

H/02/27/02

**Meeting of the Senatus Curriculum and Progression Committee
to be held at 2.00pm on Thursday 26 January 2017
in the Cuillin Room, Charles Stewart House**

A G E N D A

1. **Minutes of the meeting held on 24 November 2016** Enclosed
 2. **Matters Arising**
 - a) **Service Excellence Programme**
 - b) **Electronic Business - Request for Opt-Out from Curriculum Framework: Chemistry Integrated Masters Programmes**
 - c) **Electronic Business - MSc Transformative Learning and Teaching**
 - d) **Support for Study**
- For Discussion**
3. **Collaborative Learning Design in Practice - Fiona Hale, Information Services** Presentation
 4. **Timetabling Policy and Guidance - Wednesday PM analysis** CSPC 16/17 3A
 5. **Student-Led, Individually-Created Courses: model for mainstreaming** CSPC 16/17 3 B
 6. **CAHSS: Psychology (BMedSci Hons)** CSPC 16/17 3 C
 7. **CMVM: MBChB Examination Delivery in Alberta** CSPC 16/17 3 D
 8. **Collaborative activities - arrangements for certificates and transcripts for dual/multiple awards** CLOSED (E)
- For information and formal business**
9. **Collaborative Provision: Memoranda of Agreement** CLOSED (F)
 10. **Resits and Academic Failure Working Group** Verbal Update
 11. **Knowledge Strategy Committee Report** CSPC 16/17 3G
 12. **Dates of Meetings in 2017/18**
 - 21 September 2017
 - 23 November 2017
 - 25 January 2018
 - 15 March 2018
 - 5 April 2018
 - 31 May 2018
 13. **Any Other Business**

Ailsa Taylor, Academic Services, 19 January 2017

H/02/27/02
CSPC: 24.11.16

The University of Edinburgh

**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

The University of Edinburgh

Senatus Curriculum and Student Progression Committee

26 January 2017

Timetabling Policy & Guidance – Weds PM analysis

Executive Summary

This paper, in an update to that presented in March 2016, summarises the extent to which the current timetabling policy regarding Weds pm teaching is circumvented and the reasons given by Schools for the scheduling of core teaching during this restricted period

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

Aligns with the strategic objective of Leadership in Learning

Action requested

To discuss and note emerging issues

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

Policy will be re-drafted in the event that CSPC approves any changes

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. Resource implications (including staffing)

Additional timetable modelling may be required to ensure the current/revised policy is upheld, although no additional costs or funding is envisaged

2. Risk assessment

The key risk is pressure on the existing teaching estate by moving more classes out of the Weds pm period

3. Equality and Diversity

Upholding the current policy will strengthen the commitment to Equality and Diversity implied by the "ring-fenced" Weds pm period

4. Freedom of information

Paper is open

Key words

Originator of the paper

Scott Rosie – Head of Timetabling Services

Amy Partridge-Hicks – Timetable Operations & Modelling Manager

January 2017

Timetabling Policy & Guidance - Weds pm analysis

1. Introduction

The Shared Academic Timetabling Policy & Guidance was approved and introduced by C&SPC in 2011, with the most revision approved in April 2013. The existing policy makes clear reference to Wednesday pm teaching:

“Only in exceptional circumstances will core lecture or class slots be scheduled on Wednesday afternoon when no alternative can be found. Scheduling such a class at this time must be approved by the relevant College Learning and Teaching Committee. This does not preclude schools from offering classes (e.g. laboratories) on a Wednesday afternoon, provided that alternative times are offered at other points in the week.”

While this policy is largely respected, with only 2.2% of core teaching scheduled during the Weds pm period (13.00-18.00) concerns have been raised by EUSA and EUSU representatives that the current level of scheduled core teaching serves to erode the sense of a “ring-fenced” afternoon to enable students to pursue sporting, and other, endeavours. This paper presents analysis of 16/17 Weds pm teaching and summarises key areas for consideration going forward.

