H/02/27/02
CSPC: 24.11.16

<u>The University of Edinburgh</u>

**Minutes of the Senatus Curriculum and Student Progression Committee (CSPC)
held on Thursday 24 November 2016 in the Cuillin Room, Charles Stewart House**

Present:

Professor Alan Murray (Convener)	Assistant Principal, Academic Support
Professor Graeme Reid	Dean of Learning and Teaching (CSCE)
Mr Alan Brown	Associate Dean (Academic Progress) , CAHSS
Dr Theresa McKinven	Head of PG Section (CAHSS)
Ms Alex Laidlaw	Head of Academic Affairs (CSCE)
Dr Sheila Lodge	Head of Academic Administration (CMVM)
Professor Helen Cameron	Director, Centre for Medical Education (CMVM)
Mr John Lowrey	Dean of Undergraduate Studies (CAHSS)
Dr Antony Maciocia	Dean of Students (CSCE)
Mr Patrick Garratt	Vice President Academic Affairs, EUSA
Dr Neil Lent	Institute for Academic Development (IAD)
Dr Adam Bunni	Head of Governance and Regulatory Team, Academic Services

In attendance:

Ms Ailsa Taylor (Secretary)	Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services
Mr Tom Ward	Director, Academic Services
Ms Claire Thomson	Academic Adviser, The Advice Place
Dr Gavin McCabe	Employability Consultant, Edinburgh Award Manager
Dr Simon Riley	Edinburgh Medical School

Apologies for absence:

Dr Geoff Pearson	Dean of Students (CMVM)
Mr Barry Neilson	Director of Student Systems
Dr Ewen Macpherson	School of Engineering
Professor Susan Rhind	Assistant Principal, Assessment and Feedback
Professor Lesley McAra	Assistant Principal, Community Relations

1. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the previous meeting held on Thursday 22 September 2016 were approved as an accurate record.

2. Matters Arising

Item 1 (Service Excellence/Assessment and Degree Regulations Review)

Mr Tom Ward updated the Committee on Service Excellence Programme developments in relation to one of the programme's proposed outline business cases (policy development). In

April 2016 the Committee had agreed to move to a three-yearly review of any substantive corrections to the assessment and degree regulations. It had been agreed that the regulations would all continue to undergo essential minor corrections on an annual basis, but this would only involve minor factual corrections/additions and amendment of broken links. This would be actioned by Academic Services, and there would be no requirement to hold any big annual regulation review meetings annually between January and March. It was proposed that this would still be a sensible approach to take, particularly as the Service Excellence Programme may also have implications for academic policy and regulations. This proposed approach to the degree and assessment regulations review was endorsed again by the Committee.

Item 2 (Models for Degree Types Task Group)
The Models for Degree Types Task Group was due to meet on 30 November 2016. The group was to be convened by Professor Alan Murray and had been established to undertake a review of the Models for Degree Types. The group would be required to draft any revisions to the current document to present to the Committee for approval during 2016/17. They would also consider any implications of any amendments to the Models for Degree Types as a result of new developments (such as Student-Led Individually Created Courses, University-wide courses and Programme Pathways).

Item 3 (Zhejiang update)
Mr Tom Ward updated the Committee on the latest development with the Zhejiang University collaboration. Students had started on programme, and we had now received the documentation that we had been waiting for in relation to conduct procedures, and this was currently under review. Discussions were taking place about the quality assurance arrangements with the Quality Assurance Committee, and this was expected to include a site visit to Zhejiang. This site visit was expected to be part teaching programme review and part student services review (with a focus on other aspect such as governance) and was likely to take place in May 2017.

Item 4 (Collaborative activities – arrangements for certificates and transcripts for dual/multiple awards)
At the last meeting in September, Mr Tom Ward had agreed to explore Chinese ministry of education requirements further regarding degree certificate wording and report back to a future meeting. Mr Ward had a meeting with the University's China Office on the following day, and would report back the outcome to the Committee.

