

Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee**Thursday 21 May 2026 at 2:00pm****Microsoft Teams****AGENDA**

Present: Katya Amott Dr Adam Bunni Dr Lawrence Dritsas Lisa Dawson Dr Valentina Ferlito Lindsey Fox Myles Blaney Professor Dave Laurenson Dr Matt Bell Isabel Lavers Dr Chris Mowat Dr Kirsten Phimister Dr Emily Taylor (Convener) Kirsty Woomble Professor Gill Aitken Victoria Buchanan Lucy Evans Catriona Morley Professor James Hopgood Robin Gay	Vice President Education, Students' Association Head of Academic Policy, Academic Quality and Standards Dean of Students (CAHSS) Academic Registrar, Registry Services Senate representative (CMVM) Head of Postgraduate Research Student Administration (CSE) Acting Head of Digital Learning Applications and Media Senate representative (CSE) Senate representative (CSE) Academic Administration Manager (CMVM) Dean of Students (CSE) Head of Taught Student Administration (CSE) Dean of Quality Assurance and Curriculum Validation (CAHSS) Head of Postgraduate Research Student Office (CAHSS) Dean of Education (CMVM) Director, Disability and Learning Support Service (Co-opted member) Associate Principal and Deputy Secretary, Students (Co-opted member) Head of Taught Student Administration & Support (CAHSS) Dean of Quality and Enhancement (CSE) Student Voice Manager (EUSA)
In attendance: Meg Batty Professor Tina Harrison	Academic Quality and Standards Manager (AQS) Deputy Vice Principal Students (Engagement)
Apologies: Heather Innes Professor Linda Kirstein (Vice-Convener) Professor Ruth Andrew Charlotte Macdonald	Academic Engagement Coordinator, Students' Association (Co-opted member) Dean of Education (CSE) Dean of Postgraduate Research (CMVM) Advice Place Manager, Students' Association

1.	Welcome and apologies The Convener welcomed Myles Blaney as a new member of the Committee, noting that Myles has replaced Karen Howie on the Committee due to Karen leaving the university. The Convener noted apologies for the meeting and confirmed that James Hopgood and Robin Gay were in attendance as substitute members for Linda Kirstein and Heather Innes respectively.
2.	Minutes of the previous meeting For approval • 19 March 2026 The Committee approved the minutes of the meeting held on 19 March 2026.
3.	3.1 Matters Arising • Convener's communications: Thresholds for excluding courses The Convener thanked members for their comments on the electronic paper "Thresholds for excluding course results in Exceptional Circumstances". This paper, with the comments reflected, went to Senate on Tuesday 19th and was approved. Academic Year dates 27/28 The Convener noted at the January meeting the Committee did not approve the academic year dates for 27/28 and asked for scoping work to be completed on the turnaround time after the Fringe. This is still ongoing and therefore the academic year dates for 27/28 will be coming to the September meeting for approval. The Academic Registrar provided an update that conversations are ongoing but further consultation time is needed with estates and EUSA to understand the impact to the exam timetable. There were two additional actions that will also be reported on in September; - Kings Building is used for exams and data will be brought to the meeting in September to understand how it was used in the May diet in order for the Committee to discuss if the proposed use as a satellite campus for adjustment exams is still a priority. - Exploring the asymmetry of the two semesters will be brought to the September meeting with benchmarking e.g. University of Newcastle and University of Exeter have transitioned to exams after Christmas. • Actions Log: PGR recording on EUCLID Colleges have engaged with PGR Committees to establish expectations around recording supervision within EUCLID for all PGR students. Staff see the value of this and will be working towards better recording. Resit Data Academic Registrar has requested Colleges identify data requirements around resits and submit the requirements before the deadline,