Glossary of terms:

- **“whole class”** – teaching activities in which all students enrolled on the course are expected to attend as a single group
- **“sub-group”** – teaching activities where students enrolled on courses split up into smaller groups to engage in tutorial or workshop activities
- **“core teaching”** – Teaching delivered under the umbrella of approved EUCLID course codes. Only activities in this category have been analysed in respect to the existing policy

2. Executive summary

- 1) The current policy is subject to circumvention, but is largely respected
- 2) Existing circumvention is disproportionately weighted towards PGT activity
- 3) Schools primarily feel a variety of constraints largely determine Weds pm scheduling, rather than a preference for this slot per se
- 4) Additional modelling steps will be taken to reduce the level of scheduling for 17/18
- 5) The global offline timetable modelling project – scheduled to deliver its outcomes in April 18 – will provide insight into opportunities to adhere strictly to the current policy
- 6) The global offline timetable modelling project will also model EUSA/EUSU driven preferences to extend the existing policy more extensively across Wednesdays

3. Wednesday pm – 16/17 update summary

Table 1 confirms the number of core teaching activities (at time of analysis in Nov 16) in contravention of the current policy during 16/17. This figure represents **2.2%** of all core teaching.

Timetabling Policy & Guidance - Weds pm analysis

Number of activities	
Undergraduate	71
Postgraduate	79
UG/PG Joint	0
Overall	150

Table 1: Weds PM core teaching

The figures include all “whole class” teaching and “sub-group” teaching that does not offer alternatives elsewhere in the teaching week. This figure represents **0.77%** of all recorded core academic teaching.

It should be noted the level of PGT delivery is higher in both absolute and relative terms.

Table 2 confirms the summary of reasons given by Schools for Weds pm scheduling of core teaching

16/17 Wednesday PM Table				
Rank	Theme	No. of UG Activities	No. of PGT Activities	Total*
1	No Reason Given	32	29	61
2	Timetable Constraints and Lecturer Availability	17	33	50
3	School Willing to Seek Alternatives for following Year (Curriculum Planning)	19	10	29
4	Space Restrictions or Specialist Space required	6	21	27
5	Optional/One Off Whole Class Activities	14	6	20
6	Requires External Participation	1	13	14
7	Moving would cause cancellation of course	9	0	9
8	Students Requested Wednesday PM Slot	0	5	5
9	Placement requirements	1	0	1

Table 2: breakdown of reasons for Weds pm scheduling

* Note totals in table 2 do not match those presented in table 1 as more than one reason is often cited for a single activity by way of explanation.

Although difficult to provide scientific evidence, the engagement with Schools did not suggest any particular strong desire to schedule on Weds pm, but that it was largely felt that constraints conspire to necessitate this, although the position of Schools may differ if presented with more radical proposals to alter the existing policy.

4. Going forward

Timetabling Policy & Guidance - Weds pm analysis

4.1 Timetabling 17/18

In many cases Schools have expressed a willingness for the Timetabling Unit to assist in finding alternative, clash-free slots out with Weds pm. This extra level of modelling assistance will be incorporated within the 17/18 timetable planning period, scheduled for the period Feb-May 2017.

4.2 Additional modelling

Both EUSA and EUSU had expressed a strong preference that Weds pm becomes completely free of all core teaching, encompassing both “whole-class” and “sub-group” activity, with a stated preference that the University:

- 1) At least extends the current 13.00 cut-off to encompass all core teaching activity
- 2) Considers extending the duration of the Weds pm ring-fenced period to begin at 12.00

The global offline timetable modelling project, now initiated and due to deliver outcomes in April 2018, will model these scenarios, as well as a range of others, which may provide that allows CSPC to make changes to the current Weds pm policy in the long-term.

Scott Rosie
Head of Timetabling Services

Amy Partridge-Hicks
Timetabling Operations & Modelling Manager

January 2017

Appendix I: Shared Academic Timetabling Policy and Guidance

http://www.ed.ac.uk/polopoly_fs/1.112961!/fileManager/STU192%20Policy%20Document-v3%206_approved.pdf

The University of Edinburgh

Senatus Curriculum and Student Progression Committee (CSPC)

26 January 2017

Student-Led, Individually-Created Courses: model for mainstreaming

Executive Summary

This paper provides details on the proposed approach for mainstreaming centrally-run Student-Led, Individually-Created Courses (SLICCs), cognisant of current structures and regulations, and is based on discussions with key areas across the University. This follows CSPC's support in principle for mainstreaming centrally-run SLICCs, but request for clarity on a range of issues.

