student population, challenge assumptions that we may be making, and allow supportive resource to be directed where it is most needed. It can also support a more personalised learning experience, which may assist the University to support non-traditional learners.

14. In practice, none of these issues require any changes to the Principles and Purposes document itself, but they will need to be considered carefully when introducing specific learning analytics arrangements.

Anticipated strategic approach

15. The University is at a relatively early stage of adopting learning analytics. While some small-scale pilots are underway (in addition to the Civitas pilot – see below), it is likely that substantial further piloting at a local and relatively small-scale level will be required before the University is likely to be in a position to consider the case for institution-wide approaches to learning analytics. The Committee is therefore invited to approve the Principles and Purposes on the basis that they will assist the University to manage these pilot activities, and that Schools / Colleges would have the flexibility to determine whether and how they wish to utilise learning analytics.

16. It is possible that, as the University's experience of learning analytics becomes more mature, it may be necessary for the Committees to revisit the Principles and Purposes.

Civitas project

17. The University has been working with an external partner, Civitas Learning on a two-year pilot to understand where learning analytics approaches could be useful within the University. The project has worked with data from ODL programmes as it was felt that they would be a rich data set, and that a focus on retention may be useful within this cohort. The project has uncovered significant information about attitudes, applicability of learning analytics approaches, staff development / support requirements, policy issues, and technical and student communication

challenges. It has however also highlighted challenges with statistical significance within the ODL population, and as a result not generated any significant new insights into student learning.

Principles and Purposes for approval

18. The task group agreed to delegate to the Convener of the group, and the Assistant Principal (Digital Education) to agree the version of the Principles and Purposes to present to LTC and KSC. They have considered the feedback from the consultation and engagement processes (summarised above). The vast majority of the issues raised by stakeholders relate to implementation issues and do not affect the wording of the Principles and Purposes document. Some relatively minor changes have however been made to the document to address some specific issues. The Committee is invited to approve the document (attached as an Annex).

Plans for staff training and development

19. The consultation and engagement processes highlighted the importance of staff training and development to support the implementation of learning analytics. Prof Gasevic, and Prof Sian Bayne (Assistant Principal, Digital Education) plan to work with Information Services Group to develop a programme training activities. These are likely to include activities as part of the 'Future Teacher' programme, and activities to learn from the SHEILA and Civitas projects.

Annex- Draft Policy Principles and Objectives (v 15 May 2017)

Overview

Learning analytics has been defined as ‘the measurement, collection, analysis and reporting of data about learners and their contexts, for purposes of understanding and optimising learning and the environments in which it occurs’ (Society for Learning Analytics Research, 2012). Fundamentally, learning analytics is concerned with combining different types of data regarding student engagement and learning (eg data generated by learning management systems, student systems, library systems and other sources related to learning and teaching) in order to better understand, and improve, the learning experiences of our students. Learning analytics can be particularly valuable when teaching at scale, or online, makes it more challenging for staff to know how their students are learning.

While the University’s use of learning analytics is in its early stages, we are in a strong position to learn from our own pilot activities, and our existing expertise in education and learning sciences.

The following is the University’s statement of the Principles and Purposes that will guide the development of our Learning Analytics activities. It will be accompanied by a more detailed policy and procedure to set out how we will manage data stewardship issues such as transparency, consent, ethics, privacy and access, retention and disposal of data in line with these Principles and Purposes. It is possible that, once we have more experience of Learning Analytics, we will wish to review and update these Principles and Purposes.

Policy Principles

The policy starts from the position that all uses of data analytics for learning and teaching within the University should be ethical, transparent and focused on the enhancement of the student experience.

1. As an institution we understand that data never provides the whole picture about students’ capacities or likelihood of success, and it will therefore never be used to inform significant action at an individual level without human intervention;
2. Where we use learning analytics to target support at students, we will do so in order to help all students to reach their full academic potential, rather than taking a deficit model targeted only at supporting students at risk of failure;
3. We will be transparent about how we collect and use data, with whom we share it, where consent applies, and where responsibilities for the ethical use of data lie;

4. We recognise that data and algorithms can contain and perpetuate bias, and will actively work to recognise and minimise any potential negative impacts;
5. Good governance will be core to our approach, to ensure learning analytics projects and implementations are ethically conducted and align with organisational strategy, policy and values;
6. The introduction of learning analytics systems will be supported by focused staff and student development activities to build our institutional capacity; and
7. Data generated from learning analytics will not be used to monitor staff performance.

