**Meeting of the Senatus Academic Policy and Regulations Committee (APRC)
to be held online on Thursday 26 January 2023 at 2.00pm**

AGENDA

1.	**Welcome to new members**	
2.	**Update on Externally-Facilitated Review of Senate and its Standing Committees**	Verbal Update
3.	**Minutes of the previous meeting** For approval • 22 September 2022 (enclosed) • 25 – 31 October 2022 e-Business (open minute enclosed) • 18 – 29 November 2022 e-Business (open minute enclosed) • 20 – 21 December 2022 e-Business (open minute enclosed**)**	APRC 22/23 5A Closed minute circulated via email
4.	**Matters Arising** • Support for Study • In-person examinations • Curriculum Transformation • Online exam arrangements for 2022/23 • Activating 2020/21 Covid Academic mitigation: ZJE programmes **Report of Convener's Action** • Code of Student Conduct • Student Fitness to Practice and Appeals Committee • Summary of approved concessions	Verbal Update
For discussion		
5.	**Update on Industrial Action** For discussion	APRC 22/23 5B
6.	**Schedule of review for policies, regulations and guidance** For discussion	APRC 22/23 5C
To note and comment		
7.	**CE & SC Task Group update** To note and comment	APRC 22/23 5D
For approval		
8.	**Approval for non-standard programme start dates for the Online MBA** For approval	APRC 22/23 5E

9.	**Assessment and Feedback Coordination** For approval	APRC 22/23 5F
10.	**Academic Year Dates 2024/25 and Provisional Academic Year Dates 2025/26 and 2026/27** For approval	APRC 22/23 5G
11.	**Membership of Student Appeal Committee and Fitness to Practice Appeals Committee** For approval	APRC 22/23 5H
12.	**Senate Committees' Internal Effectiveness Review 2021/22** For approval	APRC 22/23 5I
13.	**Any Other Business**	

Academic Policy and Regulations Committee

26 January 2023

APRC Minutes

Description of paper

1. The paper provides the minutes of the 22 September meeting, the open minutes of the October e-business meeting, the open minutes of the November e-business meeting and the open minutes December e-business meeting.

Action requested / recommendation

2. For approval.

Resource implications

4. None.

Risk management

5. Not applicable.

Equality & diversity

6. Not applicable.

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

7. APRC minutes are published on the APRC website: Agendas, papers and minutes

Author

Olivia Hayes
Academic Policy Officer
January 2023

Freedom of Information

Open paper

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

UNCONFIRMED MINUTES

Present:	
Dr Paul Norris (Convenor)	Dean of Quality Assurance and Curriculum Approval (CAHSS)
Professor Patrick Hadoke (Vice-Convenor)	Director of Postgraduate Research and Early Career Research Experience (CMVM)
Professor Tim Stratford	Dean of Learning and Teaching (CSE)
Professor Jeremy Crang	Dean of Students (CAHSS)
Dr Adam Bunni	Head of Academic Affairs (CSE)
Sarah McAllister	Head of Student Support Operations, Student Systems and Administration
Rachael Quirk	Head of Taught Student Administration & Support (CAHSS)
Sam Maccallum	Vice President Education, Students' Association
Charlotte MacDonald	The Advice Place, Manager
Dr Deborah Shaw	Dean of Students (CMVM)
Dr Catherine Bovill	Senior Lecturer in Student Engagement, Institute for Academic Development (IAD)
Kirsty Woomble	Head of PGR Student Office (CAHSS)
Stephen Warrington	Dean of Student Experience (CSE)
Philippa Burrell	Head of Academic Administration (CMVM)
Dr Kathryn Nicol	Head of Academic Policy and Regulation
Karen Howie	Head of Digital Learning Applications and Media, Information Services
Professor Jamie Davies	Dean of Taught Education (CMVM)
In attendance:	
Olivia Hayes	Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services
Jon Beer	Teaching and Student Services Manager, School of Economics
Dr Tatiana Kornienko	Lecturer, School of Economics
Dr Jon Turner	Director, Institute for Academic Development
Tom Ward	Director of Academic Services
Roshni Hume	Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services
Apologies for absence:	
Professor Antony Maciocia	Dean of Postgraduate Research (CSE)

1.	Members were welcomed to the first meeting of APRC for 2022/23. Special welcome was extended to new members joining the Committee: - Professor Tim Stratford, Dean of Learning and Teaching (CSE) - Dr, Adam Bunni Head of Academic Affairs (CSE). Adam has previously served on APRC in a different capacity. - Sam Maccallum, Vice-President, Education - Dr. Kathryn Nicol, Head of Governance and Regulatory Framework Team - Ms Karen Howie, Head of Digital Learning Applications and Media

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>The EUSA Academic Engagement Coordinator will also be a co-opted member on the committee, though this position is currently vacant. EUSA will notify APRC once filled.</td></tr>
<tr><td>2.</td><td>

APRC22/23 1A: Minutes of the previous meeting
- **26 May 2022 (enclosed)**
- **15 – 22 July 2022 e-Business (enclosed)**

The minutes of the previous meetings held on 26 May were approved as an accurate record. The e-business minutes were approved with two minor amendments to reflect the updated Committee membership at the time.
</td></tr>
<tr><td>3.</td><td>

Matters Arising from 2021/22
- **Support for Study**
  - A short Support for Study policy update paper was due to be presented to the September meeting of APRC.
  - APRC had requested further work be done on the policy, and the Deputy Secretary, Students has asked for further time to review feedback and practices before updates are brought to APRC.

Matters Arising from 26 May meeting:
- **Code of Student Conduct**
  - APRC approved amendments to the Code at its meeting on 26 May, and the Code was taken to Court for approval by Resolution, to take effect from January 2023.
  - Court considered a paper in June, and Court agreed to refer the draft Resolution to Senate and the General Council for observations in line with the requirements of the 1966 Act. It is expected that the policy will be presented to Court for final approval in December 2022.The revised Code is expected to take effect from January 2023.

- **Programme and Course Handbooks Policy Update**
  - Corrections to the policy were made in consultation with the College Deans of Students. Changes were approved by Convenor's Action.

- **Taught Assessment Regulations**
  - The new Assessment and Feedback Principles and Priorities discussed at the 26 May 2022 meeting of APRC were approved by the Senate Education Committee on 8 September 2022.
  - The Taught Assessment Regulations have been updated to refer to the new principles and priorities and amendments to Regulations 11, 15 and 16 were agreed and approved by Convenor's action.

Report of Convener's Action
The Convener updated APRC on the actions which have been taken by Convener's action since the Committee last met.

Student Discipline Officers: The revised list of Student Discipline Officers was approved by Convenor's Action. The revised SDO list is available online at [Student Discipline Officers](#).

Student Discipline Committee: There were additions to the Student Discipline Committee over the summer, which were approved by Convenor's Action. The list of Committee members is available online at [Student Discipline Committee](#).
The Committee agreed that Convenor's action should be used to approve any further additions, as required.
</td></tr>
</table>

	Concessions approved by Convenor's action: A total of 25 concessions were approved. Two concessions were rejected. The Convenor gave a broad overview of approved concessions approved by category: • Extensions, AIS and period of study: 12 • Posthumous awards: 2 • Visiting student: 2 • Other categories not elsewhere defined with fewer than 2 students: 3 • External Examiners: 6 The Convener confirmed that no exam board took place in Semester 2 without external examiner oversight. APRC was reminded that it had been granted devolved authority from SQAC to consider policies related to external examiners. This is to enable the efficient management and oversight of concessions required to address the impact of industrial action.
For approval	
4.	**APRC 22/23 1B: Academic Misconduct Procedure** For approval This item was introduced by Roshni Hume, Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services. The paper proposes changes to the Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures. Ms Hume noted that the proposals put to APRC today are interim measures, primarily intended to speed up the process for staff and students. If approved, these measures will be implemented in the current academic year. It is intended more substantial revisions to the Procedure will be presented to APRC for approval in semester 2, and that if approved these will be implemented for academic year 2023/24. The Committee discussed the proposed amendments. The following points were made: • Colleges were generally supportive of the changes which are intended to address a high volume of work being faced by CAMOs. Evidence suggests that a significant number of the cases dealt with in 2021/22 could likely be resolved at School level with the proposed changes. • The changes are a transparent way of ensuring penalties are fairly applied in cases of low-level academic misconduct. • A concern regarding the workload implications for School Academic Misconduct Officers (SAMOs) was raised and it was queried whether SAMOs had been consulted and if the changed Procedure would be reflected in WAM allocations. • The application of penalties by SAMOs was raised. It was queried whether SAMOs would take account of the assessment weighting in determining an appropriate penalty, with a penalty in a single piece of assessment having greater impact on an overall grade than an assessment with a lower weighting. • The Procedure should indicate the expected turnaround time for management of an academic misconduct case by SAMOs. • A question regarding record-keeping was raised, noting that the Procedure required Schools to share information about penalties applied by SAMOs, in order to tell whether a case was a first or subsequent offence. • A query regarding the application of penalties in Pass/Fail courses was raised. • A query regarding providing an outcome to students following the resit diet was raised. • APRC received comments from a Senate member regarding the proposed changes and the provision of guidance to SAMOs to accompany these changes. The paper author confirmed that guidance would be provided to SAMOs. • APRC recommended a series of editorial amendments to the Procedure.

		The Committee agreed that implementing a revised Procedure as soon as possible would be desirable given the high volume of work currently experienced by CAMOs.

APRC agreed that Academic Services should revise the paper in light of the comments received, This would be circulated to the Committee for consideration and approval via e-business.

Action: Academic Services to revise the paper in light of the comments received. The revised paper would be circulated to the Committee for consideration and approval via e-business. |
| 1. | | **APRC 22/23 1C: MSc Mathematical Economics & Econometrics**
For approval

This item was convened by Deputy Convener, Professor Patrick Hadoke, CMVM.

This item was introduced by Dr Tatiana Kornienko and Jon Beer, Teaching and Student Services Manager, School of Economics. The paper proposes to permit students undertaking the MSc Mathematical Economics and Econometrics (MEE) to choose between completing a dissertation or a research project as the capstone of their PGT studies.

The Committee discussed the proposal. The following points were made:
• The School have contingency plans to mitigate any disruption experienced by individual students in a group work setting.
• A higher weighting for the assessment would apply to the individual component (60%), over the group component (40%).
• Students have a choice between undertaking a dissertation or group research project. The minimum and optimal number of students required for a research project is two, however this may be up to five depending on the project.
• Students will meet the programme learning outcomes regardless of whether they complete a dissertation or a research project. Individual course descriptions will make this explicit.
• The revised structure would be monitored for QA purposes, with grades and learning outcomes, along with the usual QA mechanisms used to establish whether the alternative structure is established.

APRC approved this item.

The Committee agreed that this is an exciting proposal for the programme. The Committee would like to receive feedback on the programme's success after this has been in place for two years.

Action: School of Economics to feed back to the Committee on the programme's success after the revised arrangements have been in place for two academic years. |
| **For discussion** | | |
| 2. | | **Developments from 11 August 2022 Senate meeting, including new guidelines for Senate Committee operations**
For discussion

This item was introduced by Tom Ward, Director of Academic Services.

The paper outlines guidelines, approved by Senate, for the operation of the Senate Standing Committees, including arrangements for access to and production of Senate Committee papers. |

	The Committee discussed the paper. The following points were made: • The Externally facilitated review of Senate has been brought forward by one year to 2022/23. Senate Standing Committee members will have an opportunity to feed into this review. • A revision to the composition of Standing Committee membership will be presented to the next meeting of Senate on 12 October. Members of the Committee were reminded of the channels for feeding into this discussion. The Committee agreed that decisions on APRC business are taken as a collective and it would be useful to clarify whether any new members joining the Committee join as individuals or as representative of a wider body, such as Senate, Schools or Colleges. APRC noted the paper and guidelines.
For information	
3.	**Vice President Education Priorities 2022/23** For information This item was introduced by Sam Maccallum, VP Education, Students' Association. A number of students have raised concerns regarding a return to in-person assessment and a lack of clarity on the format of assessment nor expectations surrounding in-person examinations. The Committee discussed this and the following points were made: • The regulations do not define a requirement for in-person or online examinations, and this is left to the discretion of course organisers to establish what constitutes appropriate assessment for a course. There may be a role for guidance to inform on this, at a School, College or service level. • There has been concern regarding a significant increase in instances relating to academic integrity since online examinations have been held. • For students, in-person exams do not constitute a 'return to normal'. Concern was raised regarding the level of support offered to students if courses are to return to in-person, as many Honours students will not have sat in-person exams during their time at University. • A longer-term consideration of the appropriateness of assessment was requested. This item is to be discussed at the next meeting of the Student Council. Members were invited to submit comments by email to Sam Maccallum. **Action:** The Convener will contact the Deputy Secretary Students for a discussion on in-person assessments to be added to the agenda for an upcoming Student Lifecycle Group meeting.
4.	**Curriculum Transformation – Presentation & verbal update** For information This item was introduced by Dr Jon Turner, Director of the Institute for Academic Development. The Committee received an update and presentation on the Curriculum Transformation Programme intended to assist with forward planning of upcoming Committee business. The development of a proposed curriculum framework will be presented to Standing Committees and Senate in early 2023, with the intention that this will be presented to the University by the end of 2022/23.

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>The programme is currently on track and it is anticipated that work will be compressed around January 2023, to allow sufficient lead in time for Schools to consider programme changes required for implementation.
Members were invited to submit comments by email to Dr Jon Turner.

Action: The Convener will take forward discussions between Curriculum Transformation and Academic Services to confirm indicative timescales, impacted policies and the actions likely to be requested of APRC.</td></tr>
<tr><td>5.</td><td>**APRC Membership and Terms of Reference**
For information

This item was provided to the Committee for information. The membership and terms of reference APRC were presented to APRC in May 2022 however a number of positions remained vacant at that time, and have since been filled over the summer. The paper presents the updated membership and terms of reference.

Senate gave time-limited approval of the membership of its Standing Committees, which will expire at the next Ordinary meeting of Senate. Senate members would have an opportunity to comment on proposed revisions to the membership at the forthcoming Senate meeting on 12 October.

APRC noted the paper.</td></tr>
<tr><td>6.</td><td>**CE & SC Task Group update**
For information

This item was provided to the Committee for information. APRC was asked to note the progress of the short-life task group.

The Committee discussed this and the following points were made:
• The group are working to an ambitious timeframe and there is potential for industrial action to impact on the group's work.
• The update does not highlight the need for potential systems development in light of any proposed policy changes. This is to be considered as having potential resource implications and risk to the work of the group.
• It is unlikely that the task group will reach complete consensus on a draft policy. The Committee are aware of the forthcoming challenges in agreeing a way forward on this policy.
Comments were received from a Senate member regarding the importance of engaging in meaningful discussion with Schools. This would be passed to the paper authors.

APRC requested the CE & SC task group provide the Committee with a more substantive update for the 26 November meeting.</td></tr>
<tr><td>7.</td><td>**Any Other Business**

• **Inclusion of publications in thesis**
    ○ The Deputy Convener, Patrick Hadoke provided an update on the inclusion of publications in a thesis, which has previously been raised at APRC. Regulation 32 of the PGR Assessment Regulations provide clear instruction on the inclusion of publication in a thesis. It was reiterated that inclusion of publications in a thesis is not a substitute for writing a thesis and poor scholarship may apply in these cases.</td></tr>
</table>

- **Online examinations submission window**
  - Sarah McAllister, Head of Student Support Operations, Registry Services, raised concern regarding the need for a consistent approach for handling late submissions of online examinations across the University ahead of the December 2022 exam diet.
  - A definitive steer is needed with sufficient time for this to be implemented and communicated ahead of the December exam diet. This should be reflected in guidance for students and staff to be communicated out ahead of the exam diet commencing.
  - It was noted that the current position is that online centrally delivered exams include a one-hour submission window, and that submissions made after this deadline will be marked as 0 unless there is an accepted special circumstances application. The Committee acknowledged that if there are to be any changes to this position, changes would need to be agreed and communicated ahead of the next scheduled committee meeting and in time for implementation ahead of the December exam diet.
  - APRC are aware of the need to move quickly and would take action to support this as required and between meetings if necessary.
  - **Action:** This item would be taken forward by ESC and Academic Services for discussion with Colleges, Systems and the Students' Association.