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

Leadership in learning; Influencing globally; Contributing locally

Action requested

CSPC is asked to approve the move from pilot to mainstreaming for SLICCs run centrally, ready to commence for summer 2017 and owned by the Moray House School of Education, amending plans and providing recommendations as appropriate.

CSPC is asked to advise whether or not the interim quota on overall student numbers applied for the first two years of mainstreaming should be split between Y1 and Y2 students and, if so, what ratio should be used.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

Approval by CSPC will be passed directly to those steering SLICCs, and implementation for summer 2017 will commence.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. Resource implications (including staffing)

Mainstreaming for summer 2017 will involve staff from the central services of IAD and Careers Service, and schools that choose to be involved. IAD and Careers Service have already been providing this support and have agreed to continue this from existing resources; the Moray House School of Education has agreed to take ownership of the course, including all quality assurance aspects.

2. Risk assessment

The University's SLICCs pilots have already commanded significant interest elsewhere in the sector. Failure to move from piloting into mainstreaming will result in competitors overtaking the University in an area where it is leading innovation.

3. Equality and Diversity

The SLICC model is designed to offer student's agency and maximise equality and diversity. The second pilot saw a substantial spread of student activities from a wide range of student backgrounds, in particular Widening Participation students (~45%).

4. Freedom of information

The paper is open.

Key words

Student-led; enhancement; independent learning; reflective learning; learning and assessment literacy; engagement through partnership; flexibility; interdisciplinary provision

Originators of the paper

Prof Lesley McAra – SLICCs Academic Champion, Assistant Principal Community Relations

Dr Gavin McCabe – SLICCs Co-Lead, Employability Consultancy

Dr Simon Riley – SLICCs Co-Lead, IAD and Edinburgh Medical School

Dr Adam Bunni – Head of Governance and Regulatory Team, Academic Services

Mr Patrick Garratt – VPAA, Edinburgh University Students' Association

Mr John Lowrey – Dean of Undergraduate Studies, CAHSS

Mr Tom Ward – Director, Academic Services

January 2017



STUDENT-LED INDIVIDUALLY-CREATED COURSES MODEL FOR MAINSTREAMING

Overview

1. This paper provides details on the proposed approach for mainstreaming centrally-run Student-Led, Individually-Created Courses (SLICCs), based on discussions with key areas across the University and cognisant of current structures and regulations. This follows CSPC's support in November 2016 for mainstreaming centrally-run SLICCs in principle, i.e. moving them out of piloting, but request for clarity on a number of issues.
2. As indicated in November, the in-programme pilots of SLICCs are making substantial progress. This semester all Y2 Medical students (200+) are undertaking group SLICCs. In-programme versions are being planned for 2017/18 in: the MasterCard Foundations Scholars programme; the International Office summer school; Y1 and Y2 undergraduate design in ECA (SCQF Levels 7 and 8); and at SCQF Level 11 in Advanced Veterinary Practice; Stem Cells and Translational Neurology; Biodiversity, Wildlife and Ecosystem Health; Regenerative Medicine; Global e-Health; Public Health Sciences (ODL); and Primary Dental Care (ODL). This paper focusses specifically on mainstreaming the centrally-run SLICCs and addressing questions raised by CSPC.

Context and update

3. On 24 November 2016, CSPC considered the progress and plans for SLICCs. At that meeting, there was clear support for the pedagogy of the SLICC framework and approach, highlighting the opportunities presented when embedding in existing programmes and courses. Discussions also recognised that summer SLICCs were at the vanguard of a number of the considerations relating to greater flexibility in learning and teaching that the institution is exploring – in particular the implications of current degree structures and governance on supporting innovations, and enabling multi- and cross-disciplinary working while addressing implications of disciplinary silos. It was appreciated that SLICCs represent only one element of this choreography, surfacing the issues, but are not able to offer final solutions on all.
4. Further clarification on a number of regulatory and governance issues was requested by CSPC, specifically in relation to mainstreaming the centrally-run SLICCs for 2017 and beyond, ensuring that these operate in a way that is compatible with current structures and arrangements. A range of parties across the University have discussed the issues, seeking to identify the optimal solutions under current structures and governance, while also maximising the offering to our students. The proposal given below is believed to be the best way forward, and is followed by commentary on a number of specific issues raised in previous discussions.