Purposes of Learning Analytics

Learning analytics approaches can support a range of activities within the institution. While to date they have been explored by universities primarily as means to improve retention, they also have potential benefits for the enhancement of student experience, currently of more importance to the University of Edinburgh:

- **Quality** – Learning analytics can be used as a form of feedback on the efficacy of pedagogical design. Academic teams can use analytics about student activity (individual or cohort) as part of course review and re-design processes as well as potentially using analytics as a form of in-course monitoring and feedback. Individual staff can use learning analytics to reflect on the impact of their teaching.
- **Equity** – Learning analytics approaches can allow us to see more nuanced views of our highly diverse student population, challenge assumptions that we may be making, and allow supportive resource to be directed where it is most needed.
- **Personalised feedback** – Learning analytics can be used to tailor the messages and support that we offer to our students, providing more personalised feedback to support student reflection and academic planning.
- **Coping with scale** – With the challenge of growing cohorts of students, learning analytics can help to strengthen the academic relationship by doing some of the heavy lifting of identifying individuals or groups of individuals that might benefit from particular interventions or information from staff.
- **Student Experience** – In addition to supporting a more personalised

experience, learning analytics can improve progression and retention, ensure that our academic offerings align with the needs and goals of students, and support satisfaction and wellbeing. Analytics can also be used to promote critical reflection skills and enable our students to take responsibility for their own learning.

- **Skills** – Interactions with analytics as part of the University learning experience can help our students build 'digital savviness' and prompt more critical reflection on how data about them is being used more generally, what consent might actually mean and how algorithms work across datasets to define and profile individuals. Learning analytics approaches can also be used to promote the development of key employability skills. Supporting staff to develop skills in working with learning analytics applications is also an investment in institutional capacity and leadership.
- **Efficiency** – Learning analytics can be used to evaluate and demonstrate institutional efficiency through a) measuring the impact of initiatives and validating that benefits are being realised and b) demonstrating that publically-funded resource is being deployed in support of the best outcomes of all students.

The University of Edinburgh

Senate Learning and Teaching Committee

24 May 2017

Near Future Teaching: Designing the Future of Digital Education at Edinburgh Update for LTC

Executive Summary

In its September 2016 meeting, LTC approved the establishment of a task group to support a two-year project to design the future of digital education at the University of Edinburgh. This paper provides a brief update on the project to date.

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

The project aligns with the strategic theme of leadership in learning, and the development themes of influencing globally and digital transformation and data.

Action requested

For information.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

n/a

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. Resource implications (including staffing)

none

2. Risk assessment

N/A

3. Equality and Diversity

N/A

4. Freedom of information

open

Key words

digital education, vision, learning, technology, teaching, digital transformation

Originator of the paper

Siân Bayne, AP Digital Education and Jennifer Williams (IAD)

Near Future Teaching: designing the future of digital education at Edinburgh Update for LTC

This initiative is conducting a university-wide series of events and consultations focused on developing a strong, creative vision for digital education which can inform strategy, policy and planning for the coming decade or more. The project takes an approach to consultation which is open-ended, inclusive and focused on the development of innovative educational responses to the big, new problems and possibilities of a digital society. It aims to harness the collective vision and energy of the university to shape and inform our approach, developing methods which can be applied to other strategic projects.

The project is led by AP Digital Education (Siân Bayne), supported by the Institute for Academic Development (Jon Turner, Jennifer Williams and Lucy Ridley) and Information Services (Lucy Kendra and web team).

Main points to note

1. **The initiative is proceeding as planned** – the task group has met twice; a name for the initiative (Near Future Teaching) agreed; the programme of pilot events has been completed; graphic design and branding of the initiative has been completed and the web site built to launch shortly; the social media presence for the project has been created; events for next academic year have been agreed and organisation of these is underway.
2. **Pilot events are complete** – these have included a ‘Wine and Cheese’ session with undergraduate students at Pollock Halls (January 2016); a workshop during the Festival of Creative Learning (February 2017); a discussion event with digital humanities students in the School of Literatures, Languages and Cultures (March 2017, led by Anouk Lang); and an initial series of vox pop interviews with students at the Main Library and Kings Buildings.
3. **Planning for upcoming activities is underway** – these draw on the expertise and leadership of the task group and include both student and staff activity:
 - an expansion of the vox pop interviews to Little France and Easter Bush, with pop-up studios at key events (for example elearning@Edinburgh)
 - events within the staff-facing Future Teacher series next semester, to include a ‘Create and Talk’ session in the uCreate studio, a creative writing and future fictions for education (led by Jennifer Williams), and ‘Analytics Futures’ (led by Dragan Gasevic)
 - the Digital Futures for Learning course on the MSc in Digital Education will be committed to the Near Future Teaching project in semester one 2017/18 (led by Jen Ross), drawing in informed perspectives from our ODL students
 - a Design Informatics Collider event on Near Future Teaching will be held in September (led by Chris Speed) to bring a cross-disciplinary design-based approach to the questions raised by the project
 - between September and December 2017 focused events with students will be held in medicine, veterinary medicine and science and engineering (‘Driving Digital Education Futures’) (with task group College reps)

