

Senatus Academicus

28 September 2016 at 2.00pm, Informatics Forum, Crichton St.

AGENDA

1. **Presentation and Discussion Theme: *Interdisciplinarity*** (approx. 1 hr 15 mins)
 - **Research**
Professor Catherine Lyall, School of Social and Political Science
Professor Jon Oberlander, School of Informatics
 - **Teaching and Learning**
Dr Zoe Marks, School of Social and Political Science
Professor Chris Speed, Edinburgh College of Art
 - **Conditions and Consequences**
Mr Gary Jebb, Director of Estates
Professor Christine Bell, School of Law, Assistant Principal Global Justice

2. **National Student Survey 2016: Results and Responses** **S 16-17 1 A**
For Comment and Consideration (approx. 30 mins)

Interlude and Tea/Coffee Break

Formal Business

3. Report of E-Business conducted 6 – 14 September 2016 **S 16-17 1 B**
For noting
4. Special Minutes **S 16-17 1 C**
Senate is invited to adopt the Special Minutes
5. Knowledge Strategy Committee Report **S 16-17 1 D**
For noting

Communications

6. Development of Policy for Lecture Recording **S 16-17 1 E**
For comment
7. Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) **Verbal update**
8. Edinburgh University Students' Association Priorities for 2016/17 **S 16-17 1 F**
For information

Closed

9. Further Report from the Honorary Degrees Committee **S 16-17 1 G**
For approval **CLOSED**

If you require this agenda or any of the papers in an alternative format e.g. large print please contact SenateSupport@ed.ac.uk

The University of Edinburgh

Senate

28 September 2016

National Student Survey 2016 – Results and Responses

Executive Summary

This paper presents an analysis of the results of the 2016 National Student Survey, and recommends a number of measures aimed at improving the University's position in the Survey. The paper was originally considered by CMG on 30 August. Further discussion took place at Principal's Strategy Group on 16 September and at Senate Learning and Teaching Committee on 21 September.

Action requested

Senate is asked to:

- comment on the results and analysis of the 2016 NSS
- consider the recommendations on our responses to the 2016 NSS

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

Learning and Teaching Policy Group is maintaining oversight of the implementation of agreed recommendations, working with Colleges/Schools and through Senate and Court Committees as appropriate.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. Resource implications (including staffing)

A number of the measures proposed require additional resources. These are being considered by other Committees.

2. Risk assessment

The University faces a pressing reputational risk with NSS now set to drive half of the metrics that will be used to inform institutional grades in the second phase of the Teaching Excellence Framework, which will unfold this academic year. Whether or not the University participates in the TEF, it is likely that league tables will be produced including all UK Universities, and that these will have high visibility in the sector and for prospective students. Our initial position in these league tables is likely to be a very weak one. The measures recommended in this paper will help manage the reputational risk that is likely to arise.

3. Equality and Diversity

Where the University changes its practices or processes in order to take forward the agenda set out in this paper, it will take account of the equality and diversity implications.

4. Freedom of information

Open

Originator of the paper

Senior Vice Principal Charlie Jeffery

National Student Survey 2016: Results and Responses

NSS 2016 Results

1. The results of NSS 2016 are deeply disappointing. We fell back on each of the Primary Themes. Our relative position has, as a result, worsened significantly. We stand at 93rd or worse out of 123 UK HEIs on six of the seven Primary Themes. School-level performance remains uneven, and on each Primary Theme there is a pattern in which only a small number of Schools have improved their position over the last year, while significantly more have seen a worsening of position, some quite substantially. In each College there are Schools with either persistently low scores year on year and/or which have seen significant drops in performance in 2016. Our weak NSS results are a University-wide concern.
2. Three of the Primary Themes – Teaching on My Course, Assessment and Feedback, and Academic Support – are set to form three of the six initial metrics set to inform institutional gradings in the second phase of the Teaching Excellence Framework that will unfold this academic year. We have seen that league tables based on TEF metrics will be generated whether or not we participate in the TEF. Any 2016-17 TEF metrics league table will depict the University as among the weaker UK institutions.
3. Our weaker NSS results will erode our position in the main UK university league tables. We may see increasing public comment about Edinburgh's NSS/TEF metric performance. There is a danger this will begin to damage our reputation and impact on our ability to attract students from home and abroad at the quality levels we want to see. It is no exaggeration to conclude that the NSS has become the biggest internal risk the University faces.

Analysis

4. There is no obvious single reason for the general drop in NSS performance this year. There are possible explanations for some of the School-specific drops, for example where 'normal service' has been disrupted by decants to enable major investment in their facilities. But some of the biggest drops in performance are in previously high-performing Schools which did not face such challenges. And the free text comments from students in decanted Schools do not reveal student dissatisfaction related to decants. Schools are now carrying out careful analysis of their own results and are developing appropriate responses to the issues they identify.
5. The NSS free text comments are instructive. They reveal specific issues which appear to have affected outcomes in particular Schools. But they also reveal concerns which are common across the University, also in our better-performing Schools. The most consistent and university-wide concern raised in these comments is that students perceive their lecturers to prioritise research and as a result neglect teaching, and/or to be poor at teaching because they have been recruited only for their research skills.

