Senatus Academicus

Wednesday 3 February 2016 at 2.00 p.m. in Lecture Theatre B
Chancellor's Building, Little France

AGENDA

Presentation and Discussion Theme:
Edinburgh Global

Tea/Coffee

1. **Introduction**
   - Mr Alan Mackay, Director, International Office

2. **Edinburgh Global**
   - Professor James Smith, Vice-Principal International

3. **Global Research Partnership**
   - Edinburgh-National Centre of Biological Sciences, Bangalore, India, College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine

4. **Global Teaching Partnership**
   - Rachel Simmonds, Edinburgh College of Art, Donghhua University, Shanghai College of Fashion and Innovation, College of Humanities and Social Science
   - Dr Tom Bruce, School of Engineering, College of Science and Engineering, 2+2 partnership with Chinese universities
   - Dr Robin Ramsay, Centre for Population Health Sciences, College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine, Family Medicine Postgraduate Programme, Christian Medical College, Vellore, India
   -

   Go Abroad and Student Perspective
   - Ryan Broll, student participant, Tanzania Summer School
   - Go Abroad student perspectives

   Next Step and Ideas
   - Professor James Smith, Vice-Principal International

Interlude

PRINCIPAL'S COMMUNICATIONS **Verbal Update**

FORMAL BUSINESS

1. Report of E-Business conducted 12 – 20 January 2016 S 15-16 2 A
   For noting

   New Members:
   Professor A Kiayias, Chair of Cyber Security and Privacy
   Professor G Masterton, Chair of Future Infrastructure

2. Senate Assessor Vacancies – Call for Nominations S 15-16 2 B

If you require this agenda or any of the papers in an alternative format e.g. large print please contact philippa.ward@ed.ac.uk, telephone 0131 651 6083.

For approval, and for Senate members to consider and make nominations for the vacancies

3.	Conferment of the Title of Emeritus Professor **For approval**	S 15-16 2 C
4.	Report from Central Academic Promotions Committee **For information**	S 15-16 2 D
5.	Resolutions – Chairs **To make observations**	S 15-16 2 E
6.	Senate Membership of Knowledge Strategy Committee **For approval**	S 15-16 2 F

ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

7.	Special Minutes **For approval**	S 15-16 2 G

COMMUNICATIONS

8.	Higher Education Governance Bill **For information**	Verbal
9.	Fulfilling Our Potential: Teaching Excellence, Social Mobility and Student Choice **For noting**	S 15-16 2 H
10.	Enhancement-led Institutional Review – Outcome and Response **For information**	S 15-16 2 I
11.	Student Experience Update **For information**	S 15-16 2 J
12.	Light Touch Governance Review: Senate and Senate Committees **For approval**	S 15-16 2 K
13.	Update from 3 Projects – Student Systems **For noting**	S 15-16 2 L

If you require this agenda or any of the papers in an alternative format e.g. large print please contact philippa.ward@ed.ac.uk, telephone 0131 651 6083.

H/02/02/02
S: 3.2.16

S 15/16 2 A

The University of Edinburgh

Senate

3 February 2016

Report of E-Business conducted 12 – 20 January 2016

Executive Summary

This paper provides the draft report of the electronic business of Senate conducted from 12 – 20 January 2016.

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

Not applicable

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? Not relevant

4. Freedom of Information
   This is an open paper.

Any other relevant information, including keywords

Minutes, Emeritus, Knowledge Strategy, Resolutions

Originator of the paper

Senate Secretariat
January 2016

The University of Edinburgh

Electronic Senatus

Report of the Electronic Business of Senate Conducted from
Tuesday 12 January to Wednesday 20 January 2016

Formal Business

1. Minutes from the Senate Meeting on 30 September 2015

The minutes of the meeting of Senate held on 30 September 2015 were approved.

a. Special Meeting and Graduation Ceremonials on 24, 25, 26 and 27 November 2015

The minutes of the Special Meetings and Graduation Ceremonials in November 2015 were taken as read and approved. It was noted that copies are available from Student Administration, Old College.

2. Membership of Senate

The Senatus noted the new professorial and student members.

3. Conferment of the title Emeritus Professor

The Senatus agreed to confer the title of Professor Emeritus/Emerita on the Professors listed in Paper C, requesting that the relevant Heads of College prepare the necessary Special Minutes:

Professor E Austin, School of Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences
Professor J Duffy, School of Literatures, Languages and Cultures
Professor W MacNee, School of Clinical Sciences
Professor G Murray, Molecular, Genetic and Population Health Sciences
Professor I Pirie, Edinburgh College of Art
Professor R Sharpe, School of Clinical Sciences

Arising from the Minutes

4. Special Minute

The Senatus adopted the Special Minute for Professor J M Rotter, Emeritus Professor of Civil Engineering.

Communications and Reports

5. Communications from the University Court

The Senatus noted the content of the report from the University Court on its meetings of 21 September and 7 December 2015, and offered no observations on the draft resolutions.

6. Report from the Central Academic Promotions Committee

The Senatus noted the report from the Central Academic Promotions Committee informing it of the award of one further out of cycle Personal Chair.

7. Resolutions

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. 2/2016:	Alteration of the title of the Morrison Chair of International Business
Draft Resolution No. 3/2016	Foundation of a Chair of Cognitive Ageing and/or Cognitive Epidemiology
Draft Resolution No. 4/2016	Foundation of a Personal Chair of Neurobiology

8. Knowledge Strategy Committee Report

The Senatus noted the Knowledge Strategy Committee Report.

9. Changes to Terms of Reference for Curriculum and Student Progression Committee and Learning and Teaching Committee

The Senatus approved the changes to the Terms of Reference for Curriculum and Student Progression Committee and Learning and Teaching Committee.

10. Report of the Senate Exception Committee

The Senatus noted the business approved by the Senate Exception Committee.

H/02/02/02
S: 3.2.16

e-S 15/16 2 B

fThe University of Edinburgh

Senate

3 February 2016

Senate Assessor Vacancies – Call for nominations

Executive Summary
The Senatus elects from its membership four Senatus Assessors to serve on the University Court, of whom at least one must be a Professor and at least one a non-professorial member of the teaching staff. There are two vacancies arising for Senate Assessor. The term of office is 1 August 2016 – 31 July 2020.

How does this align with the University/College/ School/Committee's strategic plans and priorities?
Not applicable.

Action requested
This paper invites Senate members to do the following:

- approve the Regulations for the Conduct of the Senate Assessor Elections to be held on 16 and 17 March 2016
- to approve the constitution of the Scrutinising Committee
- to consider and make nominations for the vacancies arising for Senate Assessors

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?
Key dates will be communicated in the Senate Committees' Newsletter. Senate will be formally advised of the outcome of the election at the meeting of e-Senate to be held from 10 to 18 May 2016.

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? Continuing Senate Assessors will be Professor Sarah Cooper and Dr Claire Phillips. Senate members should take into consideration equality and diversity implications when making a nomination.

4. Freedom of Information
   This is an open paper.

Any other relevant information, including keywords
Senate Assessor

Originator of the paper
Philippa Ward
Senate Clerk

Senate Assessor Election

Action requested

This paper invites Senate members to do the following:

- approve the Regulations for the Conduct of the Senate Assessor Elections to be held on 16 and 17 March 2016.
- approve the constitution of the Scrutinising Committee.
- consider and make nominations for the vacancies arising for Senate Assessors.

Background

The Senatus elects from its membership four Senatus Assessors to serve on the University Court, of whom at least one must be a Professor and at least one a non-professorial member of the teaching staff. There are now two vacancies arising for Senate Assessors:

Two ordinary term vacancies: 1 August 2016 – 31 July 31 2020

The Senate must elect from its membership two Assessors to fill these two vacancies.

The University Court

The present powers of the Court are defined in the Universities (Scotland) Act 1966, and include among others: the administration and management of the whole revenue and property of the University; the regulation of the salaries of all members of staff; and the establishment of Committees of its own members or others and the determination of the membership and the quorum of such committees. As a corporate body it owns all the University's property and other assets and employs all the University's staff as well as being responsible for the effectiveness of its internal management arrangements.

The membership of the Court, which totals 22, is drawn from a range of internal and external sources. In addition to the Rector (elected by staff and students) and the Principal, members (known as 'Assessors') are elected by the Senatus Academicus (four) and the General Council (three). Assessors are also elected by the Chancellor, the City of Edinburgh Council and by the non-teaching staff of the University (one of each). The Students' Representative Council nominates two student members and Court itself can co-opt up to eight other members, at least seven of whom must be from outwith the University.

The Role of the Senate Assessor

It is fundamental to the successful operation of the Court and discharge of its responsibilities that members nominated by particular constituencies should act independently as members of a corporate body, and not as if delegated by the group they represent. Members need to recognise and understand the distinction between executive management of the University (responsibility for which rests with the University's senior managers) and the role of Court in providing high-level strategic oversight and ensuring that adequate control and monitoring arrangements exist to ensure that management is exercising proper stewardship and working towards agreed strategic objectives.

The Court currently meets five times a year. The Court's committees normally meet between three and six times a year on various days of the week. It is assumed that members will attend the majority if not all, meetings of Court, but the University does recognise that on occasion for health or other reasons this will not be possible. The University does, however, expect all members to be committed and willing to engage with the work of Court and the University.

Court members are invited to attend a number of University ceremonial events and some social events throughout the year. They are very welcome at these events, but the University recognises that other commitments may limit members' ability to accept all such invitations.

Members will be expected to serve on a number of Court Committees (normally around two committees at any one time). Members' particular expertise and experience are taken into account by the University in deciding on which committees they are asked to join.
Prospective candidates should further note that as a member of Court, on election, they will require to acknowledge that they are familiar with the University's approved Code of Conduct and understand their obligations under it specifically including the requirements: to declare areas of potential conflicts of interest; confirm that they are able to comply with the general duties of a Trustee of a charity in accordance with the Charities and Trustee Investment (Scotland) Act 2005 and that they are not disqualified from acting as a Trustee by virtue of a disqualification listed within the Act.