	3.2 Report of Convener's Action CSE Concession A concession was approved by full Committee in September 2025 for a number of Geosciences students to progress to Year 4 carrying a compulsory course of 10 credits due to being unable to complete the fieldtrip as a result of industrial action. The Convener approved for the concession to be extended by a year where students secured an industrial placement meaning they would not be able to attend the fieldtrip in academic year 26/27. Student Discipline Committee (SDC) Membership The Convener approved seven nominations for new student members of the Student Discipline Committee. Their term starts on 1st June 2026. The Convener noted the impressive range of student submissions. Summary of Approved Concessions Approved via Convener's Action 2025/26 (since previous meeting on 19 March 2026) The Convener noted that 13 concession requests had been approved.
4.	SUBSTANTIVE ITEMS
4.1	Industrial Action: Variations to Academic Regulations and Policies The paper was presented by Lucy Evans and Tina Harrison. The Convener gave context to the paper; The University is in a period of industrial action and continue to meet with UCU. However, the university has a responsibility to minimise the impact to our students' education. University regulations include the ability to apply temporary variations in order to mitigate any disruption to students receiving their awards or progression decisions. APRCs task was to recommend variation for approval to Senate who will hold an extraordinary meeting on Monday. Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC) were conducting electronic business concurrently to seek their approval for the External Examiners variations to recommend for approval to Senate. The Convener emphasised the importance of the paper, the work that went into it and the proposed actions which reflect our commitment to our students. The detail of the paper had been consulted on widely and took account of previous experience. The University's regulations allow us to make variations to mitigate the disruption to students. The role of APRC is to ensure that we are maintaining academic standards and working in best interest of students, so that they can progress and receive their awards in a timely fashion Academic standards are those set by the University as an awarding body. We have applied the variations proposed previously. These have been reviewed by the QAA previously, following a concern raised with them by a member of staff. The QAA found that they pose no risk to academic standards. The proposed variations are in line with those put in place previously, but some are more tightly constrained, e.g. credit on aggregate reduced from 60 to 40 credits.

Based on the QAA's judgement of our approach, APRC need not have any concern about academic standards, but focus on working in the best interest of our students.

The Scottish Funding Council has launched a National Review of Awarding Arrangements and we expect to be included in the process, and therefore be subject to scrutiny of our assessment and awarding processes within this calendar year therefore this sets us up appropriately.

It was highlighted that the main risk is not the variations themselves, but applying the variations consistently across Schools and Colleges.

*Senate Support note – a motion passed on Tuesday 19 May will ensure Boards of Examiners document use of variations which will be reported to Senate at its first Ordinary meeting of the 2026/27 academic year.

APRC agreed to recommend that Senate approve the temporary activation of Taught Assessment Regulation 70.

This was based on the rationale presented in paper APRC 25/26 4B.

APRC agreed to recommend that Senate approve the temporary activation of Taught Assessment Regulation 71.

This was based on the rationale presented in paper APRC 25/26 4B.

APRC agreed to recommend that Senate Quality Assurance Committee and Senate approve the temporary amendment to remove the requirement to consult External Examiners when setting examination papers (Annex A, Point 1). This was subject to the instructions for Boards of Examiners clearly stating point 37a (robust internal scrutiny of papers) is a condition of using the variation.

The Convener noted that this variation is under the delegated authority of SQAC but APRC are asked for a view.

The Committee discussed the impact of removing the requirement to consult with External Examiners when setting examination papers. Members highlighted that this regulation is approaching obsolescence but is currently in place therefore must be considered. One member raised that many assessments have moved to in class tests to address the impact of AI, and that these are not subject to approval by external examiners. This indicates the proposed variation is standard practice in other assessments and does not pose a significant risk to academic standards. Experience from one member as an external examiner for another university is that they do not see papers at all.

One member raised that Annex A, point 1 does not state that the variation can only be applied on the condition of point 37a, i.e. robust internal scrutiny of papers. The Committee agree to recommend the variation on the condition that the instruction provided to Board of Examiners clearly highlights point 37a is a condition of using this variation.

The Committee noted this regulation should be highlighted for removal or reviewed in due course to be expanded to cover all assessments. Accreditation bodies should be consulted through this review as they may ask for samples of external examiner input on both coursework and exams.

APRC agreed to recommend that Senate Quality Assurance Committee and Senate approve the temporary amendment to External Examiners for Taught Programmes Policy as presented in Annex A, Point 1. This was subject to clarification that the variation should only be enacted where the EE resignation was as a result of industrial action.

The Convener noted that this variation is under the delegated authority of SQAC but APRC are asked for a view. One member raised that the instruction advises this variation may be used where an External Examiner resigns, but felt that this should only apply where an External Examiner resigns as a result of industrial action. The existing process in place for an External Examiner resignation for reasons outside of industrial action should be followed in other cases. The Committee discussed that the standard process relies upon concessions from Colleges and APRC, and is therefore not agile enough for the current situation.

One member raised that staff may already have additional responsibilities as a result of MAB, therefore asking Schools to do additional 'internal-external' work outside of their domain is an additional resource requirement. Paper authors clarified that a staff member from another School taking on the 'internal-external' role is subject to agreed resourcing, and does not mandate someone to make themselves available.