6. Other common concerns are about late and/or poor quality of feedback on assessed work, organisational deficits and/or poor communication of changes to scheduled teaching arrangements, the widespread use of postgraduate tutors especially in AHSS (connecting to perceptions that lecturers prioritise research over teaching), and poor Personal Tutoring. These comments often do not refer to final year experience only; students also carry with them memories of earlier experience into the NSS questionnaire. Addressing the causes of these experiences – likely the result of actions of a small minority of teaching staff – needs to be a consistent and high priority.
7. All that said, if we step back from the NSS we can see a mismatch between what students tell us about our teaching in the NSS and other evidence that we have about the quality of our teaching.
8. We have regular external review of the quality of teaching of various kinds: accreditation reviews by professional bodies; last year’s institution-wide Enhancement-Led Institutional Review; subject-level Teaching Programme Reviews involving external panel members; external examiner reports; and external membership of the Senate Quality Assurance Committee. This range of external review mechanisms tells us both that our practices are generally in line with provision in comparator institutions and that the number of areas identified in review processes as examples of good practice very significantly outweigh areas identified as ones for improvement.
9. Internally our students give us feedback on their teaching in various ways in addition to NSS. For example students give feedback on particular teachers and courses in their nominations both to the annual EUSA Teaching Awards and to the School-level teaching awards that a number of Schools run. Last academic year students submitted a total of 2,268 EUSA Teaching Awards nominations recognising 1,023 individuals and courses, many underpinned by powerful and thoughtful arguments about teaching quality.
10. In addition, our quality assurance processes require the collection of feedback from our students on the courses they have taken, typically in the form of end-of-semester feedback questionnaires. We are not able to report systematically on this feedback until the end of this semester when all Schools will use a common feedback platform (EvaSys). But it is clear from the partial data we can assess from Schools currently using EvaSys that
 - Students are significantly more positive in their EvaSys evaluations of their *teachers* than they are of their general experience as measured through NSS
 - And students are also significantly more positive in the evaluation of their *individual courses* on some measures where we score badly in NSS – for example on feedback.
11. Pointing to these more positive indicators of teaching quality is not to imply complacency. But we can say that our practice, as reviewed externally, does not

stand out markedly from institutions that score much better than us in NSS. And we can say that students find much to say about our teaching that is positive when they think about the *courses* they have just experienced and, especially, the *individuals* who have taught them. There is a mismatch here between student perceptions of their more concrete, personal experiences focused on teachers and courses than the more abstract four-year, institutional experiences captured in NSS.

12. We need to address and bridge this mismatch of personal vs institutional experience as a matter of urgency. To do so we need to understand how this mismatch arises. Over the last few months open meetings with staff in all Schools have confirmed a widespread view that as an institution we do not value academics highly enough in their student-facing roles as teachers and personal tutors, that we do not incentivise and reward those roles as we should, and that we incentivise and reward research-related roles in ways that lead colleagues overtly to prioritise research over teaching.
13. I do not accept the implication I sometimes heard drawn from this that there is a necessary trade-off between excellent research and excellent teaching. There are plenty of examples of individuals at this University who excel at research *and* teaching, some examples of Schools at this University which excel at both, and plenty of examples of institutions in the UK and elsewhere that excel at both.
14. But there is a strong perception among our staff that as an institution we are believed to prioritise research *over* (especially undergraduate) teaching. And I should note that where we have demonstrably acted already for several years to challenge that perception, for example by recognising 'teaching-heavy' cases for promotion, we are still not *believed* to reward excellent teaching.
15. Against this background there is a very strong case that the core of the problems revealed in NSS result from the belief that, as an institution, we prioritise research *over* teaching, in the process
 - 'Authorising' colleagues to neglect teaching (or to recruit academics who lack adequate teaching skills)
 - Conveying to our undergraduate students that we do not prioritise them or value them as part of our learning community
16. If this is the case then addressing our NSS problem is not just a matter of intervening, say, to improve feedback or the quality of personal tutoring or to ensure particular Schools address obvious shortfalls. It requires us also to act consistently across the University
 - In embedding an unambiguous commitment to teaching quality in our management practices
 - In building a practice of engagement with our undergraduate students which conveys our commitment to them

Meeting the Challenge

17. We have put in place strong foundations for meeting these challenges. Over the last year we have
- Established a team, convened in a new Learning and Teaching Policy Group, which brings together University-level academic leads, key professional service leads, and College Deans of Teaching and enables coordinated action across the University
 - Worked closely with Heads of School to identify good practice in promoting quality teaching and effective student engagement
 - Built communities of practice to exchange experience and raise the profile of teaching across the University, as we have done around assessment and feedback and the personal tutor system, and through the platform for debate about teaching on the *Teaching Matters* website.
 - Put in place better management information on teaching, for example on feedback turnaround times and the EvaSys course evaluation system
18. We have also reviewed and adapted core staffing processes to express the due priority we should be giving to teaching: in annual review; recognition and reward; workload allocation; and academic staff recruitment processes. Additional work is advanced on professional staff development in teaching and in streamlining capability processes for addressing underperformance.