Proposal

5. To date, SLICCs have operated over the summer months, allowing students to make their final submissions immediately prior to Welcome Week in September. While this offered the greatest flexibility in terms of the types of summer experience that a student could use for their SLICC, it presented significant problems. In particular, students' results were not available until the SLICCs Board of Examiners held in late October, preventing most students from using the credit gained towards progression.

6. It is proposed that centrally-run SLICCs alter their timeframe. Students will still be able to commence their activity immediately after the May examinations, but will now have until the first week in August to make their final submission. While this places some restrictions, this will allow the students' work to be considered as part of standard resit Boards in late August, therefore making students' results available before the start of Semester 1 and enabling students to use this elective credit within that year of study, for example instead of an outside elective course. The SLICC credit is recorded against the academic year in which the SLICC course was started.
7. Discretionary dispensations for submissions after the late August resit board will be considered where a student's activity occurs too late in the vacation period to be completed in time or where a student's preparations for summer resits will be put at risk by their SLICC work. In both circumstances, this would be on the clear understanding that the student will receive their provisional SLICC marks after the start of the semester which will only be confirmed at a later Board (for example January), and so with this timing they cannot be used to inform programme elective choices for the coming year of study.
8. No structure currently exists that could easily 'own' such SLICCs centrally and so the Moray House School of Education has agreed to take full ownership of the centrally-run SLICCs, offering it as an outside elective to any eligible students from any discipline. This ownership will therefore include all quality assurance and regulatory aspects of the course, Board of Studies, Board of Examiners, appointment of the Course Organiser (Dr Simon Riley in the first instance), and would sit under the School's TPR.
9. Resource will be attributed to the Moray House School of Education in relation to the student FTE on the course. Part of this will then be re-attributed to schools contributing staff time as tutors. Strong support will be maintained from IAD and the Employability Consultancy/Careers Service to run the course. The number of students on the SLICCs will affect resources – the resourcing requirements and availability will therefore be reviewed annually between the support services and the School. In its current and anticipated form, this covers staff time to oversee the course set-up in PebblePad, the development and refreshing of course materials, and the support for both students and tutors before and during the course. This maximises the efficiency of being able to share course resources and structures between the summer SLICCs (run centrally and owned by the Moray House School of Education) and the in-programme SLICCs (owned by individual schools).
10. In the future, the aspiration will be to move to offering both summertime and semester-time SLICCs for elective credit, in addition to the in-programme embedded SLICCs owned by individual schools. Doing so will provide the greatest mainstreaming possibilities. If current institutional structures and regulations are still in place at that point, whichever school(s) choose to host the semester-time SLICCs, they would include these within their existing Boards of Examiners – ensuring the semester-time SLICCs coincided with these would avoid unnecessary additional effort.

Specific questions and issues raised previously

Tier 4 visas

11. Advice from the Compliance Team indicates that there are no issues for Tier 4 students with SLICCs. Students would remain responsible for complying with the requirements of their visa. As the SLICC credit is recorded against the academic year in which the SLICC course was started, Tier 4 students would have to have a full (120) credit load in Y2, even if they carried additional credit from a SLICC passed in Y1.

Eligibility, scale and selection

12. To be eligible for the course, students must:
 - a. be a Y1 or Y2 undergraduate student. Y3 or other non-final year students will only be permitted to undertake a summer SLICC via a College Concession granted via the relevant Dean;
 - b. submit an initial application that presents a viable SLICC. They must then submit a full proposal that is approved by a SLICCs tutor. Only at this point are they enrolled on EUCLID for the SLICC course.
13. In the first two years, a quota of at most 200 students would be applied until it is possible to accurately forecast the expected number of students each year and therefore plan to meet demand, without having to ration places. A dispensation to allow this quota would be sought from CAHSS. Once accurate forecasting is possible, the quota would be removed and the numbers monitored. If forecasted demand rose beyond what is possible to support under existing resources from the School and the support services, this would require discussion at the institutional level. While a quota is in place, the criteria on eligibility and selection would be defined accordingly and laid out clearly to students from the outset.
14. All other things being equal, places would be allocated first-come, first-served, and would be based on the date students submit their full proposals for review by a tutor.