Item 5 (Moderation
The requirement to review the moderation procedures had been agreed by the Committee, and some initial scoping work had started on this in the spring of 2016. Feedback from Colleges had been useful so far, but more feedback was required from Schools about their requirements. Any comments would be welcome, and should be directed in the first instance to Mr Tom Ward at tom.ward@ed.ac.uk

3. Student-Led Individually Created Courses (SLICCs) (CSPC 16/17 2 A)

Dr Simon Riley introduced this paper, which reported on the progress made in implementing SLICCs, including a summary of the main evaluation outcomes from the summer 2016 pilot. Plans were introduced in the paper for mainstreaming the centrally-run SLICCs from summer 2017. The SLICCs model for reflective experiential learning was being developed to enable significant flexibility, either as a 10 or 20 credit option, based on any of Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework levels 7,8,10 and 11,and as individual or group - based SLICCs. The summer 2016 pilot had involved two different forms: SLICCs for additional credit that ran over the summer 2016; and in-programme SLICCs, where existing degree programmes and

courses could embed the SLICC reflective learning framework and supporting materials into their provision. On the latter, discussions were currently underway with over 13 Schools that planned to use the centrally-developed framework and resources in future, to build the SLICCs model into existing programmes. The first of these was expected to take place in semester 2 of 2016/17, with over 200 second year medical students undertaking group projects.

Extensive discussion was held on this agenda item. Members were broadly supportive of the SLICC concept and impressed by the progress made so far. However, members of the Committee raised a number of queries/concerns, particularly in relation to plans for the centrally-run SLICCs, as opposed to the in-programme SLICCs.

Clarification was sought from the Committee on the following matters, which were to be addressed in a paper which was to be brought before the Committee in January 2017:

- The position regarding students holding Tier 4 visas, to ensure no contravention of relevant legislation;

- The selection process for new students. What would the criteria for selection be? In the pilot, students had self-selected, although final numbers had been reduced, as some students chose not to continue;

- How student failure would be tackled. In the pilot, SLICCs had only been available to students in good academic standing and no students had failed, so this had not been an issue;

- Maximum numbers of students on programme/scalability. What would happen if SLICCs went viral, and how would numbers be controlled/capped (a suggestion was made that numbers could be capped at 200 in the first instance);

- Staff resource. How would this be managed, given the demands on time from staff who were already stretched?

- Credit type and use. Would credit achieved through a SLICC remain as "additional credit" as per the recent pilot, or would it become core credit? What were the implications for progression, when students had achieved SLICCs credit? Could it in theory replace a (non-core) failed course for progression purposes?

- Implications for the Teaching Excellence Framework, particularly in the light of discussions on metrics for non-continuation;

- The rationale behind mainstreaming of centrally-run SLICCs. Why continue to invest in summer SLICCs, with the additional demands on staff, rather than solely on in-programme SLICCs?

Committee members remarked particularly on the need to manage student expectations. There was a requirement for absolute clarity from the outset, so that students were clear about how they could use the credits, who could apply, and what the criteria for selection might be.

It was pointed out that our students could, in theory, take credits during our Summer Schools, and if they did, there could be an argument formed that those credits could also be

counted towards a University degree here, were this to be accepted. This created the possibility that, along with SLICCs, there could be two different ways that students could use the summer to accumulate credits in addition to the standard 120 credit load, and that this could, in theory, create opportunities for an 'accelerated' degree, were it to be accepted.

Committee members were supportive of the idea that SLICCs became "mainstreamed", but some concerns were raised about whether it was viable for students to study SLICCs as part of their normal credit load. It would leave little or no space for outside course choices, and as such could limit viable alternative routes into honours programmes. In addition, the timing of the processes looked to be problematic, given that examination boards in October would not know whether the students had passed at the right time for passed credit to be taken account of in the coming year. If the numbers were very small, as they were in the pilots, then such issues may not prove to be too problematic, but if the numbers increased then more careful institutional scrutiny would be essential, particularly in relation to resources.

It was agreed that Dr Simon Riley and Dr Gavin McCabe would seek to clarify these points further and bring another SLICCs paper to the Committee in January 2017; this paper should make clear precisely what the Committee is being asked to consider and endorse.

> **ACTION: Dr Simon Riley and Dr Gavin McCabe to present another SLICCs paper to the Committee in January 2017, in order to address the points for clarification.**

4. Interpreting the Taught Assessment Regulation on Feedback Deadlines (CSPC 16/17 2 B)

The Committee discussed the contents of this paper from Professor Susan Rhind, and confirmed that the requirement to provide feedback "within 15 working days of submission, or in time to be of use in subsequent assessments within the course, whichever is sooner" applied to the provision of marks as well as other types of feedback. In confirming this position, the Committee noted that in some cases there could be good pedagogical reasons for providing feedback ahead of the mark, and emphasised that this remained possible as long as both were provided within 15 working days. The Committee also noted that feedback from Students' Association class representatives suggested that the vast majority of students would expect marks at the same time as feedback.