Proposed Actions

19. We need now to assure ourselves that these processes are being used rigorously in our Schools to ensure appropriate priority is given to teaching – for example that each annual review conversation for a staff member with a teaching role includes a meaningful conversation about teaching which sets objectives for the coming year, and reviews those objectives at the next review meeting.
20. We need also to convey that the behaviours which drive negative NSS free-text comments are simply unacceptable.
21. We need to ensure that we have a practice of meaningful engagement with all of our undergraduate students, in each part of the University, so that they understand themselves as part of a community which genuinely values them. This ambition has been discussed with all Heads of College and Heads of School and all have agreed the following:
- For Schools to hold early semester engagement events for honours-level students with maximal student attendance which highlight to students the positive external reviewer and internal student feedback we have on our teaching, discuss the 'mismatch' with NSS results, and build a commitment to continuing dialogue

- For every honours-level course this semester and next to have a mid-semester feedback event for students to comment on the positives on their course and to raise areas of concern, with each course convenor analysing and responding to feedback in class the next week. A number of Schools already use this technique and report significant impact.
 - For all Schools to use the ability we will have through EvaSys to report comprehensively back to students in a next wave of engagement events at the start of semester two (and just before the NSS survey opens) how students evaluated their semester one courses, replaying positives, and responding as appropriate to areas of concern revealed.
 - For Vice and Assistant Principals with learning and teaching roles to discuss these actions and the rationale for them in open meetings with teaching staff in all Schools over the next few weeks and to listen and respond to concerns and ideas they have at the teaching 'coal-face'.
22. In addition, and in order to underpin the emphasis on positive examples of student feedback, the Deputy Secretary Student Experience has been working with Communications and Marketing to produce a set of visual messages designed to convey the importance of teaching and of students which will be displayed in prominent physical locations across the University and used also in on-line communications (using the theme 'Inspiring Students'). These will succeed the 'welcome' messages used to 'dress' the University during September and will be supplemented at the start of semester two with equivalent School-level messages using a common 'Inspiring Students' template.
23. This package of measures - developed through extensive consultation at all levels of the University - is designed to discuss with and convey to both students and staff a step-change in the explicit priority we give to teaching and to our students.

Further Issues

24. Consultation with Heads of School and College prompted by the NSS results has opened up a number of other areas where we may need to think further about the how we embed priorities around teaching and students
- Giving fuller consideration to teaching facilities and more informal student-centred facilities as we develop plans for the University estate.
 - Producing a better student digital experience, ensuring that our online services support students' learning and their wider experience more effectively than now
 - Implementing a more systematic approach to leadership development which nurtures effective leadership at all levels, including below the level of the School.
 - Reflecting further on the different roles performed by members of academic staff as we give sharper focus to teaching while expecting at the same time enhanced performance in research. In due course this could involve consideration of a more explicit teaching track for career development as well as a review of the role played by postgraduate tutors and demonstrators in our teaching provision. In the short term it will require careful coordination of messaging on teaching (as we follow through on the issues raised in this paper) and research (as the next REF approaches).

The University of Edinburgh

Senate

28 September 2016

**Report of Electronic Business of Senate
conducted from 6 – 14 September 2016**

Executive Summary

This paper provides the draft report of the electronic business of Senate conducted between 6 and 14 September 2016.

Action requested

For noting.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

Key decisions will be communicated in the Senate Committees' Newsletter.

Resource/Risk/Compliance

1. Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? No

2. Risk assessment

Does the paper include a risk analysis? No

3. Equality and Diversity

Does the paper have equality and diversity implications? No

4. Freedom of Information

This is an open paper.

Originator of the paper

Senate Secretariat
20 September 2016

The University of Edinburgh

Electronic Senate

**Report of Electronic Business of Senate conducted from
Tuesday 6 to Wednesday 14 September 2016**

FORMAL BUSINESS

1. Minutes from the Senate meeting held on 1 June 2016

Senate approved the minutes of the meeting of Senate held on 1 June 2016.

a. Special Meeting and Graduation Ceremonials on 25, 27, 28, 29 and 30 June and 1 and 2 July 2016

The minutes of the Special Meetings and Graduation Ceremonials in June and July 2016 were taken as read and approved. It was noted that copies are available from Student Administration, Old College.

2. Membership of Senate

Senate noted the changes to the membership of Senate.

3. Conferment of the title of Professor Emeritus

Senate agreed to confer the title of Professor Emeritus on those professors listed in the paper who had recently retired, or whose retirement was imminent.

MATTERS ARISING

4. Special Minutes

Senate adopted the Special Minute for Professor David Taylor, Emeritus Professor of Tropical Health.

COMMUNICATIONS AND REPORTS

5. Annual Report to the Scottish Funding Council on Institution-Led Review and Enhancement Activity 2015/16

Senate noted the report.

6. Communications from the University Court

Senate noted the content of the report from the University Court on its meeting of 20 June 2016.

7. Resolutions - Chairs

Court presented to Senatus draft Resolutions in accordance with the procedures for the creation of new chairs, renaming of existing chairs and the process for personal chairs. Senatus, having considered the draft Resolutions below, offered no observations.

Draft Resolution No. 52/2016: Foundation of a Personal Chair of Business and Sustainable Development
Draft Resolution No. 56/2016: Foundation of a Personal Chair of Black Studies
Draft Resolution No. 53/2016: Foundation of a Chair of Accountancy
Draft Resolution No. 57/2016: Foundation of a Chair of Avian Biology
Draft Resolution No. 58/2016: Foundation of a Chair of Power Electronics
Draft Resolution No. 59/2016: Foundation of a Chair of Integrated Sensor Technology
Draft Resolution No. 54/2016: Alteration of the title of the Chair of Cultural Relations
Draft Resolution No. 55/2016: Alteration of the title of the Chair of Medical Statistics

8. Report from the Central Academic Promotions Committee

Senate noted the paper, which reported on an Out of Cycle Personal Chair recommendation.

