

The University of Edinburgh
Senate Quality Assurance Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on
Tuesday 10th September 2024, 2-5pm
Hybrid meeting: Argyle House Meeting Room 14
and Microsoft Teams

1. Attendance

Present:	Position:
Professor Tina Harrison	Deputy Vice Principal, Students (Enhancement) (Convener)
Professor Matthew Bailey	Dean of Quality, CMVM
Dr Michael Barany	Senate Representative
Professor Laura Bradley	Doctoral College Representative of CAHSS (PGR)
Marianne Brown	Head of Student Analytics, Insights and Modelling
Brian Connolly	Acting Head of Quality Assurance and Enhancement, Academic Services
Dr Anne Desler	School Representative of CAHSS
Faten Adam	School Representative of CSE
Olivia Eadie	Co-Director, Institute for Academic Development
Professor Nazira Karodia	Deputy Vice Chancellor and Vice Principal of Learning & Teaching, Edinburgh Napier University
Professor Linda Kirstein	Dean of Education Quality Assurance and Culture, CSE
Callum Paterson	Academic Engagement and Policy Coordinator
Dr Neneh Rowa-Dewar	School Representative of CMVM
Dr Emily Taylor	Dean of Quality Assurance and Curriculum Validation, CAHSS
Dylan Walch	Vice President (Education), Students' Association
Sinéad Docherty	Committee Secretary, Academic Services
In attendance:	
Dr Andy Law	Observer from Senate Task and Finish Group
Dr Kate Ash-Irisarri	Observer from Senate Task and Finish Group

2. Welcome and introductions

The Convener welcomed members to the first SQAC meeting of 2024/25 and in particular the two new members, Dylan Walch, VP Education and Faten Adam, School Representative of CSE, as well as returning elected Senate member, Dr Michael Barany.

The Convener also welcomed the two Senate Effectiveness Review Task and Finish Group representatives who were in attendance to observe the meeting.

The Convener extended thanks and congratulations to the Dean of Education Quality Assurance and Culture, CSE who will be moving on to a new role within the College. The Committee look

forward to welcoming Professor James Hopgood as the new Dean of Quality Assurance, CSE from the next meeting.

3. Note of e-business and minutes (SQAC 24/25 1A and 1B)

The Committee approved the note of e-business relating to 29th April – 6th May 2024.

The Committee noted a query received in relation to the minutes of the May meeting (Paper B Degree Awarded Analysis 2022-23) seeking clarification on the reference to ‘...Schools being asked to award marks in the 80s and 90s to make full use of the scale’. It was noted that this point, originally made during the discussion of awarding gaps and degree outcomes, referred to the encouragement (but not a formal University policy) given to subject areas, particularly within the Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, a number of years previous in response to comments from External Examiners.

In order to understand the current use of the mark scale, the Committee noted that the inclusion of aggregated data in the annual analysis of degree outcomes would be useful in providing more insight. This was suggested as an area that the Student Data Monitoring Task & Finish Group could explore as part of their work. It was also noted that the understanding and use of descriptors and rubrics is an important component of making full use of the mark scale.

Action: Committee Secretary to refer the request for aggregated data in the degree outcome paper to the authors of this work.

The Committee approved the minutes of the meeting held on 16th May 2024.

Action: Committee Secretary to publish final version of April’s e-business note and May minutes on the Committee webpage.

4. Matters Arising

- **Minutes**

In relation to a request for the draft minutes to be circulated to members sooner after a meeting, the Convener confirmed the intention that minutes would be circulated within 2 weeks, when possible.

- **Scottish Funding Council (SFC) Tertiary Quality Review**

The Convener reported that the SFC has published the [Guidance on quality for colleges and universities AY 2024-25 to AY 2030-31](#) which outlines the key elements of Scotland’s new Tertiary Quality Enhancement Framework (TQEF). It was noted that the Convener and members of Academic Services had attended a number of information sessions organised by the SFC since the August 2024 publication.