Please contact Dr Lewis Allan, Head of Court Services, for further details about University Court and the role of the Senate Assessor: Lewis.Allan@ed.ac.uk

For an informal discussion about their experience of the role, you may contact the current Senate Assessors, details at the following link: http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/governance-strategic-planning/governance/university-court/membership'

Nomination Process

Nominations for the two vacancies for Senatus Assessors, proposed and seconded by members of the Senatus, must be received by the Deputy Returning Officer, Philippa Ward, by noon on Wednesday 17 February 2016. Those nominated must be members of the Senatus. If more than two candidates are nominated, they will be invited to supply brief biographical details for consideration by members of the Senatus as part of the election process.

Scrutinising Committee

A Scrutinising Committee will scrutinise and confirm the validity of the nominations. The composition of the Scrutinising Committee for this election will be as follows:

- Sheriff Principal Edward Bowen - representative of the University Court
- Dr Paul Norris - representative of the Senatus Academicus
- Dr Lewis Allan - representative of the University Secretary

Election Date and method of delivery

In the event of there being only two valid candidates for the two vacancies and therefore an uncontested election, the Deputy Returning Officer shall declare and publicise as soon as practicable and no later than 48 hours after the meeting of the Scrutinising Committee the names of the two valid candidates elected.

If more than two candidates are nominated, an electronic election will take place, and Senate will be advised as such. The Senate Assessor Election will be held from 9.00 am on Wednesday 16 March to 7.00 pm on Thursday 17 March 2016. The Deputy Returning Officer shall ensure that a notice of the result of the election is posted on the Old College Notice Board, communicated to Senate members via email, and posted to the Senate webpages as soon as is practicable after the result has been declared. Senate will be formally advised of the outcome of the election via the e-Senate meeting to be held from 10 to 18 May 2016.

Election of Senatus Assessor on the University Court
Nomination form for ordinary term vacancies

This form is valid only in respect of the election taking place by electronic ballot to be held by the Senate from 16 to 17 March 2016 for two vacancies for Senatus Assessors on the University Court (term runs 1 August 2016 to 31 July 2020). Only members of the Senate are eligible to nominate and be nominated.

We (please print),

.....

and

.....

nominate

.....

as a candidate for election as an Assessor on the University Court.

Signature of proposer.....

Signature of seconder.....

Declaration by candidate

I declare that I am a member of the Senatus and that I consent to the above nomination.

S**ignature of candidate**.....

Nominations must be received by the Deputy Returning Officer, Philippa Ward, by noon on Wednesday 17 February 2016.

Address: Philippa Ward, Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services, The University of Edinburgh, Old College, South Bridge, Edinburgh EH8 9YL

The persons elected will serve from 1 August 2016 to 31 July 2020.

University of Edinburgh

Regulations for the Conduct of the Senate Assessor Elections to be held from 16 to 17 March 2016.

The Senate Assessor Elections shall be held from 9.00am on Wednesday 16 March to 7.00pm on Thursday 17 March 2016.

Role of the Returning and Deputy Returning Officers

1. Tracey Slaven, Deputy Secretary, Strategic Planning shall be the Returning Officer. Philippa Ward, Senate Clerk, has been designated Deputy Returning Officer and shall be responsible for the management of the election and the declaration of the result of the election.

2. The Deputy Returning Officer shall publicise the election to Senate members and voting procedure and make arrangements as appropriate to secure the good conduct of the election.

3. The Deputy Returning Officer shall provide nomination forms and communicate the nomination process and election process.

Electoral Roll

4. All members of Senate shall have only one vote.

Nominations and Validation of Candidates

5. The call for nominations shall commence at 2.00pm on Wednesday 3 February 2016. No nominations shall be accepted before this date and time.

6. All nominations must be submitted on the approved form and lodged with the Deputy Returning Officer by 12 noon on Wednesday 17 February 2016.

7. Nominations may be made only by members of Senate.

8. The nomination form must be fully completed.

9. Nominations must be accompanied by a written acceptance of nomination signed by the nominee (located on the nomination form).

10. If the Deputy Returning Officer believes there is any cause for concern regarding the validity of a nomination, this matter shall be drawn to the attention of the nominee/candidate, who shall be given the opportunity to address the cause for concern, prior to it being considered by the Scrutinising Committee.

11. The following Committee, to be known as the Scrutinising Committee, shall be appointed by the Senate to scrutinise nominations and confirm the validation of the nominations and hear any appeal against disqualification by the Returning Officer:

Sheriff Principal Edward Bowen - representative of the University Court
Dr Paul Norris – Representative of Senatus Academicus
Dr Lewis Allan - representative of the University Secretary

The decision of the Scrutinising Committee is final.

12. As soon as practicable, each nominee shall be notified of the outcome of the Scrutinising Committee's deliberations and the list of candidates for the election shall then be confirmed and communicated to Senate members.

13. In the event of there being only two valid candidates for the two ordinary term vacancies and therefore an uncontested election, the Deputy Returning Officer shall declare and publicise as soon as practicable and no later than 48 hours after the meeting of the Scrutinising Committee the name of the two valid candidates elected.

Conduct of election process

14. If more than two candidates are nominated for the two ordinary term vacancies, candidates will be invited to supply brief biographical details for consideration by members of the Senate as part of the election process.

Voting arrangements

15. Voting shall be conducted on-line using a secure University portal.

16. Members of Senate shall be permitted access and shall be able to vote from 9.00 am on 16 March 2016 until 7.00 pm on 17 March 2016.

Counting

17. All votes cast on-line shall be counted using an electronic counting system.

Declaration

18. The Deputy Returning Officer shall ensure that a notice of the result of the election is posted on the Old College Notice Board, communicated to Senate members via email and posted to the Senate webpages as soon as is practicable after the result has been declared.

H/02/02/02
S: 3.2.16

S 15/16 2 C

The University of Edinburgh

Senate

3 February 2016

Conferment of the Title of Emeritus Professor

Executive Summary

The Senate is invited to confer the title of Professor Emeritus upon those professors who retired recently or whose retirement is imminent.

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

Not applicable.

Action requested

For approval.

Resource/Risk/Compliance

1. Resource implications
   None.

2. Risk Assessment
   This paper does not include a risk assessment.

3. Equality and Diversity
   Not applicable.

4. Freedom of Information
   Open paper.

Originator of the paper

Senate Secretariat
Academic Services
January 2016

Senatus Academicus

3 February 2016

Conferment of the Title of Professor Emeritus

Action Requested

The Senatus is invited to confer the title of Emeritus upon the following Professors who have retired or will be retiring soon:

Name	School/College
Professor A Barnard	Personal Chair of the Anthropology of Southern Africa
Professor D Greasley	Personal Chair of Economic History
Professor A McKinlay	Personal Chair of Social Psychology
Professor R Pethig	Chair of Bio-Electronics

H/02/02/02
S: 3.2.16

S 15/16 2 D

The University of Edinburgh

Senate

3 February 2016

Report from Central Academic Promotions Committee

Executive Summary

This paper reports on the Out of Cycle creation of a Personal Chair.

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

Not Applicable

Action requested

For information.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

No further action is necessary.

Resource/Risk/Compliance

1. Resource implications
   None.
2. Risk assessment
   This paper does not include a risk assessment.
3. Equality and Diversity
   Equality and diversity is central to the considerations of the Central Academic Promotions Committee.
4. Freedom of Information
   This paper can be included in open business.

Any other relevant information, including keywords

Originator of the paper

Martyn Peggie, Deputy Director- Reward, Systems, Business Information and Resourcing, UHRS

The following Out of Cycle awards of Personal Chairs have been made since the last report to Senate:

Name	Chair	With effect from
Professor Chris Haslett	Personal Chair in Translational Medicine	1 January 2016

Martyn Peggie, Deputy Director - Reward, Systems, Business Information and Resourcing, UHRS

H/02/02/02
S: 3.2.16

S 15/16 2 E

The University of Edinburgh

Senate

3 February 2016

Resolutions – Chairs

Executive Summary

This report is presented to Senate in accordance with the procedures for the creation of new chairs, renaming of existing chairs and alteration of Resolutions.

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

Not applicable.

Action requested

Senate is invited to make observations on the attached draft Resolutions.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

Via Senate's report to University Court.

Resouce/Risk/Compliance

1. Resource implications
   There are no resource implications. Part of the approval process involved confirmation of the funding being in place to support new Chairs.

2. Risk Assessment
   The paper does not include a risk analysis. There are reputational considerations in establishing and renaming Chairs and updating regulations, which are considered as part of the University's approval processes.

3. Equality and Diversity
   There are no specific equality and diversity issues associated with this paper. However, equality and diversity best practice and agreed procedures are adopted in appointing individuals to Chairs.

4. Freedom of Information
   Open paper.

Any Other Relevant Information, including keywords

Court, Resolutions, Chairs

Originator of the paper

Ms K Graham, Deputy Head of Court Services
Deputy Head of Court Services
January 2016

Senate

Resolutions

Establishment of Chairs

The Central Management Group at its meeting on 19 January 2016 approved the creation of the following new Chairs:

Draft Resolution No. 5/2016: Foundation of a Chair of Cultural Relations

Draft Resolution No. 6/2016: Foundation of a Chair of Medical Bioinformatics

Draft Resolution No. 7/2016: Foundation of a Chair of Statistics

Personal Chairs

This Personal Chair requires to be created as a result of internal staff movements:

Draft Resolution No. 8/2016: Foundation of a Personal Chair of Translational Medicine

All the above Resolutions will be considered in final form at the Court meeting on 25 April 2016.

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

Draft Resolution of the University Court No. 5/2016

Foundation of a Chair of Cultural Relations

At Edinburgh, the Twenty fifth day of April, Two thousand and sixteen.

WHEREAS the University Court deems it expedient to found a Chair of Cultural Relations.

THEREFORE the University Court, after consultation with the Senatus Academicus and in exercise of the powers conferred upon it by Section 3 of the Universities (Scotland) Act, 1966, with special reference to paragraph 5 of Part II of Schedule 2 to that Act, hereby resolves:

1. There shall be a Chair of Cultural Relations in the University of Edinburgh.

2. The patronage of the Chair shall be vested in and exercised by the University Court of the University of Edinburgh.

3. This Resolution shall come into force with effect from 1 September Two thousand and sixteen.

For and on behalf of the University Court

SARAH SMITH

University Secretary

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

Draft Resolution of the University Court No. 6/2016

Foundation of a Chair of Medical Bioinformatics

At Edinburgh, the Twenty fifth day of April, Two thousand and sixteen.

WHEREAS the University Court deems it expedient to found a Chair of Medical Bioinformatics.

