<u>The University of Edinburgh</u>
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

**Meeting to be held on Wednesday 9 September 2020
at 2pm via Microsoft Teams**

A G E N D A

1. **Welcome and Apologies**

2. Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 21 May 2020 and the electronic meeting conducted between Monday 17 and Monday 24 August 2020 — SQAC 20/21 1A / SQAC 20/21 1B

3. **Matters Arising**

For Discussion

4. Students' Association Priorities 2020-21 — SQAC 20/21 1C

5. Enhancement Led Institutional Review (ELIR) Reflective Analysis — SQAC 20/21 1D

6. Internal Periodic Review Themes 2019-20 — SQAC 20/21 1E

7. Thematic Review:
- 2018-19 Progress Update — SQAC 20/21 1F
- 2017-18 Progress Update — SQAC 20/21 1G

8. Monitoring Retention, Progression, and Attainment Data — SQAC 20/21 1H

9. Committee Effectiveness Review: Questionnaire Initial Analysis — SQAC 20/21 1I

10. Personal Tutor (PT) System Oversight Group — SQAC 20/21 1J

11. UK Quality Code for Higher Education - Advice and Guidance Mapping — SQAC 20/21 1K

For Information and Formal Business

12. Terms of Reference, Senate Committees Members' Guidance and Committee Priorities 2020-21 — SQAC 20/21 1L

13. Scottish Funding Council Annual Report 2019-20 — SQAC 20/21 1M

14. Quality Processes – University Level Actions Update — SQAC 20/21 1N

15. Enhancement Theme 2020-2023: Resilient Learning Communities — Verbal
https://www.enhancementthemes.ac.uk/resilient-learning-communities

16. Internal Periodic Review – Reports and Responses — SQAC 20/21 1O

17. **Any Other Business**

18. **Date of Next Meeting:** Thursday 17 December 2020, 2pm, MS Teams

<p align="center"><u>The University of Edinburgh</u>
Senate Quality Assurance Committee</p>

<p align="center">**Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 21 May 2020 at 2pm
via Microsoft Teams**</p>

Present:

Professor Tina Harrison **(Convener)**	Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance
Brian Connolly	Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services
Dr Gail Duursma	School Representative (Engineering), College of Science and Engineering
Olivia Eadie	Assistant Director and Head of Operations and Projects, Institute for Academic Development
Dr Jeni Harden	School Representative (School of Molecular, Genetic and Population Health Sciences), College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine
Dr Katherine Inglis	School Representative (Literatures, Languages and Cultures), College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences
Nichola Kett	Head of Quality Assurance and Enhancement Team, Academic Services
Dr Linda Kirstein	Dean of Education Quality Assurance and Culture, College of Science and Engineering
Dr Paul Norris	Dean of Quality Assurance and Curriculum Approval, College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences
Dr Claire Phillips	Dean of Quality Assurance, College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine
Katie Scott	Head of Student Opportunities, Students' Association
Steph Vallancey	Vice President (Education), Students' Association
Paula Webster	Head of Student Analytics, Insights and Modelling, Student Systems Partnership

Apologies:

Brian Green	Deputy Associate Principal (Learning & Teaching), University of Strathclyde
Stuart Lamot	Edinburgh University Students' Association Representative

1.   **Welcome and Apologies**

The Convenor noted that Brian Green had reached the end of his three year term of office and thanked him for all his work as external member of the Committee. The Convenor and Academic Services would make arrangements for a new external member to join the Committee in the new academic year. The Convenor also thanked Steph Vallancey for all her work this year as Vice President (Education) and welcomed Katie Scott to her first meeting as co-opted member.

2.   **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 24 April 2020**

The Committee approved the minutes of the previous meeting.

3.   **Matters Arising**

It was noted (in reference to the previous Convenor's Communications) that the exam board decision trees that were being developed by the University's Resilience Team would not be taken forward.

4.   **Convenor's Communications**

The Convenor updated the Committee on the following:

- **Adaptation and Renewal Team (ART)** – The Convenor noted that the University had established an Adaptation and Renewal Team (ART) led by the Principal to lead the work that is needed to respond to the short, medium and longer term challenges caused by the Covid-19 pandemic. ART will report to the University Executive and will function as a team to enable swift decisions to be made in a number of time-critical areas and to ensure that those decisions are well informed and understood. ART has 4 main strands: Research; Students; Estates & Infrastructure; Reshaping. The Students strand will be led by Professor Colm Harmon (Vice Principal Students) and consists of 3 main areas of work: Transition to the University (led by Professor James Smith, Vice Principal International); Delivering Curriculum Resilience (led by Professor Harmon); Rethinking Student Admin & Support (RSAS) (led by Gavin Douglas, Deputy Secretary Student Experience). SQAC will have the opportunity to feed into each of these groups.

- **Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR)** – The Convenor noted that discussions with Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) Scotland regarding the rescheduled ELIR were still at an early stage. However, the review visits were most likely to be moved to semester two 2020-21, with the Reflective Analysis (RA) and supporting Advanced Information Set (AIS) submitted towards the end of November 2020. A key factor in rescheduling was the timing of the three internal periodic reviews that were postponed in 2019-20 and the eight reviews that were scheduled for semester two 2020-21. A further update will follow in due course once the details of the review have been confirmed.

- **External Examiner Exceptional Appointments** - The Convenor noted that as Covid-19 impacts were likely to be ongoing it had been agreed with the Colleges that exceptional appointments would be considered by SQAC in a batch either via an eSQAC during the summer or at the first meeting of the next academic year.

- **Annual Monitoring, Review and Reporting: University Level Actions -** The Convenor noted that a report of loop-closing updates for the Colleges and Schools on University level actions from last year's QA reporting cycle would be considered via an eSQAC during the summer.

For Discussion

5.	**Annual Monitoring, Review and Reporting: Changes due to Covid-19 Pandemic**

The Committee considered changes to the annual monitoring, review and reporting process in response to the Covid-19 outbreak.

It was noted that following the discussion of the interim process at the Committee meeting in April, the Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance, the College Deans of Quality and College quality contacts and Academic Services had worked together to develop the report templates and timescale. In response to feedback, the scope of the process had been widened to allow optional updates on actions identified from last year's reporting cycle and a reflection on other aspects of academic standards, student performance and the student learning experience (including industrial action). There would be no requirement to include Massive Open Online Courses in the interim process.

The Committee agreed the following reporting level deadlines with the understanding that there was a degree of flexibility should this be required:

- Programme/programme cluster - Friday 30 October 2020
- School/Deanery - Friday 20 November 2020
- College - Friday 27 November 2020

The SQAC Sub-Group will then meet in early-December to consider the reports and a full Committee meeting to approve the Sub-Group's final report will be held in mid-December.

It was agreed that at the conclusion of the interim process, the Committee would take a decision on when and how to return to normal annual monitoring, review and reporting processes, including on any changes to the normal process.

It was noted that the interim process would likely lead to less consideration of demographic data than the normal process as it was less directive on the range of data which should be considered as part of annual monitoring. The Committee agreed that while the streamlined process needed to encompass all students it would be important to consider demographic data in more detail next year.

The Committee agreed that the reporting templates should include additional guidance drawing attention to the Data Protection Policy and making it clear that reports should not contain information which identified an individual student or member of staff.

Action: Academic Services to amend reporting template guidance to clarify data protection requirements.

The Committee **approved** the suspension of normal annual monitoring, review and reporting processes and the implementation of an interim process in response to Covid-19.

6.	**Student Voice**

6.1   Student Voice Policy – Changes

The Committee considered changes to the Student Voice Policy to extend the requirement for mid-course feedback to include postgraduate taught courses that run for 10 weeks or longer from academic session 2020-21.

It was noted that at the December 2019 meeting the Committee had approved revisions to the Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Principles and Operational Guidance and that these had been included in the Student Voice Policy to mandate particular approaches from 2020-21.

The Committee **approved** the changes to the Student Voice Policy.

6.2   Work related to the Covid-19 Pandemic – Update

The Committee noted that the Students' Association was working to ensure induction and training was in place to assist the incoming student representatives for the 2020-21 academic session. Guidance was also being developed for staff on ways to support the student voice remotely.

7.   Student Support Service Annual Review – Minor Change

The Committee considered changes to the Student Support Services Annual Review (SSSAR) process in response to the Covid-19 outbreak.

It was proposed that SSSAR reporting for 2019-20 be streamlined to focus on impacts of industrial action and Covid-19 which would reduce the reporting burden on services while also ensuring compliance. A revised reporting template would be circulated to services by the end of May with a reporting deadline in mid-November. Services would be invited to submit their reports from the end of August to a new SharePoint site, which would facilitate sharing of experience and practice with other services.

The Committee agreed that guidance and communications to the services must emphasise the need to reflect on impact from the student perspective.

The Committee **approved** the suspension of normal annual reporting processes and the implementation of an interim process in response to Covid-19.

8.   Thematic Review Guidance – Minor Change

The Committee considered a minor change to the Thematic Review Guidance. At the meeting held on Thursday 27 February 2020, the Committee agreed that the current approach to Thematic Review should be maintained but that it should be reserved for significant issues requiring in-depth exploration. It was noted that the proposed amendment aligned the guidance accordingly.

The Committee **approved** the minor change Thematic Review Guidance.

9.   Scotland's Rural College (SRUC) Accreditation

The Committee noted the annual report of the SRUC Accreditation Committee.

It was noted that in May 2020 the College of Science and Engineering Curriculum Approval Board considered and approved a proposed change of title of the undergraduate programme from "Environmental Resource Management (BSc)" to BSc (Hons) Environmental Management, following feedback from the Internal-led Review of this programme.

The Committee noted that Academic Services would co-ordinate the annual SRUC Accreditation Committee from 2020-21 onwards, including arrangements for a new Memorandum of Understanding.

10.   Operation of Senate Standing Committees

10.1   Annual Report of the Senate Standing Committees

The Committee noted the annual report that was approved by eSenate at the meeting held on 13 May 2020.

10.2   Themes for 2020/21 Senate Meetings

The Committee was invited to suggest themes for next year's Senate meetings. The following suggestions were noted: the affordability of education; the Curriculum Review and the new system of student support; transition and attainment. Members were invited to send any further suggestions to the Committee Secretary by Thursday 28 May 2020.

10.3   Annual Review of Effectiveness of Senate Standing Committees

Members were invited to comment on the effectiveness of Committee meetings via email to either the Convenor or Committee Secretary.

For Information and Formal Business

11.   Internal Periodic Review – Responses

The Committee **approved** the final reports and **confirmed** that it was content with progress on the TPR Medicine.

12.   Knowledge Strategy Committee – Update

The Committee **noted** the update for information.

13.   Meeting Dates
The Committee noted that a meeting would be conducted via email correspondence during the summer to enable the approval of items which do not require substantial discussion in order to provide feedback to schools in a timeous manner.
The Committee also noted the following provisional dates for the 2020-21 academic session and that changes may be required in response to the pandemic (all meetings due to take place between 2-4pm, venues TBC):
- Thursday 17 September 2020
- Thursday 3 December 2020
- Thursday 25 February 2021
- Thursday 22 April 2021
- Thursday 20 May 2021

<u>The University of Edinburgh</u>
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

**Notes of the electronic meeting of Senate Quality Assurance Committee
conducted from Monday 17 to Monday 24 August 2020**

Notes

1.   **Formal Business**
The electronic meeting was conducted to enable the Committee to approve
items which did not require substantial discussion in order to provide
feedback to schools in a timeous manner.

2.   **For Approval**

2.1   **Course Enhancement Questionnaires – Hybrid Teaching Questions**   Paper A

The Committee **approved** the wording of the proposed Hybrid Teaching
Questions. The stated preference of the majority of responses was for
question ii.a but with the following slight addition to the question to make it
more constructive and solution-focused:
- ***Is there anything else you'd like to tell us about your experience
  of hybrid teaching and learning on this course that would help
  us improve our approach?***

The following was also noted:
- Pandemic – members noted concerns in regard to the administrative
  work required to run the CEQs and the staff capacity at school-level
  during the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic.
- Terminology – must ensure that current terminology is used when
  communicating with students.
- Equality and Diversity – must ensure that any bias (gender or other
  protected characteristics) in this process is minimised as much as
  possible.

2.2   **Student-Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance**   Paper B
      (includes guidance to support the Hybrid Teaching model)

The Committee **approved** the Guidance with the following amendments:

- Page 2, terminology of 'Online Learner student representatives' –
  change to '*All students engaging with courses at the University either
  in person or face to face should have opportunity*…'
- Page 2, Frequency of Meetings - add asynchronous meetings as an
  approach to consider.
- Page 5, Remit – clarify that sentence reading '…*to ensure there is a
  space for development of a community*…' is included as an item for
  consideration that could be an area for the School and the Students'
  Association to consider over the semester.
- Page 5, Hybrid teaching model approach – '*The flexibility of digital
  forums may enable a larger number of student <u>representatives</u> to
  participate'*.
- Page 8, Meeting format. '~~Online Learner student representatives and
  students~~ *All students engaging with courses at the University either*

*in person or face to face should have opportunity should have the
opportunity to participate digitally during the meeting or input via
other electronic means beforehand.'*
- Page 11, Online Learner (OL) Student participation – change as
  Page 8 above.

2.3   Internal Review Reports and Responses   Paper C

The Committee **approved** the following Final Reports 2019/20:
- Internal Periodic Review of Centre for Open Learning (UG provision)
- Internal Periodic Review of Chemistry (UG & PGT provision)
- Internal Periodic Review of Divinity (UG provision)
- Internal Periodic Review of Politics and International Relations (UG
  provision)

The Committee received and noted the following Year on responses
2018/19:
- Postgraduate Programme Review of College of Medicine and
  Veterinary Medicine (PGR provision)
- Postgraduate Programme Review of GeoSciences (PGR provision)
- Teaching Programme Review of History of Art (UG provision)

The Committee received and noted the following 14 week response
2019/20:
- Postgraduate Programme Review of Literatures, Languages and
  Cultures (PGR & PGT provision)

3.   For Information

3.1   Subject Benchmark Statement

The Committee received and noted the following statement:

- **Architecture**

4.   Date of Next Meeting:
Wednesday 9 September 2020 at 2pm via Microsoft Teams

<u>The University of Edinburgh</u>
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

9 September 2020

Students' Association Vice President Education Priorities 2020-21

Description of paper:
1. This paper notes the priorities of the Students' Association Vice-President Education and the Sabbatical team for 2020-21.

Action requested / recommendation:
2. For information and discussion.

Background and context:
3. Annual report on the priorities of the student representatives for the coming year.

Discussion:
4. See attached paper.

Resource implications:
5. Action arising from the ideas discussed in the paper may have resource implications. These will be considered in detail if specific action is proposed.

Risk management:
6. The risk of any action arising from the ideas discussed in the paper will be assessed if specific action is proposed.

Equality & diversity:
7. The ideas discussed in the paper aim to encourage and support equality and diversity. The equality impact of any specific actions arising from the paper will need to be assessed once the actions are proposed.

Communication, implementation and evaluation of the impact of any action agreed:
8. This will be agreed if specific actions arising from the ideas discussed in the paper are identified.

Author   **Presenter**
Stuart Lamont   **Fizzy Abou Jawad,**
Academic Policy Coordinator   Edinburgh University Students'
Edinburgh University Students'   Association Vice President Education
Association

Freedom of Information: Open

Priorities of the Students' Association Vice-President Education for 2020-21:

1. **Improving the quality and consistency of teaching and feedback**
    *   Fizzy will work with Schools and university bodies to improve the quality and consistency around assessment feedback. Her aim is to build on new practice arising from COVID-19 by continuing to push for online assessment feedback, delivered consistently across all Programmes.
    *   Fizzy will be working on promoting academic representative roles in the wider student body. The Student Association will research effective structures to improve communication between Programme and School reps, so that feedback can effectively be brought to staff.

2. **Ensuring all students have access to high-quality academic support**
    *   Fizzy will be exploring ways to give students who are completing joint honours more freedom to 'design' of their academic support structure.
    *   Since implementation of the Personal Tutor and Student Support Review has been delayed until next year, Fizzy will take this as an opportunity to ensure that changes will work for all students and can be adapted to provide sufficient support for all cohorts.

3. **Create an inclusive and accessible learning environment**
    *   Fizzy's current focus is on the impact which COVID-19 will have on the learning environment. The Hybrid Model has potential to create a more inclusive environment for all students long term. Fizzy will working alongside Schools on universal lecture recording and promoting the use of alternative forms of assessment beyond this academic year. Fizzy will be also be supporting BME Liberation Officer throughout the year on their work tackling the BME attainment gap at the university.

The Sabbatical Team's shared priorities for 2020-21 are as follows:

1. **Building inclusion**
    We are committed to building a University community in which all students feel welcome, respected, and able to participate, with a particular focus on addressing the financial barriers to student life and the negative experience of our Black and Minority Ethnic members.

2. **Ensuring support**
    Robust, consistent, and accessible support for all students is vital, particularly in-light of the challenging personal circumstances many of our members will experience as a result of the pandemic.

3. Facilitating connection
It is more important than ever that we ensure that students - no matter which campus they are based at or what their mode of study is - feel connected to each other, to the University, and the wider Edinburgh community.

Stuart Lamont
Academic Policy Coordinator
Edinburgh University Students' Association

<u>The University of Edinburgh</u>
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

9 September 2020

Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR) Reflective Analysis

Description of paper
1. This paper presents the Reflective Analysis (RA), a key piece of evidence to support the University's ELIR.

2. The RA document can be viewed at the Committee wiki:
    https://www.wiki.ed.ac.uk/display/SQAC/Wednesday+9+September+2020

Action requested / recommendation
3. To recommend the content of the RA for approval by eSenate (15 – 23 September 2020). At its meeting on 28 September 2020, University Court will be invited to approve the RA.

Background and context
4. ELIR is the method used by the Quality Assurance Agency Scotland (QAAS) to review and assess the effectiveness of higher education institutions' approaches to securing academic standards and the quality of the student experience. The University's next ELIR takes place in semester 2 2020/21.

Discussion
5. The RA is a self-evaluation of our strategies, policies and practices in support of academic standards, learning and teaching and the student experience.

6. The RA covers: our strategies, structure and background information; the student learning experience; how we enhance learning and teaching (including how we develop and support staff); how we manage the quality of our courses and programmes; and how we manage our collaborative provision (where we work in partnership with other organisations to deliver courses and programmes).

   Preparation of the Reflective Analysis

7. Drafts of chapters 2, 3, 4 and 5, developed using information gathered from colleagues across the University and the Students' Association, were made available to all staff and students in November and December 2019 with accompanying Teaching Matters blog posts. Comments received on the draft chapters were used to develop a first draft of the RA.

8. The first draft was then reviewed by key internal and external stakeholders in late January/early February 2020. Comments received on the first draft were used to develop a second draft, which was made available to all staff and students in March and April 2020 with an accompanying Teaching Matters blog post.

9. At this stage, due to the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic, QAAS needed to make changes to their schedule of ELIRs, and asked that our review be postponed. In May 2020 QAAS confirmed the new ELIR visit dates (February and March 2021).

10. Given the new ELIR visit dates, it was agreed that the RA would be presented to the relevant committees in September 2020 in order to meet the deadline for submission of the RA and supporting Advanced Information Set (AIS) in early December 2020. Academic Services continued to update the RA, requesting updates from colleagues across the University and the Students' Association. The RA was then reviewed one final time by the Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance.

11. Alongside updates to activities throughout the RA, the major change that has been made since the second draft is the addition of a reflection on actions taken in response to the Covid-19 pandemic.

12. Unless otherwise stated, the RA represents the University's actions and intentions as at August 2020. The ELIR review team will be provided with updates on activities in advance of their visits as appropriate.