The Convener confirmed that a new institutional annual reporting process to the SFC has been implemented from 2024/25, the Self-Evaluation Action Plan (SEAP). The SEAP will replace

both the annual report and statement of assurance on Institution-Led Review and the learning and quality aspects of the Outcome Agreement process. It has been developed alongside the new TQEF and will form part of the evidence base for institutional quality reviews throughout the sector. The report will consist of two sections: Self-Evaluation which reports on annual institutional quality assurance and enhancement activities and outcomes and an Action Plan which details the planned institution level enhancement activities arising from the self-evaluation. The report will include progress updates on the actions taken since the last external review. It is a concise, high-level summary of themes discussed and associated actions taken by various groups and committees across the institution, and as such is drawn from existing reports and papers and updates from relevant stakeholders. There is an additional expectation that the SEAP is developed in partnership with students.

It was noted that the SEAP submission deadline will be 30 November each year (or the first working day in December, where the 30 November falls on a weekend or bank holiday as it does this year) and the final document must be reviewed and signed off by the Accountable Officer (i.e. Principal) in advance of submission (and should be shared with the Governing Body to support their oversight of quality assurance and enhancement).

The Convener also confirmed that a new institutional review process will be implemented from 2024/25, the Tertiary Quality Enhancement Review (TQER). This will replace the previous Enhancement Led Institutional Review (ELIR) and Quality Enhancement and Standards Review (QESR). In the first year of TQER, two institutions (one Higher Education and one Further Education) have been chosen to undertake review. The schedule for all other institutions will be published by the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) in the Autumn of 2024, with specific dates for each institution confirmed 8 months in advance.

The Convener confirmed that a communication on the TQEF and TQER will be circulated to key stakeholders across the University.

Action: Convener to circulate a communication to colleagues on the key elements of the new TQEF and TQER.

- **Quality Enhancement & Standards Review (QESR)**

The Convener confirmed that the University's [Action Plan](#) in response to the recommendations of the [2023 QESR](#) was submitted as required to the QAA in July 2024. It was noted that feedback from the QAA had been positive with just one additional request to confirm that training will be in place (and uptake monitored) for the start of the 2024/25 academic year for all postgraduate research students who teach. It was noted that data on this had been gathered during the summer (as part of the annual monitoring process) and Colleges are working with Schools to ensure that this training is in place and monitored.

Action: Convener to include an update on progress with the QESR Action Plan in the TQEF/TQER communication.

The VP Education presented the Committee with their priorities for academic year 2024/25:

- Advocate for transparency and accountability in University decision-making, to help students shape their experience and make their own informed decisions;
- Enhance student's experience of interacting with the University, with services offering the support and standards expected and students able to navigate these services;
- Empower student leaders to create change.

The VP Education explained that their priorities are driven by the objective of improving the education experience for students. It was noted that student partnership and student voice are integral in all these priorities, and the VP Education is committed to ensuring that the student voice is working within the existing QA processes. There was emphasis on working within teams and in collaboration, from a student perspective, to streamline University services.

The Committee reflected on the commitment to empower student leaders, and asked how to create more meaningful interactions in engaging with the wider student population. The VP Education suggested that there are different best practice approaches at different levels, and that a small group of engaged people can be an effective way to engage with the student voice.

The VP Education proposed improvements to the student representative system and its governance, to make sure that reps are feeding back to students and strengthening the representative system at School level. It was also recognised that, in addition to information flowing up and down within Schools, there is a need to build structures which enable the flow across College level and more widely across the institution.

The VP Education reflected that, in terms of aligning with the Student Partnership Agreement, this existing agreement might not be where student partnerships work is moving toward. There may be a sense that the SPA is low-level, at the moment, and is seen as more of a funding package than a student partnership opportunity.

The Committee were informed of the wider work of the EUSA Sabbatical Officer team and their shared priorities for 2024/25, including pay and reward for student reps, additional accommodation and food support for the student population to offer an accessible and communal package, and enhancing the existing University services in place to make them more student-centred and accessible at the point of use.

The Committee noted its support for the priorities set out and expressed its commitment to working with the VP Education throughout the year to accomplish these priorities.