APRC agreed to recommend that Senate Quality Assurance Committee and Senate approve the temporary amendment to External Examiners for Taught Programmes Policy as presented in Annex A, Point 2.

The Convener noted that this variation is under the delegated authority of SQAC but APRC are asked for a view. Following member questions, the paper authors confirmed that the expectation that Boards should operate with the adjusted quorum was a requirement, where the MAB affected normal participation of members. It was the Convener's responsibility to determine and explain where the adjusted quorum would not allow the Board sufficient expertise to make decisions. The Committee requested that these two points are clearly reflected in the instructions to Boards.

APRC agreed to recommend that Senate approve the temporary amendment to the Handbook for Boards of Examiners for Taught Courses as presented in Annex A, Point 3, and approved the role of Internal-External examiners defined above.

This was based on the rationale presented in paper APRC 25/26 4B and based on the discussed on the previous variations.

APRC agreed to recommend that Senate Quality Assurance Committee and Senate approve the temporary amendment to External Examiners for Taught Programmes Policy as presented in Annex A, Point 3.

The Convener noted that this variation is under the delegated authority of SQAC but APRC are asked for a view. This was approved for recommendation to Senate based on the rationale presented in paper APRC 25/26 4B.

APRC agreed to recommend that Senate approve the temporary amendment to Taught Assessment Regulation 13 as presented in Annex A, Point 4.

The Committee discussed that Boards already have the powers to amend weightings of a course and this change was specifically in the removal for the requirement to consult with students and External Examiners, and receive approval from College.

The Committee agreed to recommend the variation on the understanding that this will only apply where an assessment has not taken place and that there is therefore no prospect of marks becoming available. The variation will not apply where assessment has happened but marks are not yet available. The instructions to Boards will clarify this point.

Use of the variation must take account of any external or accrediting requirements.

A member noted the impact upon students who may be disadvantaged, e.g. where an assessment component which they were hoping would improve their course result is removed.

Members noted concerns about situations where learning outcomes are not explicitly mapped to components of assessment, and this information is only known to Course Organisers. One member noted a concern about removing the involvement of External Examiners in this process.

EUSA members requested that information about variations be reflected in the FAQs for students, with the paper authors noting that this can be discussed at Academic Contingency Group.

APRC agreed to recommend that Senate approve the temporary amendment to Taught Assessment Regulation 35 as presented in Annex A, Point 5.

The Committee discussed the variation where normally courses are marked from 0-100 but there is not enough evidence available to provide a robust mark, but there is enough evidence to confirm that the student has passed. In this scenario, the Board may award a PASS/FAIL.

One member raised concerns regarding operationalising the variation in terms of the level of modelling that may be required of teaching offices. This may involve the use of offline spreadsheets and the higher possibility of human error. It was agreed that the Academic Contingency Group will investigate providing teaching offices with additional reporting tools to ensure consistent modelling scenarios.

One member raised that in the previous MAB, Boards had questioned what was considered a robust boundary for a Pass/Fail course. The Committee agreed where the reliable results available are above the standard pass mark of 40% for UG, then a PASS could be awarded and this would be included in the instructions for Boards.

The Committee noted that Boards and Teaching Offices may need additional time to consider student cases and considered the key dates regarding awarding and graduation. The Academic Registrar confirmed there is some flexibility in confirming awards after the award deadline, where necessary. Where an award is confirmed late ahead of graduation, there may be situations where students can still graduate but would not receive a certificate.

APRC agreed to recommend that Senate approve the temporary amendment to Taught Assessment Regulation 51 as presented in Annex A, Point 6. This is subject to an amendment to 51b agreed that in addition to core and compulsory courses, courses which were pre-requisites to future compulsory courses are also exempt from the award of credit on aggregate.

The paper authors noted that in the previous MAB the threshold was set at 60 credits and this has been reduced to 40 credits following feedback from Schools.

The Committee noted that some courses which are pre-requisites for courses in subsequent years are not noted as core or compulsory on the relevant Degree Programme Table. The Committee agreed that in addition to core and compulsory courses, courses which were pre-requisites for future compulsory courses must also be exempt from the award of credit on aggregate.

APRC agreed to recommend that Senate approve the temporary amendment to Taught Assessment Regulation 52 as presented in Annex A, Point 7. This was subject to information being included in the instruction document regarding conditional progression.