9. Report of the Senate Exception Committee

Senate noted the business approved by the Senate Exception Committee.

10. Senate Membership of the Knowledge Strategy Committee

Senate approved the change to the Senate representation on Knowledge Strategy Committee.

11. Membership of the University Library Committee

Senate approved the University of Edinburgh Library Committee membership for 2016/17.

The University of Edinburgh

Senate

28 September 2016

Special Minutes

Executive Summary

The paper provides the Special Minutes for Professor G Gretton, Professor F Mitchell and Professor B Webber.

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

Not applicable

Action requested

The Senatus is invited to adopt the Special Minutes.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

Emeritus Professor procedures for communication will be followed.

Resource/Risk/Compliance

1. Resource implications
Does the paper have resource implications? No.
2. Risk assessment
Does the paper include a risk analysis? No.
3. Equality and Diversity
Has due consideration been given to the equality impact of this paper? Not relevant.
4. Freedom of Information
This is an open paper.

Any other relevant information, including keywords

Special Minute

Originator of the paper

Senate Secretariat
September 2016

Special Minute

Professor George Lidderdale Gretton, BA LLB FRSE

George Gretton has spent his entire academic career at Edinburgh. Following undergraduate degrees at Durham (English and philosophy) and Edinburgh (law), he qualified as a solicitor before being appointed as a lecturer in the Law Faculty at Edinburgh in 1981. From 1994 until his retirement in July 2016 he held the Lord President Reid Chair of Law.

Precocious (his first article was published while still an undergraduate), energetic, and a master stylist, George Gretton rapidly established a reputation as a fresh and distinctive voice in the world of legal scholarship. His early work – luminous, iconoclastic, dazzling – was received with some alarm by those accustomed to less demanding fare. By mid-career, and with a substantial body of work behind him, his views had won wide acceptance, and his publications were read with respect and admiration both within the academy and beyond it.

The focus of Professor Gretton's work is the law of property in its broadest sense, extending into such commercial-law topics as rights in security and diligence (the latter being the subject of his first book) but also including notable contributions to the law of trusts and succession. Not everything has been aimed at an academic audience. As a committed teacher, and someone with a keen interest in legal practice, Professor Gretton has also written with a student or practitioner readership primarily in mind. He is co-author of both the standard student work on property law and also the standard practitioner work on conveyancing. For more than a quarter of a century he and a colleague have delivered what the legal profession has come to regard as an indispensable annual seminar on recent developments in the law of conveyancing, and published the results in the form of an annual book.

Behind this prolific output lies long reflection and deep learning. If Professor Gretton has not yet managed to read all the books in the Law Library – an ambition he has expressed, not entirely in jest, on more than one occasion – he has certainly read a large number of them, often covering areas of scholarship which are remote from his own core interests. The Law Library, indeed, is one of his passions, and its status as one of the best law libraries in the UK owes much to the years he has spent convening the Law Library Committee, seeking out additional sources of money, and scouring publishers' catalogues for books which ought to be acquired.

Through his writing, but also through his lectures and academic papers, Professor Gretton's influence on colleagues and pupils has been immense and sustained. In his hands even the most dry and technical subject can seem absorbing and, due to his comic timing and sense of the absurd, fun. A *Festschrift* is in preparation by his pupils and will be presented to him at a conference in his honour which is to be held in December of next year.

In recent years, the arrival of grandchildren has provided a certain amount of competition for Professor Gretton's attention. In retirement, he and his wife Helen will be able to spend more time with them. But there is much more academic work to come, and, with his new emeritus status, Professor Gretton will remain an active and much-valued member of the Law School community.

Special Minute

Professor Falconer Mitchell B.Com., C.A. Emeritus Professor of Management Accounting

Falconer Mitchell retires from his personal chair in management accounting on September 30 2016. By this time he will have completed over 40 years as lecturer, senior lecturer and professor at the university. During this time, Falconer has made an “all-rounder’s” contribution in teaching, administration and research.

Over his employment he has taught at all undergraduate levels on auditing and financial accounting as well as management accounting. In recent years his teaching has been to postgraduates on MBA, PhD and MSc programmes. He has successfully supervised 12 doctoral students and three masters by research students. He has examined well over thirty PhD students not only in the UK but also in Australia, Malaysia, Norway, Finland Denmark, Italy, Belgium and Sweden.

Falconer has served as Head of Group/Department on four three year spells and also acted as Head of the embryo Business School during its transition from a departmental structure. He has also been a longstanding Director of Studies, a Convenor of the Board of Studies and Chair of the Undergraduate Exam Board.

In research Falconer’s work has covered the topics of accounting history, management accounting change, cost management and many contemporary management accounting issues. He has obtained over 20 research grants, edited/authored over 20 books and had around 150 research papers and contributory chapters published. He maintained strong links with The Chartered Institute of Management Accountants where he edited three editions of their Official Terminology, served on their Research Committee for over 20 years and acted as the Chair of their Research Board for over 10 years.

Falconer will be continuing to research and write and will remain an active and much valued member of the Business School community. He now lives with his partner Val in Stirling. He also looks forward to having more time to spend with his sons Scott and Keith, his daughters-in-law Huimin and Sharon and his grandchildren Renee, Bryce and William.