6. School Annual Quality Reports 2023/24: Sub Group Report (SQAC 24/25 1D)

The Committee discussed the report from the sub-group tasked with reviewing the school annual quality reports. It was noted that a new Student Outcomes reporting box has been added (with a specific prompt to reflect on any differences in attainment for different student demographic

groups) and specific reflections had been required on the following institutional priorities: Student Voice Policy; Assessment & Feedback Principles & Priorities; student support; and the impact of the industrial action.

The following themes for further development at University level were agreed:

Student Support

The Sub Group noted that it was apparent throughout the reports that the Student Advisor role was highly valued and their contributions had been recognised by a number of Schools. Two specific examples of good practice within this theme were highlighted by the Sub Group; the heat maps of student email interactions with Student Advisors, devised by the School of Economics, and the research and published report by the School of Informatics which considered the switch to the new student support model within the School. The Committee acknowledged the report's findings that students value reliability and consistency as key aspects of student support provision.

Action: Student Support Continuous Improvement Group (SSCIG) to share the good practice and findings from School of Economics and School of Informatics.

The Sub Group noted that the Cohort Lead role had been identified as having had variable success; there were clear examples of individuals working well in the role and engaging with students but many Schools reporting that the role could be more effective. The Sub Group found that there was demand for enhanced central guidance on how to deploy the role and design events to best engage with students. It was identified that the role was felt to be working well in smaller Schools and tight academic areas. There were, however, challenges for students on joint programmes, with Schools concerned about gaps or inconsistency in the student experience. It was suggested that the issues with the student support model reflect the limits of the structures in place within the University, including issues around the teaching model and over-reliance on PGR tutors. These factors may help to explain the concern around the academic support gap and the expected role and responsibilities of cohort leads.

Action: Committee Secretary to refer issues to the Student Support Continuous Improvement Group (SSCIG) for response to SQAC.

Assessment and Feedback

The Sub Group noted that Schools were looking for further guidance on Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) and assessment to help with concerns around academic integrity. It was noted that Schools had started to develop their own approaches and in some areas this has resulted in a return to in-person exams. However, the positive opportunities of Generative AI as a tool were also recognised, particularly in regard to graduate attributes and the need for University of Edinburgh students to learn how to use AI tools responsibly. The Convener confirmed that the Assessment & Feedback Strategy Group had considered the issues and updated guidance for students is due to be published shortly. The Convener also confirmed that work is ongoing around innovative uses of Generative AI in teaching, and a paper is due to be presented to Senate Education Committee (SEC) later in the academic year to agree the institutional position on exams.

Views of wider Senate elected members were fed into this discussion on assessment and feedback. There was agreement that colleagues see Generative AI as a major concern that must be addressed. There is interest from wider Senate in the paper on assessment formats and resits being presented to SEC by Professor Tina Harrison and Senate elected members request that this item is also presented to a future meeting of Senate. Finally, Senate elected members welcome the efforts to understand turnaround times more carefully across the institution and seek to understand the impact that the metric is having on student satisfaction, as some members report their experience of very fast turnaround times not seeming to correlate to improved satisfaction.

In relation to quality of feedback, the Convener confirmed that work is being undertaken with the Internal Audit team to develop an institutional framework for conducting audits on quality of feedback. The approach is based on the tool developed by the Director of Quality for the Deanery of Molecular, Genetic and Population Health Sciences. It was noted that the School of GeoSciences has agreed to pilot the feedback audit, conversations are ongoing with the Business School about joining the pilot, and that a School or Deanery from within CMVM should also be invited join the pilot.

Action: Dean of Quality CMVM to liaise with Schools and Deaneries within College to identify a volunteer for the feedback audit pilot work.

The Committee recognised that the audit work must be an open process at School level, and communication with colleagues must be clear and considerate to sensitivities. It was noted that the focus on quality of feedback is driven by professional development for colleagues, as well as moderation requirements. It was agreed that there is further work to be done on following up External Examiner reports and supporting colleagues in conversations around moderation. Feedback turnaround times, published marking criteria and rubrics adhering to the Assessment and Feedback Principles and Priorities, feedback templates and established minimum standards were all identified as mechanisms for enhancing assessment and feedback. The Committee agreed that a desirable outcome for this work is consistency of experience for students.

