

**Senate Quality Assurance Committee e-business
Monday 29th April – Monday 6th May 2024 5pm**

Note of e-business

1.	Items for noting	
1.1	Minutes of the meeting held on 22nd February 2024. To note.	SQAC 23/24 4A
	<p>The Committee had discussed these minutes in the meeting of 25th April 2024 and agreed to amend the wording around feedback quality and turnaround times, in the context of the QESR recommendation.</p> <p>This amendment was incorporated and the updated, final version was shared with the Committee via e-business for noting.</p>	
2.	Items for approval	
2.1	Committee Priorities 2024/25 Revised draft – for approval.	SQAC 23/24 4H
	<p>This item was discussed in the meeting of SQAC on April 25th and comments from members had been noted. A revised draft was shared via e-business.</p> <p>Two members confirmed approval through e-business. Comments received from other members as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The QESR Priority clarifications are good, but there still needs to be language reflecting the committee agreement that one of SQAC's roles in this priority is to facilitate greater ownership and understanding of QESR and related processes and requirements in Senate at large. I appreciate that this aspect is now included in the updated TQEF priority. • The SSM Priority updates are good, and there still needs to be added the aspect of SQAC to consider implications for the role of quality assurance in change management more broadly, and how the rollout of SSM was able to get so far past the pilot phase without a QA framework. • Under the P&A Monitoring Priority, this should include the discussed dimension of focusing on quality data and high standards of evidence collection and use. • Need to make sure all QESR priorities for 2024-25 are explicitly identified. <p>These comments were incorporated into the revised draft which will be presented at the meeting of SQAC on 16th May.</p> <p>One further comment was received via e-business:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I also thought the committee had a consensus on the additional priority of assessing our QA apparatus for internal systems and change processes including core teaching infrastructure such as VLEs, Exceptional Circumstances, and Timetabling. 	

	<p>During its meeting on 25th April 2024, this had been discussed by the Committee and agreed as an area of focus rather than a priority, due to the overall responsibility falling within the remit of the Deputy Secretary, Students. Therefore, this item was not included as a Committee priority.</p> <p>This paper was approved on the basis of a majority nil response, recorded as assent. A member raised concern that it is inappropriate to regard a nil response as assent, and the Committee's legitimacy depends on being able to demonstrate thorough and active responsibility for items in its remit.</p>	
2.2	<p>Internal Periodic Review: Reports and Responses</p> <p>The Committee is invited to approve the IPR Final Reports and Responses published on the Committee SharePoint.</p>	SQAC 23/24 2H
	<p>Comments received from the Committee as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● School of Divinity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In relation to paired Level 10/11 courses - clarification on a desirable ratio or limit that programme directors can work towards along with a timeframe for completion. ● Moray House School of Education and Sport <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is recognition that much of the work against recommendations remains ongoing with the change in leadership necessarily resulted in some delays. ○ It seems the Moray House work on the recommendations is still mostly incomplete, with many at the point of convening groups to look at issues that haven't finished meeting or reporting yet. We should try to understand to what extent that is a fault of poor goal-setting vs insufficient attention to the goals. Where activities have taken place with MH, evidence of effectiveness could be improved. ○ Branding work delayed by change of Head of School but query if this would have been a good use of resources anyway. ○ What is the desired outcome of improved staff data literacy? The comments suggest risk of mission drift and redundant effort. <p>The reports and responses were reviewed by the Committee, and critical comments and questions will be tracked through Academic Services. As there was no direction not to approve, these are taken as approved by assent.</p>	
	<p>Date of next meeting Thursday 16th May 2024 2-5pm, Hybrid meeting: Cuillin Room Charles Stewart House and Microsoft Teams</p>	