Staff resourcing

15. As mentioned above, the Moray House School of Education would appoint the Course Organiser (in the first instance Dr Simon Riley), support for whom and administration would be reviewed annually between the School and the Careers Service and IAD.
16. As is currently the case, SLICCs tutors will come from multiple schools. It will be ensured that for each tutor it is clear the relevant Head of School is both aware and supports the staff member taking this role. Teaching load will be attributed accordingly.
17. (Contextual information: There are over 30 experienced staff tutors on SLICCs. There are many others who have indicated an interest in participating, often to gain experience to enable them to take an informed view of embedding SLICCs in existing programmes. Because SLICCs are student-led, the pilots have shown that relatively low amounts of staff time are required as tutors – median of 2.75 hours per student in total.)
18. SLICCs are important to emerging initiatives within the University and a selling point for our institution – novel and innovative, supporting and capturing student’s external learning opportunities within an academic context. However we also recognise the risk that SLICCs may in part add to spreading staff time more thinly, but also note that this issue is far wider than just SLICCs. The quota described above will ensure the effect of such a risk is modest in the short-term. If there is demand for expansion beyond this quota in the future, this will have to be considered, discussed, agreed and resourced appropriately by the University.

Credit type and use

19. Both 10- and 20-credit versions of the SLICC reflective learning framework have been developed. While piloting took place for 10 credits, moving to 20 credits will enable SLICCs to appropriately reflect student engagement and the learning gains, to better integrate into existing curricula, while making it economic in terms of staff time.
20. The University would view this credit as of equivalent currency to any other non-core credit of the same level, meaning that students will be able to count it as elective credit towards their degree programmes where the DPTs allow for it.

21. Regardless of whether or not they plan to undertake a SLICC in the following summer, students would still be required to sign-up for the required number of credits at the start of the academic year, as it would be uncertain that they will develop an academically viable proposal for their SLICC. From the outset, this will need to be made clear to students interested in undertaking a SLICC.
22. For Y1 students, credit gained through a summer SLICC could be used in different ways. They would still have to sign-up for a full credit-load for Y1 with the SLICC as additional credit, however they could then substitute credit gained through their SLICC for failed elective credit in Y1 or Y2. Alternatively, they could use credit gained to create a lighter load for Y2 (where this is appropriate, for example because they no longer need to address a credit deficit) – here it would be elective credit, essentially an outside course.
23. For Y2 students undertaking a SLICC in the summer before their third year, it would in essence be additional credit unless it was used to substitute for elective credit where a student failed a 20-credit outside course in Y2.
24. The maximum number of summertime SLICCs a student could complete is two: one in each of their summers following Y1 and Y2. They would be recorded as different courses on the student's record, as two SLICCs will be entered into the course catalogue, one for Y1 students and the other for Y2 students. Both would be at SCQF Level 8. The distinction will be clear in the course titles. While the learning outcomes will be the same, the experiential nature means the 'content' of each SLICC course will differ markedly. Within the application process, students will be required to indicate if they have completed a SLICC previously and, if so, how their second will differ from, and/or build on their first.
25. Absolute clarity for students will be essential from the outset, ensuring they are clear about: how they can use the credits and any limitations, who can apply, and what the selection criteria are (where a quota applies).
26. **Given the shift from elective credit for Y1 students to additional credit for Y2 students, CSPC is asked for guidance on whether or not the overall quota on student numbers should be split between Y1 and Y2 students and, if so, what ratio should be used while the quota is in place.**

Failures and resubmission

27. Students failing the course within the pilots were offered the opportunity to resubmit. This would continue once mainstreamed and a dispensation from CAHSS sought to restrict it to a single resubmission attempt given that students must collect evidence and reflections **during** their summer activity in order to complete their SLICC – after an initial resubmission attempt, too much time would have elapsed to make this viably the same SLICC. Given it is experience-based, students can resubmit but cannot retake a SLICC.

Non-continuation and TEF

28. Any non-continuation risks are likely to require specific consideration if SLICCs expand to being in-year but off-programme, i.e. where students select to undertake a SLICC as part of their required credit load for that year and do this to the exclusion of taking a subject that they could continue into honours. Any proposal for SLICCs to move to in-year and off-programme would be brought to the relevant committee(s) for discussion.
29. In addition, there is an argument here that SLICCs are actually beneficial – the framework helps support learning and assessment literacy, and the experience can be re-motivating for students, particularly due to the student co-creation, ownership and ability to apply academic study to an area of professional or academic interest.