Action: Committee Secretary to refer issues to the Assessment and Feedback Strategy Group for response to SQAC.

Student Voice & Partnership

The Sub Group noted that Schools continue to make significant efforts to provide opportunities for students to feedback on their student experience through locally organised student voice mechanisms, and provided examples of feedback mechanisms used. However, many Schools, particularly those using survey tools, reported issues with engagement and low response rates, with concerns regarding the utility of feedback derived from such low levels of engagement. It was common for Schools to report high student satisfaction with opportunities for providing feedback, but a much lower student satisfaction in terms of students feeling that feedback is valued and action taken as a result. The Sub Group noted that the School reports generally lacked information on actions taken in response to feedback from students, and approaches to closing the feedback loop, and agreed that the template next year should prompt for this.

The Sub Group noted that a possible aspect challenging closing the feedback loop may be due to the challenges of identifying and responding to issues at School level (which can be addressed

and responded to locally) versus those that are not within the control of the School and which require institutional-level response and action, making it more challenging at School level to close the feedback loop and may create a disconnect between students and decision makers. The sub-Group noted a need for a more effective means of escalating issues that cannot be addressed at School level.

Action: Academic Services to revise School Quality Reporting template to prompt Schools next year to update on actions taken in response to student feedback and approaches to closing the feedback loop.

Action: Colleges to encourage and support Schools to consider feedback mechanisms that encourage dialogue with students, reducing reliance on surveys attracting low responses.

Action: Students' Association and Academic Services to work together to consider an effective approach for escalating issues requiring University level attention and response through the student representation structures.

Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI)

The Committee noted the value of the report template including reference to student outcomes and progression and therefore greater reporting on these areas this year. There was a query as to whether definitions of outcomes and progression vary across Schools; it was proposed that the Student Data Monitoring Task and Finish Group should explore the definitions and develop guidance for how Schools should use the progression and outcome data that is available to them.

Action: Committee Secretary to refer issues to the Student Data Monitoring Task and Finish Group for response to SQAC.

Postgraduate Research Student Experience

In relation to the postgraduate research (PGR) student experience, it was highlighted that the key elements in the reports addressed completion times, training for PGR students who teach and the student support model not extending to postgraduate taught (PGT) students. Responses around lengthening completion times reflect the trend in the sector to move to a 4-year funding model. It was acknowledged that this presents issues for Widening Participation (WP) students and those who are self-funding, who are expected to complete an unfunded period at the end of their studies. It was agreed that the University needs to improve its understanding and awareness of the scale of this issue.

The Doctoral College representative noted concerns that the data referenced in the School reports is not robust because different parameters were used to evidence the responses. It was proposed that the templates should provide central data, generated with the same parameters, to ensure greater consistency although it was recognised that there will be resource required to support this work. It was also noted that the data provided included students with an authorised interruption of studies (AIS) status; some Schools manually excluded this from their report, but the inclusion elsewhere impacted the reported completion rates.

The Committee agreed that further actions were required to appropriately escalate the concerns raised within the theme of PGR student experience. It was agreed that the points around PGR students and student support should be directed to the Student Experience Group for their

attention, and the points around completion rates should be directed towards the Doctoral College who can help to strengthen annual reviews and expectations across the University. Finally, it was agreed that the action in the Sub Group's report, concerning the records of training for PGR students who teach, should be redirected to Professor Antony Maciocia, as the institutional PGR Lead on the External Quality Review Oversight Group.

Action: Committee Secretary to refer relevant issues to Student Experience Group, Doctoral College, PGR Lead on the External Quality Review Oversight Group for response to SQAC.

The Committee considered the remaining themes identified by the report. These reflected issues that had come up strongly through some reports but were not widespread. These areas were noted by the Committee and it was agreed that responsibility lay with the relevant Colleges to monitor and support work in these areas. It was agreed to raise concerns around student attendance and engagement with the Student Support Continuous Improvement Group (SSCIG) and to direct the concerns around space and estates to the central estates team. This was recognised to be an ongoing issue where Schools need support and information. It was acknowledged that the building and moving programme underway is having an impact on expectations and understanding of available space.