The Committee discussed cases where progression Boards may have information missing on core course or courses that are pre-requisites to future learning. It is the Board's responsibility to identify how critical the course is and to allow conditional progression where necessary. The Committee agreed to recommend the variation dependent on information being added to the Instruction regarding conditional progression.

APRC agreed to recommend that Senate approve the temporary amendment to Taught Assessment Regulation 56 as presented in Annex A, Point 8.

This was based on the rationale presented in paper APRC 25/26 4B.

APRC agree to recommend that Senate approve the temporary amendment to Taught Assessment Regulation 53 as presented in Annex A, Point 9.

The Committee considered the fairness of applying credit on aggregate to students in differing scenarios:

- Student is re-sitting but has not been effectively engaging therefore is it fair to award credit on aggregate;
- It is the student's last opportunity to resit but they have not previously passed the resits;
- Student does not engage in the final assessment;
- Student may be offered credit on aggregate and not a further resit opportunity;
- Student may fail the MAB-affected assessments but have 40% average for credits we have marks for therefore would still be awarded credit on aggregate.

The Committee noted that credit on aggregate can be offered to other cohorts where the assessment is affected by MAB, and agreed that to ensure fairness it should be applied to General and Ordinary Degrees. The Committee agreed that in circumstances where the student has an average of 40% for courses with numerical marks, it would be appropriate to apply credit on aggregate.

The paper authors clarified that credit on aggregate would only be applied for a MAB-affected result and not for fails due to non-engagement with assessment. The paper authors clarified that should information become available indicating the Board would have made a less favourable decision for the student, then the Board would not change this so as not to disadvantage the student.

The Committee recommended that the regulations relating to the award of General and Ordinary Degrees should be reviewed, with consideration given as to whether to allow the award of credit on aggregate as standard.

	APRC agreed to recommend that Senate approve the temporary amendment to Taught Assessment Regulation 54 as presented in Annex A, Point 10 This was based on the rationale presented in paper APRC 25/26 4B. APRC agreed to recommend that Senate approve the temporary amendment to Taught Assessment Regulation 57 as presented in Annex A, Point 11. This was based on the rationale presented in paper APRC 25/26 4B. Overall APRC members reached a unanimous decision on all items and collectively recommend the variations for approval to Senate.
4.2	Appointment of APRC Convener and Vice-Convener The Convener outlined that a motion was approved at the 19 May 2026 Senate that the Conveners for the Senate Standing Committees would be appointed via an election. Nominees would be from the members of Senate and the members of Senate would vote in the elections. Therefore, the Committee would not be appointing a Convener and would receive further information regarding the election result in due course. The Convener noted that the Vice-Convener role was not included under this motion approved by Senate which leaves a potential gap around student concession approvals. The Committee agreed the Vice-Convener role would not be appointed during the meeting as Senate Support were actively working through the next steps for the Vice-Convener role following Senate. The Committee noted the risks of not having a Convener or Vice-Convener elected and in post by 1st August to review student concessions and Convener's actions and highlighted the importance of a seamless handover.
4.3	Proposed amendments to Taught Assessment Regulations 2026/27 The paper was presented by Dr Adam Bunni, Head of Academic Policy. The Committee discussed the proposed amendments, with the following points raised in the discussion: Regulation 25 Religious Observance - Committee members raised that permitting a student an alternative assessment during a resit diet, is in conflict with regulation 27.1 which states 'Boards must take the same approach to resits for all students on a particular course, except where a student's previous attempt is a null sit.' - The Committee agreed that 27.1 should also exempt cases of religious observance, the wording for which would be drafted and approved by Convener's action. Regulation 27.6 Resit Assessment - The Committee clarified that for extraordinary cases, a concession could be requested at College level to allow students to go beyond the 2 academic sessions. The intention of the addition is, alongside DRPS Regulation 2, for Colleges to apply this more stringently where not in the student's best interest to carry on. - The Committee discussed the need for a grace period however, it was noted that this regulation would be introduced in academic year 26/27 so would only be meaningful where a student was going into the second of their 2 academic sessions.