THEREFORE the University Court, after consultation with the Senatus Academicus and in exercise of the powers conferred upon it by Section 3 of the Universities (Scotland) Act, 1966, with special reference to paragraph 5 of Part II of Schedule 2 to that Act, hereby resolves:

1. There shall be a Chair of Medical Bioinformatics in the University of Edinburgh.

2. The patronage of the Chair shall be vested in and exercised by the University Court of the University of Edinburgh.

3. This Resolution shall come into force with effect from 1 January Two thousand and sixteen.

For and on behalf of the University Court

SARAH SMITH

University Secretary

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

Draft Resolution of the University Court No. 7/2016

Foundation of a Chair of Statistics

At Edinburgh, the Twenty fifth day of April, Two thousand and sixteen.

WHEREAS the University Court deems it expedient to found a Chair of Statistics.

THEREFORE the University Court, after consultation with the Senatus Academicus and in exercise of the powers conferred upon it by Section 3 of the Universities (Scotland) Act, 1966, with special reference to paragraph 5 of Part II of Schedule 2 to that Act, hereby resolves:

1. There shall be a Chair of Statistics in the University of Edinburgh.

2. The patronage of the Chair shall be vested in and exercised by the University Court of the University of Edinburgh.

3. This Resolution shall come into force with effect from 1 April Two thousand and sixteen.

For and on behalf of the University Court

SARAH SMITH

University Secretary

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

Draft Resolution of the University Court No. 8/2016

Foundation of a Personal Chair of Translational Medicine

At Edinburgh, the Twenty fifth day of April, Two thousand and sixteen.

WHEREAS the University Court deems it expedient to found a Personal Chair of Translational Medicine:

THEREFORE the University Court, after consultation with the Senatus Academicus and in exercise of the powers conferred upon it by Section 3 of the Universities (Scotland) Act, 1966, with special reference to paragraph 5 of Part II of Schedule 2 to that Act, hereby resolves:

1. There shall be a Personal Chair of Translational Medicine in the University of Edinburgh.

2. The patronage of the Chair shall be vested in and exercised by the University Court of the University of Edinburgh.

3. Notwithstanding the personal nature of this Chair, the terms and conditions of appointment and tenure which by Statute, Ordinance and otherwise apply to other Chairs in the University shall be deemed to apply in like manner to the Personal Chair of Translational Medicine together with all other rights, privileges and duties attaching to the office of Professor.

4. This Resolution shall come into force with effect from 1 January Two thousand and sixteen.

For and on behalf of the University Court

SARAH SMITH

University Secretary

H/02/02/02
S: 3.2.16

S 15/16 2 F

The University of Edinburgh

Senate

3 February 2016

Senate Membership of Knowledge Strategy Committee

Executive Summary

This paper outlines recommendations for Senate representation on Knowledge Strategy Committee, a joint committee of Senate and Court.

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

Not applicable

Action requested

Senate is invited to approve Senate representation on Knowledge Strategy Committee.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

Confirmation will be communicated to the Committee Secretary of Knowledge Strategy Committee.

Resource/Risk/Compliance

1. **Resource implications**
   Not applicable
2. **Risk assessment**
   Not applicable
3. **Equality and Diversity**
   The proposed change in Senate representation will enhance the gender balance on the Knowledge Strategy Committee. We will continue to monitor representation as it changes.
4. **Freedom of Information**
   Open paper

Any other relevant information, including keywords

Originator of the paper

Tom Ward
Director of Academic Services
7 January 2016

Senate Membership of Knowledge Strategy Committee

Since 2014-15, Knowledge Strategy Committee (KSC) has been a joint Committee of Senate and Court. Senate has five representatives on KSC.

At present, each of the Senate Committees is represented on KSC by a College representatives from the relevant Senate Committee:

- Curriculum and Student Progression Committee - Professor Allan Cumming
- Learning and Teaching Committee – currently vacant
- Quality Assurance Committee - Dr Gordon McDougall
- Researcher Experience - Professor Richard Coyne

Now KSC is into its second session of operation in its joint Senate / Court format, the Learning and Teaching Policy Group (LTPG) has reflected on Senate's representation on the Committee. Given the strategic importance of the link between the Senate Committees and KSC, LTPG recommends that, instead of current arrangements, the Senate Committees be represented on KSC by the Conveners of the four Committees:

- Curriculum and Student Progression Committee - Professor Allan Murray (Assistant Principal, Academic Support)
- Learning and Teaching Committee – Professor Charlie Jeffery (Senior Vice-Principal)
- Quality Assurance Committee – Professor Tina Harrison (Assistant Principal, Academic Standards and Quality Assurance)
- Researcher Experience - Professor Jeremy Bradshaw (Assistant Principal, Researcher Development)

The term of office will be for a maximum of three years. Senate is invited to approve this change in representation.

The other Senate representative on KSC (Professor Jeff Haywood, Vice-Principal Digital Education) would be unchanged. In addition, EUSA will continue to have a representative on KSC.

Tom Ward
Director of Academic Services

H/02/02/02
S: 3.2.16

S 15/16 2 G

The University of Edinburgh

Senate

3 February 2016

Special Minutes

Executive Summary

The paper provides the Special Minutes for Professor E Austin and Professor G Murray.

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 for Professor E Austin and Professor G Murray.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

Emeritus / Emerita 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
January 2016

Special Minute

Elizabeth Austin, MA, DPhil
Emerita Professor of Individual Differences and Psychometrics

Elizabeth Austin graduated from the University of Oxford with a first degree and DPhil in Chemistry (1974, 1977). She held junior research fellowships at Somerville and St. Hilda's colleges, a research fellowship at Newcastle and research posts at Strathclyde.

During this phase of her career her work using mathematical and computational modelling was published in chemical/atomic and condensed matter physics journals. Whilst working on these projects she developed an interest in modelling other complex systems, which led to a move to first Biomathematics and Statistics Scotland (1994), where she worked on psychological data then to lectureship in the Differential Psychology group at Edinburgh (1998).

Her subsequent research focussed on individual differences in personality, intelligence and emotional intelligence (EI), using both experimental and questionnaire methods to examine measurement issues and the ways in which these cognitive and dispositional differences relate to behaviour and life experiences. Her research on EI has made internationally-recognised contributions to this area. One strand of this work examined associations of EI with coping, health and academic performance, providing insights into the mechanisms by which EI contributes to life success and quality, whilst a second strand pioneered the examination of how EI scores are related to performance on laboratory emotion-processing tasks. A third strand examined the "dark side" of EI. This work pre-dated the recent growth in interest in this topic, with her published tests assessing managing/manipulating the emotions of others becoming a key resource. The recent (2013) Managing the Emotions of Others Scale has translations completed or in progress into several European languages and also Mandarin and Japanese. In other areas her contributions have included work on delineating the associations between personality traits and the broader autism phenotype, studies of the determinants of academic performance in medical students, and examination of the use of item response theory in improving the psychometric properties of personality and clinical screening tests.

The above research programme has had considerable international impact, resulting in invitations to present at conferences and symposia and edit journal special issues. During her time at Edinburgh she was awarded the prestigious H. J. Eysenck Memorial Scholarship and served as a member of the Board of Directors of the International Society for the Study of Individual Differences.

In addition to PhD supervision, Elizabeth used her research as a basis for research-led teaching, with final-year undergraduates having the opportunity to explore open research questions and to have their work published in peer-reviewed journals. Her research also informed her teaching in research methods, individual differences and psychometrics. She held subject-area leadership roles related to undergraduate teaching (including teaching director, teaching committee convenor, exam board convenor) in which she was responsible for initiating and coordinating the use of more varied assessment and feedback and enhanced student support, and a complete restructuring of the 3rd year honours course.

In retirement she plans to focus on writing and research, including collaborative projects with colleagues in Edinburgh and elsewhere, and contributing to a textbook on EI for the British Psychological Society textbook series. She will continue to supervise PhD students and engage with the broader academic community via journal editorial work, peer reviewing and external examining. She is also looking forward to having more time for travel and to pursue her other interests, which include opera and classical music.

Special Minute

Gordon Murray MA DipMathStat PhD CStat FRCPEd FRSE
Emeritus Professor of Medical Statistics

Gordon Murray retired on 30th September 2015 after 19 years of service to the University of Edinburgh as the first holder of the established Chair in Medical Statistics. He graduated from the University of Cambridge in 1974 with a BA in Mathematics from Trinity College and graduated with a Diploma in Mathematical Statistics in 1975. He then moved to the University of Glasgow to study for his PhD under the supervision of Michael Titterington. For the final year of his PhD studies he was employed in the Department of Neurosurgery at the University of Glasgow during an exciting early phase of research relating to the Glasgow Coma Scale. This stimulated a career-long interest in applied clinical research in general, and in research into recovery following head injury in particular. After holding a series of posts between the Department of Statistics and the Medical School at the University of Glasgow Gordon became the founding Director of the Robertson Centre for Biostatistics and was promoted to a Personal Chair in Medical Statistics.

In 1996 Gordon moved to the University of Edinburgh to take up the newly established Chair in Medical Statistics. At Edinburgh Gordon continued to work on his interest in recovery following brain injury, being very actively involved in the foundation and activities of the European Brain Injury Consortium. His interests in the methodological aspects of designing and analysing clinical trials of treatments for brain injury married perfectly with work based in Edinburgh for evaluating treatments for stroke and other neurological diseases. This led to very productive collaborations with clinicians based in the Division of Clinical Neurosciences at Edinburgh. His interest in clinical trial methodology led further to fruitful collaborations in many other clinical disciplines including, anaesthesia, arthritis, cancer, cardiology, critical care, diabetes, orthopaedics, palliative care, peripheral vascular disease, psychiatry, reproductive medicine, respiratory medicine and surgery. To date Gordon has published over 500 peer reviewed papers in the medical and statistical literature, and his contribution to applied clinical research was recognised when he was appointed as one of the very few non-clinical Fellows of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh.

As well as being heavily involved in applied clinical research, Gordon continued to keep abreast of his home discipline of medical statistics, with a key research theme being to develop methods to increase the efficiency of the design and analysis of clinical trials. For five years he was Director of the Edinburgh MRC Hub for Trials Methodology Research and hosted a very successful Clinical Trials Methodology Conference held at the Edinburgh International Conference Centre in 2013.