A member raised the issue of resit entitlement which had been apparent in some of the School reports. It was highlighted that Schools and Colleges are having to manage a large number of concessions as a result of resit delays, and there should be the expectation that resits take place in the same academic year. It was questioned whether the resit model is generally fit for purpose. It was requested that the University's language around resit provision be reviewed and strengthened to improve the process and timing.

Action: Convener to take issue of resit entitlement to the A&F Strategy Group for action.

The Convener recorded thanks to the members of the Sub Group for their time reading the School annual quality reports and working on the Sub Group report.

7. Internal Periodic Review Themes 2023/24 (SQAC 24/25 1E)

The analysis of themes from the Internal Periodic Reviews (IPRs) held in 2023/24 was presented to the Committee by the Head of Quality Assurance and Enhancement, Academic Services. It was noted that the identified areas for development in this paper align with the themes identified through the annual monitoring quality process.

It was noted, in relation to the Assessment & Feedback recommendations, that the A&F Strategy Group is in operation and is supporting the work to deliver the changes required by the QESR recommendation. Therefore, the responsibility for action around A&F recommendations will also lie with the Strategy Group, as well as Schools and Colleges.

The Committee flagged that the average number of 12 recommendations per report was high, and may impact the depth of response provided by the Schools. The Committee also highlighted that commitment of staff was often commended, although commendations should focus on

good practice and action that had been taken. The Committee agreed that there can be other mechanisms through which to recognise contributions of staff and it is important for the reports to be targeted in their use of commendations and recommendations.

Action: Academic Services to review IPR report template and guidance to provide more instruction on maximum number of recommendations and the language used to identify commendations.

8. Student Support – 2023/24 Feedback Outcomes (SQAC 24/25 1F)

This item was presented to the Committee for noting by the Head of Student Analytics, Insights and Modelling. It was explained that the outcomes had been informed through focus groups, that a more detailed report has also been produced and is available, and that the outcomes align with the themes identified in the annual monitoring reports. Key outcomes highlighted that students want to be proactively supported and receive personalised support, and that there is ongoing work to do to effectively embed the Cohort Lead role within the new model.

Action: Head of SAIM to share more detailed version of the feedback outcomes report with Committee members.

The Committee discussed the report and noted appreciation for the triangulation of feedback from different review methods. Issues with inconsistency in the application of the model was noted as an important aspect for the University; in managing and implementing significant change projects, it is important to provide clear and specific guidance and a detailed framework. It is not sufficient to cascade information to Schools for their interpretation, and this results in significant workload for Schools applying the broad guidance to their own area.

It was suggested that there is a need for a mindset switch from thinking about how the Personal Tutor role was used and what the academic role needs to be within the new model. Conversations and interactions with students can take place in different environments, not just a one-to-one setting. The Committee were informed of the training event organised for Cohort Leads working within CAHSS, which was found to be a positive group exercise that included examples of successful activities and what worked well within the model. The Committee agreed it would be useful for good practice examples to be shared more widely across the University.

It was communicated to the Committee that this paper had generated much discussion within the elected cohort of wider Senate members. It was reported that this paper presented to SQAC was understood to have articulated issues within the student support model, whereas a paper on the SEC agenda appeared to be less cognisant of the issues identified within the model.

The Committee discussed the importance of improving communication channels to Schools and Colleges to address any disconnect around the evaluation of the model. It was noted that Senate Standing Committee papers are written for different audiences and it is appropriate that the greater level of detail belongs with SQAC as it is the Committee with responsibility for monitoring the student support framework.

The Convener recognised that the implementation of the new student support model had been a significant shift, both for the University and in the context of the sector. The increase in student satisfaction with mental health support was highlighted as an indication that the system is working well, and it was noted that most students have had experience of the previous system against which they can compare.

The Committee addressed a concern noted in the paper some students do not know where to go for the appropriate support. Triaging through different services needs to work well, and whilst Student Advisors are a key contact for students, not everything has to go through this channel. Academic staff should also be aware of the services that students should be signposted to for support, and be available for contact with students that does relate to academic matters. The Committee suggested it would be useful to track how often Student Advisors are connecting students with academic staff, and develop a better understanding of what good academic support means within the model.