13. There are a small number of paragraphs, highlighted in pink, which are being updated and/or confirmed with content owners. It is planned to have these updated before the RA is presented to eSenate and University Court.

Further work on presentational aspects

14. Academic Services will continue work on the glossary of acronyms, referencing within the RA (e.g. to related sections and appendices), the appendices, and web links. The Principal's foreword and photographs will also be added to the RA. The RA will then undergo a graphic design process by Communications and Marketing.

Resource implications
15. There are no specific resource implications associated with the RA.

Risk management
16. A successful ELIR is of vital importance to the University

Equality & diversity
17. No issues are associated with this paper.

Communication, implementation and evaluation of the impact of any action agreed
18. Academic Services will ensure that the RA and accompanying AIS are submitted to the Quality Assurance Agency Scotland by the required deadline.

<u>Author</u>
Professor Tina Harrison (Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance) and the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Team, Academic Services (with content provided by colleagues from across the University and the Students' Association).
2 September 2020

Freedom of information
19. The paper is open.

<u>The University of Edinburgh</u>
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

9 September 2020

Internal Periodic Review Themes 2019/20

Executive Summary
The paper identifies areas of good practice and further development arising from internal periodic reviews held in 2019/20, and proposes responsibility for action in response.

How does this align with the University / Committee's strategic plans and priorities?
The paper is relevant to the Committee's responsibility for the quality assurance framework.

Action requested
For discussion and approval of proposals for responsibility for action in response.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?
- Responsibility for action in response will be communicated to those allocated the role, along with example recommendations to provide context.
- College Deans of Quality will be asked to communicate the areas and the outcome of the discussion to relevant College committees.
- Academic Services will communicate the areas and responsibility for action in response to Schools/subject areas which had provision reviewed in 2019/20.
- Consideration will be given to how areas of good practice can be shared across the University in 2020/21 in the context of the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic.
- Areas for further development will also be reported to University Executive.

Resource / Risk / Compliance
   1. **Resource implications (including staffing)**
      There are no additional resource implications associated with this paper at this point.

   2. **Risk assessment**
      Failure to respond to areas for further development would constitute an institutional risk.

   3. **Equality and Diversity**
      The paper itself does not require an Equality Impact Assessment. The Equality Impact Assessment for internal periodic review processes is published at: https://edin.ac/2p3B7WZ

   4. **Freedom of information**
      The paper is open.

Key words
Internal review, IPR, good practice.

Originator of the paper
Nichola Kett, Academic Policy Manager, Academic Services
Gillian Mackintosh, Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services
2 September 2020

Internal Periodic Reviews – 2019/20
- Business School (undergraduate taught)
- Centre for Open Learning (undergraduate taught)
- Chemistry (postgraduate and undergraduate taught)
- Divinity (undergraduate taught)
- Geography (undergraduate taught)
- Informatics (postgraduate research)
- Literatures, Languages and Cultures (postgraduate taught and research)
- Politics and International Relations (undergraduate taught)
- Social and Political Science (postgraduate research)
- Social Policy (undergraduate taught)

Individual review reports are available at: https://edin.ac/2Yn59qP

Areas of Good Practice

The following areas of good practice either appear across a number of reviews as commendations and/or are related to key University activities.

- **The dedicated support provided to students by both academic and professional staff, including as part of the Personal Tutor system and during students' transitions.** Examples include:
  - "Welcome/Year Meetings" at the start of each semester to disseminate information and preparing students for the year ahead [Geography]
  - A questionnaire on expectation at induction which is completed by both supervisors and students, results are then exchanged so both groups can see the differences. The School has found this very useful in establishing clear expectations between students and supervisors [Informatics]
  - The approach for a Training Needs Analysis of PhD students at the beginning of their studies. In tandem with a robust annual progression review where training needs are also reviewed, this individualised approach to training will support successful and timely completion of study.[Social and Political Sciences]
  - The School employing the services of an embedded learning technologist to progress digital education initiatives for both on-campus and online learning enhancement. [Divinity]
  - The Professional Services and teaching staff for delivering such a dedicated and consistent level of support to students, showing leadership and resilience during a period of significant change [Centre for Open Learning]
  - The administrative support provided by the Teaching Organisation, the Laboratory Technicians and the work of the Director of Postgraduate Teaching [Chemistry]
  - The outstanding work of the current Director of Undergraduate Teaching for leadership in enhancing the learning and teaching culture across UG provision, the Teaching Manager for effective leadership of the Professional Services team and for establishing a student centred and mutually supportive team ethos. As well as all aspects of the Professional services team's work – their support of each other, their academic colleagues, and the wider student community. [Divinity]
  - The Personal Tutors and Student Support Team work well together to provide robust student support. The Student Support Office and Student Support Coordinator dedication and commitment to supporting students. [Geography]
  - The Student Support Officers and the Subject Area Support Officer for the excellent support they provide to staff and students [Politics and International Relations]
  - The importance of the Senior PT role and commends the commitment with which it is carried out as well as the Student Support Officer role and the way it is currently executed within the Subject Area. [Social Policy]

  o The School's positive and passionate staff. The professional services, supervisors and management provide a stimulating environment for students [Informatics]

- **Commitment to teaching and curriculum development.** Examples include:
  - o The flexibility of the Geography programmes and the opportunity for students to further shape their learning experience through optional course selections. [Geography]
  - o The sharing of good practice and engaged discussion on teaching through a monthly reading group "Talking about teaching" and the inclusion of "sharing practice" as a standing item at the Geography Degree Programme meetings. [Geography]
  - o The pre-honours course structure which is question and issues based. [Politics and International Relations]
  - o The Subject Area's commitment to diversifying the curriculum [Social Policy]
  - o The commitment to research led teaching. [Politics and International Relations]
  - o The Global Challenges for Business course (including the Learning to Fail aspect) is seen to be highly important for student transition [Business]
  - o The collaborative approach taken to enhancing the learning experience of both staff and students, by developing a close working relationship between Learning Technologists and other staff in curriculum development and staff upskilling. [Centre for Open Learning]
  - o The dedication to enhancing the student experience and commitment to developing opportunities for hearing and using the student voice to build community and shape the development of the curriculum. [Geography]

- **Developing employability and graduate attributes through involvement of the Careers Service.** Examples include:
  - o The work of the Careers Service and Chemistry's Careers Consultant [Chemistry]
  - o In response to the lower than desired DLHE scores for highly skilled employment and further study, the School was commended for building a close and productive relationship with the relevant services including the Careers Service [Business]
  - o The tutorials on graduate attributes and career preparations provided by the Subject Area and the Careers Service [Politics and International Relations]

- **Supporting and developing staff, including support for tutors and demonstrators, continuing professional development, and roles to support tutors and demonstrators.** Examples include:
  - o The Schools engagement with the Edinburgh Teaching Award and encouraging all staff including University Teachers and students to obtain formal recognition of their teaching efforts. [Informatics]
  - o The good practice in tutor training and materials provided by Course Organisers in the larger courses [Informatics]
  - o A group marking exercise held by a member of teaching staff to work through examples with the tutors. Towards the end of the course, the staff member reviews tutorial engagement and carries out a tutorial observation. The outcome of the observation and tutorial engagement is discussed with the PG tutor [Social Policy]
  - o The induction workshops and guaranteed hours tutor mentoring model in English Literature, which includes induction, briefing, mentoring and reflection. [Literatures, Languages and Cultures]
  - o The vision of the School in appointing the role of PG Tutor coordinator as well as the work and initiative of the PG Tutor Coordinator for fulsomely achieving that vision through the recruitment, training, support and evaluation of the PG Tutoring community. [Divinity]
  - o The School's approach to the teaching presentation at interview [Business]
  - o Recent investment in leadership training for Academic and Professional Services staff. Current engagement amongst Academic Staff with the Edinburgh Teaching

Award (EdTA) and the International Accreditation Association for Higher Education (AHE) [Business]
- o The adaption of the WAM to provide staff with space to innovate practice and share across the subject area. [Geography]
- o The approach to the annual review process. [Politics and International Relations]
- o The dedication to the continuing professional development of staff and initiatives including the planned addition of recognised time for CPD activity (5%) and citizenship (10%) in roles and the workload allocation model [Centre for Open Learning]

- **Community building through initiatives including peer support, societies and social activities.** Examples include:
  - o An alumni event and student conference to support community building [Literatures, Languages and Cultures].
  - o The excellent integration across staff groups, and students feel well connected within their cohorts, across year groups and with academic staff. The 'Social Space', which provides a high quality communal area and is used by all groups within the School, 'Chemunity', which fosters mental health awareness, Academic Families, which connect students across years and 'ChemSoc' all add to the sense of community. [Chemistry]
  - o An initiative to put in place a holistic approach to student development through pathways to the Edinburgh Awards, and the innovative BizPALS scheme [Business]
  - o The Social Policy Student Society and its commitment to fostering community [Social Policy]
  - o Community outreach working with local schools via the Festival of Social Science events which has led to the setting up of the Q-Step Academy to work with a range of local schools and Modern Studies teacher.[Social Policy]
  - o A Distinguished Scholar Lecture Series [Politics and International Relations]
  - o A School Choir established to break down barriers between Subject Areas [School of Social and Political Sciences]
  - o Dissertation retreats [Social Policy and Politics and International Relations]
  - o For placing staff community at the forefront of its plans for growth and change, including the all staff newsletter, the Away Days and other events. [Centre for Open Learning]

- **Accessibility, Inclusivity and Widening Participation**
  - o The School's overall awareness of and approach to issues of equality and diversity and the low differentials seen in the School's degree results when these are broken down by gender and ethnic origin. [Chemistry]
  - o The Schools commitment to Widening Participation (WP) by dedicating staff time to having a WP Coordinator in place [Geography]
  - o The existing initiatives to support widening participation activity and the current consultations to explore further links [Politics and International Relations]
  - o The excellent local outreach activity and its promotion of inclusivity and accessibility across all provision. [Centre for Open Learning]

Areas for Further Development

Proposal for responsibility for action: refer to Human Resources for response.

- **Tutors and demonstrators (recommended in eight reviews).** Recommendations covered training (including continuing professional development), allocation of work and remuneration, the creation of roles to provide support, and recruitment processes.

Proposal for responsibility for action: refer to Space Strategy Group for response.*

- **Space (recommended in seven reviews).** Recommendations related to the impact that pressures on and challenges with the estate are having on the student and staff experience, including on the ability to build community. The lack of space for tutors and demonstrators to carry out marking and meet with students was also noted.

Proposal for responsibility for action: refer to Senate Education Committee for response.

- **Community building (recommended in six reviews).** Recommendations focused on developing and implementing approaches to improve community building. The impact of pressures on and challenges with the estate on efforts to build community was also noted.

- **Curriculum (recommended in six reviews).** Recommendations relating to curriculum development and course provision, and embedding and assessing skills and employability within the core curriculum.

Proposal for responsibility for action: refer to review of Personal Tutor and Student Support Team Review for response.

- **Student support (recommended in six reviews).** Recommendations related to the importance of clearly communicating support available to students and also encouraged the preservation of good practice within the current Personal Tutor system in future models of support.

---

* Noting that recommendations arose from reviews carried out before the Covid-19 pandemic and impacts that the pandemic is having on the management of the University's estate in 2020/21.

Please note: some overarching themes also received a high number of recommendations across reviews but those recommendations were review-specific and/or so varied that a strong theme for further development at University-level could not be extracted.

Sharing Good Practice

Academic Services will consider how areas of good practice can be shared across the University in 2020/21 in the context of the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic. There are number of good practice examples relating to community building and tutors and demonstrators, which are also areas for further development so we may wish to focus on these areas. Additionally, the new Enhancement Theme is resilient learning communities.

Further examples of good practice will also be identified through annual monitoring (academic provision and student support) and presented to the Committee in December 2020.

<u>The University of Edinburgh</u>
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

9 September 2020

Thematic Review 2018-19:
Black and minority ethnic (BME) students'
experiences of support at the University

Report on Recommendations/Remitted Actions

Description of paper:
1. The year-on progress update of the implementation of the recommendations of the Thematic Review 2018-19: Black and minority ethnic (BME) students' experiences of support at the University.

Action requested / recommendation:
2. For discussion.

Background and context:
3. At the meeting held on Wednesday 18 September 2019, Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC) approved the final report of the <u>Thematic Review 2018-19: Black and minority ethnic (BME) students' experiences of support at the University</u>. The individuals and areas remitted actions have been asked to provide a year-on response to each, noting expected timescales for completion and highlighting potential barriers to progress.

Discussion:
4. Committee is asked to consider the responses and determine if sufficient progress has been made to implement the recommendations.

Resource implications:
5. Resource implications were considered as part of the review.

Risk management:
6. Risks were considered as part of the review.

Equality & diversity:
7. Equality and diversity was an integral part of the review.

Communication, implementation and evaluation of the impact of any action:
8. Committee Secretary will feedback comments to relevant areas.

Author   **Presenter**
Brian Connolly, Academic Policy   **Brian Connolly,** Academic Policy
Officer, Academic Services   Officer, Academic Services

Freedom of Information: Open

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

Thematic Review 2018-19:
Black and minority ethnic (BME) students' experiences of support at the University

Year-on report on Recommendations/Remitted Actions

Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC), at the meeting held on Wednesday 18 September 2019, approved the final report of the Thematic Review 2018-19: Black and minority ethnic (BME) students' experiences of support at the University. The recommendations of the review were then remitted to the individuals and areas identified in the report and a taskforce established by Professor Sarah Cunningham-Burley under the new Equality, Diversity & Inclusion Committee, to drive forward the recommendations.

SQAC is required to oversee progress on the implementation of the report recommendations, via an initial 14 week report and then subsequent annual reports, until all outstanding actions have been resolved. In February 2020 SQAC considered the initial responses from the individuals and areas with remitted actions updating the Committee on progress and identifying possible barriers to completion (these have been included below).

The individuals and areas remitted actions have been asked to provide a year-on response to each action, noting expected timescales for completion and highlighting potential barriers to progress. The following responses were received:

Report Paragraph Reference	Recommendation	Initial Update	Year-on Update	Completion date/ *Expected completion date*
4.1.1	The Review Panel **recommends** that the University work with the student BME Liberation Campaign, BME Staff Network, and the	The University will take a holistic approach to responding to both the Thematic Review of BME student experiences, and the LTC report on Using	The University Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) Committee has since been set up and a Race Equality and Anti-Racist Sub-Group formed. This sub-group, led by Prof Rowena	June 2021

| | Race Equality Working Group (see section 4.1.5) to identify mechanisms for reporting racial micro-aggressions and racism. | the Curriculum to Promote Inclusion, Equality and Diversity.

Professor Sarah Cunningham-Burley will drive forward the recommendations of both reports under the new Equality, Diversity & Inclusion Committee. A 'Race Equality' subgroup (which may have task and finish groups within it) will be established to take forward the Thematic Review recommendations and will also convened by Professor Cunningham-Burley. In addition to responding to the thematic and other reviews, it will also prepare for submitting to the Race Equality Charter Mark (RECM).

The Deputy Secretary Student Experience Gavin Douglas presented a paper to the University Executive in January, noting the recommendations from the Thematic Review, the LTC review and the recent Equality and Human Rights Commission's (EHRC) critical <u>report</u> into how universities across the UK handle racial harassment. The University Executive will also consider ethnicity data from the Equality Diversity Monitoring and Research Committee (EDMARC) in March.

So there has been quite a bit of discussion and thinking here - now to | Arshad, has representation from the Students' Association Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) Liberation Officer, BAME staff and student networks. A key priority identified (and endorsed by the University Executive) is to ensure the Report and Support mechanisms are fit for purpose to enable reporting of racism and racial harassment with appropriate support and feedback to those reporting. A requirement is also to ensure that where appropriate, sanctions are applied to those committing racism and racial harassment. There should also be opportunities for anonymous reporting. A meeting will take place by end of October between Deputy University Secretary Gavin Douglas with Rowena Arshad (Race Equality sub-group convenor) and Ayanda Ngobeni (BAME Liberation Officer). Developments will also be discussed at the Race Equality sub-group meeting on 6th October 2020. | |

		move to an integrated, holistic action plan. There is some activity already of course. **In short, the Thematic Review is stimulating action.**		
4.1.2	The Review Panel **recommends** that the University work with the student BME Liberation Campaign, BME Staff Network and the Race Equality Working Group (see section 4.1.5) to identify mechanisms that address BME staff-student experiences.	See response for 4.1.1	The Sense of Belonging strand of the Student Experience Action Plan is working on various aspects capturing BAME student experiences. (e.g. the work being taken forward with a PTAS grant by Dr Mohini Gray).	Dec 2021
			SQAC will be asked for advice on what could be put in place to ensure that Schools report on BAME dimensions of student experience.	Dec 2020
			There is a proposal to capture BAME staff experiences currently being discussed with the EDI Committee lead, Prof Sarah Cunningham-Burley, to be taken forward, if funded during Semester 1 2020/21.	Dec 2020
4.1.3	The Review Panel **recommends** that University Leadership recognise the need to improve knowledge and upskill in the area of developing racial literacy.	See response for 4.1.1	This is recognised and a mechanism still needs to be worked out as to how to achieve this. There is a high profile lecture series The Edinburgh Race Lecture Series (Protocol Office and RaceED), and the Principal has chaired at least one of these. University Executive/Academic	Dec 2020

			Strategy Group encouraged to read Enno-Lodge's 'Why I'm no longer talking to White People about Race'.	
4.1.4	The Review Panel **recommends** that the Principal leads a conversation on 'race' in higher education and the implications for the University of Edinburgh.	See response for 4.1.1	The Principal has led conversations within the University in specific meetings of the Academic Strategy Group (17th June 2020) and Leaders Forum (7th July 2020), and Court (July 24th 2020). Continued conversations planned with at least one online townhall meeting for all University EDI leads and possibly one for all staff (September to December 2020). A circular was sent to all staff outlining the University's initial action areas for race equality on 21st July 2020.	Dec 2020
4.1.4	The Review Panel **recommends** that the University provide each Head of College, School, and Professional Service area with a copy of 'Why I'm No Longer Talking to White People About Race'.	See response for 4.1.1	An e-book link has been sent to all service and school leads.	**Completed**
4.1.5	The Review Panel **recommends** that the	See response for 4.1.1	The University will begin discussions on this at the end of Semester 2 of the	2022