- various social media approaches will be used to draw further input from staff and students

Over semester 2 of the next academic year further discussions will take place with Schools and Colleges based on sharing and further development of the synthesised project findings. The format for these are yet to be determined, but they will focus on ways in which the project outputs will be used to inform future planning. The project will finish in September 2018, with a large project dissemination event taking place during semester 2 of the next academic year.

Key messages to date

- We have modified our original intention to develop a single workshop design for use with different groups in multiple contexts: this has proved not to be feasible where expectations across different stakeholder groups and disciplines can vary widely. Rather than asking staff and students to come to pre-defined workshops for this initiative, we have designed a methodology which allows us to take the project to them, working across multiple areas of activity and in different forms. The input and support of steering group members for this has been key.
- It is easy for discussions with a futures focus to slip into an assumption that technology will by necessity drive change in a particular way. Conversations we have had to date emphasise the need to strike a balance between a focus on future technology, and a focus on the values that will shape our engagement with these.
- High quality documentation of these events and conversations is essential and will become increasingly so as we begin to push out communications through the web site: expert media support from ISG (Lucy Kendra) has been key to the work we have done to date, as has the work of Jennifer Williams (IAD) on project design and management.
- Conversations with students to date suggest that they are most interested in ways in which technology can enhance and render more flexible current teaching methods, rather than in radical calls for a complete reconfiguration of the way we approach teaching through technology. One focus has been the desire for the classroom to be more responsive to the individual (so they can learn where they want, and when they want). For example, approaches like lecture recording are valued for the flexibility they introduce to the student day, and there is recognition of the value of self-study online, but there is little appetite for the abandoning of the lecture as an event. More detailed discussion of emergent themes and their implications will be brought to future meetings of LTC as appropriate.

Task group membership

Sian Bayne – Assistant Principal Digital Education (convenor)
Sarah Cunningham-Burley – Assistant Principal Research-led Learning
Tim Fawns – MSc Clinical Education Programme Coordinator
Judy Hardy – CSE: Professor of Physics Education
Sarah Henderson – CMVM: Programme Director MSc in Clinical Management of Pain
Melissa Highton – Assistant Principal Online Learning
Anouk Lang – Lecturer in English Literature/Digital Humanities
Susan Rhind – CMVM: Assistant Principal Assessment and Feedback

LTC: 24.05.2017
H/02/25/02

LTC 16/17 5 L

Jen Ross – CAHSS: Senior Lecturer in Digital Education

Michael Rovatsos – Senior Lecturer in Artificial Intelligence, School of Informatics

Michael Seery – Reader in Chemistry Education

Chris Speed – Chair of Design Informatics

Jon Turner – Director IAD

Jennifer Williams - Projects & Engagement Coordinator IAD

EUSA rep

Sian Bayne (AP Digital Education) and Jennifer Williams (IAD)

12 May 2017

LTC: 24.05.2017
H/02/25/02

LTC 16/17 M

The University of Edinburgh

Senate Learning and Teaching Committee

24 May 2017

Update from Research-Led Learning and Teaching Task Group

Executive Summary

This paper provides an update from Learning and Teaching Committee's Research-Led Learning and Teaching Task Group.

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

Leadership in learning

Action requested

For information

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

Paper provided for information

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. Resource implications (including staffing)

None

2. Risk assessment

Not included. Paper is for information

3. Equality and Diversity

Not included. Paper is for information

4. Freedom of information

The paper is open

Originator of the paper

Sarah Cunningham-Burley
Assistant Principal Research-Led Learning
May 2017

Task Group on Research-led learning (the group has met twice)

Update

Members confirmed that they were content with the remit for the Group, subject to the following:

- In addition to scoping practice within University of Edinburgh Schools, there would be benefit in scoping practice in other UK and worldwide universities.
- It would be important to consider both on-campus and online learning.
- It would be necessary to clarify whether the Group was considering UG only or UG and PGT provision.
- Communications would need to be considered carefully. There were some concerns about the term 'research-led learning and teaching' on the basis that it may reinforce an idea that the University prioritises research over teaching. Members discussed the alternative terms, 'research-led teaching and teaching-led research', 'research-teaching nexus', 'research-rich learning and teaching' and 'research-based learning and teaching'. It was agreed that broad definitions encompassing all characterisations of research-led learning would be required.
 - There would be benefit in developing some performance metrics for research-teaching linkages.