Throughout his career Gordon has had a passion for promoting good research practice and for rooting out misconduct. He was a founding member of the UK Research Integrity Office and continues to serve on its Advisory Board. He has written widely on the topic and has acted as an Expert Witness in high profile cases of allegations of research misconduct. The theme of good research practice runs through much of his teaching.

We wish Gordon a happy retirement in the heart of his family with his wife, Lilian, three sons and two grandchildren. The extra time should lead to improvement in his limited ballroom dancing skills, a tidier allotment, and a few more Munros ‘bagged’.

H/02/02/02
S: 3.2.16

S 15/16 2 H

The University of Edinburgh

Senate

3 February 2016

Fulfilling Our Potential: Teaching Excellence, Social Mobility and Student Choice

Executive Summary

This paper summarises the main proposals in the recent UK Government Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) Green Paper 'Fulfilling Our Potential: Teaching Excellence, Social Mobility and Student Choice', and the University's response to the consultation on these proposals. While some of the proposals have direct implications only for institutions in England, others have direct or indirect implications for institutions elsewhere in the UK. It is therefore possible that some of these changes would have material consequences for the University, depending on the details of implementation and the response of the Scottish Government and agencies.

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

Not applicable.

Action requested

Senate is invited to **note** the paper.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

Not applicable – since this is a consultation paper there are no actions to be implemented and communicated at this stage.

Resource/Risk/Compliance

1. Resource implications
   Since this is a consultation paper and its implications for Scottish HE are not yet clear, it is not yet possible to quantify the potential resources implications.
2. Risk assessment
   Not applicable
3. Equality and Diversity
   If the University was required to change any of its policies or practices as a result of the proposals in the paper, it would undertake an equality review at that stage.
4. Freedom of Information
   Open paper

Any other relevant information, including keywords

Originator of the paper

Tom Ward, Director of Academic Services
22 January 2016

Fulfilling Our Potential: Teaching Excellence, Social Mobility and Student Choice

1 Green Paper

On 6 November 2015, The UK Government Department for Business, Innovation and Skills published the Green Paper 'Fulfilling Our Potential: Teaching Excellence, Social Mobility and Student Choice'. The consultation document is available at:

https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/higher-education-teaching-excellence-social-mobility-and-student-choice

The consultation document signals some quite radical shifts with significant implications for the future of the sector and its supporting infrastructure. Since the documentation is for consultation, it is not yet clear what the UK government will ultimately implement. While some of the proposals have direct implications only for English institutions, others have direct or indirect implications for institutions elsewhere in the UK. It is therefore possible that some of these changes would have material consequences for Scottish HE, depending on the details of implementation and the response of the Scottish Government and agencies.

2 Key proposals

2.1 Teaching Quality

A Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF)

- The stated rationales for the TEF are to recognise and reward high quality teaching, improve value for money for students, provide better information for prospective students and for employers, and ensure that all institutions give teaching the same significance as research.

- The TEF should include all disciplines and types of delivery (ie full time, part time work based and distance learning). While the TEF should be open to all levels of study, undergraduate and taught postgraduate qualifications in due course the proposed scope for the TEF would be more limited in the first two years of operation.

- In year one, those institutions that have passed their most recent QA review would progress to Level 1 of the TEF, and would be able to charge higher tuition fees in 2017/18.

- In year two, institutions would be able to apply for higher levels of the TEF. The higher the TEF level achieved, the higher fee the institution could charge from 2018/19.

- Institutions would be assessed for the higher levels of the TEF (eg levels 2 to 4) in relation to three key aspects of teaching excellence: teaching quality; learning environment; and student outcomes and learning gain. Under this model institutions would be assessed against a core set of quantitative data, and would also be allowed to offer additional information (for example, information about the institution's mission and context, levels of teaching contact time). The core metrics would initially be: employment/destination; retention/continuation; student satisfaction.

- The paper envisages a three to five year rolling TEF cycle.

- TEF assessments would be independent of Government, and would be the responsibility of a "panel of independent experts" including academics, students and employers / professional representatives.

- Initially the panel would reach views at institutional level only, but in time the Green Paper envisages moving to having separate panels for each discipline, combined with an overall institutional TEF level aggregated from the individual discipline scores.

- The paper does not propose routine visits as part of the TEF assessment.

- There would be pre-conditions for applying for TEF assessment, for example compliance with Consumer and Marketing Authority (CMA) guidance on consumer protection, widening participation (see below), and Grade Point Averages (see below).

- A technical consultation will be held in 2016 to cover the operational details of the TEF metrics and the assessment criteria, process and outcomes.

A new system of degree classifications

- The paper suggests that the current system of Honours Degree Classification (HDC) is no longer on its own capable of providing students and employers with the information they require, and encourages institutions to move to using the Grade Point Average (GPA) system alongside or as a substitute for HDC.

- Universities making a submission for a higher level of TEF award would have to say whether they propose to move to using the GPA system, and this would be taken into account in the TEF assessment. Institutions would also have to demonstrate that they are taking steps to tackle perceived grade inflation.

2.2 Social Mobility and widening participation

- The Office for Fair Access (OFFA) would be asked to focus specifically on the degree attainment and progression to employment and further study of those particular groups where there is evidence that more needs to be done, for example white males from disadvantaged backgrounds, and Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) groups.

- A precondition of applying for a TEF assessment would be that universities are "fulfilling widening participation expectations in recruiting and supporting students from disadvantaged backgrounds". The TEF metrics would be broken down by disadvantaged group and taken account of in TEF assessments.

- The paper notes that the Prime Minister recently announced an initiative for higher education institutions to recruit on a 'name blind' basis, and that UCAS is currently consulting with the sector on this. The Green Paper suggests that the Government explore introducing legal powers to require bodies (eg UCAS) to release data on the outcomes of the admissions process, to promote trust in the admissions system and to help policy makers and researchers better understand how students' background, prior attainment and programme choices lead to an offer of a place.

2.3 Regulation of the higher education sector

Simplified regulation of new HE providers

- The paper proposes to remove barriers for new/private providers to offer higher education, for example by shortening the timescales for applying for degree awarding powers and University title.

Consumer protection

- There should be a requirement for all providers to have contingency arrangements in place to provide academic continuity for students in the event of provider exit, course or campus closure.

Simplifying the higher education architecture

- The Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) and the Office for Fair Access (OFFA) should be merged to create a new arms-length public body with a duty to act both as regulator and 'student champion' – the Office for Students (OfS). The OfS would have overall responsibility for the quality assurance functions currently managed by HEFCE and delivered by QAA, the new TEF functions, the widening access function (currently undertaken by OFFA), and collecting and providing information.

- The Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) and the Universities and Colleges Admissions Service (UCAS) would continue unchanged. The Student Loans Company (SLC) would also continue unchanged.

- The paper leaves future of the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) and the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) unclear, since it seeks views on whether and to what extent the OfS should have power to contract out its functions (e.g. to HESA or QAA).

- The Government would "deregulate and modernise the constitutional arrangements governing Higher Education Corporations with a view to placing them on a more equitable footing with other institutions incorporated under different and more flexible constitutional arrangements." Among other things, the paper proposes simplifying the role of the Privy Council in approving higher education institutions' governing documents.

- The Green Paper suggests that treating HEFCE-funded higher education institutions as "public bodies" is anomalous, now that their principal source of income (for teaching) is student fees, not teaching grant, and that alternative providers are not treated as public providers. In this context, it notes the cost to higher education institutions of having duties under the Freedom of Information Act. However, while suggesting that all HE providers should be subject to the same requirements, the Green Paper does not make a specific proposal in this area.

2.4 Funding

A new mechanism for the allocation of teaching grant

- The paper considers future options for determining the allocation of teaching grant and the financial sustainability function (currently undertaken by HEFCE), including the option of BIS taking on responsibility for allocating teaching grant with support from an independent advisory committee.

Reducing complexity and bureaucracy in research funding

- The paper proposes to reduce complexity and bureaucracy, while maintaining the dual support system.

- The allocation of institutional quality-related research funding (QR) would continue. However, it would no longer be administered by HEFCE. The consultation proposes various options, including a different body taking on HEFCE's research role, and an overarching body bringing together Research Council functions with management of QR funding for England.

- The Research Excellence Framework (REF) will continue on a peer review basis and will be held again before 2021.

3 University response to Green Paper

The University has responded to the consultation on the Green Paper. In its response it:

- Emphasises that excellence in learning and excellence in research have unambiguously equal priority and that the important link between teaching and research must be recognised;

- Supports the UK Government's aspirations to improve the standard of teaching and to widen access to Higher Education;

- Highlights the potential implications of the proposals for the Scottish, Welsh and Northern Ireland sectors, and notes distinctive and valuable features of Scottish higher education;

- Suggests that the TEF should be UK wide and based on consultation across the devolved nations, and comments in detail on various aspects of the TEF proposals;

- Raises some issues regarding aspects of the proposals for opening up the sector to new providers;

- Expresses concern that the separation of HEFCE's responsibilities for QR funding from support for teaching could undermine what should be a productive, innovative and experience enhancing interface between ground-breaking research and teaching;

- Welcomes the recognition in the Green Paper that Government investment in research is vital, the ongoing commitment to the Haldane Principle and the intent is to "ensure the integrity of the dual funding system", and emphasises that it is essential that these principles are not undermined in the proposed new structure for research funding; and

- Strongly encourages early confirmation of the scope and rules for the next REF.

The full response is available on the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee's website at the following url (see Paper L):

www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/agendapapers20160127.pdf

H/02/02/02
S: 3.2.16

e-S 15/16 2 I

The University of Edinburgh

Senate

3 February 2016

Enhancement-led Institutional Review
Outcome and Response

Executive Summary

The paper outlines the outcome judgement and initial feedback from the recent Enhancement-Led Institutional Review and sets out the proposed approach to address the recommended areas for further development.

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

Excellence in Education; Outstanding Student Experience

Action requested

For information.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

Via the Senate Committees' Newsletter

Resource/Risk/Compliance

1. Resource implications
   Does the paper have resource implications? Not included in this paper.

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

Originator of the paper

Professor Tina Harrison
Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance
January 2016

Enhancement-led Institutional Review
Outcome and Response

Introduction

This paper outlines the outcome judgement and initial feedback from the recent Enhancement-Led Institutional Review and sets out the proposed approach to address the recommended areas for further development.