			2020/21 session with the intention of an application being made in 2022.	
	University reapplies for the Race Equality Charter Mark (RECM).			
4.1.6	The Review Panel **recommends** that the University conduct a benchmarking of approaches to supporting BME students across the UK. The findings of this exercise must be implemented at a level above the benchmarked basic level of provision.	See response for 4.1.1	This is being taken forward by the Student Experience Action Plan team.	2020-21
4.1.7	The Review Panel **recommends** that the EDMARC Report receives a high profile communication upon publication and that each College, School, and Professional Service is systematically required to provide a formal response each year.	See response for 4.1.1	Governance and Strategic Planning (GaSP) has agreed to take this forward from 2020/21.	2020-21
4.1.7	The Review Panel **recommends** that the University review the collection of data for BME students to provide more granular data,	See response for 4.1.1	Equality Diversity Monitoring and Research Committee (EDMARC) will take this forward AY 20/21.	2020-21

	accessible via the PowerBI Data dashboards.			
4.1.7	The Review Panel **recommends** that the University requires Colleges, Schools, Deaneries, and Professional Services to respond to BME data as part of annual review processes.	See response for 4.1.1	See response to 4.1.7	2020-21
4.2.1	The Review Panel **recommends** that the Sense of Belonging strand of the Student Experience Action Plan consider ways of specifically improving the experience of community and belonging for BME students.	See response for 4.1.1	Sense of Belonging strand of the Student Experience Action Plan will take this forward.	2020-21
4.2.1	The Review Panel **recommends** that the University recognise and celebrate the contributions of BME staff and students.	See response for 4.1.1	RACE:ED is now launched https://www.race.ed.ac.uk/ and captures the work of all academics in teaching, research and knowledge exchange in the area of race equality. There will be events related to Black History Month each year. However, further work needs to occur about how we celebrate the contributions of BAME staff and	October 6 2020

			students. This will be brought to the Race Equality and Anti-Racist Sub-Committee meeting on October 6th 2020.	
4.2.2	The Review Panel **recommends** that the University recruit a new BME Outreach Officer to work with BME communities. The Review Panel encourages the University to use positive action to diversify staffing.	See response for 4.1.1	Delayed due to the Covid19 pandemic.	2020-21
4.2.2	The Review Panel **recommends** that the University commit to increase the percentage of BME staff, both academic and professional services, with immediate priority in the professional services areas. The Review Panel encourages the University to use positive action to diversify staffing.	See response for 4.1.1	This is one of 5 priority areas identified in the circular sent to all staff outlining the University's initial action areas for race equality on 21st July 2020. Actual next steps still to be identified. Meeting between EDI Committee Convenor and Corporate Services Group (CSG) Directors held 27/8/2020 to discuss how to take this (and other EDI matters) forward. Plan to be developed for EDI governance within CSG and action plan which diversifying staff will be considered. Meetings with other Support Groups to be set up.	Oct-Dec 2020 for initial meetings; action is long term.
4.2.3	The Review Panel **recommends** that Student	The Pre-arrival and Induction team will begin revising pre-arrival information in spring 2020 for September 2020 entry,	Student Recruitment and Admissions (SRA) has started to revise the material being given out to students.	2020-21

	Recruitment and Admissions consult with the Students' Association and the student BME Liberation Campaign to explore how the pre-arrival information can be enhanced to better meet the needs of BME students.	and will consult with students at this point. The initial focus will be on developing existing interactive maps of local shops, services and facilities to ensure they are more comprehensive and inclusive.	Shelagh Green leading on Adaptation and Renewal Team (ART) work around EDI training for students.	
4.2.4	The Review Panel **recommends** that the Sense of Belonging strand of the Student Experience Action Plan consult with the Students' Association and the student BME Liberation Campaign to agree how best to target funding for BME groups, societies and networks.	See response for 4.1.1	Sense of Belonging strand of the Student Experience Action Plan will take this forward.	2020-21
4.3.1	The Review Team **recommends** that the Service Excellence Programme ensure that a systematic staff training programme is an integral part of the final recommendations of the current Personal Tutor and Student Support Team Review.	In the evolved model of student support, we will be creating school/deanery based teams of professional Advisors who will support cohorts of students throughout their time at the university. As part of the change programme, we will be developing a robust recruitment, induction and training programme to ensure they are well equipped and skilled to support our diverse student populations. We will be working with the Student Wellbeing	Conversations are happening with those leading on the Student Support Team review. The work by the team has been paused due to the pandemic.	2020-21

		function to identify key skills and training resources specific to supporting students' wellbeing, and with a number of other functions across the university to identify key skills and resources needed for other aspects of the advisor role, and all other roles associated with the evolved model of student support, notably Academic Cohort Leads and Peer Senior School Leaders. A key evaluation criteria of the evolved model is that the new structure will 'appropriately recognise and develop individuals' ensuring colleagues in student-facing roles are well supported, trained and rewarded in their roles.		
4.3.2	The Review Panel **recommends** that the Student Counselling Service use positive action to diversify its staffing.	In the last two periods of recruitment, August 2019 and December 2019, advertisements for counsellor post vacancies have been circulated on the Black, African and Asian Therapy network (the largest community of Counsellors and Psychotherapists of Black, African, Asian and Caribbean Heritage in the UK). We will continue to advertise all vacancies through this network. The vacancies that have arisen have largely been for counsellors to work in the evening on a sessional basis (c. 6-8 hours per week).	This is one of 5 priority areas identified in the circular sent to all staff outlining the University's initial action areas for race equality on 21st July 2020. We expect the Counselling Service to have in place mechanisms to better meet the needs of a multicultural and multilingual student community by the end of Semester 1 of 2020/21.	January 2021

4.3.2	The Review Panel **recommends** that the Student Counselling Service should ensure that it has a Service Level Agreement is in place with any organisation that it uses to support University of Edinburgh students.	The service does not use any external organisation to support University of Edinburgh students. The service signposts students to external organisations, including the NHS, who are open to and serve members of the local community including students. These include organisations that work with particular population groups within Edinburgh (e.g. BME women, or members of the LGBTQ community) or who work with particular issues (e.g. bereavement, self-harm, drug use) or users resident in particular areas of the city. Organisations will work with students who meet their client population irrespective of whether they are students or not. SCS have collated a significant list of twenty-five local and national agencies and organisations, both general and specialist, all of which information is already publically available, and it would constitute a significant additional administrative workload to negotiate SLAs with each. The service does not subcontract work to other agencies so there is no need for an SLA.	As above	January 2021
4.3.2	The Review Panel **recommends** that the Student Counselling Service conduct a	SCS was represented at the Westminster Higher Education Forum policy conference: Priorities for tackling racial	Delayed due to the Covid-19 pandemic.	2020-21

	benchmarking of approaches to supporting BME students across the UK. The findings of this exercise must be implemented at a level above the benchmarked basic level of provision.	harassment and improving the BAME experience in Higher Education. SCS are undertaking a benchmarking exercise through the Heads of University Counselling Service network (part of BACP) and the Association of Managers of Student Services in Higher Education network.		
4.4.1	The Review Panel **recommends** that the proposed Curriculum Review enables BME students to be involved in diversifying content, including the co-design of curricula and assessments. Academic staff must collaborate with BME students to understand their experiences in the design, implementation and evaluation of their access, progression, and employability activities.	The Thematic Review recommendation will be considered as part of the ongoing consultation phase of the Curriculum Review.	There is an action point in the University circular mentioned above that we will be looking for each School to begin discussions about Decolonising the Curriculum in their various subject areas. The Vice Principal Students has also agreed to be a champion for equalities issues (including race equality) as part of the lead person in charge of the Curriculum Review.	Dec 2020
4.4.2	The Review Panel **recommends** that the University address the attainment/awarding gap. The	See response for 4.1.1	This work is being taken forward with a PTAS grant by Dr Mohini Gray and will last for 13 months- reporting by Semester 1 2021/22.	Semester 1 2021/22

	action plan should include targets to reduce the attainment gap.			
4.4.2	The Review Panel **recommends** that Senate Quality Assurance Committee implement systematic monitoring of retention, progression and degree outcome data for BME students and, if appropriate, recommend interventions where there are clear and consistent patterns of divergence between BME students and white students.	SQAC considered a proposal for systematic monitoring of retention, progression, and attainment data at the meeting held on Thursday 27 February 2020. The Committee agreed that the approach to monitoring Degree Classification Outcome data could be expanded to encompass retention and progression data. In April each year the Committee receives an annual report on degree classification outcomes of successfully exiting undergraduates, including sector trends in undergraduate degree classification outcomes. Any subject areas considered to have diverged substantially from either the University average or comparators in their discipline are then asked to specifically reflect on the issue, and any proposed remediation, in their School Annual Quality Report. The Committee then continues to monitor progress via these two annual reporting processes until the issue is considered to have been resolved. This approach ensures systematic University oversight	SQAC has identified this as one of its priorities for the academic year 2020-21.	2020-21

| | | whilst also encouraging Schools to engage with the specific data on attainment, reflect on the issues and context, and then seek local solutions.

The Committee agreed that this approach should be expanded to include data on retention and progression as well as attainment. It was also agreed that timescales should be reviewed to determine if the data could be considered earlier in the academic year.

The Committee agreed that the first step would be to determine the data set and the methodological approach. The Head of Student Data and Surveys (Student Systems) and the Dean of Quality Assurance and Curriculum Approval (CAHSS) have been tasked to examine data set and methodological options for monitoring retention, progression, and attainment. | | |

<u>The University of Edinburgh</u>
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

9 September 2020

Thematic Review 2017-18:
Mature Students and Student Parents and Carers

Report on Recommendations/Remitted Actions

Description of paper:
1. The progress update on the implementation of the recommendations of the Thematic Review 2017-18: Mature Students and Student Parents and Carers

Action requested / recommendation:
2. For discussion.

Background and context:
3. The final report and recommendations of the 2017-18 Thematic Review of support for Mature Students and Student Parents and Carers were approved at the meeting of the Committee held on 20 September 2018.

4. The Committee considered an update on progress to implement the recommendations from the review at the meeting held on 18 September 2019. The Committee was content with progress and agreed to receive an annual report until all actions had been completed.

Discussion:
5. Committee is asked to consider the responses and determine if sufficient progress has been made to implement the recommendations.

Resource implications:
6. Resource implications were considered as part of the review.

Risk management:
7. Risks were considered as part of the review.

Equality & diversity:
8. Equality and diversity was an integral part of the review.

Communication, implementation and evaluation of the impact of any action:
9. Committee Secretary will feedback comments to relevant areas.

Author	**Presenter**
Brian Connolly, Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services	**Brian Connolly,** Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services

Freedom of Information: Open

<u>The University of Edinburgh</u>
Senate Quality Assurance Committee

**Thematic Review 2017-18:
Mature Students and Student Parents and Carers**

Report on outstanding Recommendations/Remitted Actions

Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC), at the meeting held on Thursday 20 September 2018, approved the final report of the Thematic Review of Support for Mature Students and Student Parents and Carers. The recommendations of the review were then remitted to the individuals and areas identified in the report, which in most instances involved further consultative and developmental work during the 2018-19 academic session.

SQAC is required to oversee progress on the implementation of the report recommendations, via an initial 14 week report and then subsequent annual reports, until all outstanding actions have been resolved. In September 2019 SQAC considered year-on responses from the individuals and areas with remitted actions updating the Committee on progress and identifying possible barriers to completion (these have been included below).

The individuals and areas with outstanding actions have been asked to provide a further response to each action, noting expected timescales for completion and highlighting potential barriers to progress. The following responses were received:

Recommendation	Timescale for completion	Year-on Update	Current Update
The review panel **recommends** that the **Director of Student Wellbeing** and **Senate Curriculum and Student Progression Committee** develop and implement a Student Parent and Student Carer Policy setting clear expectations for when the institution and the individual need to take action.	December 2020	Initial draft has been completed through 'Edinburgh Cares' group, this now needs to be completed. Collaboration with colleagues from Academic Services is taking place.	Further discussions with Edinburgh Cares and Academic Services, agreed that policy on this may not be needed. Plan is to have a clear statement of intent on our web-pages regarding how we support student parents and student carers, articulating the types of support which we can put in place. We will then monitor and analyse ESC applications through 20/21, and if there are

			themes and support requests which are not covered through existing policies, then we will identify how best we can fill these gaps.
The review panel **recommends** that the **Director of Student Wellbeing** develop and implement a systematic and sensitive disclosure process for student parents and carers with follow-up assessment of needs and appropriate support, advice and guidance. This system must be underpinned by a programme of training for academic and professional service staff supporting it, with particular in-depth training for those assessing the needs and recommending support mechanisms.	April 2020	This is now completed. Edinburgh Cares group took this forward with colleagues from Student Systems and Administration. Training programme has been organised for academic and professional services staff.	The annual registration process captures if students have dependants and if they are a carer. We collect data once students have matriculated and from this year we will be following up with those students and offering them support and advice. We do also offer this advice and guidance for students pre entry. We have worked with external organisations to deliver training to staff, and this will be ongoing.
The review panel **recommends** that **Senate Curriculum and Student Progression Committee** and the **Director of Student Wellbeing** consider developing a system of adjustments (covering issues such as extensions and examination arrangements) that are consistent with, but not the same as, those for disabled students.	Dec 2020	This will be integrated into the work within the first recommendation above.	See information in first row above.
The review panel **recommends** that the **Director of Student Wellbeing** and **Student Systems** develop central, user-friendly webpage portals for mature students, student parents, and student carers. These pages	Nov 2019	Web-content for students within these groups has been refreshed within the work of Edinburgh Cares project. Will require ongoing monitoring and updating within Edinburgh Cares work.	**Completed**

must provide clear and supportive information on support, representation and facilities including application details and profiles, quotes, videos or case studies, wider local community information (e.g. childcare, finance etc.).			
The review panel **recommends** that the **Vice-Principal People and Culture** and **Director of Student Wellbeing** conduct a strategic review of childcare provision, from the provision of child friendly spaces and crèche facilities to nurseries and childcare bursaries. The review must include benchmarking with peer institutions and consultation with students and staff in order to understand fully the needs of students and staff and to provide an evidence base for strategic decision making regarding the allocation of resources.	August 2020	Significant piece of work. VP People and Culture has now left the organisation. Director of Student Wellbeing will pick up this piece of work with VP Students.	This is being considered through University Court and the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) Committee.
The review panel **recommends** that the **Director of Student Wellbeing** explore the need to support the development of online or in-person social networks for mature students and student parents and carers, recognising the lack of time they have to establish these on their own.	Dec 2019	Collaboration with incoming student reps required (through Edinburgh Cares) to ensure that existing networks are working, and to identify any gaps.	**Completed.** Links with student reps established, and ongoing. Student reps change each year- work with new reps starting in Oct 2020.

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

9 September 2020

Monitoring Retention, Progression, and Attainment Data

Description of paper:

1. This paper notes the Committee's decision to implement a new system to monitor student retention, progression, and attainment data and invites the Committee to consider the next steps required to achieve this outcome.

Action requested / recommendation:

2. For discussion.

Background and context:

3. At the meeting held on 27 February 2020 the Committee agreed to implement a new system for monitoring retention, progression, and attainment data. This decision was made in response to recommendations from the 2017-18 and 2018-19 Thematic Reviews.

4. Specifically, the aim of the new system would be to understand how well the University supports different groups throughout the student life-cycle: the likelihood of different student groups continuing or withdrawing from study at the University; the extent to which the University enables different student groups to fulfil their potential during their time at Edinburgh; and how successful the University is at supporting different student groups transition within their programme of study and afterwards to employment or further study.

5. The Committee agreed that the current approach to monitoring Degree Classification Outcome data will be expanded to encompass retention and progression data. There will be an annual meeting dedicated to considering the data, including sector trends, for a range of different student groups such as Black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) students, mature students, and student parents and carers. Any subject area considered to have diverged substantially from either the University average or comparators in their discipline will then asked to specifically reflect on the issue, and any proposed remediation, in their School Annual Quality Report. The Committee will then continue to monitor progress via these two annual reporting processes until the issue is considered to have been resolved.

6. This approach will allow the University a degree of central oversight whilst also encouraging Schools to engage with the data, reflect on the issues, and seek local solutions. It will be important to understand this data in terms of the 'distance travelled' by different groups to provide a greater understanding of the 'value added' by the University and the extent to which the needs of different student groups have been supported by the University.

7. The Committee agreed that the first step will be to determine the data set and methodology. The Head of Student Data and Surveys (Student Systems) and the Dean of Quality Assurance and Curriculum Approval (CAHSS) have been tasked to examine data set and methodological options for monitoring student retention, progression, and attainment.

Discussion:
8. Discuss and agree a work plan, milestones and timescales for the academic year 2020-21.

Resource implications:
9. Additional statistical analysis resources may be required to systematically monitor retention, progression, and attainment data. These will need to be costed depending on the methodological approach agreed by the Committee.

Risk management:
10. Poor performance in retention, progression, and attainment metrics is a risk to the University's reputation, increasing as these measures gain more publicity. As these measures gain more profile, it will be an increasing risk to the University's reputation if we do not develop a better understanding of which groups of students are at higher risk of withdrawing or under-achieving and of any underlying reasons.

Equality & diversity:
11. Equality and diversity issues are integral to the development of a new system.

Communication, implementation and evaluation of the impact of any action agreed:
12. Committee Secretary will feedback comments to relevant areas.

Author
Brian Connolly, Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services

Presenter
Brian Connolly, Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services

September 2020

Freedom of Information: Open

<u>The University of Edinburgh</u>
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

9 September 2020

Committee Effectiveness Review: Questionnaire Initial Analysis

Description of paper
1. Following a light-touch Committee Effectiveness Review, initial analysis of the feedback received from Senate Committee members is presented for discussion.

Action requested / recommendation
2. Each of the Senate Committees is invited to consider the narrative and, while recognising the low response rate to the review, to take forward a set of recommendations that will aid continuous improvement of our approach to academic governance in 2020/21.

Background and context
3. The University is required under the 2017 Scottish Code of Good HE Governance to carry out annual internal reviews of Senate and the committees which carry delegated responsibilities. In summer 2020, Academic Services carried out a primarily self-reflective review with input requested from committee members across the themes of Remit, Composition, Support, Engagement and Impact of the committees' work.

Discussion
4. The response rate was extremely low across all three committees (13 replies in total), so there is little to act on, but there are potentially some common themes such as in relation to committee remits, communication and equality, diversity and inclusion.

5. Overall, committees reported that their remit was clear and that they had adapted well to the change in composition and terms of reference introduced in 2019/20. Members also reported that they had a good understanding of their role and that there is an understanding of how the committee's work relates to the bigger picture.

6. There was feedback across all the committees indicating a recognition that consideration of EDI within the committee business and in terms of membership needs to be improved.

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

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

Equality & diversity

9. The findings of the questionnaire demonstrate a recognition of the need to improve diversity of our committees. It is recognised that as a high proportion of committee members are appointed by virtue of their job/role (*ex officio*) the committees can do little to change the diversity of the membership as this depends upon the characteristics of staff recruited to positions across the university. It is suggested in the report that committees actively consider their membership and in particular look to the opportunity for co-option of members and the inclusion of a range of non-committee members in task groups in order to diversify the input to business discussions and decision making. It has been recommended that the committees seek a more active approach from contributors - for example requiring better evidence that EDI has been considered when constructing cover-papers.

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

10. Director of Academic Services will feedback comments to relevant areas.

Author   **Presenter**
Sue MacGregor,   **Sue MacGregor**,
Director of Academic Services   Director of Academic Services
September 2020   September 2020

Freedom of Information
Open

Committee Effectiveness Review:
Questionnaire Initial Analysis

1. Context

1.1. Under the 2017 Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance, universities are expected to carry out an annual internal review of the effectiveness of their academic board (at the University of Edinburgh, the academic board is Senate). Senate Standing Committees operate under delegated authority from Senate. Therefore, during Summer 2020, Academic Services conducted a light-touch review of the Senate Standing Committees (Education Committee, Quality Assurance Committee, Academic Policy & Regulations Committee).

1.2. The review was primarily self-reflective and the input requested from committee members was intended to be proportionate to the current University priorities, particularly taking into account the ongoing University response to the Covid-19 emergency.

1.3. The review process intended to gather information on and evaluate effectiveness in terms of the:
   i.   Composition of the committee
   ii.   Support and facilitation of committee meetings
   iii. Engagement of members and knowledge and understanding of their roles and committee remits
   iv.   Impact and strategic relevance of Senate Committees' work

2. Response rate

2.1. The response rate was extremely low across all three committees (13 replies in total), so there is little to act on, but there are potentially some common themes such as in relation to committee remits, communication and equality, diversity and inclusion.

3. Analysis of comments by Committee

SQAC

- **Committee Remit** – respondents felt the remit was clear and the Committee adapted effectively to challenges and changes to priorities. *"The remit is clear. It often has oversight of the work of others which is appropriate given the nature of the committee role."*
- **Governance and Impact** – the majority of respondents understood how the Committee linked to the wider governance framework and University strategic priorities. However linkages to the University Executive could be better, particularly regarding feedback on recommendations and business passed up

to Exec by SQAC: *"I do not feel that the work of Executive is well connected to SQAC (ie academic related business going via Exec)"*

- **Composition/EDI** – respondents were satisfied that the Committee had the appropriate composition to fulfil its remit but some responders felt that it could be more diverse (in relation to Equality, Diversity and Inclusion) – *"I think the composition isn't suitably representative of the diverse population of the University - and certainly not its aims. If we look at the race"*
- **Role** – most of the respondents felt they had a clear understanding of their role and responsibilities.
- **Communications** – respondents felt that the Committee communicates effectively with stakeholders.
- **Support** – all respondents felt that the Committee was effectively supported by Academic Services.