Dimensions of research-led learning and teaching – the Group considered the four dimensions of research-led learning and teaching namely, 'learning about research / research-informed learning', 'learning to do research', 'learning in a research mode', and 'learning about learning'. These were considered by members to be extremely useful. 'Learning to do research' was considered to be particularly complex because of differences in definitions and processes of research.

Staff 'buy in' – any proposals developed by the Group would need to be considered by academic staff to be realistic and achievable. It was agreed that the Group would aim to develop a set of examples of research-led learning and teaching, including pre-Honours examples from across subject areas.

Enquiry-based learning – this could be considered a parallel for 'learning in a research mode'. However, it was noted that enquiry-based learning is also undertaken by high-quality teaching institutions, and it will be important for the University to develop distinctive teaching that reflects the fact that it is a research-intensive institution.

Transformation - the importance of transformation during a student's time at University from student to researcher. It was noted that a 4 year degree programme allows greater opportunity for this transformation to occur.

Community – members discussed the importance of seeing students as junior colleagues. It was noted that this can only be achieved through increased partnership with academic staff, postdoctoral researchers and research students. It was also recognised that the University's buildings often lack the necessary communal space to facilitate this.

Core and Additional - research- led learning and teaching should be core our curricula and pedagogies; however, we should also offer a range of enhanced opportunities with more aspirational targets to support student and staff engagement.

Barriers identified to date - Class sizes; Estate constraints; Failure of some Scottish students to engage with Advanced Highers; The School system, which discourages interdisciplinary activity

LTC: 24.05.2017
H/02/25/02

LTC 16/17 M

Developing metrics – the Group thought that metrics should reflect the range of opportunities available to staff and students rather than impose a ‘gold standard’ that may not apply across all subject areas (e.g. student authorship on research publications). It would also be important to surface research-led learning and teaching in course and programme materials.

Remit and Membership of Task Group

- Scope current practices across Schools;
- Drawing on the Universitas 21 work, develop the University's narrative regarding how its research strengths enable it to offer programmes underpinned by research-led teaching and learning, with a particular focus on the University's undergraduate degree programmes;
- Develop a framework to enable Schools to evaluate the extent to which their programmes are delivering research-led teaching and learning, and instigate pilots of the framework in a small number of programmes;
- Identify barriers to and enablers of research-led teaching and learning, and feed them into the strand of work on fostering and embedding innovation (see above); and
- Consider the merits of developing a community of practice around research-led teaching and learning and an increased web presence on research-led teaching and learning and the research/teaching nexus.

Assistant Principal Research-Led Learning (Convener)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sarah Cunningham-Burley
School Director of Teaching from each College	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phil Bailey (Chemistry, CSE) • Philip Larkman (BMTO, CMVM) • Elizabeth Bomberg (SPS, CAHSS)
School Director of Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • David Cavanagh (Institute of Immunology and Infection Research, CSE)
College Deans of Learning and Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graeme Reid (CSE) • Neil Turner (CMVM) • Neil Mulholland (CAHSS)
College Dean of Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To fill
Head of School	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Iain Gordon (Maths, CSE)
SLICCS Rep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simon Riley
University Research Strategy Rep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Charlotte Brady
Governance and Strategic Planning Rep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pauline Jones
Institute for Academic Development Rep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jon Turner (possibly also Lara Isbel in attendance)
Students' Association Rep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tanya Lubicz-Nawrocka
Administrator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pippa Ward

LTC: 24.05.2017
H/02/25/02

LTC 16/17 M

The University of Edinburgh

Senate Learning and Teaching Committee

24 May 2017

Update from University-Wide Courses Task Group

Executive Summary

This paper provides an update from Learning and Teaching Committee's University-Wide Courses Task Group

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

Leadership in learning

Action requested

For information

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

Paper provided for information

Resource / Risk / Compliance

- 1. Resource implications (including staffing)**
None
- 2. Risk assessment**
Not included. Paper is for information
- 3. Equality and Diversity**
Not included. Paper is for information
- 4. Freedom of information**
The paper is open