Action: Continuous Improvement Group will investigate the definition of academic support that has been referred to in the evaluation.

9. Student Support – Evaluation and Monitoring Framework Plan (SQAC 24/25 1G)

The Head of Student Analytics, Insights and Modelling presented an update on the evaluation approach that has now been developed to evaluate and monitor the newly implemented student support model. The Student Support (Continuous Improvement) Group (SSCIG) have responsibility for actions arising from this work.

It was outlined that the framework relies on various data sources and this is expected to provide a comprehensive picture of the impact of the model. There was a query around the benchmarks and targets for the key indicators. The Committee were informed that benchmarking has been undertaken where possible, but that baseline data was not always available. It was noted that the data required is not all held in one place, and therefore there is the need to triangulate the data and review the impact retrospectively.

The discussion raised some areas for consideration in the framework. It was noted that some metrics must be defined, such as the benchmark for what is considered to be low turnover in Student Advisor roles and the total number of students who can be supported by Wellbeing Advisors. It was recognised that the PTES survey has a low response rate and queried how effective this is as a data source. The presenter highlighted the range of data sources used as inputs to mitigate the surveys with a low response rate, and explained that the framework had to identify data that is in existence and not expect Schools and College to undertake further data collection.

It was acknowledged that some data sources may have limitations, but it is hugely important for student views and understanding of support to be fed into the evaluation and this is sourced, in part, through survey responses. It is hoped that the cohort evaluation activity will be piloted this academic year, with the student voice informing how this activity is integrated into the model.

It was proposed that it would be helpful for QA processes to ask more targeted questions around student support and engagement with EUSA and the student voice. In response to queries around surveying students, it was explained that NSS questions are set externally and the University cannot adjust the wording of the questions. The University can select the banks of rotational questions; SEC has responsibility for approving the selected question banks, an item it considers in semester 2. It was suggested that it would be useful for Schools to know what questions were to be included in the NSS in advance of the survey.

Action: Head of SAIM to circulate communication to Schools to confirm the NSS question set in advance of the survey going to students.

It was confirmed to the Committee that there will be some scope with the framework to see how certain groups of students are impacted by the student support model, where the data can support this. In relation to awarding gaps, there was a question around the diversity of Student Advisors and whether this correlates with how students seek support. It was confirmed that the initial recruitment of Student Advisors was targeted to achieve similar representation to that of the student population, although it was not known where those Student Advisors were placed within the institution.

The Committee were informed that the SSCIG are expected to complete a progress report by the end of the semester which will be presented to SQAC.

10. Senate Committees' Internal Effectiveness Review 2022/23 (SQAC 24/25 1H)

The Committee Secretary outlined the key findings of the internal effectiveness review.

During the discussion, low participation in e-business was raised as a concern, with the Committee prompted to consider how to evidence baseline engagement with e-business or reassess how it uses e-business.

In relation to the proposed action for time to be set aside at the final meeting of the year for members to complete the internal effectiveness survey, it was noted that this should not be necessary as it is the responsibility of members to engage with the survey and the in-meeting time constraint is not conducive for free text comments and feedback.

The Committee felt it was helpful to see the responses in relation to how effectively communication is managed. It was agreed to set aside some time in a subsequent meeting for the Committee to explore how to better communicate the work it does. There was concern that some of the work of the Committee risks being duplicated because of lack of awareness or visibility within the wider institution. The Senate Committee newsletter was highlighted as a useful tool for communicating the Committee's activity, although it is not known how effective this is.

Action: Committee Secretary to enquire into recipients of and engagement with Senate Committees newsletter and report back to next meeting.

The Committee discussed mechanisms and approaches to diversify its membership. Suggestions included a co-opted member with EDI expertise, such as a School Director of EDI, joining the Committee or seeking input from the new EDI lead at University level to align with broader strategy. It was proposed that SQAC should seek to work in collaboration with the EDI Committee rather than rely on representation within the Committee membership. There was caution against tokenism and divesting the Committee of its responsibility to consider EDI matters.