APRC

- **Committee Remit** – respondents agreed that the remit was clear and that the Committee had adapted to changes well. Agreed that there had been very little in the way of formal APRC task groups recently – *"Would be good to use task groups so that others outside the Committee could have opportunities to be part of the work"*. However, the Committee has been focused on other projects/groups that require feedback from APRC at key stages of their work (for example in relation to special circumstances and coursework extensions).
- **Governance & Impact** - majority agreement that there are clear links between Committee business and the University proprieties and that APRC makes the desired impact. Slight disagreement about effectiveness of the flow of business between College Committees, Senate and other Committees – *" membership allows for a good flow of information to Colleges (and so to Schools/Deaneries)". "Would be helpful to have a visual diagram of how the committee link".* It was noted there are a great deal of papers and it's a lot of reading to ask members to get through – *"Maybe use targeted pre reading".*
- **Composition** – respondents agreed that the size and composition was suitable and that *" meetings work well and members are not afraid to discuss difficult issues"*. It was recognised that this is a Committee *" where quite wide representation is important, professional staff and academics".*
- **EDI** –agreed that this could be improved – *"More emphasis should be placed on EDI to embed it into the decision making and discussion".*
- PGR – agree that further thought needs to be given to APRC's role in relation to PGR governance. Members have noted that we also need to better articulate where the Doctoral College will sit within this when it comes to policy and regulations relating to PGR students.
- **Role** – there was majority agreement that members had clear understanding of their role and responsibilities with an appreciation of strong member engagement in the Committee.
- **Communications** – respondents agreed that the Committee communicates effectively with stakeholders and members had clear understanding of their role in cascading information - *"the Senate Committees newsletter has been*

a big help." "Sometimes there is not enough time between getting the papers and the meeting to undertake consultation".

- **Support -** all respondents felt that the Committee was effectively supported by Academic Services.

SEC

- **Committee Remit** – respondents felt the remit was clear and the Committee adapted effectively to challenges and changes to priorities. However, some improvements were suggested - *"there needs to be better strategic use of task/workgroups". " We need to explore further how better to join up Student Experience with Senate Committee activity".*
- **Governance and Impact** – all respondents understood how the Committee linked to the wider governance framework and University strategic priorities, including the links between Senate and the Committees. However, some respondents felt that communication to the wider community could be improved e.g. *"…decisions made in Senate Committees [may not] reach everyone and always lead to changes in practice in all Schools."* There was concern that making an impact could be a struggle - *"In the current crisis where the lines of governance have been somewhat undermined."* Specifically in relation to oversight of PGR (as a result of the disbanding of REC) there was a sense that the SEC should strengthen its consideration of PGR matters within the cycle of business and should ensure clarity of the relationship between the Doctoral College and academic governance.
- **Composition** – respondents were satisfied that the Committee had the appropriate composition *"It has been really helpful to include Heads of School…"* although *"Committees are rather large which makes them less agile."*
- **EDI** – The majority of respondents agreed that the Committee adequately addresses EDI considerations when discussing its business. However, all respondents disagreed that the composition of the SEC is suitably representative – *"OK on gender but no BAME representation". "Cover papers rarely genuinely address EDI and evidence deep and change orientated thinking".*
- **Role** – Respondents felt they had a clear understanding of their role and responsibilities and that members engaged fully in Committee business.
- **Communications** – Most respondents felt that the Committee communicates effectively with stakeholders and all said that they had a clear understanding of their role as a representative of their College or Group. However some did not have a clear understanding of their role in cascading information from the Committee – *"I do not believe that Committee members should be expected to deliver decisions and actions unaided".*
- **Support** – all respondents felt that the Committee was effectively supported by Academic Services.

4. **Committees and Coronavirus Covid-19**

4.1. Academic Services has reviewed Senate Standing Committees' Covid-19 preparedness for 2020/21, in the context of ongoing developments in the governance and management of learning and teaching and the student experience as part of the University's management of the impact of the Covid-19 emergency.

4.2. Each of the Committees has played a role during 2019/20 in the response to Covid-19 in particular:
   i.   APRC has provided the necessary oversight for concession arrangements and academic guidance and moved its business to online meetings which will continue for the foreseeable future.
   ii. SQAC has done significant work, supported prominently by the team in Academic Services, to ensure that the approach to scheduling and conducting IPRs and other QA processes are streamlined, taken online and that colleagues and externals can carry out their roles safely and effectively either remotely or on campus in 2020/21. Preparation for ELIR has been re-organised to ensure we meet the revised QAA schedule for review in 2021.
   iii. SEC convened additional meetings to ensure it could cover items of business relating to assessment, timetabling & the teaching week and hybrid learning & teaching. The Committee is well prepared to conduct its business flexibly and online during the new academic year.

4.3. There are cross-overs in the membership and interests of SEC and the ART working groups. It is suggested that SEC strengthens its role in governance of learning & teaching matters in relation to the ART programme and hybrid learning and teaching is fully implemented in the new academic year.

5. **Suggested Actions in light of responses (combined)**

5.1. Because of the low number of respondents, a combined analysis of the answers to the review questions suggests the following recommended actions:

Area Under Review	Recommended Action	Responsible	Date
Remit	1. Committees to discuss the relevance of task groups for areas of business in particular to enable wider participation and representation which could be beneficial to the Committee in its decision making. 2. SEC to consider how to include relevant matters relating to student experience into the cycle of business (while recognising how student experience is handled by Executive). 3. SEC to consider how to strengthen governance of hybrid L&T and curriculum matters in 2020/21 where these are initiated via the ART programme. 4. SEC to consider its coverage of PGR matters and continue to monitor the development of the Doctoral College and its role (if any) in PGR governance.	Academic Services and Senate Standing Committee Conveners SEC Convener SEC Convener SEC Convener	
Composition	5. Committees to consider their membership actively in the course of each year in order to ensure it remains relevant (e.g co-opted members).	Academic Services	
Governance & Impact	6. Paperwork – Committees to consider whether it may be possible to allocate readers for some of the more peripheral items. 7. Presentation of papers - Committees to invite those who submit papers to present them if they are not a member. This seems to happen in some cases but not in others. This would ensure a more helpful discussion and better understanding for those who are putting the proposal forward for approval and understand the issues raised when a paper is not approved.	Academic Services Academic Services	
EDI	8. More emphasis across all Committees on EDI as an integral consideration to all business and decision making. 9. Committees to request that contributors ensure that cover papers portray more evidence of EDI considerations.	Senate Standing Committee Conveners Academic Services	
Role	10. Conveners and Secretaries to introduce continually improved inductions for members.	Academic Services and Senate Standing	

	11. Re-set the expectations for the role of members in the cascading of information to constituencies in respect of each Committee's remit and decision making, with specific reference to the requirement for information to be reported to and from relevant College committees.	Committee Conveners	
Communications	12. Academic Services to work with Committees to build on the success of the Committee Newsletter and to support increase in effective cascading of information to stakeholders.	Academic Services	

Personal Tutor System Oversight Group

Description of paper

1. This paper proposes that the Personal Tutor (PT) System Oversight Group has now reached the end of its effective lifespan and that responsibility for oversight of the PT system be focused on School Annual Quality Reports and the Adaptation and Renewal team responsible for the transition to hybrid learning, teaching and support.

2. The paper also notes that this approach seems to be implicit in the new Guiding Principles for PTs and Student Support Staff which references the School Annual Quality Report process in its Monitoring and Improvement section.

Action requested / recommendation

3. The Committee is invited to discuss the issues and agree on an approach to overseeing the PT system for the academic year 2020-21.

Background and context

4. The PT System Oversight Group was established in 2015 and tasked by Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC) with the responsibility for quality assurance (QA) oversight of the PT system during the transition from the conclusion of the implementation of PT system (i.e. the end of Enhancing Student Support (ESS) project) to full mainstreaming within the QA processes of each School.

5. The Group is convened by Professor Alan Murray, Assistant Principal Academic Support, and comprises all College Deans of Students and Quality, the Students' Association Vice President (VP) Education, and Academic Services representatives. The Group has met twice annually: in semester one to consider the most recent student survey results and the implications for individual schools and the PT system as a whole; and semester two approve the School Personal Tutoring Statements.

6. The primary responsibility of the Group has been to ensure that each School remains aligned to the University's commitment to a quality student experience across the PT system, as enshrined in the School Personal Tutoring Statement (SPTS). However, Schools were not required to update their SPTS this year due to the Covid-19 pandemic and the adoption of a new set of Guiding Principles for PTs and Student Support Staff produced by the Adaptation and Renewal team responsible for the transition to hybrid learning, teaching and support. Furthermore, with the anticipated changes to student support, as part of the Personal Tutor and Student Support Review, it is unlikely that the Group will be required to meet again to approve SPTS.

7. The Group has also continued to monitor the relative performance of schools by considering key statistical and free text data drawn from student surveys, such as the National Student Survey (NSS) and the Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES), and School and College Annual Quality Reports. However, the Group has consistently drawn attention to the limitations of the PT performance data currently available for this task. It has been the opinion of the Group that more robust and granular internal benchmark data are required if meaningful conclusions are to be drawn and/or judgements made in regard to the relative performance of both Schools and individual PTs.

8. Since September 2018 the Group has developed a role in the annual quality reporting process whereby it considers PT related trends in student surveys and then feeds comments to the September meeting of the SQAC Sub Group considering the School annual quality reports. This enables the latter group to make judgments and recommendations to Schools informed by the PT System Oversight Group's considerations which in turn allows SQAC to monitor the PT system within mainstream School QA processes. However, given the Covid-19 driven changes to the annual monitoring process and the fact that there is no PT question in the NSS or PTES this year it would be difficult for the Group to discern valid trends or make meaningful judgements in regard to the relative performance of Schools.

9. The new Guiding Principles for PTs and Student Support Staff references the School Annual Quality Report process as the oversight mechanism for a new School based approach to QA for the PT system. The Monitoring and Improvement section of the new Guiding Principles notes the following:

10. **All Schools and Deaneries must define a mechanism that ensures that that the advice and assistance that students receive from their support teams and Personal Tutors is of high quality and responsive. The results, in the form of feedback and reflections on the support provided should be included in the School's Annual Quality Report. The mechanism for monitoring and improvement must be made public and made clear to both students and the Assistant Principal for Quality Assurance.**

11. This will have implications for the way the School Annual Quality Report process is managed, with specific guidance required for reporting on each Schools' PT system.

Discussion

12. The PT System Oversight Group has held no meetings since the summer of 2019 and, given the issues noted above, it is unlikely to meet again this academic year. Therefore it is proposed that the PT System Oversight Group has now reached the end of its useful and effective lifespan. In the context of the ongoing pandemic and the Personal Tutor and Student Support Review it would be timely for the Group to step aside and clear the way for the Adaptation and Renewal team, led by Professor Alan Murray and Ros Claase (Senior Service Excellence Partner), to oversee the transition to hybrid learning and teaching and ultimately the proposed transition to a new system of student support.

Resource implications

13. Minimising any duplication of administrative requirements during the current Covid-19 pandemic will help the University to focus resources on the student experience.

Risk management

14. Enabling a smooth transition between the PT system and the proposed new system of student support will be vital to ensuring the quality of the student experience at the University.

Equality & diversity

15. There are no specific equality and diversity issues related to this proposal.

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

16. Academic Services will inform relevant areas.

Author   **Presenter**
Brian Connolly   **Brian Connolly**
Academic Services   Academic Services

Freedom of Information
Open

Senate Quality Assurance Committee

9 September 2020

UK Quality Code for Higher Education Advice and Guidance Mapping

Description of paper
1. Mapping of the University's policies and practices to the advice and guidance that underpins the UK Quality Code for Higher Education.

Action requested / recommendation
2. To approve the mapping.

Background and context
3. The UK Quality Code for Higher Education (the Code) sets out fundamental principles that should apply to higher education quality across the UK. It was significantly redeveloped in 2018 with the aims of: making it applicable across all four UK nations; reducing length and improving accessibility to a wide variety of stakeholders; and placing a greater emphasis on student outcomes and engagement.

4. The current Code comprises (for both standards and quality) mandatory expectations and core practices and, mandatory for Scotland, common practices. 12 "themes" of non-mandatory advice and guidance underpin the mandatory elements of the Code. The Code also has supporting reference documents such as subject benchmark statements and the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework.

5. Although the advice and guidance is non-mandatory, QAA Scotland expect institutions to map down to the level of guiding principles in order to demonstrate that they are meeting the mandatory expectations and practices of the Code.

6. The Advance Information Set for the University's next Enhancement-led Institutional Review will contain a mapping of the institution's policies and practices to the redeveloped Code.

7. In May 2019, Senate Learning and Teaching Committee agreed to the following approach for mapping to the advice and guidance[1]:

   - Academic Services will work with policy and practice owners to undertake, during Semester 1 2019/20, an initial mapping (using the mandatory elements of the Code and mapping down to the level of the guiding principles of the advice and guidance) with the aim of identifying any gaps. Due to the breadth of the mandatory elements of the Code and the guiding principles, it is not anticipated that any major gaps will be identified. However, if there are any

---

[1] https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/20190522combinedagendapapers.pdf (Paper E)

gaps identified, the relevant policy and/or practice will be reviewed promptly, and before the deadline for the submission of documentation for ELIR.

- Providing there are no gaps identified, thereafter, each policy and/or practice will be reviewed within its planned timescale. During these reviews, opportunities should be sought for making efficiencies whilst still ensuring the effectiveness of the policy and/or practice and that all requirements of the Code, including the guiding principles of the relevant advice and guidance theme(s), are met.
- A comprehensive mapping of the University's policies and practices to the current Code will be completed in time for the submission of the Advanced Information Set in summer 2020[2].

8. Mappings have been completed for the following advice and guidance themes:

- Admissions, recruitment and widening access
- Assessment
- Concerns, complaints and appeals
- Course design and development
- Enabling student achievement
- External expertise
- Learning and teaching
- Monitoring and evaluation
- Research degrees
- Student engagement
- Work-based learning

Discussion

9. A completed mapping is presented for approval for the final advice and guidance theme:

- Partnerships

Resource implications

10. There were resource implications for Academic Services and policy and practice owners in undertaking the mapping exercise. There may be additional resource implications as a result of reviewing policies and practices against the guiding principles of the advice and guidance, however, the recommended approach aims to minimise these.

Risk management

11. The University's policies and practices must align with the Code.

Equality & diversity

12. Equality and diversity implications would be considered as part of any review of policies and/or practices.

---

[2] New deadline: December 2020

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

13. Approved mappings are made available on the Academic Services' website https://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/quality/quality-code

Author
Nichola Kett, Academic Services
2 September 2020

Presenter
Nichola Kett, Academic Services

Freedom of Information

14. Open

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH – MAPPING TO THE UK QUALITY CODE ADVICE AND GUIDANCE
Theme – Partnerships

Expectations for standards
- The academic standards of courses meet the requirements of the relevant national qualifications framework.
- The value of qualifications awarded to students at the point of qualification and over time is in line with sector-recognised standards.

Expectations for quality
- Courses are well-designed, provide a high-quality academic experience for all students and enable a student's achievement to be reliably assessed.
- From admission through to completion, all students are provided with the support that they need to succeed in and benefit from higher education.

Core practices for standards
Where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the standards of its awards are credible and secure irrespective of where or how courses are delivered or who delivers them.

Core practices for quality
Where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the academic experience is high-quality irrespective of where or how courses are delivered and who delivers them.

Common practices for standards

Common practices for quality

https://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/quality-code/advice-and-guidance/partnerships

The guiding principles given here are not mandatory for any provider. They are a concise expression of the fundamental practices of the higher education sector, based on the experience of a wide range of providers. They are intended as a framework for providers to consider when establishing new or looking at existing higher education provision. They are not exhaustive and there will be other ways for providers to meet their requirements.

Guiding Principle	Mapping to the University's policies and/or practices	Additional notes
1. The awarding organisation will be accountable for assuring the overall quality and academic standards of the provision, regardless of the type of partnership.	Accountability is maintained via policies covering the range of partnership activity conducted by the University. These policies ensure that all partnership activity is managed through robust processes that define the responsibilities of the University in relation to collaborative activity. All courses and programmes, including collaborative programmes, must be approved under the approval process stated in the Programme and Course Approval and Management Policy: this Policy covers all credit bearing provision, non-credit bearing online courses for external release, and non-credit bearing continuing professional development courses, including postgraduate research as well as taught courses and programmes, and online learning as well as on-campus provision. This policy sets out the levels of approval (School, College, or Senate) required for different proposals.	Reflective analysis 5.1.2 refers to guiding principles for partnerships, and these are scheduled to be published on the Edinburgh Global website by late August / early September.

	This policy notes that in addition to following the normal development and approval processes for for-credit courses and programmes, all for-credit courses and programmes that involve collaboration with another institution require additional development and approval stages. Any collaborations that are non-standard, novel or higher risk require approval by the Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee, following approval from the relevant College committee. Particularly large or novel collaborations may also require approval from the Senatus Academicus, and the University Court. These additional stages are described in section 2. All courses and programmes, including collaborative provision, fall within the remit of the University's annual and periodic quality assurance processes: more information is provided in section 4.	
2. The awarding organisation will have in place appropriate governance to authorise and oversee the development and closure of partnership arrangements and to monitor their effective operation.	Policy and guidance is in place to ensure appropriate governance and authorisation of the range of partnership activity conducted by the University. These policies and guidance specify responsibilities for oversight of development, monitoring and closure of partnerships. **Governance and authorisation** The schedule of Delegated Authority for student and academic collaborations and collaborations (Delegated Authority Schedule, sections 9 and 11) sets out the authority required to approve partnership arrangements. Specific types of collaborative activity have different development and approval routes: these are summarised in the Taxonomy of collaborative arrangements on the Academic Collaborations Wiki. The Approval Processes for Collaborative Taught Programmes and Approval process for joint PhD Programmes (located on the Academic Collaborations Wiki) set out the approval processes for these partnerships, and these processes also	There is some overlap between the guidance provided by GaSP (website and wiki) and Edinburgh Global (Partnerships website and Global Partnerships Guidance). These are not in conflict but may be seen as confusing for staff and this is an area for development. The Global Partnerships team (Edinburgh Global), GaSP and Academic Services are actively discussing how this could be improved.

apply to Articulation Agreements. The Academic Collaborations Wiki also provides a suite of template Memorandum of Agreements for these partnerships.

Dual, double or multiple awards are managed under the Dual, Double and Multiple Awards Policy. These are considered exceptional arrangements by the University, and there is no specific template for these partnerships, however a signed Memorandum of Agreement is required.

Centres for Doctoral Training and equivalent postgraduate research groupings require approval under the Programme and Course Approval and Management Policy. Because these are often bespoke arrangements associated with collaborative bids for external funding, there is no specific template for these partnerships, however a signed Memorandum of Agreement is required.

Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) are delivered in collaboration with EdX, Coursera and FutureLearn. Proposals are approved by the MOOC Strategy Board and the process is outlined on the Online Learning website. One MicroMasters is currently delivered in collaboration with EdX. Courses associated with this are subject to the Programme and Course Approval and Management Policy. The MicroMasters itself is not a University of Edinburgh award, but students are awarded credit by the University of Edinburgh if they successfully complete the final credit-bearing course.

Guidance on Schools' responsibilities for the development, approval and monitoring of student exchanges is provided by the Study and Work Away team (Setting up and Managing Exchange Partners).