Special Minute

Professor Bonnie Webber, BSc, PhD, FRSE Emeritus Professor of Intelligent Systems

Bonnie Webber, FRSE, is retiring in December 2016, after eighteen years as a professor in the University of Edinburgh's School of Informatics.

She joined the School in 1998, after seven years on the research staff of Bolt Beranek & Newman Inc (Cambridge MA) while working on her PhD at Harvard, followed by twenty years at the School of Computer & Information Science, University of Pennsylvania.

Webber is known internationally for her work in Natural Language Processing. Even before completing her PhD in 1978, she had already co-chaired a large NSF-supported conference on *Theoretical Issues in Natural Language Processing* and published papers in the *IEEE Transactions on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing* and *Linguistic Inquiry*, as well as at conferences in Linguistics; Computational Linguistics; and Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing.

After finishing her PhD, she joined the faculty of the University of Pennsylvania, where she continued her research in Natural Language Processing, collaborating with Professor Aravind Joshi in work on Cooperative Question-Answering; with Dr. John R. Clark in real-time delivery of decision support in trauma care; and with Professor Norman Badler on generating computer animations based on Natural Language instructions. Her work with Clark led to her appointment to a *Long-range Planning Panel on Medical Informatics* at the National Library of Medicine (1985-1986), then to their *Board of Scientific Councilors* (1986-1990), as well as to research review panels at the National Institutes of Health and the National Institute of Mental Health. The latter continued after she left Penn, to join the University of Edinburgh.

At the University of Edinburgh, she worked with Dr. Dietlind Gerloff in the School of Biology, to start a new cross-School programme in bioinformatics. Later, she served for two years as Dean for Research in the College of Science and Engineering. At the same time, she worked with Joshi and other colleagues at the University of Pennsylvania, to create the Penn Discourse TreeBank (PDTB), a large corpus annotated according to the approach to local discourse coherence that she and Joshi started developing in 1998. The PDTB has become a major resource in the field of language processing, spawning similar efforts in Modern Standard Arabic, Chinese, Italian, Polish, Portuguese and Turkish. Europe-wide interest in the mechanisms of local discourse coherence from the perspectives of linguistics, translation, psycholinguistics, education, and language technology, has led to the establishment of a 26-country European COST network (IS1312: *TextLink*), of which she serves as Deputy Chair. (COST is the long-running European framework that supports trans-national cooperation among researchers, engineers and scholars across Europe.)

In addition to her selection as a Founding Fellow of the Association for Advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AAAI) and more recent selection as a Fellow of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL), she was elected in 2004 as a Fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh. Since then, she has served on the RSE's Fellowship Appointments sub-committee (2009-2011), their Committee on Women in Science, Engineering, Technology

and Mathematics (2010-2011), their selection panel for Personal Research Fellowships (2012-2015), and an *ad hoc* group aimed at increasing the number of women inducted into the Fellowship (2011-2016). (The group's success can be seen in the fact that 25% of new Fellows inducted into the Society in 2016 were women, the highest percentage to date.) She now holds the position of Convener of the RSE Research Awards Committee (2016-2019).

Webber has now successfully applied a similar approach to increasing the number of women inducted into the Fellowship of the ACL, where she is a Fellow and which she has served in many capacities, including President, member of the Executive Committee and member of the Editorial Board. She is committed to increasing the participation of women in scientific societies and their appointment to leadership roles in their fields. During her retirement, she is planning to continue her efforts in this area, as well as continuing her work with *TextLink* and the RSE.

The University of Edinburgh

Senate

28 September 2016

Knowledge Strategy Committee Report

Brief description of the paper, including a statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities

To update Senate on certain matters considered by Knowledge Strategy Committee at its meeting on 3 June 2016.

Action requested

Senate is invited to note the report. A separate paper regarding Senate membership of Knowledge Strategy Committee was submitted for approval to the September 2016 meeting of e-Senate.

Communication and Implementation

The approved Knowledge Strategy Committee minute will be published on the University website in due course.

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? No

Risk Assessment

Does the paper include a risk analysis? N/A

Equality and Diversity

Has due consideration been given to the equality impact of this paper? N/A

Freedom of Information

Can this paper be included in open business?
Yes

Originator of the paper

Dr Lewis Allan
Head of Court Services
31 August 2016

KNOWLEDGE STRATEGY COMMITTEE REPORT

3 June 2016

1 Matters Arising

The Convener thanked Ms Imogen Wilson, EUSA Vice-President Academic Affairs and Professor Arthur Trew for their service to the Committee.

The Convener welcomed two observers to the meeting: Patrick Garratt, EUSA Vice-President Academic Affairs-elect, and Melissa Highton, Director of the Learning, Teaching and Web Services Division and Assistant Principal Online Education from 1 September, with the recommendation that Senate appoint Melissa Highton to fill the vacancy for a Senate member of the Committee. *[Secretary's note: a separate paper regarding the Senate membership of Knowledge Strategy Committee was submitted to the September 2016 meeting of e-Senate.]*

2 Information Services Group (ISG) Strategy and Plan 2016-19

The Chief Information Officer and Librarian to the University presented an update on the ISG 10 Year Strategy and the ISG Plan 2016-19, submitted for consideration within the University's Planning Round. The Committee noted changes made to the final draft of the 2016-19 Plan to incorporate Digital Transformation activities within the Service Excellence Programme and a greater emphasis on the Lecture Capture project considered under Item 5 below. The Committee noted that the 2016-19 Planning Round will be finalised at the 20 June Court meeting and associated approval requests for expenditure on information services projects may follow over the summer period.