Next steps

30. As mentioned in paper CSPC 16/17 2 A, there is substantial push and momentum for SLICCs to be mainstreamed in light of: two years of successful piloting; the role of SLICCs in supporting innovative learning and teaching, with the University taking a leading position in the sector; the support of assessment and feedback literacy; and the significant potential for SLICCs to facilitate and support a range of key institutional agendas. Importantly, the SLICCs model has major potential in developing experiential and inter-disciplinary learning across the University, in supporting community engagement, and in the proposals for the common core curriculum and innovation in research-led learning being developed by Assistant Principal for Research-Led Learning.
31. CSPC approval of the mainstreaming plans outlined above, with amendment as appropriate, will allow the Moray House School of Education to formally take ownership of the centrally-run SLICCs and will allow student advertising and recruitment to the summer 2017 SLICCs to commence as soon as possible.
32. We suggest that a longer-term evaluation of SLICCs is undertaken two to three years after mainstreaming, reporting to a range of relevant groups including CSPC.

Consultation

33. Colleagues in Academic Services, Moray House School of Education, Edinburgh University Students' Association, Institute for Academic Development, Careers Service and the Employability Consultancy have considered and contributed to the plans and model for mainstreaming centrally-run SLICCs and the issues raised previously by CSPC.

For CSPC consideration

34. CSPC is asked to approve the plans outlined above for mainstreaming centrally-run SLICCs, amending and providing recommendations as appropriate.
35. CSPC is also asked to advise whether or not the interim quota on overall student numbers applied for the first two years of mainstreaming should be split between Y1 and Y2 students and, if so, what ratio should be used.

Further information

Originators

Prof Lesley McAra – SLICCs Academic Champion, Assistant Principal Community Relations
Dr Gavin McCabe – SLICCs Co-Lead, Employability Consultancy
Dr Simon Riley – SLICCs Co-Lead, IAD and Edinburgh Medical School
Dr Adam Bunni – Head of Governance and Regulatory Team, Academic Services
Mr Patrick Garratt – VPAA, Edinburgh University Students' Association
Mr John Lowrey – Dean of Undergraduate Studies, CAHSS
Mr Tom Ward – Director, Academic Services

January 2017

The University of Edinburgh

Senatus Curriculum and Student Progression Committee

26 January 2017

Psychology (BMedSci Hons)

Executive Summary

This paper requests approval for a temporary change to the above programme which is outwith the Models for Degree Types.

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

This temporary change will allow the School to provide high quality research-led teaching and learning.

Action requested

For approval

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

Change to the programme will be implemented from session 2017/2018 and students will be notified when they apply for admission.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. Resource implications (including staffing)

There are none.

2. Risk assessment

There are no associated risks.

3. Equality and Diversity

The paper has no major equality impacts.

4. Freedom of information

The paper is open.

Key words

Statistics and Methodology Teaching

Originator of the paper

Martin Corley (Head of Psychology)
Tom Booth (PPLS Vertical Director Research Methods)

Peter Lamont (Director of Undergraduate Studies, PPLS)

Presented at CSPC by Dr John Lowrey, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, CAHSS.

January 2017

Psychology (BMedSci Hons)

This is a proposal for a concession that will provide a temporary, but necessary, solution to a practical problem that has just arisen.

Psychology BMedSci Hons is an intercalated degree which currently accepts 6 medical students per annum. Students take 120 credits of Psychology modules in a single year, and the degree outcome is based on the weighted average of the relevant module marks. 20 of these credits constitute required modules in statistics and methodology, ensuring that the programme meets the requirements for British Psychological Society recognition, known as *Graduate Basis for Chartered Membership* (GBC).

Statistics and Methodology Teaching across the Psychology degree programmes has recently been revised. The core provision now consists of

- [RMS](#): 20-credit level-8 module, typically taken in Y2
- [RMS2](#): 10-credit level-10 module, typically taken in Y3
- [RMS3](#): 10-credit level-10 module, typically taken in Y3

The RMS modules are based on the [R Programming language](#). RMS 2 and 3 assume basic statistical and programming competence, and thus *RMS1 is a strict pre-requisite for these modules*.