Collaborative activity with Associated Institutes is managed under the Associated Institutions Policy.

University of Edinburgh currently accredits provision by one external provider: Scotland's Rural College (SRUC). The arrangement is overseen by a University-level accreditation committee which reports annually to the Senate Quality Assurance Committee.

University of Edinburgh provides third party credit rating to a very limited number of organisations, and this is managed under the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework Third Party Credit Rating Policy.

Support for development
Development of partnerships is managed through the policies referenced above, and supported by guidance documents and networks as outlined below.

Academic staff seeking to develop an academic collaboration can seek advice and guidance from a number of sources.

The Virtual Collaborations Group is a group of key University contacts who can provide advice and guidance on specific collaborative projects. Information about this group is on the Academic Collaborations Wiki. This wiki also provides guidance on developing new collaborations, and developing and authorising a detailed Memorandum of Agreement.

The International Ventures Group provides oversight and guidance on complex international collaborations and ventures. Information on this group can be found on the Edinburgh Global website:
https://global.ed.ac.uk/partnerships-contacts

Guidance is also provided on the Edinburgh Global website under 'Partnerships'. This guidance relates to a wide range of partnership activity including partnerships related to academic courses and programmes.

| | The Study and Work Away (SWAY) team provide a [staff toolkit](#) for staff considering establishing student exchange agreements, which provides information about due diligence and the appropriate approval processes for new student exchange agreements.

Guidance and support can also be provided to Schools by relevant staff in College Offices, and College Deans whose remit includes international collaborations.

Closure
The template Memorandums of Agreement on the [Academic Collaborations wiki](#) include standard clauses on the term, review and termination of collaborative agreements.

The [Programme and Course Approval and Management Policy](#) sets out Schools' responsibilities to students and to collaborative partners in the event of a programme being closed.

Monitoring
Arrangements for quality assurance monitoring are described in section 4 below.

Arrangements for monitoring and evaluation are described in section 7 below. | |
| 3. Due diligence enquiries are completed and legally binding written agreements are signed prior to the commencement of student registration - due diligence enquiries are refreshed periodically and | Information on the Academic Collaborations Wiki ([Approval Processes for Collaborative Taught Programmes](#) and [Approval Processes for joint PhD Programmes](#)) makes clear the requirement for all academic collaborations to go through academic due diligence before collaborative proposals can be approved.

This guidance also sets clear expectations that a binding memorandum of agreement is a requirement prior to commencement of any collaborative provision. A suite of Memorandum of Agreement templates is provided to staff: [Academic Collaborations wiki](#). | The template Memoranda of Agreement for taught and postgraduate research provision include provisions for review and renewal of agreements. The requirement to refresh due diligence enquiries at that point is not currently explicit in the templates or guidance, but now that this has been identified as a result of this mapping process this will be addressed by GaSP and Academic Services, in discussion with the Global Partnerships team. |

before agreements are renewed.	The International Ventures Group and Global Partnerships Team within Edinburgh Global provide support in due diligence checks for complex international partnerships. All academic collaborations are checked to ensure that all steps, including due diligence, have been adhered to prior to an agreement being passed forward for University signature: this check is carried out by Governance and Strategic Planning. Requirements for due diligence, memoranda of agreement, monitoring and renewal of Associated Institution status is set out in the Associated Institutions Policy. Requirements for due diligence, memoranda of agreement, monitoring and renewal of Third Party Credit Ratings is set out in the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework Third Party Credit Rating Policy. Further information on responsibilities for monitoring partnerships is provided in section 7.	
4. Provision delivered through partnership arrangements will be subject to quality procedures that are at least as rigorous, secure and open to scrutiny as those used for the provision delivered by the awarding organisation.	Memorandum of Agreement templates on the Academic Collaborations wiki include statements on the requirements for quality assurance. The default position in these template agreements is that collaborative programmes will be subject to the quality assurance regimes of both (or all) parties, and that each party will assist the other in monitoring and reviewing practice in line with these regimes. The School Annual Quality Report Template guidance on scope states that the report covers all taught and research credit-bearing provision including collaborative provision, and non-credit-bearing MOOCs. The University Remit for Internal Periodic Reviews states that the scope of these reviews includes provision delivered in collaboration with others.	

5. Awarding organisations that make arrangements for the delivery of learning opportunities with others, retain the authority and responsibility for awarding certificates and records of study in relation to student achievement	Memorandum of Agreement templates on the Academic Collaborations wiki include statements on responsibility for awarding certificates and maintaining student records. The award of credit and decisions on progression for students on study abroad exchange programmes are managed under the Undergraduate Degree Regulations (27-33) and College Progression Boards for Optional Study Abroad Terms of Reference. Certificates of completion for non-credit bearing courses may be provided by collaborative partners, and student records are held by the collaborative partners (Coursera, EdX and Future Learn). MicroMasters delivered in collaboration with EdX are not University of Edinburgh awards, and certificates confirming the award of a MicroMasters are issued by EdX. The MicroMasters includes one credit-bearing University of Edinburgh course (the final course, entry to which has specific admissions requirements). Students who enrol on this credit-bearing course are enrolled as University of Edinburgh students and records of their achievement are maintained by the University.	
6. All awarding organisations maintain accurate, up-to-date records of all partnership arrangements that are subject to a formal agreement.	Governance and Strategic Planning maintain a repository of academic collaborations. This provides details of arrangements where there is joint provision or where a joint or dual University of Edinburgh award is to be made. This repository is updated on receipt of signed Memorandum of Understanding or Memorandum of Agreement. An electronic record is maintained, including electronic files. Hard copies are also retained in a central area.	Data on collaborative partnerships is also held by Edinburgh Global. Data consolidation is a priority for the Global Partnerships team and they are working with GaSP and Academic Services on moving towards better integration of collaborations data.
7. Awarding organisations monitor and evaluate	Schools' responsibilities to monitor and review collaborative agreements are set out in the guidance on the Academic Collaborations wiki (Approval Processes for	**Monitoring and evaluation by Schools:**

their partnership arrangements to satisfy themselves that the arrangements are achieving their stated outcomes and that academic standards and quality are being maintained.	Collaborative Taught Programmes and Approval Processes for joint PhD Programmes).	Prior to an agreement being renewed, a School is required to assess the impact and the effectiveness of the arrangement, although Central University does not produce specific guidance about how this should be done. Whilst we do not produce specific guidance about how academic collaboration arrangements are evaluated, we are explicit in our academic collaborations guidance that Schools should set a date and process for review (normally no longer than three years), or set an interim review at the request of the collaborating universities.
	Guidance on Schools' responsibilities for the monitoring of student exchanges is provided by the Study and Work Away team (Setting up and Managing Exchange Partners).	
	Requirements for monitoring of Associated Institution status are set out in the Associated Institutions Policy.	
	Requirements for monitoring of Third Party Credit Ratings are set out in the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework Third Party Credit Rating Policy.	Reflecting on the guidance we issue to Schools and Colleges when setting up an academic collaboration, we have identified that within our templates for our arrangements, the need for monitoring, evaluation and impact should be more explicit.
	The School Annual Quality Report Template guidance on scope states that the report covers all taught and research credit-bearing provision including collaborative provision, and non-credit-bearing MOOCs.	
	The University Remit for Internal Periodic Reviews states that the scope of these reviews includes provision delivered in collaboration with others.	We will need to engage in discussions with College representatives to consider what this guidance should look like, what Schools will be required to do, and how and to whom this is reported. This work will be carried out by GaSP and Academic Services.
		Monitoring and evaluation at institutional level: There could be a gap in our institutional (rather than School) monitoring and evaluation. For example, the Associated Institution Policy states that 'The University will also review its collaborative arrangements periodically, at

(16). Course and Programme level Quality Assurance processes clearly include collaborative activity within their scope. The arrangements for strategic review at an institutional level are less clear and are not covered for example by the International Ventures Group (see RA 5.2.9 - 5.2.12).		strategic, operational and academic levels' (16). Course and Programme level Quality Assurance processes clearly include collaborative activity within their scope. The arrangements for strategic review at an institutional level are less clear and are not covered for example by the International Ventures Group (see RA 5.2.9 - 5.2.12).
		Review of the role of IVG and institutional oversight remains a priority for the Global Partnerships team, but there is no specific timeline on this.

<u>The University of Edinburgh</u>
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

9 September 2020

**Terms of Reference,
Senate Committees Members' Guidance,
and Committee Priorities 2020/21**

Description of paper:
1. This paper notes the Committee's Terms of Reference, Senate Committees Members' Guidance and outlines the planned priorities for 2020-21.

Action requested / recommendation:
2. For information.

Background and context:
3. Presented to the Committee annually for information and reference.

Discussion:
4. It is noted that the Committee's priorities for 2020/21 may need to be revisited depending on the progress of the Covid-19 pandemic.

5. The University's Academic Governance arrangements and new plans for the management and direction of the Adaptation and Renewal Programme will need to work in harmony, with all Senate Committees playing a major part.

6. Key areas of activity which will affect the cycles of business of all three Senate Committees will include the evolving approach to Curriculum Reform; response to the ELIR outcomes now expected in Semester 2 and the quality of academic experience for students and learners at all levels.

Resource implications:
7. Resource implications would be considered as part of any proposed actions in relation to the Committee priorities.

Risk management:
8. Risks will be considered as part of any proposed actions in relation to the Committee priorities.

Equality & diversity:
9. Equality and diversity will be integral to the Committee's work.

Communication, implementation and evaluation of the impact of any action agreed:
10. Committee Secretary will feedback comments to relevant areas.

<u>Author</u>   **<u>Presenter</u>**

Brian Connolly, Academic Policy
Officer, Academic Services

September 2020

 Freedom of Information: Open

Terms of Reference and Committee Priorities 2020/21

The **Terms of Reference** can be found at the following link:
http://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/committees/quality-assurance/terms-reference

Senate Committees Members' Guidance can be found at the following link:
https://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/committees

The Committee identified the following **priorities** for 2020/21 which were approved by Senate in May 2020:

Activity
• Continue to contribute to preparations for the University's next Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR) and oversee activities in response to the review.
• Review responses to the coronavirus pandemic gathered via the University's Quality Assurance Framework, gather learning for future developments and share good practice across the institution.
• Review the approach to gathering student feedback across the University from Course Enhancement Questionnaires (CEQs).
• Examine data and methodological options for the systematic monitoring of retention, progression, and attainment data.

<u>The University of Edinburgh</u>
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

9 September 2020

**Annual Report to the Scottish Funding Council on Institution-led Review and
Enhancement Activity 2019/20**

<u>Executive Summary</u>
The paper is the University's annual statement on institution-led review and enhancement
activity to the Scottish Funding Council (SFC).

<u>How does this align with the University / Committee's strategic plans and priorities?</u>
The paper is relevant to the Committee's responsibility for the quality assurance framework.

<u>Action requested</u>
Approval of the contents of the report.

In the context of the Covid-19 pandemic, the Committee is asked to note:

- This year's annual report does not include the outcomes of the annual monitoring,
  review and reporting process as the timescale for reporting has been extended.
- SFC have specifically requested that annual reports include information on the
  impact on the internal periodic review schedule.

<u>How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?</u>
The paper will also be presented to eSenate for noting and comment and to University Court
for consideration and approval. Court will be asked to return a statement of assurance to the
SFC confirming that the University's academic standards and quality of learning provision
continue to meet the requirements set by the Council.

<u>Resource / Risk / Compliance</u>

1. **Resource implications (including staffing)**
   There are no specific resource implications associated with the report.

2. **Risk assessment**
   The provision of a high quality student experience is a high level risk on the University's
   Strategic Risk Register, and is overseen by the Risk Management Committee reporting
   to Audit & Risk Committee and Court. Additionally, failure in effectiveness of the quality
   assurance framework, including aligning review activity with external expectations and
   taking action on findings, constitutes an institutional risk.

3. **Equality and Diversity**
   Quality assurance policies and processes are subject to Equality Impact Assessment.

4. **Freedom of information**
   The paper is open.

<u>Key words</u>
Quality assurance and enhancement, Scottish Funding Council, annual report

<u>Originator of the paper</u>

Professor Tina Harrison (Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance) and Nichola Kett (Academic Policy Manager, Academic Services), 2 September 2020

The University of Edinburgh

Annual Report to the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) on Institution-led Review and Enhancement Activity 2019/20

Summary of the institutional-led review outcomes from the preceding academic year (AY) including main themes, recommendations and/or commendations

The University carries out regular reviews of its subject areas and Schools as one of the main ways in which it assures itself of the quality of its academic provision and the student experience. The reviews are carried out on a six-yearly cycle and take the form of internal periodic reviews (IPRs).

IPRs – 2019/20[1]
- Business and Accounting (undergraduate taught)
- Centre for Open Learning (undergraduate taught)
- Chemistry (postgraduate and undergraduate taught)
- Divinity (undergraduate taught)
- Geography (undergraduate taught)
- Informatics (postgraduate research)
- Literatures, Languages and Cultures (postgraduate taught and research)
- Politics and International Relations (undergraduate taught)
- Social and Political Science (postgraduate research)
- Social Policy (undergraduate taught)

As agreed with the SFC, the IPR of Literatures, Languages and Cultures (postgraduate taught and postgraduate research provision) was postponed from March to October 2019. As an interim measure, a meeting with current postgraduate taught students was held in March 2019 and the review team progressed with some desk-based aspects.

As a result of the Covid-19 pandemic the following IPRs, which were due to take place in semester 2, were postponed and will now take place in 2020/21:
- Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences (postgraduate taught and research)
- Education (postgraduate taught and research)
- Social and Political Science (postgraduate taught)

As detailed in Appendix 1, SFC have granted approval for alterations to the IPR schedule to accommodate the postponed reviews and manage the volume of activity alongside the Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR) which is taking place in February and March 2021. Changes to the schedule for 2021/22 are also being considered and approval will be sought.

---

[1] Reports available at: https://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/quality/monitoringandreview/internal-review/reports

For IPRs rescheduled by one year, all provision will continue to be reviewed through annual monitoring, with School annual reports being considered by Colleges to inform their annual reports and a Sub Group which provides a report to Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SAQC). These existing processes will continue with any issues requiring attention being acted upon in the meantime.

It is planned that IPRs will take place digitally in 2020/21 and supporting guidance[2], informed by benchmarking with other Scottish higher education institutions, has been developed.

SQAC receives an annual report in September each year on areas of good practice and for further development from IPRs and remits actions as necessary[3]. A progress report on actions is then considered by SQAC at an appropriate point. The areas of good practice and for further development from 2019/20 reviews are:

Areas of good practice
- **The dedicated support provided to students by both academic and professional staff, including as part of the Personal Tutor system and during students' transitions.** Examples include:
  - A questionnaire on expectation at induction which is completed by both supervisors and students, results are then exchanged so both groups can see the differences. The School has found this very useful in establishing clear expectations between students and supervisors [Informatics]
  - The outstanding work of the current Director of Undergraduate Teaching for leadership in enhancing the learning and teaching culture across undergraduate provision, the Teaching Manager for effective leadership of the Professional Services team and for establishing a student centred and mutually supportive team ethos. As well as all aspects of the Professional Services team's work – their support of each other, their academic colleagues, and the wider student community. [Divinity]
  - The Personal Tutors and Student Support Team work well together to provide robust student support. The Student Support Office and Student Support Coordinator dedication and commitment to supporting students. [Geography]

- **Commitment to teaching and curriculum development.** Examples include:
  - The sharing of good practice and engaged discussion on teaching through a monthly reading group "Talking about teaching" and the inclusion of "sharing practice" as a standing item at the Geography Degree Programme meetings. [Geography]
  - The Subject Area's commitment to diversifying the curriculum [Social Policy]
  - The commitment to research led teaching. [Politics and International Relations]
  - The collaborative approach taken to enhancing the learning experience of both staff and students, by developing a close working relationship between Learning Technologists and other staff in curriculum development and staff upskilling. [Centre for Open Learning]

- **Developing employability and graduate attributes through involvement of the Careers Service.** Examples include:
  - The work of the Careers Service and Chemistry's Careers Consultant [Chemistry]
  - The tutorials on graduate attributes and career preparations provided by the Subject Area and the Careers Service [Politics and International Relations]

---

[2] https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/ipr-digitalmeetings.pdf
[3] Example from last year https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/sqac-agendapapers-20190918.pdf (Paper E)

- **Supporting and developing staff, including support for tutors and demonstrators, continuing professional development, and roles to support tutors and demonstrators.** Examples include:
  - The vision of the School in appointing the role of PG Tutor coordinator as well as the work and initiative of the PG Tutor Coordinator for fulsomely achieving that vision through the recruitment, training, support and evaluation of the PG Tutoring community. [Divinity]
  - Recent investment in leadership training for Academic and Professional Services staff. Current engagement amongst Academic Staff with the Edinburgh Teaching Award (EdTA) and the International Accreditation Association for Higher Education (AHE) [Business]
  - The dedication to the continuing professional development of staff and initiatives including the planned addition of recognised time for CPD activity (5%) and citizenship (10%) in roles and the workload allocation model [Centre for Open Learning]

- **Community building through initiatives including peer support, societies and social activities.** Examples include:
  - The excellent integration across staff groups, and students feel well connected within their cohorts, across year groups and with academic staff. The 'Social Space', which provides a high quality communal area and is used by all groups within the School, 'Chemunity', which fosters mental health awareness, Academic Families, which connect students across years and 'ChemSoc' all add to the sense of community. [Chemistry]
  - The Social Policy Student Society and its commitment to fostering community [Social Policy]
  - A School Choir established to break down barriers between Subject Areas [School of Social and Political Sciences]

- **Accessibility, Inclusivity and Widening Participation**
  - The School's overall awareness of and approach to issues of equality and diversity and the low differentials seen in the School's degree results when these are broken down by gender and ethnic origin. [Chemistry]
  - The Schools commitment to Widening Participation (WP) by dedicating staff time to having a WP Coordinator in place [Geography]

Areas for further development (identified in multiple reviews)
- **Tutors and demonstrators.** Recommendations covered training (including continuing professional development), allocation of work and remuneration, the creation of roles to provide support, and recruitment processes.
- **Space.** Recommendations related to the impact that pressures on and challenges with the estate are having on the student and staff experience, including on the ability to build community. The lack of space for tutors and demonstrators to carry out marking and meet with students was also noted.
- **Community building.** Recommendations focused on developing and implementing approaches to improve community building. The impact of pressures on and challenges with the estate on efforts to build community was also noted.
- **Curriculum.** Recommendations relating to curriculum development and course provision, and embedding and assessing skills and employability within the core curriculum.
- **Student support.** Recommendations related to the importance of clearly communicating support available to students and also encouraged the preservation of good practice within the current Personal Tutor system in future models of support.

No significant changes were made to the IPR process in 2019/20. Enhancements continue to be made to the data dashboards which support IPR and annual monitoring.

Annual monitoring, review and reporting – 2019/20
In response to feedback, during 2019/20 the College annual reporting cycle was brought forward from January to November and a revised reporting template used. The reports were considered at the December 2019 SQAC meeting where their quality was commended[4]. Additionally, it was noted that the changes had encouraged collaboration across a broader range of staff resulting in a greater awareness of and engagement with the reports.

Normally, each September, the Sub Group that reviews School annual quality reports submits a report to SQAC on the outcomes of annual monitoring, review and reporting processes, identifying areas of good practice and for further development and remitting actions as necessary[5]. Responses to the additional School-, College- and University-level actions arising from the review of School annual quality reports are then made available to SQAC.