3 Lecture Capture – Proposed Project Summary

The Director of the Learning, Teaching and Web Services Division delivered an overview of options for installing a lecture capture system at the University. Members welcomed the proposals and noted the positive responses from students at universities that have installed lecture capture systems. It was noted that formal business case for the project will be developed building on the comments received, with a Project Board overseeing delivery.

4 Learning Analytics Initiative – Progress Report

The Chair in Learning, Analytics and Informatics updated the Committee on the Learning Analytics initiative involving online Masters courses and conducted in partnership with Civitas Learning. The Chief Information Officer commented that the University is at the forefront of research in Learning Analytics, with the Chair in Learning, Analytics and Informatics adding that the University is collaborating with the University of Michigan, worldwide leaders in the field. It was noted that a leadership role brings risks alongside benefits but risks will be managed carefully through involvement of interested students and ethics and privacy experts from the beginning of the project.

5 EvaSys Course Evaluation

An update on EvaSys Course Evaluation Roll-Out project, including the draft Course Evaluation Policy, was received. The intention to include all those involved in teaching including those not solely employed by the University (e.g. NHS staff) was welcomed, with the importance of checking for any potential contractual barriers emphasised. The potential benefits for staff development and ensuring communication of this benefit was noted. It was suggested that the course evaluation form could provide an opportunity for students to comment on aspects of the course they found particularly valuable.

6 Digital Student Experience

The Director of Student Systems delivered a summary of a presentation produced by external consultants on the current digital student experience at the University and suggested improvements. The Committee welcomed the suggestions for improvement (e.g. avoiding 'navigation by acronym', providing a consistent experience across systems, user-first development of systems, improving digital communication to students) and noted that detailed recommendations for implementation will be submitted to a future meeting, following initial consideration by IT Committee.

7 Flexible PhD Working Group Report

The Assistant Principal Researcher Development presented the report of the Flexible PhD Working Group, established to examine changes required to allow for the provision of distance PhD study as part of the University's standard educational offering. Interest shown from online Masters students in progressing to online PhD study was noted and the potential for a wide range of PhDs, including laboratory-based PhDs to be offered by distance study (e.g. for academic staff without PhDs working in overseas universities with access to laboratories). Members commented on the importance of creating a single Edinburgh research experience for online and on-campus students, the potential to learn from the Open University and the expected start date of September 2017.

8 Computing Regulations

Revisions to the 20th edition of the University's Computing Regulations were approved. It was noted that IT Committee had examined the proposed revisions in detail and that the Audit & Risk Committee can be updated on the revisions relating to improving cyber security.

The University of Edinburgh

Senate

28 September 2016

Development of policy for Lecture Recording

Executive Summary

This paper outlines the various policy strands that need to be considered in the implementation of lecture recording at the University, and specifically offers a summary of what might be in an opt-out lecture recording policy for Edinburgh, along with insight into practice at other Universities. It should be noted that a number of other UK Universities who have to date been 'opt-in' are moving to an 'opt-out' policy for the start of the 16/17 academic year.

This paper was also considered by Senate Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) at its meeting on 21 September 2016. LTC has responsibility for finalizing the lecture recording policy.

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

Improving the student experience is a key priority for the institution.

Action requested

Senate is invited to comment on the ideas presented here. Senate Learning and Teaching Committee will take these comments into consideration when finalizing the policy.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. Resource implications (including staffing)

Not applicable here. Resourcing for the development of the policy is being considered by LTC.

2. Risk assessment

There is a risk that the implementation of lecture recording at scale will be unpopular with some academic colleagues, and also that students may not be sufficiently well informed about the reasons why certain lectures are not recorded. The policy must be sufficiently clear about the reasons for investing in lecture recording, and when opt-outs may be appropriate. The introduction of the policy more widely should be accompanied by senior level communications emphasising the student experience benefits.

3. Equality and Diversity

An Equality Impact Assessment will need to be completed as part of the development of a Lecture Recording Policy.

4. Freedom of information

Closed - Disclosure would substantially prejudice the commercial interests of any person or organization.

The substance of our proposed policy gives some key indicators about the sort of system we would like to buy and it would not be appropriate to release this information outside of the formal procurement process. It will be possible to open this paper once procurement activity has concluded.

Key words

lecture recording, student experience, digital recording, opt-out, accessibility and inclusion