Currently, every four years, the Quality Assurance Agency Scotland (QAAS) conducts an Enhancement-Led Institutional Review (ELIR) of each higher education institution in Scotland. The ELIR looks at our work in managing teaching quality and improving the student learning experience and allows the University as a whole to take a step back and reflect on what is special or different about Edinburgh, what is working, what we could be doing better, and our plans for enhancement.

This paper is based on the overall judgement and summarised themes outlined in the QAA Scotland ELIR Early Draft Outcome Report, November 2015. The final Outcome and Technical Reports are expected to be published in March 2016. The final reports will contain further detail of the specific recommendations or actions expected within each of the summarised themes.

One year after the publication of the final reports, the University is required to submit a year-on response to both QAAS and the Scottish Funding Council which will be made publicly available. We should seek to demonstrate clear progress against the recommendations at this year-on point. Thereafter, progress will be evaluated via an Annual ELIR Discussion with QAA Scotland until the next ELIR.

This paper proposes a themed approach to addressing the recommendations with senior theme leads and a three-year action plan. Senate Quality Assurance Committee will have responsibility for monitoring progress against the recommendations, with Senate Learning and Teaching Committee, Senate Researcher Experience Committee and the Learning and Teaching Policy Group providing the strategic oversight and detailed discussion of the proposed actions.

ELIR Outcome

Our ELIR review took place over two review visits during October and November 2015. At each visit the review panel conducted a number of meetings with students and staff and reviewed a wide range of documentation including the Reflective Analysis and Case Studies we submitted in advance of the review, as well as various committee papers and other documentation during the review. At the end of the process it was confirmed that the University had achieved the highest possible judgement and outcome as follows:

> "The University of Edinburgh has **effective** arrangements for managing academic standards and the student learning experience. These arrangements are likely to continue to be effective in the future.

> This is a positive judgement, which means the University has robust arrangements for securing academic standards and for enhancing the quality of the student experience."

The ELIR Early Draft Outcome Report provides an extremely positive assessment of the University, noting a large number of areas of positive practice relative to the areas for further development.

Positive practice

The ELIR report specifically highlights The Edinburgh Award – an employability scheme established by the University's Careers Service in collaboration with the Edinburgh University Students' Association (EUSA). The award recognises extra-curricular activities such as volunteering as well as involvement in initiatives such as the Peer Assisted Learning Scheme (PALS) in which students "buddy" or mentor other students.

Other areas that the report commends include our "progressive and effective approach to online distance programme development and delivery"; our "strong commitment to internationalisation of the student experience" and the significant role of the Institute for Academic Development that "continues to provide varied, flexible and tailored support to staff and students that underpins and supports strategic priorities and contributes to a culture of continuous enhancement of the student learning experience."

The report also recognises the University's "strategic approach to enhancing learning and teaching" and our effective use of self-evaluation for continuous improvement, in particular through our internal quality assurance processes, use of management information and the recently developed External Examiner Reporting System.

Edinburgh's success in the latest ELIR is a demonstration of the unambiguous priority the University has established to providing a really outstanding learning and teaching experience for all our students. Our success is a tribute to all members of the University community who have been involved, not just in the review but in our ongoing efforts to educate, develop and support our students.

Areas for further development

The Early Draft Outcome Report identifies five key areas for further development. These are areas where the review panel felt we could be doing further work in support of enhancement of the student experience, in many cases building on positive developments to date.

A high priority noted is the support we give PhD students, both in developing their doctorates but also their wider career development. We are also asked to look at specific aspects of the personal tutor system, building on the acknowledged positive progress since we launched the system. Student representation at school and college level is the third area for attention, building on the existing strong relationship the ELIR team noted we have with EUSA at institutional level. We are asked to continue our work on assessment and feedback, in particular focusing on the provision of formative feedback and seeking clarity and

consistency in approach. Finally, we are asked to progress our plans for the recognition and reward of teaching contribution.

All these are areas we are currently working on. The ELIR process has therefore been beneficial in confirming our plans and priorities.

Response to recommendations

In order to address the recommendations in a meaningful and manageable way, a themed approach is proposed based on the core themes identified in the Early Draft Outcome Report. This ensures broad alignment with existing learning and teaching priorities and Assistant/Vice Principal roles and responsibilities as part of an integrated planning process. Both Academic Services and EUSA will be key partners in this process. Effective implementation will also require collaboration with colleges and schools via the theme leads.

Five key areas identified in the ELIR report for further development are:

- Postgraduate research student experience
- Personal tutoring system
- Student representation (college and school level)
- Assessment and feedback
- Staff engagement in learning and teaching (workload allocation models)

Each substantive theme constitutes a specific package of work (to be further refined following publication of the final ELIR report) with an identifiable lead. The theme lead will be responsible for the development of the project plan, timelines and deliverables and for providing regular progress updates to Senate Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) for monitoring and reporting purposes.

Management of the overall process will be overseen by Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance and QAC will have responsibility for monitoring progress and reporting on activity.

Each theme lead will be asked to produce a detailed three-year project plan outlining priority actions for year 1 and ensuring that all recommendations have been actioned by the end of year 3 and, as far as possible, that there has been evaluation of the impact of the action. Learning and Teaching Policy Group will provide the strategic space to discuss, coordinate and agree appropriate actions and timelines. QAC will have oversight of monitoring progress against agreed actions via regular monitoring reports. The frequency of the monitoring reports is proposed to be every 3 months in year 1 (dates to be agreed to align with committee meeting dates) followed by a minimum of every 6 months in the subsequent years.

The proposed theme leads and co-leads are as follows:

- Postgraduate research student experience – Assistant Principal Jeremy Bradshaw
- Personal tutoring system – Assistant Principal Alan Murray
- Student representation (college and school level) – EUSA/College Deans
- Assessment and feedback – Assistant Principal Susan Rhind
- Staff engagement in learning and teaching (workload allocation models) – Vice Principal Jane Norman and Senior Vice Principal Charlie Jeffery

Professor Tina Harrison
Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance

H/02/02/02
S: 3.2.16

S 15/16 2 J

The University of Edinburgh

Senate
3 February 2016

Student Experience Update

Executive Summary

From November 2015 to early January 2016, the Senior Vice Principal visited all Schools with the Deputy Secretary Student Experience to discuss 2015 NSS results and wider issues in learning and teaching. The paper sets out a number of issues which directly or indirectly appear to be affecting the student experience, together with good practice examples from the various Schools which could be considered and adopted more widely.

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

Excellence in Education; Outstanding Student Experience

Action requested

For information

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

Key themes will be communicated via the Senate Committees' Newsletter.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. **Resource implications (including staffing)**

   Not applicable at this time.

2. **Risk assessment**

   Not applicable at this time.

3. **Equality and Diversity**

   Not applicable at this time.

4. **Freedom of information**

   This paper is **open**.

Originator of the paper

Professor Charlie Jeffery, Senior Vice Principal
Gavin Douglas, Deputy Secretary Student Experience

Student Experience Update

From November to early January the Senior Vice Principal visited all Schools together with Gavin Douglas, Deputy Secretary Student Experience, to discuss 2015 NSS results and wider issues in learning and teaching. Each visit involved the relevant Head of College and College Dean along with the Head of School and School Director(s) of Teaching. The agenda was NSS; performance management in learning and teaching, personal tutor system, assessment and feedback, and simplification of L&T procedures.

The following sets out a number of issues which directly or indirectly appear to be affecting student experience, together with a number of good practice examples from the various Schools which could be considered and adopted more widely.

Key Themes and Good Practice

a) General Issues

The estate: a number of Schools report short or longer term challenges around their estate. Most of these are in the George Square area where Schools have outgrown their current space. Decants add pressure in George Square and KB. Some aspects of the NSS challenge will not be resolved until we are further through our estates plan.

Joint honours: Free text NSS comments show that joint honours students (an especially large group in HSS) are unhappy with the inconsistencies (not necessarily shortfalls in quality) they encounter across Schools. We would benefit from frameworks for multi-subject degrees without the full-scale bureaucracy that accumulates around often very small degree programmes. Schools need to pay particular attention to student support and communications in larger joint honours programmes.

Good practice:

- *Some schools (eg SPS, HCA) are looking at a dedicated, single SSO or PT who can work across both schools for joint honours students.*

Student engagement: While all Schools have formal representation of students through an SSLC or similar, others have developed more sophisticated forms of engagement which support better communications, foster community - and allow issues to be addressed more rapidly:

Good practice:

- *In Education students sit on all school committees including school policy and resources. In addition, the Head of School offers a personal reference to those reps who do a good job. She observed that students are typically more involved in their own learning as a result of their involvement in the school's governance.*
- *Informatics have introduced weekly meetings between the Director of Teaching and student reps (and actions resulting are publicised through a regular blog).*
- *Maths use a range of different communications vehicles eg:*
  - *Comments boxes – dealt with by head of school who responds every 2 weeks*

- *Mid course postcards in lectures that staff can respond to. These generated positive messages (which are then fed back to students) as well as areas that students have struggled with (so lecturer can go back over the topic).*

b) Performance Issues

Annual review: Practices of annual review vary significantly. In many schools performance in teaching is not a routine agenda item (as it everywhere is for research), and we lack common understandings of what information might be used to inform a conversation on teaching performance. More generally there are differing assumptions about the role of annual review in informing performance management. Informal advice to Schools should bring more consistency in this year's annual review round, and People Committee will be reviewing formal guidelines. Better data availability from the EvaSys system will bring a standard information base from 2016-17.

Good practice:

- *A number of schools (eg Engineering, Informatics, Vets) have already modified annual review forms to include discussion on teaching. CSE are looking at requiring all schools to do this.*
- *In Maths, all staff are peer reviewed, these peer reviews are then commented on by the Director of Teaching and this forms the basis of the teaching section in the annual review.*
- *With HiSS, staff are asked to define and collate their annual review submission according to a standard template - research plan, Evasys feedback etc. Staff engagement in this process is seen as in itself a form of development*

Transparency of Data on L&T: There are divergent understandings of the transparency of information on workload and on course-level evaluation (through EvaSys or other means). I am keen to prompt a wider debate on this point as we move to roll out EvaSys across the University, and to argue that information should generally be open to all academic colleagues.