At its meeting in May 2020, SQAC agreed to suspend the normal annual monitoring, review and reporting processes due to the Covid-19 pandemic. Instead, a light-touch, interim process was approved with the aim of complementing ongoing academic contingency work. Streamlined reports will focus on the impact of and learning from the pandemic, but will also allow optional updates on actions identified from last year's reporting cycle and reflection on other aspects of academic standards, student performance and the student learning experience (including industrial action)[6]. Reporting deadlines for School annual quality reports were extended from August to November. Due to the change of timescales, the themes of positive practice for sharing and areas for further development at University-level will not be available until December 2020 and will therefore be included in next year's annual report to SFC.

Sharing Good Practice from Institution-led Review and Annual Monitoring, Review and Reporting
The reports identifying themes of positive practice for sharing and areas for further development at University level and a paper outlining examples of good practice from annual monitoring, review and reporting processes are passed to the Institute for Academic Development to identify content for Teaching Matters[7]. Examples of Teaching Matters blog posts that have been identified through quality processes are tagged[8]. A University-level event to share good practice relating to student community and student voices and student skills and employability was held in February 2020. Good practice is also shared at College-level. Additionally, an area of the University's quality website has being developed to share good practice and resources[9].

Ways in which support services were reviewed

Student Support Services Annual Review (SSSAR) – reporting on 2018/19
Student-facing support services are reviewed annually by a sub-committee of SQAC. The sub-committee submits a report on the outcomes of the review process to SQAC annually in late November/early December[10]. A peer review element, where each participating Head of Service reviews another service's report, was added to the process for reporting on 2018/19. Feedback from peer reviewers found that this reflective and self-critical process was useful in considering how Heads of Services would write their future reports.

---

[4] https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/sqac-agendapapers-20191205-web.pdf (Paper E)
[5] Example from last year https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/sqac-agendapapers-20190918.pdf (Paper C)
[6] https://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/quality/monitoringandreview/annual-monitoring-review-and-reporting
[7] https://www.ed.ac.uk/staff/teaching-matters
[8] https://www.teaching-matters-blog.ed.ac.uk/tag/quality-enhancement-report-examples/
[9] https://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/quality/good-practice
[10] https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/sqac-agendapapers-20191205-web.pdf (Paper J)

Each service receives individual feedback on their report, including commendations and areas for further consideration and reflection in next year's report. The following good practice examples were shared at the full sub-committee meeting in November 2019:
- Using key performance indicators and evaluation: Institute for Academic Development and Information Services Group
- Using LEAN for service enhancement: Student Systems and Administration
- Operating a values-led approach to service delivery: Chaplaincy

The common themes that arose from service reports and discussed at the full sub-committee meeting were:
- Affordability – the financial challenges students face and resulting barriers to participation
- Going local – opportunities and challenges for dispersed service delivery

At its meeting in May 2020 SQAC agreed to suspend the normal SSSAR reporting process and approved the implementation of an interim process in response to the Covid-19 pandemic[11]. SSSAR reporting for 2019/2020 will be streamlined to focus on impacts of industrial action and the Covid-19 pandemic. Services will be invited to submit their reports from the end of August 2020 for a mid-November deadline to a new SharePoint site, which will facilitate sharing of experience and good practice.

Student Support Thematic Review
Thematic reviews focus on the quality of the student experience in relation to a particular theme or aspect of student support which can span both student support services and academic areas. Topics for thematic reviews are influenced by the outcomes of SSSAR and discussion with the Students' Association.

The report of the 2018/19 thematic review of black and minority ethnic (BME) students' experiences of support at the University was received by SQAC in September 2019[12] and an update on actions will be provided in September 2020.

No thematic review was carried during 2019/20 and none is planned for 2020/21, partly due to the demands of our Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR). Instead, in 2019/20, a holistic overview of the outcomes of the thematic reviews to date was carried out to understand the impact and wider value of such reviews. The outcome of this review was presented to SQAC in February 2020.[13] The main messages are: student engagement is essential and has been very positive; thematic review provides the opportunity and space to explore issues; and it has adopted an agile methodology but it is resource intensive to operate. SQAC agreed that thematic reviews would continue to be undertaken, but would be reserved for significant issues requiring in-depth exploration that often cannot be achieved via IPRs or SSSAR.

Role and nature of student engagement in institution-led review

The Students' Association and the University work in partnership to ensure that students are central to academic governance, decision-making and quality assurance and enhancement.

IPR and thematic reviews both include student members on review teams. The student member of a review team will typically convene one or more meetings during the review. Membership of a review

---

[11] https://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/quality/monitoringandreview/sssar19-20
[12] https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/sqac-agendapapers-20190918.pdf (Paper F)
[13] https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/sqac-agendapapers-20200227-web.pdf (Paper F).

team is included in the student's Higher Education Achievement Record. In addition to having student members on review teams, engagement of students from review areas as a part of IPRs is regarded as essential. Briefing material aimed at students outlines ways in which they can engage with reviews and actions taken in response. Parallel briefings guide Schools on how to engage their students with reviews. The remits for all IPRs include items proposed by students in the review area.

Contextual information and key messages from analysis of data

The University is in the process of reviewing and reflecting on the results of the 2020 National Student Survey (NSS) and Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES). The results for 2019/20 reflect a period disrupted by industrial action and Covid-19. Despite this, our NSS results are broadly in line with the previous year in both absolute terms and in relation to the Russell Group, but with modest gains in learning resources and academic community. Assessment and feedback and the Students' Association continue to be our lower performing areas. Due to changes in the institutional PTES questions, results are not entirely comparable across all questions. Additionally, the survey was run for a far shorter period of time. In the majority of areas there is little change on the previous year, with the exception of overall satisfaction and employability which are lower performing aspects. Assessment and feedback scores for PTES are very good and broadly show a rising trend since 2018. The survey results will be considered by University Court and the Senate Education Committee in autumn 2020.

SQAC considers data annually on the degree classification outcomes of the University's undergraduate students, in the context of recent trends and Higher Education Statistics Agenda (HESA) data on Russell Group institutions. Most subject areas across the University are broadly in line with Russell Group comparators for their discipline and/or with the University average, however, there are a small number of outliers which diverge substantially. Whilst there may be good reasons for these areas to have these patterns of degree outcomes, SQAC asks the relevant Schools to give particular attention to their degree classification outcome data and provide an analysis of their context within their School annual quality report. To date, no University-wide action has been required. In 2020/21 (reporting on 2019/20), given the changes to the annual monitoring, review and reporting processes and additional workload faced by Schools, SQAC agreed that their oversight of this process should be light touch. Therefore it will be at the discretion of each College to determine the appropriate oversight 'conversation' with each outlier School. The outcome of these oversight conversations will be reported back to the SQAC.

Analysis of progression data showed that the University markedly outperformed the Scottish sector average and the UK sector averages for the relevant HESA Performance Indicators (non-continuation and projected outcomes), and also outperformed the HESA benchmarks for non-continuation and for the percentage projected to exit without an award or transfer. Despite these favourable rates of retention the University is not complacent; research into retention trends and associated factors is being carried out.

An analysis of 2018/19 undergraduate[14] and taught postgraduate[15] external examiners' reports shows that there continues to be a high number of commendations and a low number of issues across the University. The main theme commended in undergraduate reports across all three Colleges was the assessment process, with the sub-theme of good practice and innovation (in the programme development theme) most commented on. The main sub-theme commended in taught postgraduate reports was good practice and innovation. Many commendations were course or programme specific, however the most often occurring type of commendation related to the range,

---

[14] https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/sqac-agendapapers-20191205-web.pdf (Paper F)
[15] https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/sqac-agendapapers-20200227-web.pdf (Paper G)

quality and diversity of teaching, learning and assessment. A small number of issues raised by external examiners related to the (often timely) provision of information to examiners. No University-level action was required.

We have met the Commission for Widening Access targets of 10% of our intake to come from the 20% most deprived areas in Scotland three years ahead of schedule. Our students from SIMD20 areas represent 11.4% of this year's undergraduate intake (2019/20 cycle). In the current 2020 recruitment cycle we have been pleased to see a marginal growth and maintenance of those students who have applied and accepted offers from disadvantaged backgrounds (those who have been flagged within our contextual admissions process[16]).

Summary

The previous year's IPRs have identified good practice examples and it is important that these, and areas identified through the annual monitoring, review and reporting processes which conclude in December, are shared across the University. IPRs also identified areas for further development, and these, along with those identified from annual monitoring, review and reporting processes, will be considered and acted upon accordingly. The University's approach to improving the learning, teaching and student experience can be summarised in the ongoing and planned work outlined below, the pace and scale of which is likely to be adversely impacted by the Covid-19 pandemic in the short to medium-term.

Actions Undertaken and Planned

Strategy and Strategic Projects

Strategy 2030
In September 2019, the University launched its Strategy 2030 for the next 10 years and beyond. Strategy 2030 sets out the vision for the University, which is led by distinctive, honest and realistic guiding principles and goals. Among our priorities for delivery over the next decade are goals to strengthen interdisciplinary research, improve student satisfaction and foster a welcoming community. Our Strategy highlights our values-led approach to teaching, research and innovation, to address tomorrow's greatest challenges through the strength of our relationships, both locally and globally.

Vice-Principal Students
The University appointed its first Vice Principal Students who began in post in October 2019. This new post has strategic responsibility for the improvement of the student experience and the culture change that underpins this.

Learning and Teaching Strategy
The University published its Learning and Teaching Strategy in January 2017[17]. The Senate Education Committee reviewed progress against the agreed implementation plan at its meeting in October 2019[18]. With the development of Strategy 2030[19], marking a values-led approach to what we do, and the arrival of a new Vice Principal Students, it was decided that 2019/20 would mark the final year of the Learning and Teaching Strategy as the University moves towards a new phase of learning and teaching and a curriculum review led by the Vice Principal Students.

---

[16] https://www.ed.ac.uk/studying/undergraduate/access-edinburgh/widening-access-offers
[17] https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/learning_teaching_strategy.pdf
[18] https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/20191009agendapapers.pdf (Paper E)
[19] https://www.ed.ac.uk/about/strategy-2030

Curriculum Review
Plans for a curriculum review to be led by the Vice Principal Students have been delayed due to the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic. However, lessons learned from pivot to online and then hybrid delivery will be used to inform this review.

Service Excellence Programme (Student Administration and Support)
The Student Administration and Support (SA&S) programme is part of the Service Excellence Programme (SEP), which is tasked with transforming the University's core professional services and aims to achieve a balance between effectiveness and efficiency, underpinned by core systems and digital transformation.

During 2019/20, the programme delivered a number of enhancements including in the areas of study and work away, special circumstances and extensions, and EdHelp (a single point of help and information). Additionally, work continued on the review of student support and on programme and course information and management.

In response to the Covid-19 pandemic those elements of the SA&S programme which will support students and the staff who work with them in the short to medium term will be prioritised, while some work will be paused. The primary focus for SEP is now on delivering a transformation in the way Human Resources (HR) and finance services are delivered, underpinned and enabled by People and Money, a new web-based system for HR and finance tasks which goes live in September 2020.

Student Experience Action Plan (StEAP)
The StEAP set out a holistic programme of work to improve the student experience at Edinburgh. A key output in 2019/20 was a guide for schools on fostering a sense of belonging[20]. Due to the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic, a reduced package of work will be taken forward in 2020/21.

Adaptation and Renewal Team (ART)
Following the successful short-term response to the Covid-19 pandemic in semester 2, an ART, led by the Principal, was established to oversee the work needed to respond to the short, medium and longer-term challenges caused by the Covid-19 pandemic. ART will enable swift but well-informed decisions to be taken in a number of time-critical areas to ensure that the University continues to deliver against its overall strategy. There are four main strands:

- Research
- Students
- Estates and Infrastructure
- Re-shaping

Equality and Diversity
As part of the University's is ongoing commitment to creating an equal, diverse and inclusive environment for all students and staff, two reviews were conducted in 2018/19 in partnership with the Students' Association, to form a clearer picture of student experiences and to seek ways of promoting equality, diversity, and inclusivity within the University.

The then Senate Learning and Teaching Committee established a task group to explore using the curriculum to promote inclusion, equality and diversity[21]. The task group consulted with students and staff from across the University and noted a consensus on the importance of finding ways to

---

[20] https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/belongingguide.pdf
[21] https://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/projects/promoting-inclusion-equality-diversity-curriculum

have ongoing, open conversations about what a diverse and inclusive curriculum would look like and how this may mean different things in each College, School, and subject area.

A key finding of the thematic review of BME students' experiences of support at the University was that a gap exists between the awareness and racial literacy of University staff and the lived experiences of both UK-domiciled and international BME students.

The final reports of both reviews were published in October 2019 and in response the University has established a Race Equality and Anti-Racist Sub-Group under a new Equality, Diversity & Inclusion Committee, to drive forward the recommendations. This will include developing an institution-wide conversation on race and an application for the Advance HE Race Equality Charter Mark (RECM).

Student Voice
In September 2019, the University and the Students' Association agreed the themes priority themes of community, student voice, and social justice for the Student Partnership Agreement for 2019/20[22]. In 2019/20 11 student-staff projects linked to the priority themes were funded. Due to the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic, a number of the projects funded during 2019/20 were unable to complete. It was agreed that these projects could conclude during semester one 2020/21 if feasible with social distancing requirements. In addition, it was agreed to postpone projects for 2020/21, due to social distancing requirements and to enable Schools to focus on the move to the new hybrid teaching model. An evaluation of previous projects will be undertaken to review impact and identify where practice can be shared across the institution.

The programme representative system introduced in 2018/19, replacing the previous class representation system, continues to embed. Initial feedback indicates that this system is more efficient and effective, in terms of the number of students who are acting as representatives and the escalation of issues. Additionally, the reduction in student representatives enabled the Students' Association to return to in-person training, providing more effective training and preparation for the role, resulting in an increase in training completion rates. The Students' Association implemented a handover document for all Programme Representatives to complete at the end of their tenure which has led to an increase in completion rates when compared with the impact questionnaire completed previously. For 2020/21, revised training will be delivered digitally through both asynchronous, interactive modules completed in students' own time, and live digital sessions to consolidate knowledge and skills. The Students' Association is also developing additional guidance regarding the use of digital platforms to gather feedback and to help build community.

In 2019/20, following a successful pilot, all School Representatives were given access to the full suite of student survey reports. An evaluation found that engagement with the reports was limited. It is clear that School Representatives find having access to data from student surveys helpful in completing their roles, but that they require support to be able to utilise the information effectively. Moving forwards, the Students' Association and colleagues within the Student Analytics, Insights and Modelling team will continue to provide this data to School Representatives in September each year, and will explore opportunities to embed and enhance training opportunities to enable the representatives to engage fully with the student surveys data available to them. The Students' Association will also consider whether additional groups of student representatives could benefit from access to data.

The University have worked in partnership with the Students' Association to develop a more robust set of guidance for Schools in the running of Student-Staff Liaison Committee (SSLCs)[23]. Principles for

---

[22] https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/studentpartnershipagreement.pdf
[23] https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/sslcguidance.pdf

SSLC meetings have been added to the Student Voice Policy for 2020/21[24]. Work began in 2019/20 on the management of escalated issues and will continue in 2020/21.

Building on the positive experience of mid-course feedback (MCF) for undergraduate courses, its use was encouraged for postgraduate taught courses throughout 2019/20, recognising that it is already happening across many courses, and it has been embedded within policy for 2020/21 for all taught courses which run for 10 weeks or more. Supporting guidance was also developed.[25]

As part of Enhancement Themes work, a student guide on giving feedback was developed to explain the various student voice mechanisms to students and staff[26].

Teaching and Academic Careers
During 2019/20 and 2020/21 all Schools will be supported to develop a professional development of teaching strategy and plan. These plans will be integrated with quality assurance processes and subject to periodic review. They will include a focus on informal staff development and teaching culture, alongside task and role specific continuing professional development, and externally accredited provision, with School and institutional indicative and aspirational targets for teaching qualifications.

Careers and Employability
Careers and employability remains an important strategic priority for the University, as evidenced by the involvement of Careers Service colleagues in networks, the committee structure and IPRs.

In recognition of the changing recruitment landscape and to prepare students for the Future of Work[27] the University has invested in challenge-based experiential learning through the Students as Change Agents programme[28]. Students work in multi-disciplinary groups with external partners to address real world problems. Following a swift and successful pivot to online delivery this summer, 150 students across 20 schools, worked on live projects with host organisations, on sustainable tourism for Edinburgh and ending youth homelessness. This external activity and engagement informs curricular development, ensuring Edinburgh degrees retain the hallmark of quality and relevance.

A growing focus for the Careers Service has been support for marginalised students and the early success of the Insights programme[29] provides a strong foundation for future initiatives.

Enhancement-led Institutional Review
The University is preparing for its next ELIR which will now take place in February and March 2021. The agreed areas of focus for this review, arising from contextualisation, are: teaching and academic careers; student community and student voices; student support; widening participation; and student skills and employability.

Indication of institution-led reviews for the forthcoming cycle

Please see Appendix 1. Please note that specific timings may be subject to change to reflect

---

[24] https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/studentvoicepolicy.pdf
[25] https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/mcfguidance.pdf
[26] https://www.ed.ac.uk/students/academic-life/student-voice
[27] https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/careers_service_briefing_-_future_of_work.pdf
[28] https://www.ed.ac.uk/careers/changeprogramme
[29] https://www.ed.ac.uk/students/careers/insights/at-a-glance

schedules in Schools.

In 2019/20 9 professional bodies carried out reviews resulting in all programmes being successfully accredited/reaccredited (Appendix 2). Reviews for 83 programmes by 9 professional bodies were impacted by the Covid-19 pandemic, where reviews have been postponed, delayed and/or extensions applied.

2 September 2020

Appendix 1 - Internal Periodic Review forward schedule

2020/21	• School of Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences (Postgraduate Research & Postgraduate Taught provision) **rescheduled from 2019/20** • School of Social and Political Science (Postgraduate Taught provision) **rescheduled from 2019/20** • Moray House School of Education and Sport (Postgraduate Research & Postgraduate Taught provision) **rescheduled from 2019/20** • Clinical Education (Postgraduate Taught provision) • Health in Social Science (including Nursing Undergraduate provision, Postgraduate Taught and Postgraduate Research Provision) • Law (Undergraduate provision, Postgraduate Research & Postgraduate Taught provision) • Mathematics (Postgraduate Research Provision) • Oral Health Sciences (Undergraduate provision)
2021/22	• Biological Sciences (Undergraduate & Postgraduate Taught provision) **rescheduled from 2020/21** • Biological Sciences (Postgraduate Research Provision) • Data Science, Technology and Innovation (Postgraduate Taught Provision) • Divinity (Postgraduate Taught & Postgraduate Research Provision) • Edinburgh College of Art (all undergraduate provision) [30] • GeoSciences (Postgraduate Taught Provision) • History, Classics and Archaeology (all undergraduate provision) **rescheduled from 2020/21** • Informatics (Undergraduate & Postgraduate Taught provision) **rescheduled from 2020/21** • Mathematics (Undergraduate & Postgraduate Taught provision) • Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences (all undergraduate provision)[31] • The Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies (Postgraduate Taught Provision) • The Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies (Undergraduate provision)
2022/23	• Business (Postgraduate Taught and Postgraduate Research Provision) • Ecological and Environmental Sciences (Undergraduate provision) • Economics (Undergraduate provision, Postgraduate Research & Postgraduate Taught provision) • History, Classics and Archaeology (Postgraduate Research & Postgraduate Taught provision) • Literatures, Languages and Cultures (all undergraduate provision) [32]

---

[30] To include Architecture, Music, Art, Design, History of Art
[31] To include Psychology, Linguistics and English Language, Philosophy
[32] To include Asian Studies, Celtic & Scottish Studies, Design, English Literature, European Languages and Cultures, Islamic and Middle Eastern Studies.