In our opinion, *a student would struggle if they were asked to take RMS2 or 3 without previously having taken RMS1*. We note however that students on Psychology (BMedSci Hons) are *required to study statistics and methodology* in order to satisfy GBC (and in order to prepare for the dissertation; also a GBC requirement).

We therefore propose that, for the next 2 years, students on Psychology (BMedSci Hons) should take the (20-credit, level-8) RMS1 Methodology module, together with 100 credits of level-10 modules. Taking RMS1 satisfies GBC, and gives medics a solid foundation for further learning in statistics and methodology. It avoids the problem of students having to pick up programming “from the middle”, and provides a rational programme for Psychology (BMedSci Hons) going forward. This temporary adjustment will allow us to solve the longer term problem, either by creating a new level 10 course, or else by providing necessary support in advance so that students can prepare for the existing course.

Martin Corley (Head of Psychology)
Tom Booth (PPLS Vertical Director Research Methods)
Peter Lamont (Director of Undergraduate Studies, PPLS)

January 2017

The University of Edinburgh

Senatus Curriculum and Student Progression Committee

26 January 2017

CMVM: MBChB Examination Delivery in Alberta

Executive Summary

In order to facilitate assessment of students in the MBChB Alberta stream, a concession is required from the Taught Assessment Regulations (Regulation 25 'Examination Timetable' in 2016/17 regulations) in order to deliver MBChB Year 5 examinations annually at the University of Alberta.

Taught Assessment Regulations 2016/17

'25.5 Other than online assessment and assessment opportunities offered via Student Administration, students are not allowed to sit examinations away from Edinburgh'

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

Aligns with strategic priority of Leadership in Learning.

Action requested

For approval.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

The assessments concerned will first be delivered during the current 2016/2017 session between 14 and 16 June 2017.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

- 1. Resource implications (including staffing)**
Minor resources required from Medical Teaching budgets to deliver and return the examination papers securely and to prepare invigilators.
- 2. Risk assessment**
Potential for loss of confidential examination papers, mitigated by transporting these via a senior member of academic staff.
- 3. Equality and Diversity**
This has been considered and the paper has no major equality impacts.
- 4. Freedom of information**
Open paper.

Key words

Medicine; Alberta; assessment

Originator of the paper

David Kluth, Director of Undergraduate Medical Teaching, and Nicola Crowley, Head of Medical Teaching Organisation Administration, January 2017

Edinburgh Medical School, Medical Teaching Organisation

MBChB Examination Delivery in Alberta

The first cohort of A990 medical students are scheduled to undertake (new) Year 5 assessments on 14th-16th June 2017, which fall during their placements in Alberta. These exams are currently scheduled as follows:

Exam	Day/Date	Time
Haematology, Oncology, Palliative Care and Breast Disease online examination	Wednesday 14 th June 2017	09:00-10:30 MDT (16:00-17:30 BST)
Renal and Urology online examination	Thursday 15 th June 2017	09:00-10:30 MDT (16:00-17:30 BST)
Dermatology, Ophthalmology and Otolaryngology online examination	Friday 16 th June 2017	09:00-10:30 MDT (16:00-17:30 BST)

The examinations in Edmonton follow on immediately from their delivery in Edinburgh each day from 14:30-16:00, and students sitting in Edinburgh will not be permitted to leave their examination venue until the end of their examination.

2) Examination format and paper security

The examination will be delivered on paper in Edmonton, with answers entered on optical mark readable answer sheets. It is proposed that the question and answer papers will be taken to Edmonton and returned to Edinburgh by a senior member of the MBChB teaching team, as delegated by the Director of Undergraduate Teaching.

3) Invigilation process

It is proposed that University of Alberta invigilators will be trained to apply UoE examination policy, protocol and standards, in liaison with the University's Student Administration Examinations team.

David Kluth, Director of Undergraduate Medical Teaching

Nicola Crowley, Head of Medical Teaching Organisation Administration

Presented at CSPC by Dr Sheila Lodge, Head of Academic Administration, CMVM

January 2017

The University of Edinburgh

Senatus Curriculum and Student Progression Committee

26 January 2017

Knowledge Strategy Committee Report

Executive Summary

This paper provides an update from the Knowledge Strategy Committee meeting held on 14 October 2016. This information will also be reported to other Senate committees.