- **Report to Senate on concessions**
  - The Convener is providing a report on the concessions approved over the past 12 months to the 12 October meeting of Senate.
  - The majority of concessions received by APRC relate to Authorised Interruption of Studies and Extensions to programmes. This is something for APRC to consider longer term.

- **Format of meetings in 2022/23**
  - The Convenor updated the Committee on the format of meetings moving forward in relation to hybrid, online and/or in-person meetings.
  - It was confirmed that the Cuillin Room in Charles Stewart House has been secured for all APRC meetings this year, though the option to join online will remain.
  - The meeting appointment will be updated to be 3 hours.

- **Anonymous marking**
  - A previous discussion at APRC raised the possibility of using UUNs in anonymous marking. It was confirmed that the use of UUNs in anonymous marking has been eliminated from the proposed options. The Convener would provide a further update the Committee once available.

e-Business Meeting of the Senatus Academic Policy and Regulations Committee (APRC)
to be held Tuesday 25 October – Monday 31 October 2022

UNCONFIRMED MINUTES

For approval		
1.	**Academic Misconduct Procedure & responses to queries raised by APRC** For approval A query was raised regarding record keeping and sharing proven instances of academic misconduct between Schools and Colleges, particularly where students are taking courses or programmes across Colleges. It was confirmed that the SAMO in the School where the student had the proven case would contact the CAMO in the non-owning College to notify them. CAMO's have agreed that communications will include adequate information on procedural elements, such as this. The amendments to 3.3 and 3.4 of the Procedure were welcomed by some members. Some general comments on the proposed changes were received from a SAMO via a College representative. These general comments were shared with the paper author and will be taken forward by the College. Comments were also received from a Senate member, which were noted by the paper author and would be considered in relation to longer term changes. Some amendments to the procedure were proposed by Committee members: • With regard to 3.2, it was suggested that the wording be amended to note that the SAMO has the discretion to request either an electronic / in person meeting, or a written statement from students (i.e. if they decide to hold a meeting, there is no specific requirement that it be in person by default); • With regard to 3.3, it was suggested that the SAMO is able to apply a penalty of no more than 10 marks, except in cases where the component is worth 5% or less of the course mark. In these cases the SAMO may apply a penalty up to reducing the mark for the component to zero. It was noted that this amendment would prevent large numbers of referrals to CAMO of very low-stakes assessments, which are common in some Schools and was a proportionate change given the variable impact that a 10 mark penalty can have, depending on the size of the component being penalised. • With regard to the imposition of a penalty, it was noted that points 3.3 and 3.5 are conflicting and it would be preferable for a defined penalty of 10 marks would be appropriate and align with the lowest mark penalty relevant to the Common Marking Scheme.	APRC 22/23 2A

	• With regard to 3.7, it was suggested that the wording be amended to state the 15 working days starts when the provisional marks for a cohort are released, as opposed to when the face value mark is released for the individual student. It was noted that this would prevent delay where a face value mark for an individual student under investigation for academic misconduct, and is not confirmed for some time (as can be the case), which means the clock would not yet have started ticking on the 15 working days. • It was suggested that the wording of 3.9 be amended to "the affected mark(s) must not be ratified…". These amendments were collated and shared with the paper author for discussion with CAMOs, who fed into the proposed changes. APRC agreed that further amendments to the Procedure were required prior to this item receiving formal approval. The Committee agreed to consider further revisions to the Procedure at its next meeting in November.	
For comment		
2.	**Online exam arrangements for 2022/23** For comment This item is closed business	APRC 22/23 2B **CLOSED**

e-Business Meeting of the Senatus Academic Policy and Regulations Committee (APRC)
Friday 18 November – Tuesday 29 November 2022

UNCONFIRMED MINUTE

1.	**Welcome to new members** APRC welcome four new members to the Committee. - Dr Aidan Brown (CSE) joins APRC as an elected member of Senate - Dr Murray Earle (CAHSS) joins APRC as an elected member of Senate - Dr Donna Murray joins APRC as the representative for the Institute for Academic Development - Dr Uzma Tufail-Hanif (CMVM) joins APRC as an elected member of Senate APRC extends its thanks to departing member Professor Catherine Bovill, formerly the Institute for Academic Development representative, for her service on the Committee. The Committee will formally welcome new members and thank departing members at the next Ordinary meeting.
2.	**Matters Arising** Code of Conduct There were minor changes to the draft Code approved by APRC at its 26 May 2022 meeting. These minor changes will be based on observations from Senate and the General Council. Court requested observations from both of these bodies prior to considering approval of the revised Code. Due to the timing of feedback being received from these bodies and the timing of the next Court meeting, there is insufficient time to present changes to APRC. Any minor changes will be presented to the Convener of APRC for approval, prior to the updated Code being presented to Court for final approval at their meeting on 5 December 2022.

For approval

3.	**Proposed amendments to the Academic Misconduct Procedure - responses to queries** For approval APRC approved the paper, subject to minor amendments to the wording of a small number of regulations. These changes would be incorporated into the final Procedure. 3.3 – A minor amendment to correct syntax 3.4 - A minor amendment to correct syntax. A query was raised regarding the IAD support referred to under 3.4. It was confirmed that this refers to the existing online resources provided on the IAD website which Academic Services currently refer students to. A minor amendment to the phrasing would be made to direct students to appropriate sources of support within the University rather than referral to specific support services. 3.5 – A minor amendment to correct syntax	APRC 22/23 3A

	3.7 – A minor amendment to correct syntax 3.9 – A minor amendment to clarify the marks which must not be ratified or published A query was raised regarding record keeping and a suggestion for records to be handled in a similar manner to Learning Adjustment profiles on EUCLID. This comment would be passed to the paper author for consideration. A query was raised regarding the proportion of SAMOs who were consulted on the changes. Each of the Colleges confirmed that SAMO's were consulted on the proposed changes and no concerns were raised. A suggestion for academic misconduct penalties to be applied after special circumstances outcomes have been considered was received. The application of special circumstances outcomes is a matter for Board of Examiners to determine and this is separate from the academic misconduct process, however this comment would be passed to the paper author for consideration. It was clarified that SAMOs are not being asked to make a judgement on whether a penalty could result in a student failing a course, which is unlikely to be clear at the time that penalties are being considered.	
4.	**Online exam arrangements for 2022/23** For approval This item of business is closed.	APRC 22/23 3B **CLOSED**
5.	**Exceptional permission to consider a Higher Degree** For approval This item of business is closed.	APRC 22/23 3C **CLOSED**
6.	**Industrial action: External Examiners** For approval The majority of the Committee supported this item with members noting that this approach in line with the action taken in previous years, which has worked well. A small number of members did not support this item. One member noted that decisions should be taken in a democratic manner and by the whole Committee and that decisions could be reached timeously through e-Business which would allow numerous members to feed into decision making. Concern was raised that expedient decision making may lead to a compromise of academic standards. Another member noted that efforts should be made to resolve the ongoing action, without compromising academic standard. APRC's ability	APRC 22/23 3D

	to resolve the ongoing action is limited as this is outside of the Committee's remit. Given the responses received, this paper is considered approved. The Convener and/or Vice-Convener have authority to make a decision on concessions relating to external examiner regulations. The Convener and paper author held further discussions with those members who raised concern during the e-business meeting. In light of those discussions, the Convener agreed that if there is sufficient time to allow the Convener or Vice-Convener to consult Committee members ahead of reaching a decision, the Committee will have a short window of up to 48 hours to feed comments in. The final decision will rest with the Convener or Vice-Convener and in urgent cases they will have the authority to make a decision without Committee consultation. There will be an opportunity for further discussion on this item at the next meeting.	
For information		
7.	**Update from the Coursework Extensions & Special Circumstances Task Group & November 2022 ESC Review Update** For information APRC noted this paper. Comments received on this item would be passed to the paper authors.	APRC 22/23 3E

e-Business Meeting of the Senatus Academic Policy and Regulations Committee (APRC)
Tuesday 20 – Wednesday 21 December 2022

UNCONFIRMED MINUTE

For approval	
1.	**Activating 2020/21 Covid Academic mitigation: ZJE programmes - APRC 22/23 4A: CLOSED** For approval This item is closed business.
2.	**Non-standard academic year dates: Online MBA - APRC 22/23 4B** For approval Members raised concerns with the paper and a majority of the Committee reluctantly approved a delay for the January 2023 intake to be delayed to March 2023 on the condition that the School attend the January meeting of APRC to allow members to clarify how the revised timescale will work in practice. APRC raised concern that the sequence of action taken indicates that the School made arrangements to notify students of the later start date prior to receiving formal approval from APRC. APRC should receive proposals at an earlier stage and prior to students being notified, to allow due consideration and approval prior to arrangements being confirmed to students and/or offer holders. The Committee understand that the immediate concern relating to January is addressed with this approval, however the School intends to request a permanent change to the academic dates for this programme. APRC requires the Business School to submit a paper requesting a permanent change to the programme and permission for non-standard academic dates to the January meeting of APRC to allow the programme changes to be considered in full. Members raised concerns with elements of the proposal and the School are asked to ensure these are considered and covered in the January paper to APRC: • Clarification of the alternative semester structure and the implications of an alternative structure on access to institutional student support services. Specific concern was raised regarding student access to support services and extracurricular activities. • Detail on the knock-on implications of a delayed start on the timing of courses later in the programme. • Greater detail on the Learn Ultra issues being experienced and the requirement for permanent non-standard semester dates if the issues are resolved for the March 2023 intake and beyond. • Greater detail on the implications of the non-standard dates for staff resourcing and workload. In particular, a detailed programme structure including dates for semester breaks, assessments and with consideration of the University publication deadlines and requirement for support from central University services such as ESC. A query was raised regarding support and resourcing for the anticipated marking workload for staff assessing final capstone projects in December. • The Committee raised concern regarding the feasibility of a delay to March 2023. The Committee queried whether delaying the first intake to September 2023 would

		be more appropriate to allow these issues to be adequately addressed and to enable the cohort to commence on standard academic timescales.

APRC 22/23 5B

Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee

26 January 2023

Update on industrial action

Description of paper

1. This paper updates the Committee on the UCU industrial action, and on action taken to take to minimise the disruption to our students' studies while maintaining academic standards.

Action requested / recommendation

2. The paper invites the Committee to note the update to the industrial action and to discuss the following issues:
   - Whether it is content not to consider any general variation of policies and regulations at this stage;
   - How it would like to handle discussions about concessions relating to External Examiners; and
   - What mechanism the Committee would like to use to consider any requests for other types of concessions relating to the industrial actions.

Background and context

3. In Semester One, the University and College Union (UCU) held three days of strikes:
   - Thursday 24 November 2022
   - Friday 25 November 2022
   - Wednesday 30 November 2022

4. UCU also announced that action short of a strike will start from Wednesday 23 November 2022, until an agreement is reached or the end of the ballot mandate on 20 April 2023. This includes working to contractual hours and duties only and not volunteering to do more, not rescheduling classes and lectures cancelled due to strike action, not covering for absent colleagues, removing uploaded materials related to or not sharing materials related to, lectures or classes cancelled as a result of strike action.

5. Recently, the UCU announced another eighteen days of strikes in February and March 2023. The first will be on 1 February 2023. The UCU indicated that it willl announce the other days in week commencing 23 January 2023.

6. The UCU has also announced that it intends to hold a marking and assessment boycott later in the year, "strategically targeted to hit summer graduations". The UCU has not yet announced the detail of these arrangements.

7. As a University we are required to seek to minimise the disruption to our students' studies while maintaining academic standards. To this end, Schools and Colleges should take all reasonable steps available to them within these guidelines to ensure that their students' ability to learn, progress and graduate is not compromised by the industrial action.

8. To assist Schools and Colleges, the University's Academic Contingency Group (ACG, which includes representatives of Colleges, the Students' Association, and key professional services) issued guidance in November 2022 in response to the announcement of the three strike days in November 2022. This is available at:

    https://uoe.sharepoint.com/sites/AcademicServices/SitePages/Guidance-for-staff-on-mitigating-the-impact-of-Industrial-Action-on-teaching-and-learning.aspx

9. In the past, during some periods of industrial action and other forms of disruption (eg Covid-19 pandemic), the Committee has approved temporary variations to normal academic policies and regulations in order to provide Schools and Colleges with additional options for mitigating the disruption, where it judged that doing so would be compatible with maintaining academic standards. The ACG did not think it was necessary to ask the Committee to agree to any general variations to policies or regulations to assist Schools and Colleges to mitigate the impact of the November 2022 strike action. Therefore, it based its November 2022 guidance on normal policies and regulations.

Discussion

Potential for temporary variations to academic policies and regulations

10. The ACG is in the process of updating the guidance to take account of the UCU's plans for strikes in February and March 2023, for example to set out:

    *   Options for mitigating the impact of any disruption to the operation of Boards of Examiners
    *   Options available to Boards of Examiners to take account of any disruption to teaching and assessment when confirming Semester One course results.

11. The Committee could consider a range of general variations to academic policies and regulations in order to assist Schools and Colleges to manage any disruption. Options for temporary action include:

    Operation of Boards of Examiners:
    *   APRC could consider varying Taught Assessment Regulation 39.2 to give Conveners of Boards of Examiners (rather than Heads of College) the authority to approve any amended membership of a Board in exceptional circumstances.
    *   APRC could consider varying the arrangements on quorum (for example, to remove the need for half of the internal examiners to be present).
    *   APRC could also consider varying the requirements for External Examiner input into Boards.

    Taking account of disruption to teaching and assessment when confirming course results:
    *   APRC could activate Taught Assessment Regulation 71 (Significant disruption: where only partial results are available to Boards), which gives Boards various powers, including the ability to change the weighting for

individual components without the need to consult students and seek College approval (which TAR 13.3 would normally require).

12. At this stage, the ACG's view is that the nature and extent of disruption associated with the planned strikes in February and March 2023 is not yet clear, but that feedback from Schools and Colleges to date suggest that, for the time being, it may be manageable within existing policies and regulations combined with temporary concessions on a case by case basis (see below). Therefore, at this stage, ACG is not asking the Committee to consider any general variations to policies and regulations. ACG will however keep this issue under review. **Is the Committee content not to consider any general variation of policies and regulations at this stage?**

Case by case consideration of variations to policies and regulations

13. In November 2022, the Committee agreed by electronic business to delegate to the Convener and Vice-Convener until the end of 2022-23 to consider any requirements for temporary concessions regarding policies and regulations around External Examiners in the context of the industrial action, on the understanding that any concessions would run no longer than the end of session 2022-23. The Convener agreed that were there sufficient time to allow the Convener or Vice-Convener to consult Committee members ahead of reaching a decision, the Committee would have a short window of up to 48 hours to feed comments in. The final decision would rest with the Convener or Vice-Convener and in urgent cases they would have the authority to make a decision without Committee consultation.