The Committee also confirmed that the requirement to provide feedback "within 15 working days of submission, or in time to be of use in subsequent assessments within the course, whichever is sooner" applies to all in-course assessed work, including the final assessment for a course. The only exception was single items of assessment which are equivalent to 40 credits or more.

The Committee would take steps to ensure that the version of the Taught Assessment Regulation that applied for 2017/18 was explicit on these points. In the meantime, Committee members were encouraged to make sure that their Schools were clear about the appropriate interpretation for 2016/17

5. CAHSS: Resubmission of Taught Masters Dissertations (CSPC 16/17 2 C)

Dr Theresa McKinven presented this paper, which asked the Committee to consider whether taught masters students should be permitted to resit their dissertations. The current regulation (Regulation 58, Taught Assessment Regulations 2016/17 stated:

Regulation 58   Postgraduate dissertations

Resubmissions of revised dissertations are not permitted for postgraduate masters programmes unless a student's performance in assessment has been affected by illness, accident or circumstances beyond their control.

Application of the regulation
58.1 In exceptional circumstances, the University's Special Circumstance Policy allows the Board of Examiners to apply to the College for permission to allow a student to resubmit a revised dissertation.

Earlier this year, CAHSS College Postgraduate Studies Committee had requested that this issue be discussed across the Colleges, but CAHSS Postgraduate Studies Committee had subsequently reconsidered its view on the proposal, and no longer wished to recommend changing the current assessment regulation/position. The paper therefore requested that CSPC confirm the view that no change should be made to the regulations concerning the resubmission of taught masters dissertations.

A survey of practice in other institutions was contained in the paper, and indicated that Scottish institutions were less likely to permit resubmission than providers in England and Wales, but the position across Scottish Universities was also quite variable.

Following discussion, Committee members agreed to retain the status quo in relation to the current position. No change would be made to the assessment regulations on this for 2017/18. However, CSPC members expressed the desire for this matter to be discussed further by representatives across Colleges, to see whether there was any appetite for CSPC to reconsider the position in the future.

6. CAHSS: MSc in Transformative Learning and Teaching (CLOSED - D)

Dr Theresa McKinven presented this closed paper to the Committee, and the paper was endorsed in principle. However, a revised paper was requested, in order to clarify the following points:

- The Developing Teacher Professionalism (DTP) 1 (30 credit) course – what was the content, how was this course organised and how would it be assessed at the end of Year 1? How did DTP 1 compare to DTP 2 and to the whole of DTP? The paper referred to assessment of the complete 60 credit programme over two years, with reference to a portfolio of evidence and a professional viva. However, it was not clear what would take place in terms of assessment at the end of year 1 or what would be assessed in the professional portfolio. The answer to the question about what would happen at the end of year 1 would have implications for progression calculations, as it would be important to know whether this course was marked at the end of year 1 and if a mark was assigned as opposed to pass/fail. If, for example, it was pass/fail then would the course not be part of the progression calculation from year 1 to year 2 (progression here was outlined in the paper as "pass at least 80 credits with a mark of at least 50% in each of the courses which make up these credits; and attain an average of at least 50% for the 120 credits of study examined at the point of decision for progression").

- How progression, award of Merit and Distinction, and credit on average would be dealt with in general, with explicit consideration of this in relation to the resit element. For example, the Committee felt that it would be extremely generous to allow the mark from a second sit (resit) to count towards merit or distinction. Would it be the first sit mark that would count in this case?

Given the external time constraints, this was expected to be dealt with by correspondence with the Committee before the next meeting in January 2017.

> **Action: Dr McKinven to report back to Dr Aileen Kennedy to outline some specific queries raised by CSPC about this proposed programme. A revised paper would be sought from Dr Kennedy, and formal approval of this would be sought by correspondence before the January 2017 CSPC meeting.**

7. CAHSS: Restructure of the Doctorate in Psychotherapy and Counselling (CSPC 16/17 2 E)

This paper contained a proposal for a modification of the existing Doctorate in Psychotherapy and Counselling, namely that the full-time programme was extended from three to four years and the part-time programme from six to seven years. The proposal had the support of the College Postgraduate Studies Committee, and the School aimed to relaunch the Doctorate in Psychotherapy and Counselling from September 2017.

Following the circulation of the papers the proposal had been modified slightly, with the submission of a revised Degree Programme Table.