	• Moray House School of Education and Sport (all undergraduate provision) [33]
	• Physics and Astronomy (Postgraduate Research provision)
2023/24	• Biomedical Sciences (Undergraduate & Postgraduate Taught provision, inc Zhejiang)
	• Chemistry (Postgraduate Research provision)
	• Clinical Sciences (Postgraduate Taught Provision)
	• Engineering (Postgraduate Research provision)
	• Medicine (Undergraduate provision)
	• Molecular, Genetic and Population Health Sciences (Postgraduate Taught Provision)
	• Physics and Astronomy (Undergraduate & Postgraduate Taught provision)
	• Social and Political Science (all undergraduate provision) [34]
2024/25	• Earth Sciences (Undergraduate provision)
	• Edinburgh College of Art (Postgraduate Taught & Postgraduate Research Provision)
	• Engineering (Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught provision)
	• GeoSciences (Postgraduate Research Provision)
	• College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine (Postgraduate Research provision)
2025/26	• Business School (Undergraduate provision)
	• Centre for Open Learning (Undergraduate provision)
	• Chemistry (Undergraduate provision)
	• Divinity (Undergraduate provision)
	• Geography (Undergraduate provision)
	• Informatics (Postgraduate Research Provision)
	• Literatures, Languages and Cultures (Postgraduate Taught & Postgraduate Research Provision)
	• Social and Political Science (Postgraduate Research Provision)
2026/27	• Clinical Education (Postgraduate Taught provision)
	• Health in Social Science (including Nursing Undergraduate provision, Postgraduate Taught and Postgraduate Research Provision)
	• Law (Undergraduate provision, Postgraduate Research & Postgraduate Taught provision)
	• Mathematics (Postgraduate Research Provision)

---

[33] To include Applied Sports Science, Childhood Practice, Community Education, Physical Education, Primary Education with Gaelic, Sport and Recreation Management.

[34] To include Politics & International Relations, Social Anthropology, Sociology & Sustainable Development, Social Policy, Social Work (which will include the Master of Social Work programme)

	• Moray House School of Education and Sport (Postgraduate Research & Postgraduate Taught provision) * rescheduled from 2019/20 • Oral Health Sciences (Undergraduate provision) • School of Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences (Postgraduate Research & Postgraduate Taught provision) * rescheduled from 2019/20 • School of Social and Political Science (Postgraduate Taught provision) * rescheduled from 2019/20

Appendix 2 – Degree Programmes Accredited in 2018/19

Degree Programme Title	Name of Accrediting Body
LLB (Hons) Law and Accountancy	Association of Chartered Certified Accountants (ACCA)
MA (Hons) Accounting and Business	Association of Chartered Certified Accountants (ACCA)
MA (Hons) Accounting and Finance	Association of Chartered Certified Accountants (ACCA)
MA (Hons) Economics and Accounting	Association of Chartered Certified Accountants (ACCA)
English for Academic Purposes Summer Pre-sessional Programme	The British Association of Lecturers in English for Academic Purposes (BALEAP)
BSc (Hons) Chemical Physics	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)
BSc (Hons) Chemistry	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)
BSc (Hons) Chemistry with Environmental and Sustainable Chemistry	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)
BSc (Hons) Chemistry with Materials Chemistry	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)
BSc (Hons) Medicinal and Biological Chemistry	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)
MChem (Hons) Chemistry	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)
MChem (Hons) Chemistry with a Year Abroad	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)
MChem (Hons) Chemistry with Environmental and Sustainable Chemistry	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)
MChem (Hons) Chemistry with Environmental and Sustainable Chemistry and a Year Abroad	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)
MChem (Hons) Chemistry with Environmental and Sustainable Chemistry and Industrial Experience	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)
MChem (Hons) Chemistry with Industrial Experience	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)
MChem (Hons) Chemistry with Materials Chemistry	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)
MChem (Hons) Chemistry with Materials Chemistry and Industrial Experience	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)
MChem (Hons) Chemistry with Materials Chemistry with a Year Abroad	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)
MChem (Hons) Medicinal and Biological Chemistry	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)
MChem (Hons) Medicinal and Biological Chemistry with a Year Abroad	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)
MChem (Hons) Medicinal and Biological Chemistry with Industrial Experience	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)
MChemPhys (Hons) Chemical Physics	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)
MChemPhys (Hons) Chemical Physics with a Year Abroad	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)
MChemPhys (Hons) Chemical Physics with Industrial Experience	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)
BSc (Hons) Oral Health Sciences	General Dental Council (GDC)
MSc Clinical Education (Online Learning) - 3 Years	The Royal Australasian College Surgeons
PgCert Clinical Education (Online Learning) - 1 Year	The Royal Australasian College Surgeons
PgDip Clinical Education (Online Learning) - 2 Years	The Royal Australasian College Surgeons
HCP-Med (5 years)	General Medical Council (GMC)
MBChB Medicine	General Medical Council (GMC)

MA (Hons) Learning in Communities	Standards Council for Scotland
BEng (Hons) Computer Science and Electronics	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)
BEng (Hons) Electrical and Mechanical Engineering	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)
BEng (Hons) Electrical Engineering with Renewable Energy	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)
BEng (Hons) Electronics	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)
BEng (Hons) Electronics and Electrical Engineering	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)
BEng (Hons) Electronics and Electrical Engineering with Management	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)
BEng (Hons) Electronics and Software Engineering	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)
BEng (Hons) Engineering for Sustainable Energy	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)
MEng (Hons) Electrical And Mechanical Engineering	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)
MEng (Hons) Electrical Engineering with Renewable Energy	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)
MEng (Hons) Electronics	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)
MEng (Hons) Electronics and Computer Science	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)
MEng (Hons) Electronics and Electrical Engineering	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)
MEng (Hons) Electronics and Electrical Engineering with Management	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)
MEng (Hons) Engineering for Sustainable Energy	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)
BN Nursing (Adult)	Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC)
BN (Hons) Nursing (Adult)	Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC)
Masters in Nursing with Pre-Registration (Adult)	Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC)

Annual Report to the Scottish Funding Council on Institution-led Review and Enhancement Activity 2019/20

<u>Statement of assurance</u>

On behalf of the governing body of the University of Edinburgh, I confirm that we have considered the institution's arrangements for the management of academic standards and the quality of the learning experience for AY 2019/20, including the scope and impact of these. I further confirm that we are satisfied that the institution has effective arrangements to maintain standards and to assure and enhance the quality of its provision. We can therefore provide assurance to the Council that the academic standards and the quality of the learning provision at this institution continue to meet the requirements set by the Council.

………………………………………………………………… ……………………………………………………………

Anne Richards
Vice-Convener of Court   Date

<u>The University of Edinburgh</u>
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

9 September 2020

Quality Processes:
University Level Actions Update

Description of paper

1. This paper updates the Committee on University level actions agreed in response to issues identified as areas for further development in School Annual Quality Reports 2018-19 and themes that emerged from teaching/postgraduate programme reviews held in 2018-19.

Action requested / recommendation

2. For information.

Background and context

3. Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC), at the meeting held on 18 September 2019, approved actions at University level in response to issues identified as areas for further development in School Annual Quality Reports 2018-19 and themes that emerged from teaching/postgraduate programme reviews held in 2018-19.

Discussion

4. See attached document.

Resource implications

5. Resource implications are considered as part of each action.

Risk management

6. Ensuring that students and staff are confident that the University listens to and acts on their comments and feedback is essential to ensuring their engagement with quality processes. This report represents an element of the feedback loop from the central University level to the local School and College levels.

Equality & diversity

7. The actions encompass Equality and diversity issues.

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

8. Academic Services will inform relevant areas.

Author   **Presenter**
Brian Connolly   **Brian Connolly**
Academic Services   Academic Services

Freedom of Information
Open

<u>The University of Edinburgh</u>
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

Quality Processes:
University Level Actions Update

Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC), at the meeting held on 18 September 2019, approved actions at University level in response to issues identified as areas for further development in School Annual Quality Reports 2018-19 and themes that emerged from teaching/postgraduate programme reviews held in 2018-19.

School Annual Quality Reports 2018-19

The following responses were received during the 2019-20 academic session:

Area for Further Development	Action	Progress
Space Schools continue to identify challenges with accessing suitable learning and teaching accommodation. This included social spaces for students and staff to interact outwith timetabled sessions, appropriate space for postgraduate research students, and study space for students. Some Schools also reported challenges with suitability of staff offices, including a lack of private space to meet with students requiring support, and issues with staff and/or teaching being split across multiple sites. These issues were felt to impact on the ability to build academic communities. The importance of minimising the impact on students of estates developments at King's Building was also noted.	Convenor to submit a report on the areas for further development for consideration at University Executive.	Our ambitious estates development plan was intended to resolve a number of issues around space for learning and teaching and space for community building. A number of these plans are currently adversely affected by the impact of the coronavirus pandemic and there are likely to be longer-term implications as well due to the financial implications which have led to a number of capital projects being paused. In AY 20/21 the use of our physical estate will be severely restricted by physical distancing rules in place. The move to hybrid teaching is both a challenge and an opportunity. The amount of in-person face-to-face contact will be reduced, but the opportunities for high quality digital face-to-face interaction

		between students and staff and between students and their peers are significant. We will seek to learn lessons from our use of and students' experiences of hybrid teaching to understand how we may reduce the demands on our physical space into the future and deepen community building.
Timetabling The majority of Schools reported increasing issues with timetabling. Individual examples included: significant changes to course timetables; allocation of rooms; consecutive classes timetabled in rooms some distance apart; and communication with the Timetabling Unit. Further investigation will be required to understand the specific issues. It was noted that the complexity of our provision is challenging to timetable. Challenges with the exam timetable, specifically its release date and tight timescales for marking when examinations with large cohorts happen late in the examination period, were also raised.		As above, the timetable will be significantly impacted by the coronavirus pandemic and the scheduling of in-person and digital classes. In the short-term at least we expect to see some positive impacts on the exam timetable with the loss of physical in-person exams, at least for semester 1 of 2020/21, but the scheduling of online/remote assessments still poses a challenge. The challenges with the timetable and estates are issues that are likely to be resolved partly through the size and shaping agenda and curriculum reform as we seek to simplify our provision and strategically manage student numbers, although these are not short-term fixes and it will take several years for such changes to work through.
Pressure on Staff Time Schools reported that rising student numbers, especially in postgraduate taught programmes, and challenges with staff recruitment (appointing to and replacing posts) are increasing staff workloads and impacting on the student experience.		Addressing the size and shape issues and curriculum reform are likely to positively impact staff time. In the short-term, however, we are experiencing increased pressures on staff time with the move to hybrid teaching. This is not sustainable into the longer term and we need to ensure that we can benefit longer-term from many of the

		adaptations we have made as a result of the pandemic, to improve flexibility, workload and the student experience.
Assessment and Feedback Some Schools requested that the 15 day feedback turnaround deadline be reconsidered in light of student feedback and challenges staff have in meeting this blanket deadline for different cohort sizes and types of assessments.		The March 2020 Senate Education Committee discussed aspects of assessment and feedback (identified by SQAC through annual and periodic review) in need of further development. It was noted that some Schools had requested that the 15 day feedback turnaround deadline be reconsidered in light of student feedback and challenges staff had in meeting this blanket deadline for different cohort sizes and types of assessments. Recommendations from internal reviews focussed on the quality of feedback and implementing assessment and feedback policy on formative assessment, feedback turnaround times, and scaling of marks. It was noted that the widely held student perception of the deadline was of a two week turnaround period as opposed to the University expectation of 15 working days or a three week turnaround deadline. The Committee agreed that the 15 day feedback turnaround deadline should not be reconsidered in isolation from the impending curriculum review. This issue will be addressed as part of a wider discussion on assessment methods as part of curriculum reform.

Student Voice		A Task Group, chaired by Assistant
Several Schools questioned the purpose and usefulness of course enhancement questionnaires. This was felt to be contributing to the low, and declining, response rates. It was also felt that course enhancement questionnaires add to feelings of survey/feedback fatigue by students.		Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance has reviewed the current practice of CEQs. University Executive approved a recommendation from the Task Group that we move away from centrally managed CEQs and Schools will be asked to develop and manage their own student feedback mechanisms in ways that suit their course/teaching. The Student Analytics and Insights Team will continue to provide advice and guidance on the development of surveys. Schools will be required to report on both their approach to gathering feedback and reflections on the feedback from students in their Annual Programme Monitoring and School Annual Quality Reports. The Student Analytics and Insights Team will instead develop and run an institution-wide survey of student experience, wellbeing and belonging. Originally, these plans were due to take effect from the start of AY 2020/21, but with the added pressures on Schools, preparing for hybrid teaching, it has been decided to run CEQs centrally for a further year to reduce the burden on schools, and also remove the teaching staff questions (to remove the burden on administrative staff in identifying which staff teach which courses). The change will now take effect from AY 2021/22.

IT and Systems A collection of individual, and sometimes recurring, items were raised by Schools under this broad heading: Student record-related issues raised included annual monitoring for postgraduate research students, work and study away, special circumstances, and Boards of Examiners.	Committee Secretary to refer to the Director of Student Systems and Administration	We have not progressed as far as we would have liked with annual monitoring for PGR students. This is our next priority and we'll be approaching the Doctoral College to start thinking through meaningful metrics. Work and study away data is not stored in the central student records system at the moment so we are unlikely to have a solution for reliable reporting on this data in the near future. We do, however, have to capture data on student mobility for Data Futures so we will be looking at how we can get work and study away data on the records system and updated regularly. The special circumstances team have just started working and if Schools advise what information they would like to see I can liaise with the Head of Service to develop reporting if required.
Student record-related workarounds and the challenges of accessing meaningful data for non-standard provision (interdisciplinary, online, and open learning) were also raised.	Committee Secretary to refer to the Head of Student Data and Surveys	We can only report on data that exists in the student records system. Unfortunately this means that some non-standard provision is missed (e.g. the Centre for Open Learning, COL). We are happy to work with Schools to understand what meaningful metrics might look like and to advise on reporting however we can't deliver off-system reporting or analysis.
Several Schools, primarily within the College of Science and Engineering, also made requests for more support for online examinations.	Committee Secretary to refer to the Director of Learning, Teaching and Web Services.	We used technology already available to support the exam diet in May and there is a review of lessons learned in advance of the

		December diet. Information Services Group (ISG) are investigating pricing options for buying bundles of online invigilation services in response to a request from the College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine (CMVM). A review of e-assessment tools will be carried out in advance of procuring a replacement for QMP in 2021. There is a proliferation of technology being managed by schools locally and there is a risk that we fail to learn the lessons from our earlier proliferation of VLEs, so strategic thinking about online assessment is needed at a University level. The earlier proliferation of VLEs meant that the technology available to support online programmes was limited by the fact that a disproportionate amount of work was going into supporting all those VLEs, some of which were at end of life. The number of VLEs has been reduced from 15 to 2 over the last five years, with the large majority of programmes now using Learn VLE. Learn VLE was moved to the cloud in 2020 which brings benefits of being easier to manage and support. ISG services in digital library, learning design, user experience and media production are available to schools who are developing new online programmes.

SQAC: 09.09.20

SQAC 20/21 1N

H/02/28/02

Internal Periodic Review Themes 2018-19

The following responses were received during the 2019-20 academic session:

Area for Further Development	Action	Progress
Tutors and Demonstrators Recommendations related to training, promoting continuing professional development opportunities, improving two-way (feedback to and from) communication, allocating reasonable time for tasks, appointing a role to provide support, and appointment processes.	Academic Services to refer recommendation to the review of the Policy for the recruitment, support and development of tutors and demonstrators, which was delayed from 2018/19.	Review delayed again due to Covid-19. An important part of this review will be to take account of findings from a light-touch survey which was planned by HR to consult Schools on the effectiveness of implementing the Guaranteed Hours policy/procedures (GH). This is because a significant number of Tutors & Demonstrators fall into this category of employment. In implementing GH, the University agreed with the unions to evaluate it a year on (which was March 2020). A key focus for HR is to look at the recruitment practices for GH staff and hence Tutors & Demonstrators because while there has been positive information from Institute for Academic Development (IAD) about the take-up of training and development opportunities for these staff, there is likely to be un-evenness of experience and opportunity especially during the recruiting phase. We will therefore need to liaise with HR in particular but also IAD to confirm the status of their consultation and then look at how the feedback should be used to edit our Policy, if at all.

Widening participation	Academic Services to refer	These aspects are being addressed as part
Widening participation Recommendations related to increasing numbers of students from widening participation backgrounds, considering widening participation students through reviews of curriculum and induction arrangements, provision of additional management information, and the appointment of a subject area dedicated Widening Participation Director.	Academic Services to refer recommendations to the Widening Participation team, and to the new Vice Principal Students for the specific reference to the curriculum review.	These aspects are being addressed as part of the Widening Participation Strategy. **Increasing pathways** The University is currently working to develop in partnerships with key regional college partners to develop new access and articulation routes for target groups including mature students, students from Scotland's most deprived communities and those who have care experience. The University's initial objective with these college partnerships, is to agree formal articulation agreements for a 1+3 model (HNC to year 2 entry) in a small number of subject areas. The first agreement we have in place will enable 2nd year entry for students from Edinburgh College to the University in 2020/21 to programmes in Health in Social Science. **COVID-19 response** Recognising that students from disadvantaged or underrepresented backgrounds may face additional challenges in terms of financial hardship, wellbeing, or family support (or lack of) the University has significantly up-scaled the support for current and incoming students Now, possibly more than ever before, we are ensuring we consider those students who face disadvantage or barriers within their educational journey. We will ensure that the progress we have made in widening access over the last few years doesn't fall

		by the wayside and that we remember those learners at every stage in the student lifecycle.
Assessment and feedback Recommendations focussed on quality of feedback and implementing assessment and feedback policy on formative assessment, feedback turnaround times, and scaling of marks.	Academic Services to refer recommendations to the University Executive alongside the assessment and feedback further development outcomes from the annual monitoring, review and reporting process.	See above Assessment and Feedback – will be considered as part of the Curriculum Review.
Supporting and developing staff Recommendations covered the importance of staff engagement in continuing professional development and aspects of promotion.	Academic Services to refer recommendation to the Teaching and Academic Careers task group for consideration and response.	We discuss participation and completion rates at the Senate Education Committee each year. Participation in the Postgraduate Certificate Academic Practice (PgCAP) has remained generally stable in recent years. There is potential for growth on the PgCAP. The number of colleagues completing the full PgCAP is beginning to improve with the new version of the programme, but it will take 2-3 years to be sure this trend is established. Participation in the Edinburgh Teaching Award (EdTA) has grown but has now stabilised, reaching a steady state of around 200 participants per year on the central and existing School EdTAs. We are close to capacity for the central EdTA. Growth in engagement is most likely to come from an increased offering of School EdTAs. Looking ahead we expect to see faster growth in participation and completion due to the Teaching and Academic Careers project. A key recommendation from the project (being implemented during AYs

		2019/20 and 2020/21) is for all Schools to develop a professional development of teaching strategy and plan. These plans will be integrated with University quality assurance arrangements and subject to periodic review. They will include a focus on informal staff development and teaching culture, alongside task and role specific Continuing Professional Development (CPD), and externally accredited provision, with School and institutional indicative and aspirational targets for teaching qualifications.
Student voice Two out of three PPRs had recommendations relating to clarity and enhancement of the student representation system at postgraduate research level.	Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC) to discuss the student representation system at a future meeting.	SQAC agreed that it would progress this through the Student Partnership in Quality Scotland (sparqs) PGR Student Engagement project which has been paused due to Covid-19.
Employability and graduate attributes Recommendations related to embedding transferable skills and graduate attributes within the curriculum, extending writing skills support, engagement with alumni and employers, and extending the use of inter-disciplinary projects.	Academic Services to refer recommendations to the University Executive.	Through the Careers Service and the Edinburgh Futures Institute (EFI) there has been much consideration of skills development, including data and digital skills, interdisciplinary projects through the Students as Change Agents project. COL and IAD are playing key roles in relation to the provision of support to students in writing skills and there are various projects involving both Careers and D&A to connect students with employers and alumni. In short, there is a lot of excellent work taking place, what we need to do next is consider a more coordinated approach to these aspects in relation to the development of the

		curriculum and these will be considered as part of the role of skills development and employability agenda as part of the curriculum reform process.