14. In December 2022, the Convener of the Committee approved one concession in the context of the industrial action, for a School that had been unable to appoint a replacement External Examiner despite extensive attempts to identify a suitable candidate. The Convener agreed a temporary concession so that the School could set an examination paper without an External Examiner commenting on it, but with additional internal scrutiny.

15. Given that some Committee members had concerns regarding the delegation to the Convener and Vice-Convener of powers to consider concessions regarding External Examiners, the Convener had agreed that the Committee could have a further discussion at this meeting regarding how to approach this decision-making. **Does the Committee wish to further reflect on and discuss how it would like to handle these discussions going forward?**

16. It is likely that, in the absence of any general variations to policies and regulations, there will be situations in which Schools will make the case for concessions to assist them to mitigate particular instances of significant disruption to individual course / programmes as a result of the next phase of industrial action. Some may relate to External Examiners (see paragraphs 13 to 15), but it is possible that a small number of requests for concessions will relate to other aspects of the regulations. Until the impact of the industrial action is clearer, it is difficult to predict what aspects of the regulations and policies any requests for concessions may relate to – although it seems unlikely that requests

submitted in the next few months will relate to progression and award decisions. Requests for concessions during a period of disruption are often time-sensitive and requires a degree of dialogue and negotiation with the School in order to agree an appropriate way forward, making it difficult to consider them in a full-committee setting. **What mechanism would the Committee like to use to consider such requests?**

Resource implications

17. The application of concessions, where they are needed, would have workload implications for staff in Schools and Colleges, for Academic Services staff, and for staff involved in making the decisions. These activities would be temporary and this paper does not attempt to quantify them given the uncertainty regarding the extent to which it would be necessary for Schools to operate them.

Risk management

18. The paper aims to assist the Committee to manage the risks associated with maintaining academic standards while minimising the academic impact of the industrial action on students.

Responding to the Climate Emergency & Sustainable Development Goals

19. Not applicable

Equality & diversity

20. Not applicable

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

21. Academic Services will communicate to Schools and Colleges regarding the guidance that the ACG issues, including any temporary variations to normal policies and regulations.

Author
Dr Paul Norris (Convener of APRC)
Tom Ward (Director of Academic Services)
19 January 2022

Presenter
Tom Ward

Freedom of Information
Open

Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee

26 January 2023

Schedule of review for policies, regulations and guidance

Description of paper

1. This paper seeks the Committee's views on proposed changes to the schedule for reviewing policies, regulations, and guidance documents which are the responsibility of the Senate Committees.

Action requested / recommendation

2. The paper invites the Committee to comment on the broad approach to rescheduling the reviews, and on proposed changes to review dates. We will present refined proposals to the Committee's March 2023 meeting for approval, after we have consulted other stakeholders about some of the proposed schedules for review.

3. While the majority of the documents are the formal responsibility of APRC, some of them are the responsibility of the Senate Education Committee or the Senate Quality Assurance Committee. If the Committee supports the broad approach to rescheduling, we will seek agreement from SEC and SQAC for the new review dates for the documents that they are responsible for.

Background and context

4. All policies, regulations, guidance, and other documents approved by the Senate Standing Committees include cover sheets which state the date that the Committee will next review the document. Typically, review dates are set three to four years after the initial approval or most recent review.

5. Academic Services oversees the schedule for reviewing these documents, and supports the review process for the majority of the documents. However, due to factors associated with the Covid-19 pandemic, and staff capacity issues in Academic Services over the last two years, there is a significant backlog of documents for review. It is not realistic to address this backlog in full in 2022-23, both because of the limited capacity within Academic Services to support reviews, and capacity for the Committees and stakeholders to engage with reviews. Therefore, this paper proposes a new schedule for reviewing the documents.

6. In proposing a new review schedule we have taken account of the following factors:

   • Whether we are aware of any urgent need to review and revise a document (for example, due to changes in external regulatory context, or internal stakeholder feedback); and

   • Whether it will be necessary to review and amend any documents in order to facilitate institutional change projects.

APRC 22/23 5C

7. The University's suite of academic policies, regulations, guidance and other documents has developed incrementally over a long period of time. As a result, some related and complementary documents have different review schedules. We think it would be beneficial for the Standing Committees to group the policies and other documents in thematic cluster, and where possible to review each cluster in the same year. The paper proposes a way of clustering the documents

Discussion

8. We propose the following broad clusters:

- Casework
- Student support
- Programme and course approval
- Programme and course delivery
- Assessment and progression (Taught and Research)
- Assessment and progression (Taught)
- Assessment and progression (Research)
- Quality assurance
- Staff roles
- Other

9. The attached annex assigns each document to one of these clusters, and proposes a schedule of review.

10. We are proposing the following broad approach to each schedule:

Cluster	Main points
Casework	• Conduct of Student Conduct already reviewed and amended in 2022-23 – review again no later than 2025-26 (probably earlier) • Support for Study Policy and associated flowchart - review in 2022-23 (one year ahead of schedule), subject to current discussions hosted by Deputy Secretary (Students) • Procedure for Dealing with Suspected Academic Misconduct – consider further changes during 2022-23 • Student Appeal Regulations – review in 2024-25 as currently scheduled
Student support	• Academic and Pastoral Support Policy – review later in 2022-23 to take account of implementation of new student support model • Student Maternity and Family Leave Policy – consider technical change in 2022-23 but schedule more substantive review for 2023-24 • Authorised Interruption of Studies – delay review until 2024-25

Programme and course approval	• UG and PG Degree Regulations – review in 2022-23 • Models of Degree Types, Framework for Curricula, and Degree Programme Specification documentation – review as part of Curriculum Transformation (at present, it appears likely that the relevant work would be in 2023-24) • Consider minor changes to Programme and Course Approval and Maintenance Policy in 2022-23, to address feedback regarding section on timescales for publishing course and programme information, but otherwise do not review until 2024-25 (unless Curriculum Transformation requires an earlier review) • Review the suite of documents related to collaboration with external partners in 2024-25
Programme and course delivery	• Further consultation with stakeholders required regarding timescale for review for many policies in this category
Assessment and Progression (Taught and Research)	• Special Circumstances Policy – currently reviewing this policy as part of the Extensions and Special Circumstances task group • Possible technical updated required in 2022-23. Otherwise, delay review of Procedure for Withdrawal and Exclusion from Studies to 2024-25
Assessment and progression (Taught)	• Taught Assessment Regulations – review in 2022-23 • Review all policies related to External Examiners for taught programmes in 2023-24 (see note below about the committees' responsible for these documents) • Review all other documents in 2024-25 or 2025-26 (unless Curriculum Transformation necessitates an earlier review)
Assessment and progression (Research)	• Postgraduate Assessment Regulations for Research Degrees – review in 2022-23 • Code of Practice for Supervisors and Research Students – update in 2022-23 • Review other PGR assessment policies (along with associated guidance / forms) as a suite in 2024-25
Quality assurance	• Technical changes to policies around annual review and Student Staff Liaison Committees in 2022-23, with a view to more substantive review (if required) in 2023-24 to take account of SFC Tertiary Quality Review • Student Voice Policy – review in 2024-25
Staff roles	• Policy for the Recruitment, Support and Development of Tutors and Demonstrators – review in 2023-24

	• School Director of Quality Role – review in 2023-24 • Course Organiser Outline of Role – delay review to 2024-25
Other	• Performance Sport Policy – delay review until 2023-24 • Visiting Student and Non-Graduating Student Policy – delay review until 2024-25 • Further consultation with stakeholders required regarding timescale for review for some policies in this category

Resource implications

10. The process of reviewing and updating regulations, policies and guidelines has significant resource implications for Academic Services, and for stakeholders that would contribute to review processes. This paper seeks to manage these resource implications while meeting internal or external requirements for reviewing and updating the documents.

Risk management
11. The paper seeks to ensure that the University has a fit for purpose suite of academic regulations, policies and guidelines that will assist it to manage risks associated with teaching and research student activities.

Responding to the Climate Emergency & Sustainable Development Goals
12. Not applicable.

Equality & diversity
13. Academic Services would undertake Equality Impact Assessments when developing new policies or making substantive changes to existing policies.

Communication, implementation and evaluation of the impact of any action agreed
14. Academic Services would take responsibility for coordinating the process of reviewing the documents.

Author   **Presenter**
Tom Ward   Tom Ward
Director of Academic Services
18 January 2023

Freedom of Information
Open

Category	Title	Document Type	Last Updated	Update Due	Proposed new review session	Notes on proposed schedule	Approval committee
Assessment and Progression (Research)	Lay Summary in Theses - Guidance	Guidance	Jun-22	2022/23	2024-25	Review this suite of PGR assessment documents in the same year.	APRC
Assessment and Progression (Research)	PhD by Integrated Study Guidance	Guidance	Jan-21	2022/23	2023-24		APRC
Assessment and Progression (Research)	Thesis Format Guidance	Guidance	Jun-22	2027-28	2024-25	Review this suite of PGR assessment documents in the same year.	APRC
Assessment and Progression (Research)	Including Publications in Postgraduate Research Thesis: Guidance	Policy/Regulation/Code	Mar-22	2026/27	2024-25	Review this suite of PGR assessment documents in the same year.	APRC
Assessment and Progression (Research)	PhD by Research oral examinations by video link (Videolinked PhD oral)	Policy/Regulation/Code	May-21	2026/27	2024-25	Review this suite of PGR assessment documents in the same year.	APRC
Assessment and Progression (Research)	Handbook for External Examining of Research Degrees	Policy/Regulation/Code	Apr-22	2026/27	2024-25	Review this suite of PGR assessment documents in the same year.	APRC
Assessment and Progression (Research)	Postgraduate Assessment Regulations for Research Degrees	Policy/Regulation/Code	May-22	2023/24	2022-23	It is standard practice to review this document on an annual basis.	APRC
Assessment and Progression (Research)	Code of Practice for Supervisors and Research Students	Policy/Regulation/Code	Aug-22	2022/23	2022-23	It is standard practice to review this document on an annual basis.	APRC
Assessment and Progression (Taught and Research)	Special Circumstances Policy	Policy/Regulation/Code	May-22	2023/24	2022-23	APRC is in the process of reviewing this policy in 2022-23	APRC
Assessment and Progression (Taught and Research)	Procedure for Withdrawal and Exclusion from Studies	Policy/Regulation/Code	May-19	2022/23	2024-25	Possible technical update required in 2022-23 to bring policy in line with TAR 67 in relation to UG students (being being updated to include 'or award'). Otherwise we are not aware of any urgent need to review.	APRC
Assessment and Progression (Taught)	Handbook for Boards of Examiners for Taught Courses and Programmes	Policy/Regulation/Code	Sep-16	2021/22	2023-24	Not aware of urgent need to review, and it would be challenging to review during industrial action.	APRC
Assessment and Progression (Taught)	Taught Assessment Regulations	Policy/Regulation/Code	May-22	2022/23	2022-23	Review annually.	APRC
Assessment and progression (Taught)	Assessment and Feedback Principles and Priorities	Policy/Regulation/Code	Sep-22	2025/26	2025-26	In line with agreed schedule.	SEC
Assessment and Progression (Taught)	Undergraduate Progression Boards Policy	Policy/Regulation/Code	Apr-20	2022/23	2024-25	Not aware of any urgent need to review this policy - so propose to delay until 2024-25 unless Curriculum Transformation requires an earlier review.	APRC
Assessment and Progression (Taught)	External Examiners for Taught Programmes Policy	Policy/Regulation/Code	May-19	2023/24	2023-24	Review at the same time as the Handbook for Boards of Examiners for Taught Courses and Programmes.	QAC

Casework	Code of Student Conduct	Policy/Regulation/Code	Dec-22	2025/26	2025-26	Likely to require earlier review (feedback from General Council)	Court (following resolution process, and recommendation by APRC)
Casework	Support for Study Policy and flowchart	Policy/Regulation/Code	Jan-22	2023/24	2022-23	APRC set it as a priority for 22/23 to review the Policy	APRC
Casework	Procedure for dealing with Suspected Academic Misconduct	Policy/Regulation/Code	May-19	2023/24	2022-23	Committee has already agreed some changes in 2022-23. Planning to introduce more substantive proposals later in 2022-23	APRC
Casework	Student Appeal Regulations	Policy/Regulation/Code	May-20	2024/25	2024-25	We are not aware of reasons to bring forward a review, other than a minor technical amendment to the list of areas subject to Fitness for Practice.	APRC
Casework	Expected Behaviour Policy in relation to Appeals, Complaints, Student Conduct and Related Procedures	Policy/Regulation/Code	Aug-20	2023/24	2024-25	We will make some minor technical changes in 2022-23 to reflect the changes in titles within Academic Services (it is not necessary to seek APRC approval for these). Other than these technical changes, we are not aware of any urgent need to review this policy.	APRC
Other	Performance Sport Policy	Policy/Regulation/Code	Jun-15	2018/19	2023-24	We are aware that a review is well overdue. While it is functioning it needs a coherent approach and refresh. CAHSS want more guidance (Education) on what a national sport is.	APRC
Other	Visiting and Non-Graduating Student Policy and Procedure	Policy/Regulation/Code	Mar-19	2022/23	2024-25	No urgent issues to be addressed, so we propose to delay until 2024-25	APRC
Other	International Student Attendance and Engagement Policy	Policy/Regulation/Code	Aug-21	2022/23	TBC	We will consult the Student Immigration Service to clarify requirements for a review.	APRC
Other	University use of email as method of contacting students	Policy/Regulation/Code	Dec-21	2026/27	2026-27	We are not aware of any urgent reason to review this at earlier point.	APRC
Programme and course approval	Degree Programme Specification Guidance	Guidance	Aug-20	2023/24	2023-24	Review as part of Curriculum Transformation - for now, plan to do this work in 23-24	APRC
Programme and course approval	SCQF Third Party Credit Rating	Policy/Regulation/Code	Dec-19	2019/20	2024-25	We propose to review suite of documents related to collaboration with external partners as a suite in 24-25. We are not aware of any need to review this policy earlier than that.	QAC
Programme and course approval	Models for Degree Types	Policy/Regulation/Code	Jun-17	2021/22	2023-24	Review as part of Curriculum Transformation - for now, plan to do this work in 23-24	APRC
Programme and course approval	Dual, Double and Multiple Awards Policy	Policy/Regulation/Code	Mar-16	2023/24	2024-25	We propose to review suite of documents related to collaboration with external partners as a suite in 24-25.	APRC
Programme and course approval	Framework for Curricula	Policy/Regulation/Code	Jun-17	2021/22	2023-24	Review as part of Curriculum Transformation - for now - assuming this will happen in 23-24	APRC
Programme and course approval	Programme and Course Design, Development, Approval, Changes and Closure Policy	Policy/Regulation/Code	May-22	2024/25	2024-25	Aim to make minor updates to section relating to course annd programme publication dates in 2022-23 . We propose a more substantive review in 2024-25 (or earlier, if Curriculum Transformation, or other developments such as the Degree Finder replacement, require it)	APRC
Programme and course approval	Programme and Course Handbooks Policy	Policy/Regulation/Code	May-22	2022/23	2022-23	Technical update only - we are not aware of any need for a more substantive review at this stage.	APRC
Programme and course approval	Degree Regulations -UG	Policy/Regulation/Code	May-22	2022/23	2022-23	Review annually	APRC
Programme and course approval	Associated Institution Policy	Policy/Regulation/Code	Dec-19	2022/23	2024-25	Review suite of documents related to collaboration with external partners as a suite in 24-25.	QAC
Programme and course approval	Degree Regulations -PG	Policy/Regulation/Code	May-22	2022/23	2022-23	We propose to review suite of documents related to collaboration with external partners as a suite in 24-25. We are not aware of any need to review this policy earlier than that.	APRC