It was recognised that the Committee will have a particular focus on EDI matters and awarding gaps, through its oversight of the Student Data Monitoring Task & Finish Group. It was agreed that the Committee does have a role in sharing good practice and creating greater impact from the work that it does. The Business School's Widening Participation film for staff was cited as an example of good practice noticed through a quality process which should be shared more widely for the benefit of colleagues across the institution.

Action: Academic Services to enhance mechanisms for promoting and sharing good practice as an outcome of QA processes.

11. Committee Terms of Reference and Membership 2024/25 (SQAC 24/25 11)

The Convener presented these administrative items for noting. The updates to membership that had been confirmed over the summer were reflected in the revised membership list.

The Committee discussed the vacant positions within its membership, which are two co-opted positions and two unfilled Senate elected representative positions. The Convener proposed a colleague for one of the co-opted places; this colleague has a background in statistics and would be a valuable contributor, especially in the work of the Student Data Monitoring Task & Finish Group.

There was discussion of the process for nominating a co-opted member to the Committee. Members were advised that the expectation of co-opting members from the wider university is described in historical minutes referenced in the Standing Orders. Members expressed an expectation that an advert for interest would need to be made available across the University, for colleagues to then express their interest in joining on a co-opted place.

The Committee were informed that there are interested parties who wish to take the vacant Senate elected positions, one from CSE and one from CMVM, which would ensure Senate representation on behalf of all three Colleges. It was acknowledged that there is an annual election process for Senate representatives to join the Senate Standing Committees and the Committee felt that a motion would have to go to Senate to address the unfilled positions to ensure due diligence on the required process.

It was agreed that the Student Data Monitoring Group membership would be reviewed and, if any gaps identified, this may inform the expertise sought through the co-opted member process.

Action: Student Data Monitoring T&F Group Co-conveners to review membership and identify any potential gaps in expertise of the Group.

12. Internal Periodic Review: Reports and Responses (SQAC 24/25 1J)

Due to the volume of IPR documentation to consider for this meeting, the College Deans of Quality had been asked to provide commentary for the reports and response within their College.

The Dean of Quality, CMVM noted that it had been useful to have several IPRs clustered together which had highlighted themes to be addressed by the College Executive group. These themes included staff experience, development and promotion, strategic overview and the absence of a Workload Allocation Model (WAM) within the College. It was noted that the College governance review should help to address the core themes from the CMVM reports.

The Dean of Quality Assurance and Curriculum Validation, CAHSS highlighted that the recommendations in the SPS final report aligned with University and College priorities, and with the focus on assessment and feedback. It is expected that the School will benefit from parallel activity in other Schools and at College level as they make progress against the recommendations.

Two CAHSS responses were identified as needing to provide further detail and clarification; the School of Economics in relation to its recommendations around programme enhancement and graduate attributes and the School of Literatures, Languages and Cultures in relation to support for students returning from a year abroad, the timelines for addressing assessment type and volume and management structures. The Committee agreed that these Schools should be asked to update their response to include further information.

Action: Academic Services to refer areas for further updates to the relevant Schools and monitor progress through quality processes.

The CAHSS and CMVM reports and responses were approved subject to the actions identified in the commentary from the relevant Deans of Quality.

The Dean of Education Quality Assurance and Culture, CSE will provide written commentary on reports and responses belonging to Schools within CSE and this will be shared with the Committee to assist their approval decisions. Some comments were noted in relation to CSE Schools; it was highlighted that the estate-based recommendation is not within the School of Chemistry's power to address and questioned whether all the recommendations made to the School of Engineering can be effectively measured and assessed. In response to the estate-based recommendation, it was emphasised that IPRs can ask for the University to address problems that cannot be solved at School or College level.

13. A.O.B.

It was noted that a number of suggestions during discussions had been directed towards the Student Data Monitoring Task & Finish Group. It was emphasised that the workload of the group needs to be appropriate and in line with the remit in order to ensure its task is manageable.

14. Date of next meeting

The next meeting will take place on Thursday 5th December 2024, 2-5pm.