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

Aligns with the strategic goal of leadership in learning.

Action requested

For information

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

CSPC colleagues to communicate information onwards as appropriate.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. Resource implications (including staffing)

There are none.

2. Risk assessment

There are no associated risks.

3. Equality and Diversity

Equality and diversity issues have been considered. No impact assessment is required,

4. Freedom of information

The paper is open.

Key words

Originator of the paper

Dr Lewis Allan, Head of Court Services, January 2017

KNOWLEDGE STRATEGY COMMITTEE REPORT

14 October 2016

1 Business Intelligence / Management Information Programme Board Proposal

The Head of the College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (CAHSS) presented a proposal to redefine the Business Intelligence (BI) / Management Information (MI) Programme Board as the BI/MI Governance Board, reporting to Knowledge Strategy Committee; and to clarify the Board's position in relation to the Service Excellence and Digital Transformation Programmes. It was noted that including a definition of BI/MI in the terms of reference for the Governance Board would be helpful.

The proposed changes, to rename the BI/MI Programme Board to the BI/MI Governance Board and a revised remit for the reconfigured Governance Board were approved.

The Head of CAHSS vacated the meeting.

The Committee approved the appointment of the Head of CAHSS as the Convener of the new Governance Board.

2 Online Assessment & Feedback

The Committee received a summary of analysis undertaken on the challenges of moving to an online assessment and feedback system across the University and the measurement of turnaround times. It was noted that the narrower topic of measurement of assessment and feedback turnaround times has been incorporated within the Service Excellence Programme, with an Outline Business Case developed. The following points were discussed:

- The current large variety of practices in Schools leads to an uneven student experience;
- No single system can adequately provide online assessment and feedback for all disciplines as yet so a 'best of breed' approach for cognate disciplines is expected;
- Turnaround times may increase at first during a transitional period as staff acquaint themselves with the new system and initially try to replicate offline practices online but trained staff advisors can aid the transition;
- Early adopters have in general found the advantages of online assessment to outweigh the disadvantages;
- The rationale for change should be communicated clearly to staff to aid 'buy-in'.

3 Student Digital Experience: Next Steps

The Committee received a progress update following the summary of the Headscape student digital experience presentation received at the June meeting. Members commented on the importance of pre-arrival communications to

students, that many of the current flaws affect staff as well as students and that digital champions could be appointed at all staff levels, not only senior levels. It was noted that two Service Excellence Programme projects directly relate to this area, with Outline Business Cases in development.

4 Digital Transformation

Subsequent to Court's approval of a £3m 'digitalisation envelope' within the 2016-19 Planning Round, an initial tranche of underpinning Digital Transformation projects were reviewed. Members discussed:

- The governance process – with recommended projects to be reviewed by the Finance Director, Vice-Principal Planning, Resources & Research Policy and the Deputy Secretary Strategic Planning before submission to Policy & Resources Committee;
- Projects classed as Priority 1B will be amended and considered at a future meeting;
- Accommodating the running costs for the projects after the Year 3 end date – with projects to be incorporated within the Information Services Group budget at no extra cost.

The Priority 1A bids (Enterprise Data Warehouse Service; accelerated software testing; Notifications Service; User-centred MyEd; Enterprise APIs; User Experience for Self Service; Student Digital Experience Standards) were approved for submission to the Policy & Resources Committee.

5 Current Capital Envelope Forecast

The Information Services Group ten year Capital Forecast was noted, with expenditure of £79.61m planned for the period 2016/17-2025/26.

6 Digital Research Services: Governance & Funding

The proposed approach to governance of Digital Research Services (DRS) projects and services, and details the initial 2016/17 spend required to deliver against the first year's programme were reviewed. The importance of outreach following the establishment of the oversight groups and the role of College research groups in placing representatives on oversight groups was discussed. The proposed governance approach and the initial 2016/17 expenditure were approved.

7 Learning Analytics Policy Task Group

The remit, membership, reporting arrangements and timelines for a joint Knowledge Strategy Committee and Senate Learning and Teaching Committee task group to develop a University policy on Learning Analytics was approved.