Programme and course delivery	Work-Based and Placement Learning Policy	Policy/Regulation/Code	May-22	2022/23	TBC	Checking with Study and Work Away team on whether updates required this year.	QAC
Programme and course delivery	Accessible and Inclusive Learning policy	Policy/Regulation/Code	Jan-13	2018/19	TBC	Consult with Disability and Learning Support Service regarding requirements for review.	SEC
Programme and course delivery	Open Educational Resources Policy	Policy/Regulation/Code	Sep-21	2024/25	2024-25	We are not aware of a need for an earlier review, although we will check with ISG.	SEC
Programme and course delivery	Academic Timetabling Policy	Policy/Regulation/Code	May-18	Not specified	TBC	Consult with Timetabling Unit to clarify requirements for review.	APRC
Programme and course delivery	Learning Analytics Policy and Procedures	Policy/Regulation/Code	May-18	2019-20	TBC	Consult with Prof Sian Bayne and with ISG regarding requirements for review.	SEC
Programme and course delivery	Learning Analytics Principles and Purposes	Policy/Regulation/Code	May-17	2019-20	TBC	Consult with Prof Sian Bayne and with ISG regarding requirements for review.	SEC
Programme and course delivery	Lecture Recording Policy	Policy/Regulation/Code	Sep-18	2020/21	2022/23	ISG currently leading review of the Policy	SEC
Programme and course delivery	Virtual Classroom Policy	Policy/Regulation/Code	May-22	TBC	2022/23	ISG currently leading review of the Policy	SEC
Quality assurance	Guidance for Schools regarding communication between student representatives and students	Guidance	Jul-19	2019-20	2022-23	Already planning to update in 2022-23	QAC
Quality assurance	Student Support Services Annual Review (SSSAR) Guidance	Guidance	Nov-16	2019/20	2022-23		QAC
Quality assurance	Annual Monitoring, Review and Reporting Policy	Policy/Regulation/Code	Aug-19	2022/23	2022-23	We plan technical changes in 2022-23 to ensure it reflects current processes, then will have more substantive review in 2023-24 if required to take account of external developments.	QAC
Quality assurance	Student Voice Policy	Policy/Regulation/Code	May-21	2021/22	2024-25	Policy updated recently, and we are not aware of any need for a review in the near future.	QAC
Quality assurance	Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Policy	Policy/Regulation/Code	Sep-21	2021/22	2022-23	We plan technical changes in 2022-23 to ensure it reflects current processes.	QAC
Quality assurance	Student Support Services Annual Review (SSSAR) Policy	Policy/Regulation/Code	May-17	2022/23	2022-23	We plan light-touch review to learn from practices during the Covid pandemic and take account of views of Deputy Secretary (Students).	QAC
Staff roles	School Director of Quality Role Outline	Guidance	May-21	2023/24	2023/24		QAC
Staff roles	Course Organiser Outline of Role	Guidance	Jun-21	2023/24	2024/25	We are not aware of any urgent need to review this, so propose to reschedule to 2024-25	APRC
Staff roles	Policy for the Recruitment, Support and Development of Tutors and Demonstrators	Policy/Regulation/Code	Sep-17	2021/22	2023-24	Prof Antony Maciocia is leading a strand of work on tutors and demonstrators in response to the ELIR. It is possible that this will lead to recommendations for changes to policy.	SEC
Student support	Academic and Pastoral Support Policy	Policy/Regulation/Code	Sep-22	2023/24	2022/23	Technical review undertaken Sept 22. Fuller review planned by end 2022-23 to take account of new student support model.	SEC
Student support	Authorised Interruption of Study Policy	Policy/Regulation/Code	May-18	2022/23	2024/25	We are not aware of any urgent need to review this policy.	APRC
Student support	Student Maternity and Family Leave Policy	Policy/Regulation/Code	Jun-17	2020/21	2023-24	While we are aware that some stakeholders would like us to review this, we are not aware of any urgent need to amend the policy. We propose to review in 2023-24.	APRC

Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee

26 January 2023

Update from the Coursework Extension and Special Circumstances Task Group & November 2022 ESC Review Update

Description of paper

1. The paper provides APRC with an update on the work of the Coursework Extension and Special Circumstances Task Group which has taken place in the period November - January. This is the third update from the group. The second update was received at the November e-business meeting of APRC.

Action requested / recommendation

2. The update on the task group's work is provided to APRC to note and comment.

Background and context

3. At its May 2022 meeting, APRC approved a task group to review the coursework extension and special circumstances policies with a view to bringing policy changes to the March 2023 meeting for implementation in the 2023-24 academic year. The approved remit, deliverables and membership of the task group are provided in Appendix 1 for information.

4. The task group was formulated in August 2022, and four meetings have been held to date. Further meetings have been scheduled in February, March and April.

5. The task group's work was front-loaded in Semester 1, with the group expected to have a clear direction of travel by January 2023. The group are aware of the significant dissatisfaction around the existing policies and there is a strong appetite for improvement among members. The group agree that the existing policies and associated workload are unsustainable across the University community and there is a strong drive for positive change in this area.

6. The task group are expected to present policy changes for approval by the end of 2022/23. The task group are aware of the dates for relevant meetings of APRC for annual policy approvals and the group has representation from Student Systems and Student Administration to ensure any proposed changes can be considered by systems in real-time and ahead of the formulation of the finalised policy, to be considered for approval by APRC.

7. There is an ESC Review running simultaneous to the task group, which focuses on policy, practice and service recommendations. The ESC Review have met with individual schools to talk through the recommendations and hear what is working well and areas for improvement in relation to the ESC Service. This review is planning to produce a report with recommendations to address issues raised in the wider context.

Discussion

8. There is high expectation among the wider University community on the forthcoming policy revisions, with a hope that the task group will deliver a policy which achieves a balanced and relational approach that equally promotes student and staff wellbeing.

9. Discussions to date have highlighted that achieving the interests of students and staff will require compromise and achieving a policy which meets the interests of all members is likely to be very challenging. It is reiterated that a revised policy alone will not be sufficient to address the issues and concerns raised by both students and staff. This is understood to be a challenge across the sector. Practice to address this issue varies across the sector and there does not appear to be a standard sector-wide response to the problem.

10. The group's remit is focussed on a reduction of coursework extensions, however it is unlikely this can be achieved without consideration of the wider issues which feed into the volume. Additional factors include, but are not limited to: assessment design, volume of assessment and the bunching of deadlines, structure of the academic year, key dates, graduation deadlines and ensuring adequate resource for student support.

11. The group are focussed on improving on the current policy, though any improvement is likely to require compromise. Additionally, there are other change projects underway across the University, such as Curriculum Transformation, and recommendations by the group may be impacted by the outcome of these change projects.

12. At its November meeting, the group considered a draft policy which incorporated blue-sky thinking put forward by members and discussed at the October meeting. The group provided feedback on the draft policy and considered the practical application of proposals included in the draft. The group broadly agreed that the draft was not suitable and further work was required. In preparation for the January meeting, the group were asked to work together in smaller groups to advance on reaching a compromise on key sticking points between meetings. Members were asked to focus on 2-3 sets of comments returned by members. Groups were asked to consolidate themes and identify potential changes to the existing policy.

13. The group met again in mid-January to discuss the compromises reached by smaller groups. The group made encouraging progress, reaching a compromise on key sticking points.

14. In considering key areas, the group noted that they support adopting a package of measures, and that each individual measure is supported in the context of other measures also being adopted.

15. The group expressed early support for the following package of measures, support for which is dependent on the complete package being adopted by APRC:

- **A sliding scale of late penalties.** For example, rather than deducting five marks per day that an assessment is late, the first day may attract a penalty of two marks, the second day a penalty of three marks and so on. The group notes that this is outside the remit of the task group and penalties for late submission of coursework sits within the Taught Assessment Regulations. This recommendation would be included as part of wider recommendations which sit outside the remit of the group, but which are closely linked to the policies the group is reviewing.
The group held mixed views on whether this measure would help to reduce extensions, however the change is seen as generally being more supportive to students.

- **A revised definition for Coursework Extensions**. The revised definition clarifies that a coursework extension is appropriate in cases where it is

expected that circumstances can be mitigated for with a short extension of a defined number of days. The specified number of days was not agreed, and will be revisited at future discussions by the group.

It is hoped this clarification will develop better understanding that coursework extensions are appropriate if a student expects to be able to submit within the extended deadline. If not, then other mechanisms such as special circumstances may be more appropriate avenues to provide support.

- **Applications for coursework extensions will be accepted from 2 weeks prior to the published submission deadline.** The group agreed to support limiting the application window for coursework extensions to two weeks prior to the submission deadline. The group support this on a trial basis in 2023/24 with the recommendation that APRC evaluate the effectiveness of this measure ahead of the 2024/25 academic year. **The policy is to make clear that students are encouraged to seek support or speak with a Student Advisor if they require support outside of the 2 week application window.**

It is acknowledged that this measure is a departure from current practice and would require thorough and clear communication to ensure students are aware that support is available outside of the 2 week window.

16. There is general support among the group for the introduction of a threshold limit to the number of self-certified applications for coursework extensions that a student can submit each year.

It is intended that applications be linked to 'events' meaning that in practical terms an event may impact on numerous coursework submissions. For example, a student has tonsillitis which affects them for 5 days. During this period, they have three coursework assessments due. The tonsillitis would constitute one event, despite impacting on three coursework assessments.

It is **not** intended that no further applications would be possible after reaching the threshold. Rather, any applications beyond the threshold may require additional action, for example, for the student to provide supporting evidence or to have a conversation with a Student Advisor, or other appropriate support staff.

17. It is expected that introducing a threshold limit may have system implications and the group agreed that this would likely require significant changes, which may be ambitious ahead of the 2023/24 academic year.

18. Discussions also highlighted that there are groups of students who are not currently eligible for Extra Time Learning Adjustment support from the Disability and Learning Support Service (DLSS). The task group strongly support advocating for greater support to be afforded to specific student groups, who do currently receive Learning Adjustment Support. This includes widening participation students, care experienced students and student carers.

19. The group's work was frontloaded in Semester 1 and the group expected to have a clear direction of travel by January. Despite best efforts, the work of the group is ongoing, to this end the group have scheduled additional meetings in February, March and April.

20. At its next meeting, the group expect to consider further recommendations including the duration of coursework extensions and key sticking points within the special circumstances policy.
21. The policy will be accompanied by guidance for staff and students, as set out in the deliverables for the task group. The guidance will be developed once the final policy is agreed, in consultation with key stakeholders.

Resource implications
22. The potential resource implications of the task group were considered by APRC when approving the group. At present, resource implications are limited to the work of the members on the task group and members were made aware of the expected resource requirements via the terms of reference.
23. The group have received a strong steer from APRC that this is a crucial area of review, and members have been asked to prioritise this area of work.
24. At present, existing policies on coursework extensions and special circumstances require a high level of resource and the impact of policies on staff workload is a key driver in undertaking this review. Resource is a key focus of the work of the task group. The review of policies is being undertaken with the intention of presenting changes to policy that will reduce the resource required to support these.
25. The group are taking account of student and staff workload implications for staff throughout discussions. However, it is expected that if APRC agree to adopt recommendations produced by the task group, these will have resource implications for the University. Areas impacted either directly or indirectly by recommendations surfacing from the task group are likely to include: Student Systems, Academic Services, the Disability and Learning Support Service, the Extensions and Special Circumstances team, The Advice Place, and School staff including Student Advisors, Teaching Offices and Course Organisers.
APRC are asked to take account of resourcing implications in considering any final recommendations from the task group.

Risk management
26. There are potential risks relating to resourcing and staff workload if policy and processes are unchanged.
27. There are potential risks relating to the student experience and support provided to students if policy and processes are unchanged
28. The task group are aware of the risks associated with the review of these policies and are carefully considering the staff and student experience throughout their work.
29. There is a risk that focus on the policy in isolation without taking into account wider interdependencies will not fully address the potential risks for staff workload and student experience.
30. There is a risk that any delay to the policy work being advanced will have an impact on student and staff experience in 2023/24. However, a rushed approach and not paying sufficient attention to interdependencies will carry the risk of not fully addressing the issues the task group set out to consider.

Equality & diversity

31. Equality and diversity implications are being considered by the task group at each stage of their work.

32. The task group strongly advocate for greater support to be afforded to specific student groups, who do currently receive Learning Adjustment Support. This recommendation is expected to be included in the task group's final report for APRC.

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

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

<u>**Author**</u>
Professor Sabine Rolle
Convener of CE & SC Task Group

Olivia Hayes
Academic Policy Officer
January 2023

<u>**Presenter**</u>
Professor Sabine Rolle
Convener of CE & SC Task Group

Olivia Hayes
Academic Policy Officer
January 2023

Freedom of Information
Open

Appendix 1:

Task Group to review Coursework Extension and Special Circumstances Policies

Background:

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

a. Remit:

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

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

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

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

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

b. Membership:

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

3 x Representative each from CMVM and CSE. 4 x Representative from CAHSS[1]. College representatives will comprise of one College representative, one School academic representative such as a Director of Teaching or Convener of a Board of Examiners, and one School professional services representative such as a teaching administration or student support staff member.
Colleges are asked to consider breadth of student type and experience in nominating their representatives.

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

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

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

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

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

c. Methodology:

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

d. Deliverables

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

---

[1] CAHSS have four College representatives on the group to reflect the higher student numbers within this College.

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

e. Timelines:

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

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

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

Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee

26 January 2023

Approval for non-standard programme start dates for the Online MBA

Description of paper
1. This paper is seeking permission for the part time Online Masters in Business Administration (MBA) to deviate from the standard academic year start dates with one of the two standard entry points to be in March.

Action requested / recommendation
2. APRC is asked to **approve** a non-standard academic year start date for the Online MBA. This part time programme will be delivered wholly online and will have two entry points separated by 6 monthly intervals, March and September. As March is a non-standard start date APRC is asked to approve this programme commencement date (effective from March 2023 onwards).

Background and context
3. In March 2022 the Business School submitted a proposal to the CAHSS College Office to launch a new programme which was to be a part time (33 months), online version of the successful MBA programme. Market testing identified the Online MBA as a strategic gap within the current programme portfolio of the Business School. This programme would complement and enhance the existing suite of MBA programmes which include the full time one year MBA and part time Executive MBA (for experienced managers) and which are administered and directed by a specialist unit based within the Business School.

4. On 10th May 2022, the Online MBA was validated by a CAHSS panel subject to some minor clarifications. Revised paperwork was provided by the School and formal notification of the programme approval was confirmed to the School on 7th June 2022. Please see Online MBA Programme overview for further details of this closed programme where all teaching, assessment and student support is delivered within the Business School. Further details can also be viewed in the degree finder information.

5. The two entry points for this programme within each academic year enable a synergistic and sustainable delivery model with planned courses being delivered to each cohort but in a different order to allow the same courses to be taken by different cohorts at the same time.

6. At the point of validation it was suggested that the two entry points would be January (which is typically viewed as an accepted and standard programme start) and July (a non-standard start time). The CAHSS College Office would like to offer sincere apologies to APRC colleagues for our oversight such that we did not seek formal approval for the non-standard programme start date for the 2nd cohort of this new programme at the point of launch.