Good practice:

- *Vets share feedback scores from their current course evaluation and courses are grouped red/amber/green (this analysis is then shared with the teaching committee). They have seen positive results from colleagues keen to improve and get out of red/amber (but noted that staff – including good teachers – may take these sorts of issues very personally).*
- *Informatics publish numeric survey results and staff responses to all students* https://www.inf.ed.ac.uk/admin/ITO/course-survey-reports/ *They also use the data to help students choose future courses, eg by publishing answers to the question on their current questionnaire "what would you tell other students about this course*
- *Geosciences publish their Evasys course results very openly (on UoE intranet) and use Evasys as entrance point into a discussion at Annual Review.*
- *Maths: Evasys results are open (not free text) to staff and students – note that poor performers "feel awkward". Not yet using Evasys in annual review but "students are aware that Evasys counts".*

Capability processes: There is a wide perception that capability processes are cumbersome and may deter action on under-performance. I have begun a dialogue across central and College HR directors aimed at giving Heads of School the support they need to address under-performance. This will need to consider tutors and demonstrators as well as core academic staff. There are

some examples of effective and relatively swift action which suggest the problem may be more one of confidence in procedures rather than procedures themselves. People Committee will be reviewing the capability process.

Peer observation of teaching: Use of peer observation to prompt discussion about teaching approach and performance is very patchy. We need to consider whether to move to a more standardised expectation around peer review.

c) Personal tutor system

Schools take often quite different approaches to personal tutor support, reflecting differences of tradition and culture. There are some concerns that the system is cumbersome. We now have strong evidence from re-analysis of ESES that around 80% of personal tutors in all Schools provide good support and around 20% do not. AP Alan Murray is working on approaches to identifying and addressing performance issues (at both ends of the scale) and is keen that Heads of School begin now to address under-performance to secure improvement including reallocation of workload to other tasks if necessary.

Good practice examples:

- *Chemistry has a well-regarded PT system, which relies on the use of specialist staff. A number of schools are interested in exploring this model further. Chemistry stress that their PT system is embedded within a strong culture of building relationships between staff and students.*
- *A number of schools (eg Maths, PPLS, and Chemistry) adopt a cohort approach so that students have (as far as possible) the same PT for three or more years.*
- *Schools are increasingly flexing the PT system to meet students' needs better. Eg Informatics have introduced more frequent PT meetings for first year students.*
- *Moray House have produced Student Support FAQ's which set out clearly where students need to go for support and prevent / reduce the problem of students being passed "from pillar to post".*
- *Several schools (eg Vets / Chemistry / Informatics / Moray House) have mandatory training for all PT's (once a year or more often).*
- *SPS have produced and distributed business cards that clearly show a student's PT and contact details and (on the other side) their SSO.*
- *There is some evidence that support systems work particularly well where the PT and SSO teams are closely linked and mutually supportive. Moray House and Divinity both adopt an inclusive "one staff" approach, eg ensuring that SSO's and PT's are trained together; the Vet School have established a "Student Support and Management Group" that brings together their student support team with senior academic staff and the Chair of Vet Education.*

d) Assessment and feedback

Assessment and feedback timeliness: Schools are generally focused on the 15 day benchmark and in the great majority of cases achieving it (some have established shorter, 10-day benchmarks). There will be a systematic review to confirm compliance rates in the next few weeks. However even when Schools have clear evidence of close to 100% compliance, this is not generally reflected in better 'timeliness' scores in NSS. One explanation is a tendency to bunch deadlines in different courses at the end of a semester so students have the opportunity neither to feed forward between individual pieces of coursework across courses, nor to feed forward

into exam preparation for the same course when the exam follows directly at the end of the semester. Schools should consider approaching assessment on a programme-wide basis, scheduling coursework to enable feed-forward and considering whether traditional assessment patterns are still appropriate.

A number of Heads of School suggested that the low score on assessment and feedback was more symptomatic of wider student concerns about how much contact students have with staff and/or the approachability of staff and are trying to address this as well.

Good practice examples:

- *Informatics: work to a 10 day internal deadline, with return of feedback monitored automatically including a dashboard and auto-emails to staff who are behind*
- *SPS use a screen ticker tape to update students on feedback turnaround time*
- *Divinity: get "heads up" from course secretaries who will alert HoS to possibly poor feedback before essays returned. Chemistry have a similar approach, where course secretaries can flag up concerns to course organisers.*
- *HCA have introduced new workload rules to improve student access to staff - new formula is 4-5 contact hrs per week during semester (standard office hours plus one hour per course taught). Engineering have introduced mandatory surgery hours for all staff who teach – "Availability of staff to see students correlates with perceived enthusiasm of staff"*
- *Vets have experimented with immediate feedback and explanation, ie straight after students have completed an MCQ. This has proved popular.*
- *Chemistry have moved to the immediate release of provisional marks subject to moderation – which they believe accounts for significant increase in score for promptness of feedback.*
- *Chemistry have introduced a final year project review mid project - in December (ie just before NSS) which has been positive re quality of feedback responses.*
- *In Chemistry a Student rep was commissioned to produce a leaflet on "what to make of feedback" for students*
- *Biological Sciences run a "Meet the marker" to improve transparency and practice (ie as staff have to justify marks given). It was noted that "students could attend more - esp in early years."*

Academic year dates and exams: there is growing recognition that examining S1 courses at the end of S2 is unpopular, especially where widespread use of 10 credit courses produced a large number of S2 exams. There is wide support for a rescheduling of the academic year to accommodate a fuller S1 exam diet (and parallel action in CSE and elsewhere to reduce the number of 10 credit courses aligns well with this aim). The pattern of the academic year will be reviewed this semester.

Charlie Jeffery
Gavin Douglas

January 2016

H/02/02/02
S: 3.2.16

S 15/16 2 K

The University of Edinburgh

Senate

3 February 2016

Light Touch Governance Review: Senate and the Senate Committees

Executive Summary

This paper sets out the findings of the light touch governance review of Senate and its Standing Committees, Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC), Researcher Experience Committee (REC), Curriculum and Student Progression Committee (CSPC) and Quality Assurance Committee (QAC).

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

A periodic review of the governance of Senate and its Committee helps ensure that the Senate and its Committees operate effectively to meet their responsibilities of safeguarding academic standards, assuring the quality of all teaching at the University and the delivery of related strategic targets.

Action requested

Senate is invited to approve the recommendations contained in the report.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

The report will be communicated to Senate Committees.

Resource/Risk/Compliance

1. Resource implications
   Not applicable
2. Risk assessment
   Not applicable
3. Equality and Diversity
   The review identified no equality or diversity issues.
4. Freedom of Information
   Open paper

Any other relevant information, including keywords

Committee, governance

Originator of the paper

Anne Marie O'Mullane
Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services

Light Touch Governance Review:
Senate and the Senate Committees

1. OVERVIEW

1.1 This paper sets out the findings of the light touch governance review of Senate and its Standing Committees, Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC), Researcher Experience Committee (REC), Curriculum and Student Progression Committee (CSPC) and Quality Assurance Committee (QAC). Senate and the Senate Committees play a vital role in safeguarding academic standards and the quality of all teaching at the University. This effectiveness review has found that Senate and the Senate Committees are operating effectively, although it has also identified some issues, particularly regarding communication. The recommendations contained within the report are aimed at improving the effectiveness of Senate and the Senate Committees' operation.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 The last review of Senate and the Senate Committees was reported to Senate on 22 October 2008. The review resulted in the formation of the current suite of Senate Committees in 3 June 2009. Senate agreed in October 2014 that Senate Committees' Conveners' Forum (now reconstituted as the Learning and Teaching Policy Group) would oversee a light-touch governance review in 2014/15, in advance of the externally facilitated review of Senate and its Committees in 2015/16. The latter review will be undertaken in line with the University's responsibilities under Principle 16 of the Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Academic Services conducted the review between May and September 2015. The review consisted of focus groups, and a survey of a sample of Senate members. Focus Groups were undertaken with each of the Senate Committees in May 2015. Feedback from the annual Senate Committees' Symposium (the Symposium), which took place on 9 May 2015 was also taken into consideration.

3.2 Seventy members of Senate, who had recently attended a Senate meeting, were surveyed in summer 2015. The survey was based on a Leadership Foundation for Higher Education governance survey template. Twenty four responses were received from professorial representatives, non-professorial representatives, ex-officio members and student representatives.

3.3 Questions in the survey and those posed to focus groups were grouped under broad headings: commitment to effective governance, effective governance structures and processes, effective membership, effective strategic development and effective information and communication.

4. COMMITMENT TO EFFECTIVE GOVERNANCE

4.1 Senate Committee members felt that they are clear about the boundaries of the Senate Committees' remit and the position of the committees within the academic governance framework of the University. However, on the infrequent occasion where a number of Senate Committees had an interest in the same item, some Senate

Committee members sometimes felt less clear about the boundaries and respective responsibilities of each of the Committees.

Recommendation 1: When it is necessary for more than one Senate Committee to examine the same issue, Academic Services must advise each committee regarding the aspect of the item they are considering. Where a committee decides to remit an item to another Senate Committee to examine, they must outline a rationale for taking such an action.

4.2 Senate Committee members were happy with the support they received from Senate Committee secretaries.

4.3 Senate Committees demonstrate the impact of their work in the Senate Committees' Annual Report to Senate ('the Annual Report'). Senate Committee members felt that the Senate Committees had improved in recent years in demonstrating the tangible impact of their activity via the Annual Report. However, they felt that there was still scope for improvement in this area.

4.4 Most respondents agreed or partly agreed that they felt clear about the formal role of Senate, that is, to regulate and superintend the teaching and discipline of the University and to promote research. However, a minority of Senate members felt that in practice the focus of Senate meetings was often on inspiring the University rather than drafting policy or strategy, and that the impact of Senate's discussions on the University's activities was not always clear (see also paragraph 7.2).

Recommendation 2: In order for Senate members to be able to track the impact of discussions at Senate, Senate should be informed how actions relating to an item or theme will be taken forward and who will be responsible for taking those actions.

4.5 Most respondents agreed that they felt that the Senate Support Team provided timely, informed and professional advice to Senate members.

5. EFFECTIVE GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES AND PROCESSES

5.1 Planning the priorities of the Senate Committees for the next academic year begins with discussions in the Senate Committees in March or April. These priorities are compiled by Academic Services and are discussed and refined at the annual Symposium by attendees. Following consideration by Learning and Teaching Policy Group, the proposed priorities are then included in the Annual Report for approval by the Senate. This planning and prioritisation process supports input from a wide range of stakeholders including students and a cross-section of staff from schools, colleges and support services. The Learning and Teaching Policy Group reviews the priorities from a cross-committee viewpoint, taking into consideration matters such as resources and the urgency for completion of the activity. Decisions on the resource implications of priorities do not focus solely on financial implications; the staffing cost involved in progressing the activity is also considered.