Originator of the paper

*Melissa Highton
Assistant Principal Online Learning
September 2016*

*Anne-Marie Scott
Deputy Director
IS Learning, Teaching and Web
September 2016*

Development of policy for Lecture Recording

1. At the last meeting of LTC pursuing the development of an opt-out policy for lecture recording was broadly endorsed. This paper outlines the various policy strands that need to be considered, offers a summary of what might be in an opt-out policy for Edinburgh, and gives insight into practice at other Universities. It should be noted that a number of other UK Universities who have to date been 'opt-in' are moving to an 'opt-out' policy for the start of the 16/17 academic year.
2. A survey of policies at other institutions shows that the term "lecture recording" is used more often than "lecture capture", presumably because it has more neutral connotations and may be more easily understood by non-native English speakers. It is proposed that from here on we adopt the same convention.
3. There are a number of policies which already exist within the University upon which the new lecture recording policy will draw, and others areas of policy which are not currently explicit but may need to be made so. The project team in ISG have begun the process of identifying best practice in policy existing in peer higher education institutions to provide a starting place for the development of local policy at University of Edinburgh. We anticipate that the right policies for Edinburgh will be developed as part of the project to roll out lecture recording in the coming academic year to support practice and engagement across Schools and Colleges.
4. The lecture recording implementation project will have a dedicated governance board and activities will reported from that board into LTC along with other committees. A procurement group, including user representatives, will report into the project governance board. We propose that development of lecture recording policy is overseen by a sub-group of LTC, and informed by project progress.
5. Existing relevant policy and guidelines includes:
 - Accessible and Inclusive Learning Policy (http://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/accessible_and_inclusive_learning_policy.pdf)
 - Open Educational Resources Policy (<http://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/openeducationalresourcespolicy.pdf>)
 - Timetabling Policy (http://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/stu192_policy_document-v3_6_approved.pdf)
 - Guidelines on the Relationship between Data Protection, Freedom of Information and Intellectual Property Rights (<http://www.ed.ac.uk/files/imports/fileManager/IPRPreImV6.pdf>)
6. Areas in which new policy is required:
 - Lecture recording Policy
 - Learning Analytics Policy (approaches to understanding how recordings are used)

- Media storage and retention policy (managing a growing collection of lecture recordings)
 - Provision of text transcripts (accessibility)
 - Copyright for lecture recording (use of third party materials in lectures)
7. With regard to a Lecture Recording Policy specifically, example policies from other institutions are included in Appendix 1 for colleagues to review.
 8. Based on our experiences with lecture recording to date, and consideration of similar policies at other institutions, we have outlined in Appendix 2 the suggested areas that a University of Edinburgh policy would broadly cover. We have significant institutional use of lecture recording already through CapturEd and Panopto and this policy can be seen as a framework around current practice as well as guiding the use of a new, more comprehensive system. We would welcome LTC input via a small working group to further develop this policy alongside procurement of our preferred solution. The final proposed policy would be brought back to LTC for approval.

Appendix 1: Example Lecture Recording Policies

Opt-Out

Aberystwyth University

<https://www.aber.ac.uk/en/is/regulations/lecture-capture-policy/>

University of Bristol

<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/media-library/sites/secretary/documents/student-rules-and-regs/recording-educational-activities-policy.pdf>

University of Essex

<https://listenagain.essex.ac.uk/FAQStaff.aspx>

University of Exeter

https://as.exeter.ac.uk/media/level1/academicserviceswebsite/it/recap/2016_02_29_UOE_Lecture_Capture_Policy_v13.pdf

University of Leeds

http://www.leeds.ac.uk/secretariat/documents/0Audio_Visual_Policy_2015.pdf

University of Manchester

<http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=16559>

University of Newcastle

<https://teaching.ncl.ac.uk/recap/servicepolicy/recappolicy/>

University of Sheffield

https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/polopoly_fs/1.467609!/file/Policy_webMay15.pdf

Others

University of Birmingham

www.weblearn.bham.ac.uk/documents/eula.docx

University of Glasgow

http://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_359179_en.pdf

Kings College London

<http://www.kcl.ac.uk/governancezone/Assets/Teaching/Lecture-Capture-Policy.pdf>

Loughborough University

<http://www.lboro.ac.uk/media/wwwlboroacuk/content/teachingsupport/downloads/Loughborough%20University%20Lecture%20Capture%20Policy%20Jan%202015.pdf>

University College London

<https://www.ucl.ac.uk/srs/academic-manual/policy-az/learning-and-teaching/lecturecasts>

Appendix 2: Lecture Recording Policy Overview

Introduction and scope

- Lecture recording is about adding richness to the digital collections that students can refer to in support of learning and teaching, extending the range of materials already provided by online library resources, VLE courses etc.
- Lecture recording has benefit for students
 - Provides a study aid for revision
 - Assists students who do not have English as their first language
 - Assists students who have particular educational needs
 - Assists students who have been unable to attend lectures through illness or other similar circumstances
- Lecture recording has benefit for staff
 - Supports opportunities for changing teaching practice – Flipped classroom
 - Recorded lectures become an asset that lecturers can use for other purposes, at their discretion.
- Policy applies only to centrally provided lecture recording.
- Lecture recording is a supplementary resource for students, and is not intended to replace lectures.
- Support and advice will be available to assist staff who wish to use lecture recording as the basis for changing the way in which their teaching is delivered.
- Lecture recording is not intended for the capture of seminar-type discussions or tutorials.

Opt-Out

- Lecture recording will be on an opt-out basis; the default position is that lectures will be recorded, however lectures are released to students via staff intervention, not automatically.
- The aim is to be as consistent and comprehensive as possible in support of the student experience.
- Lecture recording will be based on the information in the central timetabling system to keep the administrative burden low.
- Staff will elect to opt-out once a year by indicating which timetabled lectures should not be captured.
- Head of School takes responsibility for opt-outs, for example if there are complaints from students about particular lectures not being recorded.
- Opt-outs will be for pedagogical reasons (chalk boards, flipped classroom), ethical or privacy reasons (sensitive data such as patient case studies), or personal (staff who have a disability)

Use of materials

- The performance and moral rights of staff as the author are acknowledged and University is granted a right to use the lecture. Intellectual property rights belong to the University.
- Lectures will not be shared with anyone except the course cohort unless the academic author chooses to share more widely.
- Staff will approve and release the content to students (weekly? End of the semester?).
- Recording will be catalogued automatically using timetabling information (course code, semester, etc) and will be easy to integrate into our centrally supported Virtual Learning Environments (VLEs).
- Recordings will be retained for 2 years.
- Data about which recordings are watched and by whom may be used in conjunction with other data to provide insight into student learning and support student success.