7. From the point of validation until early December 2022 a series of system, process and implementation issues beyond the control of the school served to delay the opening of the programme for applications and impacted on preparation of core course resources. As an online programme with a high degree of asynchronous content, which will be shared across different cohorts, the importance of a consistent VLE platform from the outset was noted at point of validation. Subsequent issues encountered in the setting up of course material in Learn Ultra were primarily related to the display of video recordings, which is a critical element of this programme, and with the additional time available from a March start date, these have been resolved within the school technology team and lessons learned shared with the Learn Ultra project team. In addition when reviewing the planning and preparation the School identified that timelines for the start of teaching of the EMBA (January 2023) would impact significantly on, and limit staff resources available for, the induction and start of teaching for the Online MBA. This had not previously been picked up on due to induction for EMBA taking place in December. Following consultation within the School and with applicants and offer holders it was therefore agreed that in the interests of ensuring an optimal student experience the programme start dates should shift from January and July to March and September. At this point a [paper] was prepared and submitted to APRC for electronic consideration over 20-21 December. Although APRC gave in principle approval to delay the start of the programme from January until March 2023 a range of concerns were expressed and questions raised and this paper seeks to address those concerns and clarify the approval that is now sought.

Discussion

8. As stated above the Online MBA has been developed as a part time variant and in essence a new platform and delivery model for the well-established full time on campus MBA. As the MBA has evolved (notably during the pandemic) this programme has started to incorporate some blended delivery approaches especially for the coaching and professional development elements which are now all successfully delivered online.

9. The addition of the Online MBA to the Business School portfolio allows the School to target new markets and new students. The online offering allows those who have not been able to travel to Edinburgh to access the programme in new ways and the choice to move to part-time addresses an identified need to offer a flexible mode of study that better supports the challenging work-life-study balances that many previous MBA students have faced. This aligns with a number of School and University strategic objectives in enabling greater diversity of our applicant and entrant profiles.

10. Due to the professional nature, and accreditation requirements, of the MBA programmes, including the reliance on external partners for a high proportion of teaching and experiential learning, the courses and coaching that are offered to the students are all contained within the Business School.

11. The chosen first start date of 1st March 2023 (with teaching starting on 6th March) will mean the programme for this cohort will run from March to February for each of the first two years and 9 months in the final third year will result in an end date

of November 2025. Although it is recognised that this is out with standard academic year dates the teaching and assessment is run on well-established 3 month block models that are contained within the Business School planning unit.

12. The planning and delivery of part time programmes can be extremely resource intensive and it is recognised that part time students, especially those enrolled online, require similar levels of support to those on full time programmes. The use of two entry points and synergistic course delivery within each 12 month period has been deliberately chosen as a way to optimise sustainability for this programme as well as seeking to ensure reasonable size student cohorts to better promote an excellent student experience. The MBA Directorate includes dedicated and experienced professional services staff who provide specialist support, coaching and professional development guidance for the MBA cohorts. Many of these staff are directly involved in delivery of core elements of the programme and therefore build excellent relationships with the students.

13. The MBA programmes have no exams within the centrally scheduled exam diets and assessment takes place at the end of each block of courses (of which there are four per year, each being around 3 months). Board of Examiner meetings are appropriately timed to ensure progression and award decisions can be managed efficiently. The programme team work in close cooperation with the ESC service and coursework deadlines for the online MBA will be included in ESC processes such that students will be able to access the standard level of support from the ESC service with no difficulties.

14. We would like to seek formal approval from APRC for the March and September start dates for the Online MBA programme going forward and with effect from March 2023. It is regrettable that the appropriate permission for the non-standard start date is being sought after the programme has been launched and the authors would like to apologise for this oversight. It is recognised that, should APRC colleagues have any further concerns, the timelines for a start in March 2023 are exceptionally problematic and we hope that the reassurances provided in this paper will allow APRC to approve this request. Please be assured that the College Office will be working with the School to review feedback and evaluation from students and staff at regular intervals over the next 12 months and throughout the programme to ensure the programme is successful and that student experience and student outcomes are as positive as possible.

Resource implications

15. The choice of March and September as start dates for each iteration of this 33 month programme has been carefully considered by the School to align with resource planning and staff workload. The Head of School and Director of Professional Services have confirmed that they will work in cooperation with the relevant Head of Subject Area to ensure that staff workloads are appropriately addressed especially in relation to concerns in relation to marking of the capstone projects. The established practices and processes from the MBA and EMBA ensure that the School is able to appropriately assess the anticipated resource requirements based on student numbers and capstone choices and plan accordingly.

16. As the Business School has been working with MBA/EMBA students (the majority of which work full time and are therefore accessing teaching and support at out with standard office hours) many years there is already well established practice in ensuring students are able to access institutional support teams such as the Disability and Learning Support Services. The March and September start dates are therefore not expected to have any detrimental impact on student access to support and guidance.

Risk management
17. As stated above the risks associated with non-standard start times have been carefully reviewed and are sufficiently mitigated through the well-established existing support and planning arrangements.

Responding to the Climate Emergency & Sustainable Development Goals
18. There are no direct impacts on the climate emergency and sustainable development goals.

Equality & diversity
19. The online and part time nature of this new programme will promote and encourage greater diversity of applicants and entrants to the MBA and ensures an equality of opportunity previously unavailable to many with caring commitments or other barriers from full time on campus offerings.

Communication, implementation and evaluation of the impact of any action agreed
20. This paper has been prepared in consultation with colleagues in the Business School, the Dean of Quality Assurance and Curriculum Validation and the College Registrar. The School have previously confirmed that a decision to postpone the start from January 2023 was undertaken following consultation with legal services, Student Recruitment and Admissions and all relevant applicants and offer holders. The School will be notified of the APRC decision by the CAHSS College Office and will ensure that student and staff feedback on the design, delivery and assessment of the programme is carefully evaluated especially in the first 12 months.

Author
Lynsey Dinwoodie
Dr Lisa Kendall
Dr Paul Norris

16th January 2023

Presenter
Dr Paul Norris

APRC 22/23 5F

Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee

26 January 2023

Coordinating Institutional Activities on Assessment and Feedback

Description of paper

1. The Senate Standing Committees – Senate Education Committee (SEC), Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC), and Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee (APRC) - and the Curriculum Transformation Programme, have a range of assessment-related activities underway at present. This paper provides an overview of current or planned activities – dividing them into two categories:

    *   Activities relating to strategy and policy
    *   Activities relating to guidance, procedures, data, systems and evaluation

2. The paper sets out proposals for coordinating and governing these activities – which involves establishing two new groups. Since the governance arrangements will relate to the work of the three committees, they will all need to approve the arrangements. At its meeting on 19 January 2023, SEC confirmed that it supported the arrangements – including the establishment of the Strategy Group (see paras 9-11 below) – subject to fine-tuning the exact arrangements for the membership of the groups, and making more explicit how the groups will engage with stakeholders and with other strategic institutional projects. We are now seeking APRC's approval for the relevant aspect of the arrangements – which relate to the second group (whose remit would cover Assessment and Feedback Guidance, Procedures, Data, Systems and Evaluation Group).

Action requested / recommendation

3. The Committee is invited to approve the establishment of the new *Assessment and Feedback Guidance, Procedures, Data, Systems and Evaluation Group,* as set out in paragraphs 12 to 18.

4. If the Committee supports the establishment of this group, we will also need to seek approval from the Senate Quality Assurance Committee.

Background and context

5. For a long time, the University has regarding strengthening assessment and a feedback arrangements as a high priority, in the context of persistently low scores for assessment and feedback questions in the National Student Survey. Assessment and feedback is a key theme within the Curriculum Transformation Programme, and the report of the University's 2021 Enhancement-Led Institutional Review highlighted the area as a key priority for development activities, stating that:

    "Over an extended period of time, the University has considered a broad evidence-base which has highlighted concerns about assessment and

feedback and this remains an area of challenge for the institution. The University is asked to make demonstrable progress, within the next academic year, in prioritising the development of a holistic and strategic approach to the design and management of assessment and feedback. The University should also progress with proposals for the establishment of a common marking scheme to ensure comparability of student assessment processes across Schools."

6. As a result of the Covid-19 pandemic and the subsequent return of many activities to campus, the University has needed to consider a range of issues regarding the design and practical operation of assessment – for example, the operation of examinations in an online and on-campus format. Developments in artificial intelligence and other technologies have also stimulated institutional discussion and activities about assessment practice – particularly in the context of plagiarism and its detection. In addition, debates at sector level, for example on the topics of 'grade inflation', and the University's commitment to equality and diversity and widening participation, have generated a range of activities relating to understanding student progression and achievement.

7. As a result of these and other drivers, the University has initiated a range of different institutional initiatives on assessment and feedback. However, there is scope to coordinate and govern these activities more effectively, in order to avoid duplication and deliver positive synergies between different strands of work, and to ensure that the institution has sufficient oversight of progress in this area.

8. The Annex to this paper summarises the main activities currently underway (focussing on those that are the responsibility of the Senate Standing Committees). It highlights some outstanding issues (where the relevant committee has agreed that work should take place but no plan of action is in place) and some areas of potential overlap between different strands of activity. Paragraphs 8 to 17 propose the establishment of two new groups to coordinate and govern these activities.

Discussion

Assessment and Feedback Strategy Group

9. SEC plans to establish a strategy group with a remit to address the following:

- Institutional strategy around assessment and feedback
- Institutional strategy around academic integrity in assessment
- Institutional policy around mode of examinations from 2023-24 onwards
- Overseeing Schools' activities to align with the Assessment and Feedback Principles and Priorities, and coordinating management responses where required

10. The group will report to SEC. The membership would consist of:

- Prof Tina Harrison, Vice-Principal (Academic Standards and Quality Assurance (Convener)

- Prof Colm Harmon, Vice-Principal (Students)
- Lucy Evans (Deputy Secretary, Students)
- Deans of Learning and Teaching for each College
- One School representative from each College (either a Head of School or Director of Learning and Teaching)
- Students' Associated representative
- Other staff would be invited to contribute on particular issues

11. The Curriculum Transformation Programme established an Assessment and Feedback Group, which led the development of the Assessment and Feedback Principles. One option may be to revise the remit, membership, and reporting lines of that group so that it can cover these proposed activities along with its current remit. However, in practice, that group has not been active since 2021-22, and, while there is overlap between these proposed activities and Curriculum Transformation, it is important that the University makes progress on a range of activities in advance of the timescales for implementing Curriculum Transformation. Therefore, it will be more appropriate to have a newly-constituted strategy group reporting directly to the Senate Education Committee.

Assessment and Feedback Guidance, Procedures, Data, Systems and Evaluation Group

12. We propose to establish a second group with a remit to address the following:

- Develop institutional advice and guidance on the practical management of online and on-campus examinations
- Oversee the development of academic misconduct procedures*
- Coordinate the evaluation of the operation of examinations during 2022-23 and beyond (including the planned evaluation of the Dec 22 diet)
- Coordinate activities to enhance institutional data on student achievement, progression and completion – with a view to providing a single source of truth in a user-friendly format
- Coordinate practical activities (eg development of guidance) to support the implementation of the Assessment and Feedback Principles and Priorities
- Develop mechanisms for evaluation and monitoring of the Assessment and Feedback Principles and Priorities

* In practice, a separate sub-group would be required for this, with input from College and School Academic Misconduct Officers.

13. The group would report to the three Senate Standing Committees on issues related to their respective remits.

14. The membership would include:

- Lucy Evans (Deputy Secretary, Students) (Convener)
- Lisa Dawson (Academic Registrar)
- Prof Tina Harrison (Assistant Principal, Academic Standards and Quality Assurance, and convener of SQAC)

- Dr Paul Norris (Convener of APRC)
- Deans of Learning and teaching for three Colleges
- Deans of Quality for three Colleges
- Heads of Academic Administration from each College
- Representative of Strategic Planning
- Representative of Student Systems
- Students' Association representative
- Academic Services representative
- Information Services Group's Learning, Teaching and Web Services team representative
- Curriculum Transformation Programme representative
- Other staff would be invited to contribute on particular issues

Timelines, next steps and reporting arrangements

15. If the Committee supports the establishment of the second group, then we will seek SQAC approval for the group (see paragraph 4).

16. Each group will start by developing a workplan, taking account of the planned and outstanding issues set out in the Annex, and the level of professional services resources available to undertake the relevant work (see paragraph 19). They would present their workplans to the relevant Senate Committee(s) for approval. If the groups identify any urgent issues, they would oversee progress on these over the next several months in parallel with developing their workplans.

17. The groups would report to the relevant Senate Committees to provide an overview of progress against their workplan at least once in 2022-23 and once in 2023-24. Where they require formal Committee approval (for example, for a change to policy), they would submit formal proposals to the relevant Committee.

18. The Committees would review the operation of the two groups at the end of 2023-24 and decide whether they should continue.

Resource implications

19. Academic Services and the broader Registry Services will need to assess the resource requirements of supporting these two groups, once the Committees have signalled that they are content with the direction of travel, and the groups have developed their workplans. As part of this, the Student Analytics, Insights and Modelling team would play a key role in supporting data-related elements of the work. In addition, the Curriculum Transformation Programme have signalled that they may be able to provide some support. The workplan of each group will need to take account of available resources – this is likely to require a degree of prioritisation, and may require the phasing of some activities.

Risk management

20. The recommendations within the paper aim to enhance the assessment and feedback experience for students, reducing the risks associated with poor

performance in assessment and feedback and the likelihood of an unsatisfactory outcome in a future ELIR from not taking action

Responding to the Climate Emergency & Sustainable Development Goals
21. Not Applicable.

Equality & diversity
22. One of the Assessment and Feedback principles directly addresses inclusive assessment practice and equality in assessment outcomes, and it is likely that some of the planned activities of the Guidance, Procedures, Data and Evaluation Group would relate to developing the University's understanding of student progression, attainment and completion for students with different characteristics and backgrounds.

Communication, implementation and evaluation of the impact of any action agreed
23. Academic Services would use the Senate Committees' Newsletter to communicate regarding the establishment of these groups. Paragraphs 15 to 18 set out implementation and evaluation arrangements.

<u>**Author**</u> <u>**Presenter**</u>
Tom Ward Tom Ward
Director of Academic Services
19 January 2023

Freedom of Information
Open

Annex - overview of current institutional activities relating to assessment and feedback

1 Activities relating to strategy and policy

1.1 Assessment and Feedback Principles and Priorities (SEC)

At its 8 September 2022 meeting, the Senate Education Committee (SEC) approved the new Principles and Priorities, and asked Schools to implement them on the following basis:

- 2022-23 implement some specific elements of the document in full, plus review current assessment and feedback practice against the Principles and Priorities, identifying gaps and actions to be taken forward in the second year of operation, 2023-24; and

- 2023-24, demonstrate full alignment with the Principles for all their taught portfolio, ensuring baseline expectations are covered, and demonstrate significant action against the Priorities in preparation for Curriculum Transformation.

Over summer 2022 and Semester One of 2022-23, the University is undertaking the following activities to support the launch of the Principles and Priorities:

- During Semester one of 22-23, Prof Colm Harmon (Vice-Principal, Students), Prof Tina Harrison (Assistant Principal, Academic Standards and Quality Assurance) and Lucy Evans (Deputy Secretary, Students) met with the senior leadership team in each School separately to discuss progress with the assessment and feedback principles and priorities as part of a wider discussion on student experience.
- The Directors of Teaching Network meeting on 19 October 2022 focussed on the Principles and Priorities.
- A Teaching Matters series comprising eight blogs has provided further discussion of the Principles and Priorities : https://www.teaching-matters-blog.ed.ac.uk/tag/assessment-and-feedback-principles-and-priorities-theme/
- A student intern, working as part of the Curriculum Transformation Programme, has developed an initial draft of student-facing guidance that requires some further development before making available to students (aiming to have this available by the end of Semester 2, 2022/23).
- Prof Harrison and Dr Neil Lent (Institute for Academic Development) are coordinating a series of seminar/events with internal and external speakers to support assessment development (linking to the key Principles and Priorities).