In the revised Degree Programme Table the thesis requirement was raised to 360 credits (this would equate to 60 credits in year 2, 120 credits in year 3 and 180 credits in year 4). The word count for the thesis had increased from the original proposal of 35,000-45,000 words, to a word count of 55,000. The proposed increase to credits assigned to the doctoral thesis would result in the minimum number of Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework credits at level 12 for a doctoral degree being met (420 credits at level 12). In total, therefore, students would be required to complete 740 credits, of which 180 credits were at Level 11 and 560 credits were at Level 12).

Subject to incorporation of the revised Degree Programme Table into the plans for the new structure, the Doctorate in Psychotherapy and Counselling was approved, and could be relaunched as proposed from September 2017.

8. Programme and Course Approval and Management Policy (CSPC 16/17 2 F)

The Committee approved minor changes to the Programme and Course Approval and Management Policy, as presented in the paper. The Policy would be available on the Academic Services website for immediate implementation. The changes were made to clarify points raised at a series of College visits:

- Course Organisers – confirmation that changes to the Course Organiser and Course Secretary are management decisions (and therefore not the responsibility of Course Organisers) and added that some Schools require an additional layer of approval for minor changes to courses;

- Clarification of the timescales for approval of changes to or closure of existing courses;

- Changes to the responsibilities to students when programmes are closed to ensure alignment with the rest of the Policy.

Action: Ms Nichola Kett to make revised Programme and Course Approval Management Policy available on the Academic Services website for immediate implementation. Amendments to the Policy would be communicated to key contacts.

9. Enhanced Course Descriptor Update (CSPC 16/17 2 G)

This paper provided the Committee with an update on the impact of the implementation of the enhanced course descriptor in January 2015, and was formally noted by the Committee. The plan for courses that were not in use was that Student Systems would set the courses to not in use during this coming year's "rollover", and Schools would be informed of this, but given an option to let Student Systems know if there were particular courses that they wished to retain.

10. Update on Teaching Excellence Framework (CSPC 16/17 2 H)

Mr Tom Ward introduced this item. This paper briefed the Committee on the arrangements for the second year of the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF). There was now greater clarity regarding how the process would operate, and the three possible outcomes had been labelled Gold, Silver and Bronze. Core TEF metrics had now been confirmed, and were listed in the paper. The TEF metrics provided to assessors would be averaged over the most recent three years of available data and metrics would be flagged if they were significantly and materially above or below a benchmark (a weighted sector average). A decision had not yet been taken by the University in relation to involvement in the Teaching Excellence Framework, but the position was expected to be discussed by University Court in December 2016.

The Committee noted in particular that one of the core metrics for the TEF was non-continuation (measured by Higher Education Statistics Agency Performance Indicators). This metric was the proportion of undergraduate students who started but did not continue their studies. Students were counted between their first and second year of study. Students who continued studying at Higher Education level at the same or another provider are deemed to have continued (with the caveat that the data does not cover all other providers), whereas all other students are deemed non-continuers.

This paper was formally noted by the Committee.

11. Academic Year Dates 2018/19 and Provisional Academic Year Dates 2019/20 (CSPC 16/17 2 I)

Academic year dates for 2018/19 and provisional academic year dates for 2019/20 presented in this paper were approved by the Committee.

Action: Ailsa Taylor to send the agreed 2018/19 dates to the Digital Marketing Team in Communications and Marketing, for posting on the semester dates website at: http://www.ed.ac.uk/semester-dates

12. Senate Committee Planning (CSPC 16/17 2 J)

Mr Tom Ward introduced this item. This paper set out the framework for Senate Committee planning for 2017/18 and invited the Committee to identify any major developments that may require resourcing via the planning round.

13. Concessions 2015/16 (Closed - K)

Dr Adam Bunni presented this closed report, which was received by the Committee for information. The report provided an overview of the approved concessions to University regulations or policies approved by the Curriculum and Student Progression Committee during the 2015/16 academic session.

14. Any other business

Dr Antony Maciocia raised a query about regulations relating to MSc by Research degrees, and specifically to the transition from PhD to MSc by Research (MSc(R)). The Committee clarified that it was their view that the two year maximum period for MSc(R) degrees would start after transferring from a PhD and not be backdated to the start of the degree, so that it was always possible to transfer from a PhD to an MSc(R) at any point in the degree.

It was confirmed that a new MSc by Research task group had been formed and this group would report jointly to the Researcher Experience Committee and to the Curriculum and Student Progression Committee.

There was no further business.

Ailsa Taylor, Academic Policy Officer, 30 November 2016