5.2 Senate Committee members were satisfied with the framework for making decisions on priorities of the Committees and consider it to be an appropriately consultative process. However, Senate Committee members felt that there is a potential disconnect between the timing of prioritisation of Senate Committee activity and the timing of the University's annual planning processes. This could lead to a time delay

in progressing priorities and could impact on the agility of Committees to handle internal or external changes to the environment.

Recommendation 3: Learning and Teaching Policy Group should explore how to better align the annual prioritisation of Senate Committees' activity with the University's annual planning round.

5.3 Senate Committee members suggested that there can be difficulty in being responsible for large remits of activity without an associated budget. However, in practice this is unlikely to cause significant issues since, for the most part, Senate Committees set policies and strategies which influence how Schools and Colleges use their resources, rather than instigating activities that require direct allocation of resources (other than the staffing resources of support services).

5.4 Following the 2008 Review of Academic Governance, it was agreed that the majority of the work of each of the Committees would be progressed through limited life Task Groups which would have responsibility for specific issues or projects. Senate Committee members are satisfied that task groups are providing an effective way to progress suitable packages of activity, and particularly value the opportunity that task groups provide for involving non-Senate Committee members with relevant expertise. Sometimes, however, task group recommendations that required funding to initiate or implement were delayed due to a disjuncture between the timing of the task group reporting and the timescales of the planning round and the decision making framework on Senate Committee priorities.

Recommendation 4: Learning and Teaching Policy Group is to consider how to better feed task group recommendations into the annual process of prioritisation of Senate Committee activity.

5.5 Most respondents agreed or partly agreed that the arrangements for Senate e.g. number, timing, location, length of meetings and administration were fit for purpose.

5.6 Most respondents agreed or partly agreed that there was a clear system of delegation from Senate to the Senate Committees. A significant number of respondents answered "don't know" to this survey question. Survey responses did not explain why those respondents were unclear regarding the clarity of delegation arrangements. Academic Services provides Senate members with a Senate Governance Handbook which includes information on governance structures, delegation arrangements and reporting. However, it is possible that there is a lack of awareness of the content of the Governance Handbook.

Recommendation 5: The Annual Report of the Senate Committees should include a summary of the delegation of powers from Senate to the Senate Committees.

Recommendation 6: The Senate Support Team should publicise the Governance Handbook more widely among Senate members.

5.7 Most respondents agreed or partly agreed that there were effective arrangements in place for appropriately involving staff and students in Senate.

5.8 Most respondents agreed or partly agreed that they felt that there was trust and confidence in Senate amongst staff who came into contact with it.

5.9 Over the last few years measures have been taken to improve the quality of discussion at Senate. The first half of the Senate meeting now focusses on the presentation and discussion of a broad strategic theme. Senate members are asked once a year for themes, and Senate Agenda Committee picks the topics from the list submitted by Senate members. This provides an opportunity for Senate members to influence the topics for discussion, although in practice a comparatively small number of Senate members return themes. The presentation and discussion part of the meeting is now open to staff who are non-Senate members, and the Senate Support Team is proactive in encouraging staff to attend (see 6.7). There was less consensus on the quality of discussions at Senate meetings. Although most respondents agreed or partly agreed that there was high quality discussion, a significant number partly or fully disagreed.

6. EFFECTIVE MEMBERSHIP

6.1 Committee members were satisfied that the current composition and size of the Committees was effective. The ability for Committees to co-opt members with expertise for limited periods of time was seen as an advantage for progressing pieces of activity.

6.2 Senate Committee members were clear about their role and responsibilities. A small number of college representatives were concerned that they do not fulfil their communication role effectively, specifically, how they consult and communicate with their colleagues in Schools and Colleges. Academic Services has however taken some recent steps to assist Committee representatives to fulfil this role (see Section 8.1).

6.3 As part of new Senate Committee members' induction, the Senate Support Team circulates a Senate Committee Members' Guidance document to new members to assist them with fulfilling their roles. This was introduced in September 2012. In addition, some (though not all) Committees arrange an informal induction meeting between the Convener and new members of the Committee to introduce them to the Committee and apprise them of key activity being undertaken by the Committee. When this was available, members found it to be particularly useful. Some Senate Committee members found it sufficient to "learn on the job" by reading papers and previous sets of papers and minutes. Overall, Senate Committee members were satisfied with their induction.

Recommendation 7: All Senate Committee Conveners should meet with new members to introduce them to the Committee and apprise them of live issues that will be considered by the Committee over the next academic year.

6.4 Senate Committee members were content with the level of participation of membership in Senate Committee meetings. QAC felt the use of specific 'lead' readers for particular items helped ensure a depth of interrogation of the papers, and that this was particularly helpful when meetings had large agendas and a high volume of papers.

6.5 Most respondents agreed or partly agreed that the size, nature, skills and diversity of Senate membership are appropriate to meet its roles and responsibilities.

6.6 Since 2013, a one hour induction event for new Senate members runs on an annual basis in August or September. A supplementary event is run for student representatives who joined the Senate after the first Senate meeting of the year. The

Governance Handbook has been produced on an annual basis in order to assist Senate Members in fulfilling their role. This is circulated to new Senate members. However, despite these induction arrangements, most respondents felt that an effective induction did not exist for Senate members. One reason for this could be that the induction arrangements have only been introduced relatively recently, and will not have benefitted longer-standing Senate members.

Recommendation 8: The Senate Support Team should invite all members (not just new members) to attend a Senate induction on an annual basis and regularly highlight the existence of the Governance Handbook.

6.7 Over the last year, the Senate Support Team has taken additional steps to increase attendance at Senate meetings. In advance of Senate meetings, it has published articles in Staff News to highlight the theme for presentation and discussion, and it has also been proactive in encouraging Schools to ensure that Heads of Schools or other senior academic staff are present. As a result of these actions, attendance at the presentation and discussion section of Senate meetings averaged 59 over 2014-15, compared to 45 over the previous session.

6.8 There was less consensus on whether members' skills and experience were used effectively. Although most respondents agreed or partly agreed that their skills and experience were used effectively, a significant number partly or fully disagreed. Feedback from Senate members indicated that the success in increasing attendance at Senate meetings (leading to large meetings) may be reducing the opportunity for meaningful participation by individual Senate members.

Recommendation 9: The President of Senate, and the Senate Support Team, should explore alternative interactive meeting formats for the presentation and discussion section of the meeting in order to support a meaningful level of contribution from Senate attendees.

7. EFFECTIVE STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT

7.1 LTC and REC understood that they were the main standing committees with strategic development responsibilities, and their Committee members considered that they were effective in fulfilling this role. CSPC and QAC have less of a role in strategy development. CSPC has an implementation remit and QAC's primary role is on managing the University's quality assurance framework and sector requirements, resulting in a large amount of cyclical business on an annual basis.

7.2 Most respondents agreed or partly agreed that Senate was actively involved in the formulation, approval and review of institutional strategy for learning and teaching. A minority of respondents indicated they felt that in practice such activity took place at Senate Committee level rather than at Senate itself.

7.3 Most respondents agreed or partly agreed that Senate conducted its affairs in a way that is responsive to changing circumstances and the need for responsive decision making.

8. EFFECTIVE INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS

8.1 Senate Committee members recognised that two-way communication between Senate Committees and College Committees (and other stakeholders) was vital for managing business effectively. Academic Services undertake various activities in order to support effective communication of Senate Committee activities. The Senate Committees' Newsletter (introduced in 2013) includes key points from Senate Committee meetings, and is circulated to a large and wide range of staff across the University after each cycle of meetings. Each Senate Committee paper now includes an executive summary in the paper coversheet to assist members to communicate with and consult their constituencies regarding agenda items. In addition, concurrent to writing the minutes, the Senate Committee Secretaries are currently piloting a practice of producing a shorter meeting report, which is circulated to Committee Members as soon as possible after the meeting, to assist Committee members with early onward communication of key items. Senate Committees also report annually to Senate on key activities of the Committee and planned activity for the next year. This Annual Report is also considered by University Court.

8.2 However, while recognising these communication activities, some Senate Committee members felt that there was still room for improving the Senate Committees' communication with stakeholders and supporting College representatives in fulfilling their own consultation and communication roles.

Recommendation 10: Academic Services should monitor the effectiveness of recent initiatives designed to improve communication regarding Senate Committees' activities.

8.3 Senate Committee members were satisfied with the level of information presented in papers.

8.4 The Senate Committees' Newsletter contains key points from Senate meetings and is the main mechanism for communicating Senate activities to the broader University Committee. In addition, the Senate Governance Handbook makes clear that one of the responsibilities of Senate members is to communicate the work of the Senate to the wider University Community. There was less consensus on whether there is effective communication to and from Senate with stakeholders. Although most respondents agreed or partly agreed that there was effective communication to and from Senate with stakeholders, a significant number partly or fully disagreed. A number of comments made by Senate members indicated that they felt that the flow of information out of Senate was not optimal and that as a result the broader University community is not as aware of Senate's activities as it could be.

Recommendation 11: Academic Services should circulate draft Senate minutes to Senate members (rather than simply posting them on the website) and encourage them to circulate them to interested staff.

Anne Marie O'Mullane
Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services
25.01.2015

H/02/02/02
S: 3.2.16

S 15/16 2 L

The University of Edinburgh

Senate

Wednesday 3 February 2016

Update from 3 projects - Student Systems

Executive Summary

This paper describes the progress being made against three projects which are being implemented to help Schools enhance learning & teaching, the student experience and support general administrative efficiency and effectiveness:

- The Assessment & Progression Tools Project;
- The roll-out of the EvaSys course evaluation tool and process;
- The development of Student Data Dashboards.

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

Excellence in Education; Outstanding Student Experience

Action requested

Senate is asked to note the content of this paper.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

1. Work on the Assessment & Progression Tools (APT) project has been reporting regularly to CSPC; updates on the roll out of the EvaSys course evaluation tool and the development of Student Data Dashboard have been received in a number of places including Learning & Teaching Committee and the Quality Assurance Committee.