Senate Quality Assurance Committee

9 September 2020

Internal Review Responses

Description of paper
1. Year on response from Internal Period Review in 2018/19 and 14 week response from Internal Periodic Review 2019/20.

Action requested / recommendation
2. For comment and consideration of the recommendations. The Committee is asked to confirm that they are content with progress.

Background and context
3. The Committee confirmed it was content with progress implementing the recommendations of the Teaching Programme Review of Philosophy. The paper provides an update on progress a year on from the report.
4. The Committee confirmed it was content to implement the recommendations of the Internal Periodic Review of postgraduate research provision in the School Social and Political Science. The paper provides an update on progress 14 weeks on from the report.

Discussion
5. See attached paper.

Resource implications
6. No additional resource implications as the paper is an update on activity.

Risk management
7. No risk associated with the paper as it is an update on activity.

Equality & diversity
8. An Equality Impact Assessment was carried out on the internal review process.

Communication, implementation and evaluation of the impact of any action agreed
9. Comments on the progress towards completion of recommendations will be reported back to the Subject Area. The response will be published on the Academic Services' website.

Author
Susan Hunter
31 August 2020

Presenter
Academic Services

Freedom of Information
The paper is open.

<u>The University of Edinburgh</u>

<u>Internal Periodic Review</u>

<u>Year on response report</u>

<u>**Internal Periodic Review** of</u>:   Philosophy

Date of review: 14-15 March 2019

Date of year on response: July 2020

The School/Subject Area is responsible for reporting on progress with all recommendations, including those remitted to other areas of the University for action.

 If any recommendation has been fully addressed please record the action taken and date completed. Any barriers to progress should be highlighted on this report.

Recommendation no	Recommendation	Timescale for completion	Comment on progress towards completion and/or identify barriers to completion	Completion date
1	The review team **recommends** that the Subject Area builds on the success of its recent curricular changes by reviewing the Year 1 curriculum.	Initial Review: Academic Year 2019-20	For the academic year 2019-20, each pre-honours course will be taught by at most two lecturers. This will enable course organisers to make course-level improvements. The organisers for each Year 1 course will hold a meeting with faculty likely to teach on the course and relevant role-holders in order to review the direction and purpose of each course. A summary of the findings and any action points will be presented at a department meeting during 2019-20. This review will be the basis of any structural changes to the pre-honours curriculum. The	

| | | | subject area will also gradually incorporate the Philosophy Skills workshops into the course content of pre-honours courses.

Year on report update: Pre-honours courses continue to be taught by only 1-2 faculty members for AY 20-21. Meetings between faculty members associated with prehonours courses, and subsequent departmental discussion, were delayed by industrial action and the Covid19 crisis, so will continute into AY 20-21. Incorporation of the Philosophy Skills workshops into prehonours courses continues. | |
| 2 | The review team **recommends** that the Subject Area continues looking carefully at the variety, appropriateness and timing of the assessments it uses.

The review team **recommends** that Philosophy reviews its approach to formative feedback and ensures that all courses adhere to Regulation 15 of the Taught | Completed | i. Philosophy is looking to expand the variety and appropriateness of its forms of assessment on a course-level basis. As a department, we will create a repository of forms of assessment. This recommendation specifically addressed periodic assessment for Logic 1. The CO for Logic 1 and other relevant faculty are convening to work towards implementing periodic assessment in the 2020-21 academic year. This may involve use of Edinburgh's ∃Logic platform for marking.

Year on report update: Logic 1 has introduced periodic forms of assessment, in time for academic year 20-21. | June 2020 |

	Assessment Regulations.			September 2019
			Philosophy believes it is in compliance with Regulation 15, but that because the forms of formative feedback are diverse, this may not be visible to the students. Philosophy will update its teaching guidance for new faculty to emphasize ways to make formative feedback more visible to students. This guidance will be circulated to existing faculty. Philosophy will also discuss this issue in its welcome meetings for returning second, third, and fourth year students.	
		Completed		
3.	It is **recommended** that the Subject Area discusses ways in which it might move towards increasing the numbers of students it recruits from Scotland and from widening participation backgrounds It is **recommended** that the review of induction arrangements pays particular attention to students entering the University through non-traditional routes, from widening participation backgrounds, and with additional support needs.	Completed	The target number of Scottish and widening participation students is set by the Scottish Government. The subject area has limited power to increase their numbers. The subject area will continue participation in recruitment activities such as the Sutton Trust. Philosophy is also exploring engagement in schools, which may also help with recruitment.	September 2019

		Completed	PPLS has reviewed its induction arrangements in order to create a more welcoming, less information-focussed induction. The additional support to students provided by the writing centre and the course-specific support provided by the Philosophy Skills workshops should provide additional benefits for students from non-traditional backgrounds. PhilPALS and PhilBuddies will also provide peer academic and pastoral support under the direction of the School.	September 2019
4.	The review team **recommends** that Teaching Fellows who serve as Head Tutors are allocated time to provide in-person feedback for the Tutors they observe. It is **recommended** that Philosophy develops a more high-profile, consistent and strategic approach to encouraging staff members to work towards HEA Fellowship.	Completed On-going 2019-20	After reviewing the allocations, Philosophy has assigned Head Tutors additional hours per pre-honours course for tutor training and tutor support. The hours allocations for Head Tutors on pre-honours courses will be subject to continual review. In September 2019, PPLS will develop a plan to encourage and support staff members to work toward HEA Fellowship.	September 2019

			Year on report update: Work on this was started during 19-20 but held up by industrial action and the Covid19 crisis.	
5.	The review team **recommends** that Philosophy considers ways in which it can strengthen and develop its student partnerships.	2019-20	Philosophy will review activities to discern activities suitable for student partnerships in coordination with the Head of Student Support and Enhancement. **Year on report update:** Work on this was started during 19-20 but held up by industrial action and the Covid19 crisis.	
6.	The review team **recommends** that the Subject Area continues to seek out meaningful opportunities to embed group work and other transferable skills within the curriculum, and ensures that these are visible to and recognised by students.	2019-2020	As it creates a repository of assessment styles, Philosophy will highlight which of these teach transferrable skills. The careers consultant will also be involved in the final session of the Philosophy Skills workshops to highlight how academic skills can be transferred to employment. **Year on report update:** the final Philosophy Skills workshop was lost to the Covid19 crisis. This will be retried in academic year 20-21.	
7.	It is **recommended** that the Subject Area considers whether the dissertation course should be embedded within the credit-bearing curriculum going forwards.	2019-20	The Subject Area is sensitive to the fact that 0-credit courses should not replace credit-bearing curriculum. However, that is not the purpose of the dissertation preparation course. The subject area has experimented with a variety of means by which to relay formal requirements for the different kinds of dissertations and provide guidance. Philosophy has faced difficulties when our partner subject areas have tied dissertation information and preparation to particular courses, because not all of our	September 2019

			students do enrol in these. The 0-credit course option guarantees that students on all degree programmes are informed about their dissertation options. Similar benefits have been bestowed on students taking an optional year abroad. The course entirely consists in online videos and guidance documents for submitting a dissertation proposal. Students regularly comment on the fact that Philosophy's dissertation information is far more accessible than that of our partner subject areas.	
	It is **recommended** that Philosophy reminds students of the resources that are available to support them in their learning at relevant points during their programmes.		Philosophy will undertake a review of its guidance provided to students. The responsibility of providing this guidance and resources will be assigned to particular role holders, with reminders issued by the teaching office. The guidance will be posted at a more accessible place on the website.	
			Year on report update: this information has been revised and is now listed alongside course handbooks on the philosophy department webpage.	September 2019
		Completed		
8.	The review team **recommends** that undergraduate students are made more aware that they are welcome to attend	Completed	This will be mentioned at the welcome talks for returning students. The events will be made more visible on the website.	September 2019

	Philosophy's research seminars.			
9.	It is **recommended** that the School considers extending the scope of the PPLS Writing Centre's provision to include support for first year students.	Completed	In 2018-19, the PPLS Writing Centre offered a pilot programme of writing workshops for Year 1 undergraduates. The events had between 50-120 participants. In 2019-20, these workshops will be expanded in scope and offer support to all years, including Year 1. PPLS is not in a position to extend individual writing tuition to Year 1 undergraduates. To ensure fairness, this would require offering writing tuition to the 1,000 students in our mandatory year 1 courses, more than double the number covered at Year 2. To cover these numbers would require a substantial increase in the number of PhD students who provide staffing.	September 2019
10.	It is **recommended** that Student Recruitment and Admissions considers the potential value of providing Subject Areas with additional management information about widening participation students to allow support to be enhanced optimally.	Completed	A strand of the University's Widening Participation strategy relates to the development of tools and datasets to enable Schools and subject areas to better understand their WP cohorts, in order to anticipate and respond to their needs. Work has already been undertaken to clean the data, which it is intended will be shared via the online data dashboards. On an interim basis, data has been shared with Heads of Schools regarding WP cohorts and students with protected characteristics. This included PPLS.	

			This work is being overseen by a subgroup of the Widening Participation Strategy Implementation Group, and will be delivered in AY 19/20. **Year on report update:** PPLS colleague, Prof Graeme Trousdale, is working with the College Office, SRA and Student Systems to develop aspects of the WP Strategy in CAHSS. This includes the enhancement of the data sets and dashboards available to staff.	
11.	It is **recommended** that Estates and Buildings takes the Subject Area's feedback on the Dugald Stewart Building into account in future estates developments.	Completed	Philosophy will continue working with students to relay staff and student concerns about the available spaces. **Year on report update:** Email from estates 25th June: "As per the previous update Estates continue to facilitate effective engagement mechanisms to ensure the views of end building users are sought through the User Intelligence Groups and this information informs the ultimate design of the building. Work commenced last year to strengthen the student voice in Capital developments which has informed our approach. However in light of the current Covid crisis this work has been suspended and will recommence as we come out of lockdown restrictions. We continue to conduct post occupancy reviews which informs our approach and again in light of Covid this programme is currently suspended and will recommence as we move out of lockdown restrictions."	June, 2020
12.	It is **recommended** that the work being undertaken at		The College Dean of Undergraduate Education met with the TPR Liaison, Incoming Exam Board Convener and School Director of	

| | College-level on joint degrees considers whether it might be possible to better align the Special Circumstances and Boards of Examiners meetings for the degrees owned by each of the Subject Areas. | | Quality in August to discuss the recommendation. The recommendation was broken down into three main issues:

1. **Challenges created when Special Circumstances decisions diverge between Schools.** It was noted that the Service Excellence Programme is undertaking a project to align decisions on the validity of Special Circumstances. The results of this project aim to reduce such cross-school discrepancies.

Year on report update: A new centralised 'Extensions and Special Circumstances' team that will be taking over the approval of extensions and SCs for all students from September. | |
| | | Completed | 2. **Changes introduced at University-level that now ensure there is a gap between course and programme boards means that External Examiners must stay in Edinburgh for a longer period of time in order to attend boards.** College has highlighted that External Examiners do not have to physically attend all programme boards and that there may be electronic solutions available to ensure external examiners can engage throughout the exam board process. The Subject Area will investigate the possibility that externals attend only the Course Boards and Single Honours Programme Board.

Year on report update: the procedures for exam boards in 19-20 were, as a result of covid, entirely online. This worked very well and give support for reducing the time that external examiners are required to be in Edinburgh in future years. | |

		Special Circumstances 2020-21 (Expected)	**3. Challenges are created when course marks are not ratified by partner Schools in time for progression boards.** The University produces a list of key dates annually, which has a deadline for publication of course marks in Euclid. This precedes publication to students and joint Programme boards by a week. Philosophy will work to remind joint degree partners about these deadlines, and seek advice from College where necessary. **Year on report update:** this was all highly affected by Covid 19 so will be revisited during academic year 19-20.	
For Year on response only	Any examples of a positive change as a result of the review		- As a result of the review the department had meetings to discuss prehonours courses, which were good for building mutual understanding of how faculty approach those courses and what they think most valuable about them. This will guide further reflection on our prehonours offerings. - Logic 1's move to a short assignment structure was another positive change.	

Internal Periodic Review of: SPS PGR Programmes

Date of review: 7th and 8th of November 2019

Date of 14 week response: 31 July 2020

Date of year on response:

The School/Subject Area is responsible for reporting on progress with all recommendations, including those remitted to other areas of the University for action.

 If any recommendation has been fully addressed please record the action taken and date completed.   Any barriers to progress should be highlighted on this report.

Recommendation no	Recommendation	Timescale for completion	Comment on progress towards completion and/or identify barriers to completion	Completion date
1	The review team recommends that the School prioritise the annual PGR Annual review process and actively lead reviewing practice to be redefined as a significant event in the academic cycle across all years of the PhD, implemented robustly and efficiently for all students (2.2 & 3.1).	**2020/21 Academic Year**	Using the revised structure of the Postgraduate Board of Studies and the Postgraduate Education Committee (proposals for revisions currently under review) as the primary mechanisms for consultation, the SPS Learning and Teaching Directorate intends to engage Subject Areas via Heads of Subject, Programme Directors and other stakeholders in a round of consultation exploring the issue of annual student reviews in more depth. Given the differences in disciplinary practice	**September2020**

				represented across SPS, meeting the general aspiration of instituting PGR Annual Reviews beyond year one of the PhD degree will require more information and local guidance before a policy requiring such reviews can be instituted. The Directorate does, however, undertake this consultation with the review team's recommendation serving as a guide and motivating factor in favour of instituting the practice where possible and appropriate. From October, We will review the annual review process in SPS to improve practice and emphasise its significance as an event	
2	The review team recommends that School management prioritise the dialogue with current students regarding the redeployment of student space within the school estate plan (2.4.2 & 2.8).		Though this item has been largely superseded by the impact of the Pandemic, and the closing of all campus buildings, we have made some progress. As the school moved to open some of its building for the 2021 academic year, the PGR community were invited to put forward a representative for the Buidling Review Team. In the end we have had two representatives, and this has worked well in developing the School plans for reopening its buildings, including discussions around use of a building largely dedicated to the PGR community.	**August 2020 and ongoing**
3	The review team recommends that consideration is given to provision of additional staffing within the professional support staff team of the Graduate School(2.7.1).		Since the review, we have revised the graduate receptionist role and articulated a requirement to support the PGR support team. The team has already beenfitted from this during the last Scholarship cycle.	**September 2020**

			We're currently working on refining and further clarifying that support further.	
4	The review team recommends the School review student representation to give prominence to the role and then ensure effective inclusion on all major school committees (2.4.3).	**2020/21 Academic Year**	We will engage with the PGR student community to discuss how they might best engage with the SPS committee structure and support them to be represented on relevant committees.The Postgraduate Research Student community in SPS has demonstrated a high degree of self-organisation and engagement in the period since the lockdown due to Covid-19 went into effect. Engaging the new informal structures that students themselves have created is now a strong element of our own approach to improving student representation on formal committees and other appropriate School bodies. The Learning and Teaching Directorate has also proposed a series of changes to the Postgraduate Committee and the PG Board of Studies that is intended to enhance the overall effectiveness of these bodies, including more robust mechanisms of ensuring robust, effective student inclusion.	**Ongoing**
5	The review team recommends that the School consider the increased involvement of core academic staff in the tutor role to ensure consistency and quality across this provision (2.3.4).		We recognise that core academic staff are crucial to ensuring this consistency and quality of tutoring within the School. To that end, each Subject Area have or will identify an academic responsible for tutors and tutoring and we will meet once per semester under the guidance of the Director of Student Development. This steering group will include Tutor representation and look for ways to improve the delivery, quality and training of tutors within the School	**By November 2020**

6	The review team recommends further expansion of the Research Training Centre with a more directional suite of training opportunities and a portfolio of courses designed to support diverse student needs in research training (1.3 & 2.1).		5 new lecturing staff have joined or will be joining the RTC in the period January to September 2020. In the Independent Learning week in February 2020 the Research Training Centre (RTC) organised a Research Methods Week with 18 methods workshops attended by over 600 students from across the School. The Covid19 pandemic has inevitably required some reframing of plans. The RTC have developed online resources for both staff and students conducting research at this time. We have submitted a board of studies proposal for a suite of Micro-Methods courses from 2020/21 focussing on specific social science methods and offered for 5 credits rather than the usual longer 20 credit courses. The intention is that students will be able to flexibly chose a selection of methods training to supplement our existing methods offerings. The uncertainty around teaching in the pandemic means that we have approval to pilot these Miro-Methods courses in 2020/21 and then to offer for credit in 2021/22.	**September 2020**
7	The review team recommends that consideration be given to the appointment of a dedicated academic to manage performance and development of PGR tutors (1.6 & 2.3.4).	AY 2019/20	A Director of Student Development (0.2 FTE) has been appointed, taking up the role in May 2020.	**May 2020**
8	The review team recommends the process of PGR tutor workload allocation is communicated more		The School will look at ways of improving the detail in the Job Description provided for tutors before they	**September 2020**

	effectively to make this more transparent and equitable (1.6 & 2.3.4).		apply for a role in the School and will ensure that the hours offered to tutors are appropriate to that role while bearing in mind the eclectic mix of duties and the way that Course Organisers allocate tutor duties. In the longer term, enhanced guidance in line with the recommendations of the review team will be provided for course organisers on the tutor role - in the immediate term, Course Organizers will be reminded of their responsibilities in terms of not extending tutor duties beyond what they are paid to do. Further, to recognise the new and different role many tutors will be embarking on, a feedback mechanism will be in place for Semester 1 allowing tutors to immediately report back issues with working hours directly to the Director of Student Development, in order to enable intervention at the earliest opportunity to ensure transparency and equity.	
9	The review team recommend the School make it clear for recipients of the Alice Brown Scholarship that sufficient work exists within the School or if students require external employment (2.5.1).		The School will make clear when the scholarship is awarded what the offer entails, this is likely to take place after the award is offered via a meeting with the PGR director to ensure that they have a clear understanding of the offer.	
10	The review team recommends that the School review the induction process and consider expanding the delivery timeframe beyond Welcome Week to enable a wider volume of		For 2020/21, the School is creating a plan to elongate the induction and orientation period for new students in order to pace out the dissemination of information. This is also in line with the University's new recommendation in response to the Covid-19 situation.	**September 2020**

	information to be disseminated and understood by students(2.3.2).		Events are likely to be delivered largely online for 2020/21 and in-person where possible. It is expected events will be dispersed across a six-week period, commencing two weeks before Semester 1 begins and continuing for the first four weeks of the semester. The School is working to create an array of online content by theme so students can access it as appropriate throughout the elongated induction period. The intention is to retain this new induction structure within the School on a permanent basis. This acknowledges that spreading these events across a longer time period delivers a better student experience and a more nuanced grounding as they begin their programme of study.	
11	The review team recommends development of EUCLID to permit recording of meetings by students and increased flexibility to permit administration access to annual reports by professional support staff (2.7.2).		The School will approach Student Systems with request for comment on the feasibility of addition of a Meetings and Notes tab for PGR students.	**September 2020**
	Please report on steps taken to feedback to students on the outcomes of the review	The unexpected lockdown and move to hybrid modes of teaching delivery will require the School to extend the period of time traditionally taken to feedback to students on the outcome of the review, as our typical methods of engagement have undergone substantial revision. With these revisions now take, the School will be able to more comprehensively feedback and discuss the outcomes of the review with students during Semester 1 (and through the 2020/21 academic year) as required.		
For Year on response only	Any examples of a positive change as a result of the review			