1.2 Futures for Assessment and Misconduct (SEC)

At its 10 November 2022 meeting, SEC discussed a paper from Professor Sian Bayne (Assistant Principal, Digital Education), which provided "a brief overview of current trends and trajectories in digital assessment and plagiarism detection, with a particular focus on 1) the implications of AI-assisted text generation and 2) rising concern over routine use of plagiarism detections systems such as Turnitin." The

paper aimed to "inform a wider institutional debate on the future of assessment" – and it proposed "that Senate Education Committee lead on more fully developing a response to these new trajectories, building on the new Assessment and Feedback Principles and Priorities, and for implementation through the Curriculum Transformation Programme and the Digital Strategy."

While SEC endorsed the paper's analysis, it did not approve specific actions to address the issues highlighted in the paper.

There is potential overlap between any activities that SEC may wish to undertake in response to the paper, and work to support the implementation of the Assessment and Feedback Principles and Practices (which includes, for example, a principle around Assessment design to "support and encourage good academic practices and minimise opportunities or incentives for academic misconduct"). There is also potential overlap with the ARPC work on redeveloping academic misconduct procedures (See 2.2).

1.3   Academic Integrity (SEC)

In Spring 2022, SEC held a special meeting with representatives from the University of Sydney, and the College Academic Misconduct Officers, to discuss how to approach academic integrity. While this meeting did not lead to any formal actions, it did highlight various areas for potential development. One potential development was to create a course for students on the topic of academic integrity. The Institute for Academic Development has made progress on this issue – having identified a resource that the College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine (MVM) digital education team had developed (see separate January 2023 SEC paper on Academic Best Practice).

In its plan for 22-23, SEC agreed to follow up these discussions with Sydney by focusing on academic integrity. At present, SEC has not established a particular plan to address this – although some other activities set out in this Annex (for example, 1.4, 2.2, 2.3) are engaging with aspects of academic integrity.

1.4   Examination formats (SEC)

At its meeting on 10 November 2022, SEC discussed the issue of examination format (whether examinations should be held on-campus or online), and considered a report on the outcomes of a survey commissioned by the Students' Association on the subject of in-person examinations. The Committee agreed to some follow-up actions:

- Prof Colm Harmon to write to Schools highlighting issues set out in the Students' Association report (which he did in December 2022); and

- Setting up a short-life working group to consider the policy on the mode (online or on-campus) for resit exams in summer 2023 – with a view to securing a formal SEC position in Jan 2023 (see separate January 2023 SEC paper on August 2023 resits).

APRC 22/23 5F

These actions relate to examinations held in 2022-23. If the Committee wishes to determine policy in relation to the format of examinations from 2023-24 onwards, it will need to agree a position on this by the end of session 2022-23.

1.5 Curriculum Transformation Programme

The implementation of CTP will have implications for assessment and feedback practices - the CTP has included a working group on Assessment and Feedback, which led the development of the Assessment and Feedback Priorities and Principles document.

2 Activities relating to assessment and feedback guidance, procedures, data, systems and evaluation

2.1 Examination formats (APRC)

In November 2022, the Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee (APRC) approved some guidance for Schools / Colleges on the practical arrangements for managing online exams in 22-23 (focussing on submission deadlines). The Convener of APRC plans to take a broader look at the practical arrangements for online examinations ahead of 2023-24. APRC has agreed that future guidance would take account of exams for wholly online programmes (a category excluded from the guidance approved by APRC in November 2022).

2.2 Academic misconduct procedure (APRC)

In November 2022, APRC agreed some relatively modest amendments to the academic misconduct procedures. Academic Services plan to communicate these changes in January 2023, with a view to them taking immediate effect.

APRC plans to consider some more substantive changes to those procedures later in 2022-23.

2.3 Own Work Declarations (SEC)

The Institute for Academic Development has worked with Information Services Group on proposals for alternate ways to handle Own Work Declarations. They are presenting a separate paper on this to SEC's January 2023 meeting.

2.4 Evaluation of the implementation of the Assessment and Feedback Principles and Priorities (SEC)

When SEC approved the Principles and Priorities, the paper said that: "The Committee will need to monitor and evaluate the implementation of the Principles – including determining measures of success, and deciding the mechanisms for monitoring and evaluation. We will bring proposals to a future meeting for how to approach this."

SEC has not yet discussed how to approach this evaluation. However, at its meeting in December 2022, the Senate Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) agreed that the 2022-23 annual School Quality Reports (which they will submit in August 2023) should include the question "Please report on activities to align existing practice with the new Assessment and Feedback Principles and Priorities". This will provide one element of an overall approach to monitoring and evaluation.

2.5 *Evaluation of the operation of examinations in the December 2022 diet (SEC)*

At its 10 November 2022 meeting, SEC agreed to conduct a review of the December 2022 examination diet early in 2023. It has not yet considered any proposals for how to approach this review. If it wants to take account of the outcomes of course results from that diet, these will not be available until Boards of Examiners meet in January / early February 2023 to confirm Semester one results (deadline 9 February 2023 for publishing UG course results, and 17 February 2023 for publishing PGT course results).

2.6 *Senate Quality Assurance Committee – annual reporting on undergraduate degree award (SQAC)*

SQAC has an established practice of reviewing a report of data on UG degree award / classification on an annual basis, based on a detailed analysis (including benchmarking with comparator institutions, plus some analysis by protected characteristic) produced by Strategic Planning. Academic Services circulates this data to Schools and invites significant outliers to provide more detailed reflection. SQAC considers this dataset each Spring, and plans to discuss the next annual report on 27 April 2023. It wants the next report to include additional focus on the following:

> "… a trend analysis excluding data from the 2019-20 and 2020-21 pandemic years. The analysis should also include a comparison of entry qualifications to exit qualifications both at subject area level and institutional level to understand the trajectory of students and the value added by the University. The report should also include analysis of failure rates to understand which groups may need enhanced support."

This work has potential to overlap with the activities set out in 2.7 and 2.8 below.

2.7 *Quality Data Task Group (SQAC)*

The Student Analytics, Insights and Modelling team maintains an 'Insights Hub' suite of reports that Schools use for annual quality reporting (and that we use for periodic reviews) includes standard reports covering the following categories:

- Applications
- Course marks
- Progression
- Awards
- Graduate outcomes survey

- National Student Survey results

In 2020, SQAC agreed to set up a task group to explore ways to do more systematic monitoring of retention, progression and attainment data. In practice, due to the pandemic, staff changes, and other factors, this group has not yet made any progress. SQAC considered an update at its meeting in February 2022, and is committed to undertaking more work on this in the current session. However, it has not yet established a workplan. Were SQAC to move forward with this work, it would have potential to overlap with work under 2.6, 2.8 and 2.9, and (depending on the focus of the evaluation, 2.5).

2.8 *Equality Diversity Monitoring and Research Committee (EDMARC) and Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee (EDIC) Committee activities*

EDMARC oversees the production of annual equality and diversity reports, which include a detailed analysis of UG / PGT / PGT attainment by protected characteristic (including some data by School):

https://www.ed.ac.uk/equality-diversity/about/reports/edmarc

EDIC is undertaking work to understand the underlying causes of the awarding gaps for students from different protected characteristics, and the Convener of EDIC is exploring potential ways to collect more granular and accessible data on Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) students.

2.9 *Research into Undergraduate Non-Continuation (SEC)*

In 2018-19, Academic Services and Strategic Planning commissioned two PhD students to undertake a very thorough analysis of non-completion data. The Senate Learning and Teaching Committee (replaced by the Senate Education Committee from 2019-20) discussed the report in November 2018:

https://www.ed.ac.uk/sites/default/files/atoms/files/agendapapers20181114.pdf

The report include statistical modelling of non-continuation by a range of student characteristics, and identified various areas for further exploration. At its meeting in November 2018, the Committee made various recommendations for follow-up actions, and at its meeting in January 2019, LTC considered a paper setting up proposals for further research into the impact of other factors on non-continuation.

2.10 *Curriculum Transformation Programme – work on inclusion and accessibility*

The CTP has commissioned Advance HE to deliver a programme of learning and engagement to ensure the Curriculum Transformation Programme embeds ED&I throughout its strategy and implementation. This will include a desk-based analysis, which will include an analysis of:

- **Awarding gaps** by protected characteristics

- **Participation gaps** by protected characteristics

Advance HE is in the process of undertaking this work, and plans to submit an interim report in the near future.

Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee

26 January 2023

Academic Year Dates 2024/25 and Provisional Academic Year Dates 2025/26 and 2026/27

Description of paper
1. This paper provides proposed academic year dates 2024/25 and provisional academic year dates 2025/26 and 2026/27 for Committee approval (see Appendix 1). The academic year dates for 2023/24 have already been approved by the Academic Policy and Regulations Committee and are available at: https://www.ed.ac.uk/semester-dates/202324

   This paper also lists the programmes with non-standard academic year dates for Committee approval (see Appendix B). This information is available on the website and College Committee representatives are asked to confirm that this information is still correct at the time of the meeting (January 2023). https://www.ed.ac.uk/semester-dates/programmes-with-non-standard-academic-years

Action requested / recommendation
2. The Committee is invited to approve the proposed academic year dates 2024/25.
3. The Committee is invited to approve the provisional academic year dates 2025/26 and 2026/27.
4. College Committee representatives are invited to review the list of programmes with non-standard academic dates provided in Appendix 2 to confirm its accuracy.

Background and context
5. The academic year dates are presented to APRC annually for approval.

Discussion
6. The attached paper provides the proposed academic year dates 2024/25 and provisional academic year dates 2025/26 and 2026/27.
7. The academic year dates are drafted following the academic structure approved by Senate and published at Academic year structure.

Resource implications
8. No resource implications

Risk management
9. No key risks associated with this paper

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

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

11. The information will be conveyed to Communications and Marketing who will re-format and formally publish at https://www.ed.ac.uk/semester-dates

Author
Olivia Hayes
Academic Policy Officer
Academic Services
January 2023

Freedom of Information Open

Appendix 1: Proposed Academic Year Dates 2024/25 and Provisional Academic Year Dates 2025/26 and 2026/27

Proposed Academic Year Dates 2024/25

1	9 September 2024	Induction
2	16 September 2024	T1
3	23 September 2024	T2
4	30 September 2024	T3
5	07 October 2024	T4
6	14 October 2024	T5
7	21 October 2024	T6
8	28 October 2024	T7
9	04 November 2024	T8
10	11 November 2024	T9
11	18 November 2024	T10
12	25 November 2024	T11
13	02 December 2024	Revision
14	9 December 2024	Exams
15	16 December 2024	Exams
16	23 December 2024	Winter vac 1
17	30 December 2024	Winter vac 2
18	06 January 2025	Winter vac 3
19	13 January 2025	T1
20	20 January 2025	T2
21	27 January 2025	T3
22	03 February 2025	T4
23	10 February 2025	T5
24	17 February 2025	Flexible Learning Week
25	24 February 2025	T6
26	03 March 2025	T7
27	10 March 2025	T8
28	17 March 2025	T9
29	24 March 2025	T10
30	31 March 2025	T11
31	07 April 2025	Spring vac 1
32	14 April 2025	Spring vac 2
33	21 April 2025	Revision
34	28 April 2025	Exams
35	05 May 2025	Exams
36	12 May 2025	Exams
37	19 May 2025	Exams
38	26 May 2025	Summer vac 1
39	02 June 2025	Summer vac 2
40	09 June 2025	Summer vac 3
41	16 June 2025	Summer vac 4
42	23 June 2025	Summer vac 5
43	30 June 2025	Summer vac 6
44	07 July 2025	Summer vac 7
45	14 July 2025	Summer vac 8
46	21 July 2025	Summer vac 9
47	28 July 2025	Summer vac 10
48	04 August 2025	Summer vac 11
49	11 August 2025	Summer vac 12
50	18 August 2025	Summer vac 13
51	25 August 2025	Summer vac 14
52	01 September 2025	Summer vac 15

Provisional Academic Year Dates 2025/26

1	8 September 2025	Induction
2	15 September 2025	T1
3	22 September 2025	T2
4	29 September 2025	T3
5	06 October 2025	T4
6	13 October 2025	T5
7	20 October 2025	T6
8	27 October 2025	T7
9	03 November 2025	T8
10	10 November 2025	T9
11	17 November 2025	T10
12	24 November 2025	T11
13	01 December 2025	Revision
14	8 December 2025	Exams
15	15 December 2025	Exams
16	22 December 2025	Winter vac 1
17	29 December 2025	Winter vac 2
18	05 January 2026	Winter vac 3
19	12 January 2026	T1
20	19 January 2026	T2
21	26 January 2026	T3
22	02 February 2026	T4
23	9 February 2026	T5
24	16 February 2026	Flexible Learning Week
25	23 February 2026	T6
26	02 March 2026	T7
27	9 March 2026	T8
28	16 March 2026	T9
29	23 March 2026	T10
30	30 March 2026	T11
31	06 April 2026	Spring vac 1
32	13 April 2026	Spring vac 2
33	20 April 2026	Revision
34	27 April 2026	Exams
35	04 May 2026	Exams
36	11 May 2026	Exams
37	18 May 2026	Exams
38	25 May 2026	Summer vac 1
39	01 June 2026	Summer vac 2
40	08 June 2026	Summer vac 3
41	15 June 2026	Summer vac 4
42	22 June 2026	Summer vac 5
43	29 June 2026	Summer vac 6
44	06 July 2026	Summer vac 7
45	13 July 2026	Summer vac 8
46	20 July 2026	Summer vac 9
47	27 July 2026	Summer vac 10
48	03 August 2026	Summer vac 11
49	10 August 2026	Summer vac 12
50	17 August 2026	Summer vac 13
51	24 August 2026	Summer vac 14
52	31 August 2026	Summer vac 15

Provisional Academic Year Dates 2026/27

1	07 September 2026	Induction
2	14 September 2026	T1
3	21 September 2026	T2
4	28 September 2026	T3
5	05 October 2026	T4
6	12 October 2026	T5
7	19 October 2026	T6
8	26 October 2026	T7
9	02 November 2026	T8
10	09 November 2026	T9
11	16 November 2026	T10
12	23 November 2026	T11
13	30 November 2026	Revision
14	07 December 2026	Exams
15	14 December 2026	Exams
16	21 December 2026	Winter vac 1
17	28 December 2026	Winter vac 2
18	04 January 2027	Winter vac 3
19	11 January 2027	T1
20	18 January 2027	T2
21	25 January 2027	T3
22	01 February 2027	T4
23	08 February 2027	T5
24	15 February 2027	Flexible Learning Week
25	22 February 2027	T6
26	01 March 2027	T7
27	08 March 2027	T8
28	15 March 2027	T9
29	22 March 2027	T10
30	29 March 2027	T11
31	05 April 2027	Spring vac 1
32	12 April 2027	Spring vac 2
33	19 April 2027	Revision
34	26 April 2027	Exams
35	03 May 2027	Exams
36	10 May 2027	Exams
37	17 May 2027	Exams
38	24 May 2027	Summer vac 1
39	31 May 2027	Summer vac 2
40	07 June 2027	Summer vac 3
41	14 June 2027	Summer vac 4
42	21 June 2027	Summer vac 5
43	28 June 2027	Summer vac 6
44	05 July 2027	Summer vac 7
45	12 July 2027	Summer vac 8
46	19 July 2027	Summer vac 9
47	26 July 2027	Summer vac 10
48	02 August 2027	Summer vac 11
49	09 August 2027	Summer vac 12
50	16 August 2027	Summer vac 13
51	23 August 2027	Summer vac 14
52	30 August 2027	Summer vac 15