2. Senate held a discussion on Student Data Dashboards in June 2015.

Resource/Risk/Compliance

1. Resource implications
   Does the paper have resource implications? Yes – resource implications are being managed as part of each project.

2. Risk assessment
   Does the paper include a risk analysis? No

3. Equality and Diversity
   Does the paper have equality and diversity implications? Not relevant

4. Freedom of Information
   This is an open paper.

Any other relevant information, including keywords

Assessment, Progression, Course evaluation, Surveys, Student Data, EvaSys, EUCLID

Originator of the paper

Barry Neilson, Director of Student Systems

Wednesday 3 February 2016

Update of 3 projects from Student Systems

Description of paper

1. This paper describes the progress being made against three projects which are being implemented to help Schools enhance learning & teaching, the student experience and support general administrative efficiency and effectiveness:

    - The Assessment & Progression Tools Project;
    - The roll-out of the EvaSys course evaluation tool and process;
    - The development of Student Data Dashboards.

Action requested

2. Senate is asked to note the content of this paper.

Assessment & Progression Tools

<u>Background</u>

3. The Assessment & Progression Tools project is running over three distinct phases. The first two phases (which have been delivered) were developed to support the implementation of the 'Informing Taught Students of their Final Programme, Course and Progression Results' policy. The first two phases delivered:
    a. Changes to the EUCLID system which enabled Schools to electronically record and communicate award decisions to students. Implemented May 2014.
    b. Changes to the EUCLID system which enabled Schools to electronically record and communicate progression decisions to students with a clear note on any next steps the student had to take. Implemented May 2015.

4. The third phase of the project has been developed to deliver a number of benefits, including the following:
    a. A central place for students where assessment structures and in-year summative assessment marks (components and course level) will be held and published, including prompts on communication, covering provisional and ratified marks, regardless of which School courses belong to;
    b. Providing Personal Tutors and other staff with access to in-year and historical summative assessment results, at component and course-level, regardless which School courses belong to;
    c. Tools which will support the sharing of marks across Schools on EUCLID and provide the data/management information needed to run exam boards and reduce the volume of administrative work associated with these processes;
    d. High level processes and timelines for the exam board period in Semester 1, 2 and re-assessment;
    e. Replacement of the current SMART in-house system with the EUCLID system.

Current & Future position

5. The plan is on track to roll the new software and processes to 16 Schools and 1 Deanery for the start of the 2016/17 academic year and the project is going through the following key steps in the first half of 2016:
    a. Running a pilot of the software with 7 Schools and 1 Deanery during the 2016/17 academic year, and finalising the software development;
    b. Developing an implementation plan with each School (pilot and non-pilot School) to cover the key activities, training and process changes that need to be implemented before and then during the academic year;
    c. Liaising with each School over a number of points for consideration escalated to CSPC, including:
        i. An opportunity to review and clarify the roles and responsibilities of the exam board processes in Semester 1 and Semester 2;
        ii. Clarification on approach to progression rules into Honours programmes;
        iii. Focus on the accuracy of the information held in the DRPS and communicated to students through the Path system;
        iv. Communication of ratified course marks (and provisional) after Semester 1 courses.

6. The project is sponsored by Assistant Principal Susan Rhind, has a well-established Project Board and will continue to report to CSPC during the implementation phase.

Roll-out of EvaSys course evaluation system

Background

7. The EvaSys course evaluation system has been in use across the University for over three years now to support end of course evaluation and feedback. It is currently in use across 15 Schools with coverage of 30% of our taught courses.

8. The approach adopted across the University does contain some variation in approach, as highlighted in the table below.

Core questions	Mix between use of the standard set and variation on these.
Staff questions	Variation between use of named staff, generic feedback on Tutor, and Schools opting not to ask this set of questions.
Additional questions	Some using questions from a standard set, some developing School specific, and some not asking any additional questions.
Open questions	3 open comment questions (plus two Schools have comments at tutor level).
Engagement & Response rates	Significant variation in response rates on course surveys. Variation in staff engagement and visibility within Schools.
Use of data	Some variation on the use of the data at a course and staff level.

Current & Future position

9. By the start of the 2016/17 academic year, EvaSys course evaluation system will be rolled out to all Schools, covering all UG and PGT courses. A short-life project board will be established, sponsored by Vice Principal Jane Norman, to help deliver the project.

10. The table below illustrates the future desired position and within that the key strands in the project. A number of these have been expanded in the text below the table.

Roll out	All taught courses for the start of 2016 academic year (with any exceptions identified).
Core questions	Agreed set of core questions in advance of September 2016.
Staff questions	Agreed set of staff questions and use of named members of staff in advance of September 2016
Additional questions	Set of questions Schools can pull on for different course types or particular areas of interest for School/Subject area.
Open questions	3 open comments remain plus decision made on whether open comments should be available on individual staff members.
Policy	Re-drafted covering purpose, key principles and use of data. Of particular sensitivity the use of data to help optimize learning & teaching.
Engagement & Response rates	Engagement with EUSA and Students on the purpose of course evaluation, how the feedback will be used and the value of engaging. Engagement with colleagues both through the development of approved question sets and to share practice internally, enhance engagement rates, and distribution methods (online/paper). Engagement with Trade Unions.
In-year support	In-year support for set up and running of additional volume of questionnaires, reports and engagement.

11. It is proposed that the policy clearly sets out accessibility to data, including:
    a. The accessibility of quantitative data from the core, staff and additional questions (starting with a position of making this data open internally, and defining what we mean by open);
    b. The accessibility of free text comments, relating to course and staff (with a starting position that this will be more restricted than quantitative data);
    c. Access to data for key roles. For example course organisers will see all quantitative and free text comments on the course they are responsible for; aggregated data at the individual member of staff (providing a summary across all courses the individual teaches on) only available to the individual member of staff, the Head of School and line manager.

12. There are some practical steps that will need to be taken this year to prepare for the roll-out, including:
    a. Ensuring information stored on our systems for course organisers and staff teaching on courses is accurate;

b. Develop and test distribution methods to Heads of School, line managers and individual members of staff.

13. Communication and engagement with colleagues will be important and a set of key messages will be developed: A clear and straightforward statement of what we are trying to achieve through these steps, how the data will be used, and access to the data, linking in with broader work relating to performance in learning & teaching.

14. Likewise communication with students will be important to help ensure engagement and high response rates. Working with EUSA we will focus on the following areas:
    a. Guidance and support for students about how to give constructive feedback at the course and individual level;
    b. Clarity regarding the use of the data in Schools and clarity on what is kept confidential and what is available publicly;
    c. Clarity regarding anonymity in the process.

15. The project plan will clarify the various strands of consultation that need to be undertaken. The table below provides a summary of the high level approach that will be undertaken.

Policy	Learning & Teaching Committee & Senate People Committee and CJCNC Discussion with Union representatives	From December 2015
Questions	Quality Assurance Committee College Committees Project consultation on question sets	From January 2015
Students	Engagement with EUSA	From January 2016

Student Data Dashboards

Background

16. Senate received a paper on plans to design and develop aggregate student data dashboards to support Schools enhance learning & teaching in June 2015.

17. Prior to that discussion, Student Systems were given a steer from senior management to:
    a. Develop our use of student data to support ways to enhance learning & teaching, the student experience and operational effectiveness;
    b. Focus activity on what will make a difference at School level – provide support, help develop insights and share practice;
    c. Focus on the accessibility, visualisation and transparency of data, helping to simplify and manage complexity;
    d. Examine the use of dashboards to support these objectives.

18. Consultation with Heads of Schools, Directors of Professional Services, other colleagues and some external benchmarking took place and a number of areas Schools identified where the enhanced use of data can support their work. The table below summarises these at a high level.

Understand applications/admissions over a period of time and to plan for next year	**Understand my student cohort(s),** their characteristics, trends, progressions and outcomes**.**	**Learning & Teaching.** Survey data, linked to student record and other sources, some local level internal and external benchmarking. **Analytics/Predictive**
Standard reports for annual course and programme reviews and TPRs to have one consistent data set, spend less time looking for data and more using it	**Understand my student on an individual level** and what is happening in-year. **Analytics/Predictive**	**Effective/Efficient.** Assessment volumes, class sizes, feedback and mark turnaround, internal and external comparison, contact hours. **Analytics/Predictive**

19. A number of consistent themes emerged from consultation with external Universities who are further ahead than us in this area, notably:
    a. Accessibility, visualisation, simplicity and recognition enormously helpful in supporting change of approach in academic areas;
    b. Clear link to strategy and key indicators along with consistency of data and consistency of use, focussed at the level of need;
    c. Staff skills, technical capabilities and senior management support enormously important.

20. Prototypes have been developed using the BI Tool and Qlikview. The prototypes have been delivered at the Academic Strategy Group, Learning & Teaching Policy Group, Learning & Teaching Committee, Quality Assurance Committee and the MIBI Programme Board. Consistent, positive engagement and feedback from the academic community.

21. There is a clear demand – accessibility to the information at the level where colleagues can make a difference (course, programme, subject, school); consistency in data used to support key processes.

22. While developing and delivering the dashboards, the project team will need to be aware of a number of related matters which will help ensure the successful delivery of this project, but also help influence the MIBI Strategy within the University.

Value	Are we reporting on the data which will help Schools to enhance learning & teaching and student experience?
Resources	Ensure we have capabilities and capacity to deliver and enhance – people and systems.
Alignment	Plan, scope and clarify roles and responsibilities. Aligning central team(s), college and schools – one point of distribution and avoid duplication.
Trust	Data definitions agreed and accepted by community, consistency in use, one source. Data fitting in with operational structures (e.g. subject group)
Culture	Moving to greater active engagement and use by a wider group of colleagues, ease of access, visualisation, transparency.
Ethics and security	Clarity on the use of data, access and security, avoiding unintentional consequences.

Options

23. The options in the table below have been considered. A case has been developed to proceed with option 3 - seek to develop dashboards with additional resources and existing corporate technology (BI Suite). A decision on any investment has not been made at the point of writing this paper.

1. Do Nothing.
2. Seek to develop dashboards with existing resources and corporate technology (BI Suite).
3. Seek to develop dashboards with additional resources and existing corporate technology (BI Suite).
4. Seek to develop dashboards with additional resources and different technology (Qlikview, Tableau etc.)

Barry Neilson
Director of Student Systems
3 February 2016