Alternative formats

- Lecture recording is recognised as the main ways in which the institution provides a lecture in an alternative format.
- As with all other teaching materials, content should be provided in an alternative format upon request (transcript / subtitles).

Copyright

- Materials recorded must be cleared for copyright e.g. owned by the University, openly licensed, or explicit permission has been granted.
- The act of filming is the act of making a copy and therefore fair dealing does not apply.

The University of Edinburgh

Senate

28 September 2016

Edinburgh University Students' Association Priorities 2016-17

Brief description of the paper, including statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities where relevant

This paper seeks to provide an introduction to Edinburgh University Students' Association's new sabbatical officers and their priorities for 2016-17.

Action requested

This paper is for information

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? No

Risk Assessment

Does the paper include a risk analysis? No

Equality and Diversity

Has due consideration been given to the equality impact of this paper? Yes

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes

Any Other Relevant Information

Originators of the paper

Patrick Garratt, Students' Association Vice President Academic Affairs

The sabbatical officers elected for 2016-17 are:

Alec Edgecliffe-Johnson, Students' Association President

Patrick Garratt, Students' Association Vice President Academic Affairs (VPAA)

Jessica Husbands, Students' Association Vice President Societies & Activities (VPSA)

Jenna Kelly, Students' Association Vice President Services (VPS)

VPAA Objectives for 2016-17:

1. Breaking down student-teacher barriers

The aim is to increase provision of open platforms, through which students can have constructive input into both the content of their courses, and the assessment methods of these courses. All students should be able to take part in a pedagogical process that they feel adequately represents and accommodates for their needs, backgrounds and academic interests.

- Creating platforms for mid-semester feedback from students to staff, pertaining mainly to seminars, tutorials and laboratory sessions, and putting less weight on surveys, thus establishing a more conversational dialogue between students and staff. These platforms would serve to ensure that small but pertinent changes can be implemented during the semester, at which point students have more of a stake in their course.
- Working with all Schools to explore how students' curricula can be liberated, varying from changes to content in some disciplines, to further exploring the diversification of assessment methods and pedagogy in others
- Improving the functioning of the Class Rep system across all Schools, and putting greater weight on the role of School Conveners.
- Ensuring there is stronger transparency about the outcomes of staff-student liaison committees, and working with Schools to strengthen their communication with students.
- Continuing the Students' Association's promotion of co-curriculum.

2. Reducing the stress of studying and enhancing accessibility

The Students' Association will work with the University to ensure that the pastoral needs of students are met whilst they are studying, continuing the work of the previous sabbatical officers and the University on support for students suffering from mental health issues. We will also be putting particular weight on helping students who are on, or returning from, their year abroad.

- Working with the University to convince academics about the pedagogical benefits of lecture capture, and particularly making the case for the ways in which the recording of lectures assists the accessibility needs of students.
- Ensuring that students who are on a year abroad scheme are able to effectively communicate with their personal tutors, that they receive adequate pastoral support

whilst they are at their host institution, and that they are provided with greater support upon their return to effectively bridge the gap between pre-Honours and Honours study.

- Working with the other sabbatical officers to prioritise the enhancement of support for students suffering with mental health issues.
- Ensuring that the Learning Adjustments outlined in the Accessible and Inclusive Learning Policy are consistently implemented and that Learning Profiles are consistently recognised and accommodated.
- Establishing stronger support networks both within the Students' Association and at the University to help students for whom English is not their first language.

3. Prioritising postgraduate representation with our Students' Association, and putting particular weight on supporting postgraduate tutors

The aim is to establish clearer channels of communication and representative structures for postgraduate research students across the University. We want to provide greater support for postgraduate tutors, whom the University relies heavily on for the learning experiences of pre-Honours students.

- Creating stronger bonds of community between both PGT and PGR students with our Students' Association
- Greater provision of course-specific training for postgraduate tutors.
- Ensuring that both postgraduate tutors' and students' expectations of contact time and support are met.
- Putting greater weight on the pastoral and mental health needs of PGR students
- Relieving the pressure upon PGR students who are forced to work in part-time jobs external to their employment with the University.

4. Ensuring students are aware of the government policies affecting Higher Education, and working with the University to tackle these changes

The aim is to articulate to students the overarching changes sweeping Higher Education across the UK, and also explaining the specific features of the Scottish context. We will also be working with student associations and unions across the UK to protect the rights of international students, and ensuring that students remain politically aware with wider government policies imposed on higher education institutions.

- Ensuring that students at the University of Edinburgh can have their voices heard whilst the Scottish HE sector looks to find a possible alternative to the Teaching Excellence Framework.
- Promoting wider discussions amongst the student body about what constitutes 'teaching quality', particularly through the research of last year's Teaching Awards.
- Tackling the PREVENT agenda with the University.
- Working with NUS Scotland and the University to explore possible concessions following the cross-party steering groups' review into the reintroduction of the post-study work visa in Scotland.

- Working with the University to develop a recruitment strategy for students who enter the University of Edinburgh through articulation, and recognise a variety of Further Education qualifications.