Appendix 2: Programmes with Non-Standard Academic Years

Committee members are asked to check that the following list of programmes with non-standard academic years is still correct at the time of the meeting (January 2023). This information is available on the University's website at:
https://www.ed.ac.uk/semester-dates/programmes-with-non-standard-academic-years

College of Arts, Humanities and Social Science

Business School
- Business Administration, Master of (MBA)(Full-time)
- Business Administration with International Exchange, Master of (MBA)(Full-time)
- Executive Master of Business Administration (MBA)

Centre for Open Learning
- Access Programme
- International Foundation Programme

School of Economics
Postgraduate
- Mathematical Economics and Econometrics (MSc)

Edinburgh College of Art
Postgraduate
- European Master's in Landscape Architecture (European Masters)
- Urban Strategies and Design (MSc)

The Moray House School of Education
Undergraduate
- Community Education (BA Hons) (Full-time)
- Primary Education with Gaelic (Fluent) MA (Hons)
- Primary Education with Gaelic (Learners) MA (Hons)
- Primary Education with Earth Sciences MA (Hons)
- Primary Education with History MA (Hons)
- Primary Education with Mathematics MA (Hons)
- Primary Education with Modern Languages (German) MA (Hons)
- Primary Education with Religious Studies MA (Hons)
- Primary Education with Scottish Studies MA (Hons)
- Physical Education MA (Hons)

Postgraduate
- Dance Science and Education (MSc)
- Professional Graduate Diploma in Education (Primary) (PGDE)
- Professional Graduate Diploma in Education (Secondary) (PGDE)
- Outdoor Education (MSc)
- Outdoor Environmental Education (MSc)
- Transformative Learning and Teaching (MSc)

Online learning
- Digital Education (Online Learning) (MSc/PgDip/PgCert)
- Social Justice and Community Action (Online Learning) (MSc/PgDip/PgCert)

School of Law
Professional development
- Diploma in Professional Legal Practice

School of Health in Social Science
Undergraduate
- Nursing Studies BN (Hons)

Postgraduate
- Applied Psychology for Children and Young People (MSc)
- Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol)
- Counselling Studies (PgCert)
- Counselling (PgDip)
- Interpersonal Dialogue (MCouns)
- Nursing (MN)
- Psychological Therapies (MSc)
- Psychotherapy and Counselling (DPsychotherapy)

School of Social and Political Science
Undergraduate
- Social Work (BSc Hons)

College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine

Edinburgh Medical School
Undergraduate
- Oral Health Sciences (BSc)
- MBChB Medicine (6-year programme)

Postgraduate
- Endodontology (DClinDent)
- Oral Surgery (MClinDent & DClinDent)
- Orthodontics Dentistry (MClinDent & DClinDent)
- Paediatric Dentistry (MClinDent & DClinDent)
- Prosthodontics Dentistry (MClinDent & DClinDent)

Postgraduate online learning
- Anatomical Sciences (Online Learning) (PgDip)
- Biodiversity, Wildlife and Ecosystem Health (Online Learning) (MSc)
- Cancer Biology and Precision Oncology (MSc)
- Clinical Education (Online Learning) (MSc)
- Clinical Management of Pain (Online Learning) (MSc)
- Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases (Online Learning) (MSc)
- Clinical Ophthalmology (Online Learning) (ChM)
- Clinical Trials (Online Learning) (MSc)
- Critical Care (Online Learning) (MSc)
- Data Science, Health and Social Care (Online Learning) (MSc)
- Dental Sedation and Anxiety Management (Online Learning) (PgCert)
- Epidemiology (Online Learning) (MSc)
- Family Medicine (Online Learning) (MFM)
- General Surgery (Online Learning) (ChM)
- Global Health and Infectious Diseases (Online Learning) (MSc)
- Global Health Challenges (Online Learning) (PgCert)
- Global Health Studies (Online Learning) (PgCert)
- Imaging (Online Learning) (MSc)
- Integrated Global Health (Online Learning) (MSc)
- Internal Medicine (Online Learning) (MSc)
- International Animal Health (Online Learning) (MSc)
- Paediatric Emergency Medicine (Online Learning) (MSc)
- Patient Safety and Clinical Human Factors (Online Learning) (MSc)
- Primary Care Ophthalmology (Online Learning) (MSc)
- Public Health (Online Learning) (MPH) (Full-time)
- Public Health (Online Learning) (MPH) (Part-time)
- Science Communication and Public Engagement (Online Learning) (MSc)
- Stem Cells and Translational Neurology (Online Learning) (MSc)
- Surgical Sciences (Online Learning) (MSc)

- Trauma and Orthopaedics (Online Learning) (ChM)
- Restorative Dentistry (Online Learning) (MSc)
- Urology (Online Learning) (ChM)
- Vascular and Endovascular Surgery (Online Learning) (ChM)

[Edinburgh Medical School: Biomedical Sciences](#)
Undergraduate
- Biomedical Laboratory Science (Professional Practice) (Part-time) (BSc)

Postgraduate
- MScR in Biomedical Sciences (Life Sciences)
- MScR in Integrative Neuroscience

[Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies](#)
Undergraduate
- [BVM&S Veterinary Medicine (5-year programme)](#)
- [BVM&S Veterinary Medicine (Graduate Entry Programme - 4-year programme)](#)

Postgraduate online learning
- Advanced Clinical Practice (Online Learning) (MVetSci)
- Advanced Veterinary Practice (Online Learning) (RCVS Certificate)
- Applied Conservation Genetics and Wildlife Forensics (Online Learning) (MSc)
- Applied Poultry Science (Online Learning) (MSc)
- Clinical Animal Behaviour (Online Learning) (MSc)
- Conservation Medicine (Online Learning) (MVetSci)
- Equine Science (Online Learning) (MSc)
- Food Safety (Online Learning) (MSc)
- Global Food Security and Nutrition (Online Learning) (MSc)
- International Animal Welfare, Ethics and Law (Online Learning) (MSc)
- One Health (Online Learning) (MSc)
- Veterinary Anaesthesia and Analgesia (Online Learning) (MSc)
- Veterinary Epidemiology (Online Learning) (MSc)

College of Science and Engineering

[College of Science & Engineering](#)
Postgraduate online learning
- Data Science, Technology and Innovation (Online Learning) (MSc, PGDip, PgCert)

January 2023

Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee

26 January 2023

Membership of Student Appeal Committee and Fitness to Practice Appeals Committee

Description of paper
1. This paper sets out changes to the membership lists for the Student Appeal Committee and Fitness to Practice Appeals Committee.

Action requested / recommendation
2. The Committee is invited to approve the new membership set out below. The changes will take effect immediately.

Background and context
3. Under the University's Student Appeals Regulations, the Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee is responsible for approving the membership of the Student Appeals Committee and the Fitness to Practice Appeals Committee.

4. In December 2022, Professor Paddy Hadoke (Deputy Convener of APRC) approved some minor changes to the membership of the Student Appeals Committee under Convener's Action – largely to reflect departures from the Committees. These changes are marked * below.

5. We are now seeking the Committee's approval to some substantive changes. These changes will expand the number of members of the Student Appeals Committee, which will assist the Committee to manage the substantial increase in the volume of appeals cases (the volume of cases to date in 2022-23 is up by more than 100% on the same point in 2021-22). The changes will also expand the numbers of members on the Fitness to Practice Appeals Committee, which will put the University in a better position to establish quorate Committees for particular cases where required.

Discussion
6. The Colleges have nominated some new members for the Committees, and have also advised us that some colleagues will no longer be members of the Committee. We invite the Committee to approve the new Committee memberships set out below. The changes are marked as underlined or struck-through (with the exception of those marked *, which have already been approved by Convener's action).

7. The College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences is in the process of identifying some additional members for the Fitness to Practice Appeals Committee – including new members for Law. We will present these nominations to the Committee for approval in due course.

Student Appeal Committee Membership Academic Year 2022/23

Undergraduate Student Appeal Committee

College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences

Professor Mary Brennan	Business School
Dr Tara Morrison	Business School
Dr Alison Jack	Divinity
Professor Tonks Fawcett	Health in Social Science
Dr Jonny Murray	Edinburgh College of Art
Professor Simon Riley	Edinburgh Futures Institute
Dr Robert Lane	Edinburgh School of Law
Dr Sandra Bingham	History, Classics and Archaeology
Professor Alexis Grohmann	Literatures, Languages and Cultures
Dr Chris Perkins	Literatures, Languages and Cultures
Dr Steve Loughnan	Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences
Dr Paul Norris	Social and Political Science
Dr Andrea Birdsall	Social and Political Sciences

College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine

Dr Fanney Kristmundsdottir	Biomedical Sciences*
Dr Deborah Shaw	Biomedical Sciences
Professor Simon Riley	Clinical Sciences
Dr Alison Scott	School of Medicine
~~Dr Claire Phillips~~	~~R(D)SVS*~~
Professor Anna Meredith	R(D)SVS

College of Science and Engineering

Dr Chris Mowat (Vice-Convener)	Chemistry
Professor Heather McQueen	Biological Sciences
Dr Matt Bell	Biological Sciences
Mr Stephen Warrington	Engineering
Dr Simon Smith	Engineering
Professor Markus Mueller	Engineering
Dr Jennifer Skilling (Convener)	Engineering
Dr Caroline Nichol	GeoSciences
Dr Max Ruffert	Mathematics

* Change approved by Prof Paddy Hadoke under Convener's action, December 2022

Postgraduate Student Appeal Committee

College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences

Dr Raluca Bunduchi	Business School
Dr Colin Chandler	Health in Social Science
Dr Emily Taylor	Health in Social Science
Professor Andrew Lang	Law
~~Professor Laura Bradley~~	~~Literatures, Languages and Cultures*~~
~~Dr Andrew Hancock~~	~~Moray House School of Education*~~
Professor Simon Kirby	Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences
Professor Mitsuhiko Ota	Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences
Dr Angus Bancroft	Social and Political Science

College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine

Dr Kim Picozzi (Vice-Convener)	Biomedical Sciences
Professor Ruth Andrew	Clinical Sciences
Professor Cathy Abbott (Convener)	Molecular, Genetic and Population Health Sciences

College of Science and Engineering

~~Dr Paul Taylor~~	~~Biological Sciences~~
Professor Andrew Hudson	Biological Sciences
Dr Martin Wear	Biological Sciences
Dr Alasdair Ivens	Biological Sciences
Dr Annamaria Lilienkampf	Chemistry
Dr Prashant Valluri	Engineering
Professor Markus Mueller	Engineering
Professor Henry Thompson	Informatics*
Dr Julian Hall	Mathematics
~~Professor Judy Hardy (Vice-Convener)~~	~~Physics and Astronomy~~

* Change approved by Prof Paddy Hadoke under Convener's action, December 2022

Student Fitness to Practise Appeal Committee

College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences
~~Dr Simon Beames (Education)~~
Professor Tonks Fawcett (Health in Social Science)
Dr Helen Griffiths (Health in Social Science)
Dr Sam Fawkner (Moray House School of Education and Sport)
Professor Kay Tisdall (Moray House School of Education and Sport)
Prof John Devaney (Social and Political Sciences)
Dr Mary Mitchell (Social and Political Sciences)

College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine

~~Professor James Garden (Deanery of Clinical Sciences)~~
Professor Stephen Wigmore (Deanery of Clinical Sciences)
Dr Jen Foley (Deanery of Clinical Sciences)
Professor David Argyle (R(D)SVS)
Professor Bruce McGorum (R(D)SVS)
Dr Alex Corbishley (R(D)SVS)
Professor Anna Meredith R(D)SVS

Resource implications

8. The changes to the membership of the Committees create no new resource implications – other than the workload commitment for the individual Committee members.

Risk management

9. The increase in the number of members on the Undergraduate and Postgraduate Student Appeals Committees will assist the University to manage the substantial increase in volume of academic appeals.

Responding to the Climate Emergency & Sustainable Development Goals

10. No direct implications.

Equality & diversity

11. The changes in membership do not have any implications for equality and diversity – the paper does not propose any changes to policy, and the changes to membership do not change the overall demographic balance of the committees.

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

12. Academic Services publish the Appeal Committee memberships on the Academic Services website.

Author

Tom Ward
Director of Academic Services
18 January 2022

Presenter

Tom Ward

Freedom of Information
Open

Senatus Academic Policy and Regulations Committee

26 January 2023

Senate Committees' Internal Effectiveness Review 2021/22

Description of paper
1. At the final meeting of 2021/22, Academic Services notified Senate and its Standing Committees of plans for the annual internal review of the effectiveness of Senate and its Committees.
2. This paper provides Standing Committees with analysis and potential actions drawn from the responses received to the light-touch internal Senate Standing Committees Effectiveness Review conducted in summer 2022.

Action requested / recommendation
3. The Committees is invited to note and comment on the analysis of feedback received on each Committee and the proposed actions set out in Appendix 1, which are intended to aid continuous improvement of our approach to academic governance in 2022/23.

Background and context
4. The University is required under the 2017 Scottish Code of Good HE Governance to carry out an annual internal review of Senate and its Committees which carry delegated responsibilities.
5. In summer 2022, Academic Services issued and a short questionnaire to Senate Standing Committee members and their responses were collated.
6. The review was deliberately light touch, taking account of the forthcoming external effectiveness review to take place in 2022/23.
7. A copy of the analysis received from members in relation to Senate and its Committees will be made available to the consultant that carries out the external effectiveness review. This will highlight key issues for the review to consider.

Discussion
8. An copy of responses received in relation to this Committees and proposed actions can be found in Appendix 1.
9. Given the low number of responses (total of 12) the summary includes the raw responses received from Committee members. We are satisfied that this information is not able to identify individual respondents.
10. Suggested actions, in response to the feedback from Standing Committee members, are intended to be proportionate to the scope of an annual effectiveness review, and the volume of feedback received.
11. Senate received a copy of the responses received from Senate Committees' members at its meeting on 12 October, and was invited to provide any comments and suggestions for potential actions. No comments were received from Senate.

Resource implications
12. The recommended actions will require coordination by Committee Secretaries in Academic Services as part of their established role in support of Conveners and the cycle of committee business.

Risk management
13. This activity supports the University's obligations under the 2017 Scottish Code of Good HE Governance.

Equality & diversity

14. The review provides an opportunity to identify any equality and diversity issues in the composition of Senate Standing Committees, and the way they conduct their business.

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

15. The findings of the review have been reported to the relevant Senate Standing Committees and they will discuss and take forward actions in response.

16. Academic Services will report to Senate and its Standing Committees at the first meeting of 2023/24 on progress against actions taken in response to the review.

Authors	**Presenter:**
Tom Ward, Director of Academic Services	Olivia Hayes, Academic Policy Officer
Olivia Hayes, Academic Policy Officer	

Freedom of Information

Open

APPENDIX 1

Report of Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee Internal Effectiveness Review 2021/22

The Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee currently has 19 members. 4 responses were received to the Internal Effectiveness Review Questionnaire.

- **Committee Remit**
  Majority of respondents strongly agreed with the following statements, one respondent agreed with the following statements:
  o The Committee remit is clear
  o The Committee remit is appropriate
  o The Committee has adapted effectively to challenges of changes in priority.

  All respondents agreed that the Committee is using task groups effectively.

  General comments received in relation the Committee remit are as follows:

  o The remit of the committee is clear
  o Policy and governance decisions around wellbeing would be best placed elsewhere, but only if and when another governance structure is in place to support these.