Originator of the paper

Sarah Cunningham-Burley
Assistant Principal Research-Led Learning
May 2017

University-Wide Courses Task Group (this has met twice)

Update

There has been considerable recent discussion about 'University-wide courses'. The University's Learning and Teaching Strategy commits to providing '*University-wide courses in a broader range of skills, for example quantitative methods, digital skills and languages*' and '*the opportunity to participate in courses and modes of learning outside of a student's core discipline(s), and to develop academic skills alongside students from all parts of the University*'. The Strategic Plan 2016 refers to the development of '*flexible study pathways*'. University-wide courses may be of relevance to both the 'Portfolio Development, Innovation and Review' strand of the implementation of the University's Student Recruitment Strategy (which aims to develop and articulate the distinctive Edinburgh offer) and ongoing sector-wide discussions about the value of the Scottish four-year degree programme. Benchmarking has indicated that a number of other UK Higher Education Institutions (Manchester, Warwick, London School of Economics, Imperial College London, Sheffield, Aberdeen) are developing interdisciplinary, university-wide courses using a variety of models. These models include setting up a new structure to oversee a themed set of such courses or offering a compulsory course for all students.

The Group agreed that a University-wide course should be defined as one that is available to all students and, at this stage, is at undergraduate level (probably Level 7 or 8). It should aim to develop Edinburgh's distinctive graduate attributes, and would fall into one of the following categories:

- New, interdisciplinary courses, aiming to fill gaps in existing provision. The Group identified four courses of this type currently offered by the University – 'Our Changing World'; 'Sustainability and Social Responsibility'; 'Sustainability, Society and Environment'; and 'Understanding Gender in the Contemporary World: Key Concepts, Controversies and Challenges', though more may exist.
- Broad, skills-based courses. (There is the potential to offer core material, common to all students, with School or subject-specific material 'bolted on'.)
- Existing, School-based courses, potentially with broad appeal, which could be better publicised. (The Degree Regulations and Programmes of Study (DRPS) and PATH currently group courses by School, resulting in few students being aware of the full range of optional courses available to them.)

Decisions will need to be taken on whether courses should be credit-bearing and / or compulsory: if the University considers University-wide courses to be a high priority, a degree of requirement may be necessary, although introducing incentives to undertake such courses may prove more effective for both staff and student engagement.

The group discussed a range of themes that might serve to group courses together and also discussed whether the University of Edinburgh might consider developing a course for all students, introducing students to the City, the Enlightenment, to our research-led learning and teaching, and through this, their degree subject matter too. This could become a unique Edinburgh offer although considerable resource would be needed to develop an innovative and scalable course (probably online).

There are a number of potential barriers to the development of an extended portfolio of University-wide courses: timetable constraints; lack of space and flexibility in some Programmes; students' reluctance to undertake courses outwith their core subject, and Personal Tutors' reluctance to encourage them to do so; and potential difficulties incorporating courses of this type into the University's existing structures and broader operation. These barriers will require further consideration. Structures may have to be modified to free up time and credit from degree programmes and to ensure progression is not hindered.

Further work is required in the following areas:

1. Agreeing whether all University-wide courses should be credit bearing.
2. Agreeing whether University-wide courses should be compulsory for all students.
3. Identifying ways of overcoming barriers to the development of an extended portfolio of University-wide courses.
4. Consulting staff and students about their views on University-wide courses.
5. Consulting with a broader group of staff to finalise a list of course themes and whether there would be support for a unique 'Edinburgh' course.

LTC: 24.05.2017
H/02/25/02

LTC 16/17 N

Remit

- Map current University-wide courses;
- Identify gaps in provision, seeking feedback regarding the types of courses students may wish to take, and benchmarking provision at other institutions;
- Produce a framework for how new courses would be developed, organised and taken up; and
- Explore how to manage the resourcing of the courses.

Membership

Assistant Principal Research-Led Learning (Convener)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sarah Cunningham-Burley
Other Assistant Principals	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lesley McAra• Sian Bayne
Course Organiser	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mayank Dutia (CMVM)
College Reps	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Stuart King (Mathematics, CSE)• Neil Turner (CMVM – temporary until another rep identified)• John Lowrey (CAHSS)
School Director of Learning and Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Peter Mole (Director of UG, Business School, CAHSS)
Academic Services Rep	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Tom Ward
Students' Association Rep	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Patrick Garratt (VPAA)
Administrator	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Pippa Ward