- **Governance and Impact**
  Half of the respondents strongly agreed, and half the respondents agreed that:
  o They have a clear understanding of how the Committee fits into the academic governance framework of the University
  o There is an effective flow of business between relevant College Committees, Senate Committees and Senate
  o The Committee makes the desired impact based on its remit and priorities

  The majority of respondents agreed that there are clear links between Committee business and University strategic priorities. One respondent disagreed with this statement.

  General comments received in relation to governance and impact are as follows:
  o There is possibly not quite enough link to Quality Assurance
  o Prior to joining the Committee, a member did not have a clear understanding of how APRC fit into the academic governance framework of the University, however, this is now clear since joining the Committee.

- **Composition**
  The majority of respondents strongly agreed, and one respondent agreed that the current composition of the Committee enables it to fulfil its remit and the size of the Committee is appropriate in order for it to operate effectively.

  The following comments were made by respondents in relation to composition:

  o Members are dedicated and the mix of the membership is effective at enabling those with specialist expertise to share their views and knowledge as needed for different agenda areas. The chair enables good discussion about agenda items in order for everyone to feel they can contribute effectively and appropriately.
  o Committee membership is quite large but I think this is necessary to cover all the student cohorts. It might be helpful to have student reps covering UG/PGT/PGR to

consult and provide feedback on specific papers and proposals as asking a UG rep to feedback on a PGR proposal is not always suitable.

- **Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI)**
  The majority of the respondents agreed that the composition of the Committee is suitably representative of the diverse University population. One respondent disagreed with this statement.

  All respondents agreed that equality and diversity considerations are adequately addressed when discussing Committee business.

  The following comment was made on Equality, Diversity and Inclusion:

  - It would be good if APRC could invite some more colleagues from under-represented, and systemically marginalised groups to join.

- **Role**
  The majority of respondents strongly agreed, and one respondent agreed that:

  - They have a clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities as Committee members.
  - They received an effective induction when they joined the Committee

  All respondents strongly agreed that Committee members fully engage in Committee business.

- **Communications**
  The majority of respondents agreed, and one respondent disagreed with each of the following statements:
  - The Committee communicates effectively with stakeholders
  - They have a clear understanding of their role in cascading information from the Committee as a representative of their College or Group
  - They have a clear understanding of their role in cascading information from the Committee

  The following comments were received in relation to communications:

  - There can always be improvements in communication
  - I believe it can be made clearer to each member, which 'audience' they are to receive comments from, and who they cascade out to. Although APRC usually have open papers/minutes they are not well-advertised to the wider University community.

- **Support**
  All respondents strongly agreed that the Committee is effectively supported by Academic Services.

  The majority of respondents strongly agreed, and one respondent agreed with each of the following statements:
  - The information provided to the Committee supports effective decision-making;
  - Committee papers provide an appropriate level of detail on the background of issues brought to the Committee.

  All respondents agreed that Committee papers provide an appropriate level of detail on how Committee decisions will be implemented.

Report of Senate Education Committee Internal Effectiveness Review 2021/22

Senate Education Committee currently has 24 members. 5 responses were received to the Internal Effectiveness Review Questionnaire.

- **Committee Remit**

   All respondents agreed that:

   o   The Committee remit is clear.
   o   The Committee has adapted effectively to challenges of changes in priority.

   One respondent disagreed that the Committee is using task groups effectively and that the scope of the Committee remit is appropriate.

   In relation to scope of the Committee remit, some respondents suggested that:

   o   Student welfare issues should be dealt with elsewhere (and ideally not as part of Senate at all).
   o   There is continuing potential for overlap and duplication with the other Standing Committees, particularly in relation to Quality Assurance and ELIR recommendations. There may be benefit in being clearer on the ownership of specific actions. Effective oversight and governance of the Student Experience and Wellbeing is complex, and likely to become ever more so. Some thought needs to be given to how best to address this as the new model of student support rolls out. Education Committee already has a very wide remit and SQAC does not necessarily have the right membership. It would therefore make sense to consider a dedicated Senate Standing Committee, potentially replacing SQAC, with relevant QA oversight moving to SEC and / or APRC as necessary.

- **Governance and Impact**

   All respondents agreed that:

   o   They understood how the Committee fits into the academic governance framework of the University.
   o   There is an effective flow of business between relevant College Committees, Senate Committees and Senate.
   o   There are clear links between Committee business and University strategic priorities.

   One respondent disagreed that the Committee makes the desired impact based on its remit and priorities. They suggested that:

   o   There is a perceived large gap and disconnect between the work of SEC and Schools. The resumption of short-life task groups with membership drawn from Schools would help to address this, but some thought needs to be given to how SEC can engage and communicate with the wider University Community more effectively.

- **Composition**

   Respondents were satisfied that the size of the Committee is appropriate in order for it to operate effectively.

One respondent disagreed that the current composition of the Committee enables it to fulfil its remit.

The following comments were made by respondents in relation to composition:

- o As recent discussions at Senate have shown, not everyone in the University is convinced that the current composition of the Committee is right. Regardless of whether I agree with this point or not, it is a problem in itself if there is doubt (or even distrust) over composition - and hence decision-making processes more generally – in part of the institution. These problems may ultimately affect the Committee's ability to fulfil its remit. I would therefore be happy to add other Senate members to the Committee if that led to higher levels of trust. I would be concerned, however, that a further increase in membership (SEC is already very large) may make the Committee less agile, so any increase should be kept small.
- o While it continues to deal with student welfare issues, the Committee needs to include those with key responsibility in that area. If the Committee is not dealing with student welfare issues in the future, then the current Committee makeup is fine. The key is that the membership should include all of those with key responsibilities for aspects of the remit supplemented with a number of "experts".
- o I have put that I 'agree' on the size, but actually I am between agree and disagree. It is a good size for inclusion, and perhaps that is important for Senate committees. On the other hand, its size means its members don't really carry much responsibility since it makes that all quite diffuse.

- **Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI)**

Three respondents agreed that the composition of the Committee is suitably representative of the diverse University population, but two disagreed.

While four respondents were satisfied that equality and diversity considerations are adequately addressed when discussing Committee business, one was not.

The following comments were made:

- o I think there could be consideration given to more student representation, beyond EUSA.
- o The current makeup of the committee lacks racial diversity.

- **Role**

All respondents agreed that:

- o They have a clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities as Committee members.
- o Committee members engage fully in Committee business.

One respondent did not agree that they have received an effective induction when joining the membership of the Committee.

- **Communications**

Two respondents disagreed that the Committee communicates effectively with stakeholders and that they have a clear understanding of their role in cascading information from the Committee.

One respondent disagreed that they have a clear understanding of their role on the Committee as a representative of their College or Group.

The following comments were received in relation to communications:

- o I'm not sure that the Committee has much visibility across the University, with members of staff or with students. I'm not saying that it should necessarily have more but as a member of the Committee I don't feel necessarily that I understand what cascading I should do. This is particularly because I am there as a representative HoS, but surely I'd not cascade to my own School only - perhaps to other HoS's...?
- o This is the weakest area of the Committee function at present and it is time for us to think more carefully about how the Committee communicates and engages directly (and through reps) with the wider community.

- **Support**

All respondents felt that:

- o The Committee is effectively supported by Academic Services;
- o The information provided to the Committee supports effective decision-making;
- o Committee papers provide an appropriate level of detail on the background of issues brought to the Committee.

One respondent disagreed that Committee papers provide an appropriate level of detail on how Committee decisions will be implemented.

The following comments were received in relation to support:

- o Implementation details are sometimes a bit thin;
- o All excellent;
- o Implementation and communication plans as a result of Committee decisions need to be more carefully discussed especially in relation to any decisions that need to be referred to Senate / other committees before final action can be taken.

Report of Senate Quality Assurance Committee Internal Effectiveness Review 2021/22

Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC) currently has 12 members. Three responses were received to the following questions of the Internal Effectiveness Review Questionnaire:

1. **Committee Remit**

   Respondents agreed that the remit of the Committee is clear, that it has adapted well to changes to priorities and uses its task groups effectively. The following was noted:

   o Committee tasks groups might be able to make more rapid progress on short-life task groups if it could draw on additional resource.
   o The committee is very effective and open to different voices which I value. It would be useful to have some means to ensure those charged with taking actions forward follow through.
   o SQAC has been responsive to the changes in priority and sympathetic to the workload pressures on key staff across the institution. SQAC has used task groups well although they have been small in number over the last couple of years.

2. **Governance and Impact**

   All respondents understood how the Committee fits into the academic governance framework of the University, and considered there to be a clear link between Committee business and the University's strategic priorities.

   However, not all respondents agreed that there is an effective flow of business between College Committees, the Senate Committees and Senate. Respondents noted that:

   o Having College Deans as contributors to the committee is useful in ensuring a good relationship between College committees and Senate Committees. I find it a valuable way of being able to ensure there is 2 way communication.
   o I think that flow of information between the committees often relies on individual membership rather than something more formal. I'd also like SQAC to make more impact in terms of seeing more effective change happen. It is not always clear that the Committee's findings inform decision-making by APRC and other standing committees. This might be clearer to those who attend a range of standing committees.

   o It is notable that the Committee's ongoing scrutiny of and support for the thematic reviews does not always translate into progress and resource, which suggests that the Committee struggles - in some areas - to make the desired impact.

   o It is not clear that priorities identified by the Committee have a significant impact on Senate decision making and ESG priorities. Business flows effectively from Senate to the standing committee and to College, and from external bodies to the committee thanks to our QA VP and PS support, but it is less clear that business flows from the committee horizontally or upwards.

3. **Composition**

   All respondents were satisfied that the composition of the Committee, one noting the following:
   o I value the current composition as a range of voices are heard and can share information.

However, one respondent did not think the size of the Committee enables it to operate effectively, noting the following:

- o The current Committee is doing excellent work, but the volume of work - much of it urgent - is falling heavily on the Deans and VP, who already have significant workloads, and we risk struggling to progress some new projects without further resource. We might benefit from greater student representation.

4. Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI)

All respondents were satisfied that equality and diversity considerations are adequately addressed when discussing Committee business.

However, respondents disagreed that the composition of the Committee is suitably representative of the diverse University population. The following was noted:

- o We are not a diverse group, which reflects the disadvantage specific groups of staff face to reach the grades that are represented at the Committee. Improved representation alone would not ensure EDI considerations are adequately addressed. We could improve further by considering how we mandate EDI consideration, in terms of process and committee member knowledge of EDI.
- o The composition is a reflection of those with responsibilities at different levels in the University and Colleges which is appropriate but not as diverse as it could be.

5. Committee members - role clarity and participation

All respondents felt they had a clear understanding of their role and responsibilities, received an effective induction when they joined the Committee, and that Committee members engage fully in Committee business, with one noting the following:

- o I have been grateful for the option to engage in hybrid mode this year and would have been unable to attend without this option. I regard this as an effective reasonable adjustment and an example of how the Committee supports EDI consideration.

6. Stakeholder engagement and communications

The respondents felt that they had a clear understanding of their role as a representative of their College or Group and had a clear understanding of their role in cascading information from the Committee. One respondent noted that:

- o Papers from SQAC influence discussions at College level and vice versa if something is raised at College that needs wider discussion this is raised.

However, one respondent disagreed that the Committee communicates effectively with stakeholders, noting that:

- o The challenge of communicating QA business to all our stakeholders is longstanding. The committee is obviously working hard on this, e.g. through the Digital Maturity project, but how to ensure QAE is visible, accessible, and usable across the University is still a challenge.

7. Committee support

All respondents felt that the Committee was effectively supported by Academic Services; that the information provided to the Committee supports effective decision-making; and that Committee papers provide appropriate background of issues and an appropriate level of detail on how Committee decisions will be implemented. The following was noted:

- o Outstanding support by Academic Services throughout this year.
- o In my opinion the committee operates very effectively, is chaired very well and is collaborative in approach to items raised. The size means good discussion but clear decisions and outcomes making it a valuable contribution to the University.
- o Further digitisation in line with the Digital Maturity recommendations will be welcomed.

Potential actions in response to 2021/22 review

Area Under Review	Recommended Action	Responsible	Date
Remit	1. Committees to consider the appropriateness of their remit in addition to overlap with, and links to, other Senate Standing Committees, and to feed their views into the externally-facilitated review.	Committee Conveners Standing Committees Supported by Committee Administrators	Ongoing throughout 2022/23
Composition	2. The expansion of Standing Committee membership to include three elected academic Senate members to each Standing Committee. Senate approved the change of composition and process, with new members expected to join Committees in time for the second cycle of Committees.	Senate Clerk Committee Administrators Committee Conveners.	November 2022
Governance & Impact	3. An external effectiveness review of Senate will take place in 2022/23, and as part of this review the effectiveness of the relationship between Senate, its committees, and the wider University governance structure will be considered.	Standing Committees members are asked to engage with the external effectiveness review as and when required	All: ongoing throughout 2022/23
	4. The Convener's Forum will be asked to consider how it can support enhancement of communication between Standing Committee's particularly around items of common business.	Convener's Forum	
	5. Each committee to consider more effective use of short-life working groups	Committee Conveners Committee Administrators	
EDI	6. Each committee to give proactive consideration of EDI for all papers/discussion and decision making.	Standing Committees Committee Conveners Committee Administrators	Ongoing throughout 2022/23

	7. Committee Convener's will be considering how to respond to a motion approved at Senate on 12 October: *Each committee convener is expected to propose for approval by the Senate Exception Committee and/or next Senate Meeting reasonable additions to their committee to improve BAME, student, and trade union representation.*	Committee Conveners	By the next meeting of Senate
Role	8. Academic Services and the Convener to continue offering effective induction for members and to implement improvements to approaches where possible.	Committee Conveners Committee Administrators	Ongoing throughout 2022/23
Communications	9. A Senate Committees' Newsletter will be reintroduced from 2022 onwards. The newsletter will inform the University community of discussions and decisions taken at Senate and its Standing Committees.	Committee Administrators	The first newsletter is expected to be published in December 2022, with further newsletters to align with the cycle of Committee business.

APRC 22/23 5I

Progress on actions identified in the 2020/21 review

Area Under Review	Recommended Action	Progress against actions	Responsible
Remit	1. Student Experience to be included as standing item for SEC 2. SQAC and SEC to consider triggers for escalation and relationship with University Executive	The University is commissioning an externally-facilitated review, which will be able to take a systematic look at this issue.	Secretary Conveners' Forum
Composition	3. Senate to receive discussion paper on this topic at a later date.	Senate has discussed this and agreed some additions to Standing Committee membership. The externally-facilitated review will provide an opportunity to take a more systematic look at the composition of the committees.	Academic Services will take this forward with Senate Convener.
Governance & Impact	4. Each committee to consider more effective use of short-life working groups	No general action on this issue to date, although Committees have set up some new short-life working groups.	Convener/Secretary
EDI	5. Each committee to ensure proactive consideration of EDI for all papers/discussion and decision making. 6. Senate to receive a discussion paper on 'composition' at a later date, to include EDI .	See relevant section of table setting out proposed actions in response to 21-22 review.	Convener/Secretary Academic Services will take this forward with Senate Convener.
Role	7. Each committee to consider effective induction for members and implement revised approaches as required	Academic Services / the Conveners have offered induction to all new members, and would welcome feedback on how helpful this has been.	Convener/Secretary

Communications	8. Each committee to be more explicit at each meeting regarding how decisions will be communicated or implemented	Academic Services have continued to be attentive to this issue when producing minutes and following up on actions from Committee meetings. Academic Services are relaunching the Senate Committees Newsletter in 2022, which will assist with communicating Committee decisions.	Convener/Secretary