	The Committee agreed to approve the Taught Assessment Regulations 2026/27, subject to the additional revisions noted above being made, and approved by the Convener.
4.4	Proposed amendments to Postgraduate Assessment Regulations for Research Degrees 2026/27 The paper was presented by Dr Adam Bunni, Academic Policy Manager. The Committee agreed to approve the Postgraduate Assessment Regulations for Research Degrees 2026/27.
4.5	Internal Moderation Guidance The paper was presented by Lucy Evans and Tina Harrison. It was highlighted that there has been an absence of guidance on internal moderation and this guidance supports effective implementation of moderation for different assessments. The documents refers to templates being made available which need to be worked on if approved. Section 3.10 There is a repetition of 'for each'. Section 3.11 The Committee clarified that the section's intent is to limit single marks changed in isolation, but agreed that it should be clarified that the expectation is that the impact of any issues upon all relevant students is considered, rather than that marking adjustments need to be made for all students. Section 5.1 It was agreed that 'other academic staff' should be amended to 'Course Organiser' as they retain oversight of the moderation process which is also listed in the responsibilities in section 4.3. It was also agreed that 'with appropriate training' should be added for guaranteed hours staff. Section 3.2 and 3.3 One member raised some presentation assessments from courses based in industry may not be recordable due to the confidential nature therefore double marking methods may not be possible. One member raised where a supervisor mark must be double marked there would be instances such as lab time where it is not possible for a second marker to assess due to the significant time and expertise of lab work. The Committee were satisfied that the instructions in 3.2 and 3.3 are appropriate and could cater for examples such as those discussed. The Committee highlighted the submission of a lab book should be encouraged to enable moderation practices on lab work. It was also highlighted that lab books also support the investigation of allegations of academic misconduct at dissertation level where there is a perceived mismatch between the in-person knowledge and final mark.

	Section 5.2 It was raised that needing moderators to be independent unless there are a large number of makers penalises small teams. It was agreed 'a large proportion' was not clear and should be amended to more than 50% or a majority. The Committee discussed that a common approach could be a Course Organiser and one Teaching Assistant mark 70 students then moderate each other. Whilst the guidance is permissive of that team moderation approach, a greater level of independence is advised wherever possible. Section 7.9 Insert the link to the Registry Services, Student Systems website on scaling; Scaling marks Student Systems Student Administration Section 3.7 The Committee noted the minimum sample size of 5 is appropriate and that a maximum was removed during consultation. It was agreed it should be added that the sample size should be selected proportionally from each marker based on the overall student numbers. The Committee agreed to approve the Internal Moderation Guidance, subject to the changes discussed.
4.6	Minor Addition to the Programme and Course Handbook Policy The paper was presented by Dr Adam Bunni, Head of Academic Policy. The Committee discussed the proposed amendments, with the following points raised in the discussion: - Due to the timeline of the addition to handbooks, the student voice examples may not be fully in place for all 26/27 handbooks. - The Programme and Course Handbook Policy is due for full review and will be completed in academic year 26/27. - Boards of Studies do not approve all handbooks so additional routes for the communication strategy may be needed. - The amendment implies that only changes should be included as examples but the Committee felt it was important to include examples that feedback was received but not changed for good reason. - The examples could be mixed but at least one should be a positive change made from feedback. The Committee agreed to approve the Minor Addition to the Programme and Course Handbook Policy subject to consideration given to instruction on mixed examples.
4.7	Board of Examiners Review – Consistent Application of the Exceptional Circumstances Policy The paper was presented by Dr Adam Bunni, Academic Policy Manager and Beth Bicher, Policy and Regulations Subject Matter Expert – BoE Project. It was highlighted that several Schools piloted the EC decision tree during the January diet and the feedback highlighted different practices across School. To ensure consistent

	application of the EC policy the Committee is asked to consider the scenarios and evaluate what constitutes adequate mitigation. Scenario A The Committee considered the scenario and members showed support for option 1 to disregard course assessments and not to flag for consideration at programme level. To flag at programme level would be seen as over mitigation. Scenario B The Committee discussed and held mixed views. A majority of Committee members agreed with option 2 and felt if the assessment was not seen to negatively impact the student at course level it therefore would not need to be flagged for consideration at programme level. To flag at programme level would be seen as over mitigation. A small number of members agreed with option 1 as it was felt that by taking no action at course level and then not flagging for consideration at programme level it could be interpreted as no mitigation being implemented. Scenario D The Committee showed support for Option 1 as the learning outcomes were met and disregarding the assessment is in the best interest of the student. To not disregard would negatively impact the student. Due to time constraints the Committee did not have sufficient time to adequately discuss all the scenarios and hear all views from Committee members on all scenarios. It was agreed that this paper would be shared electronically to ensure that comments could be considered.
5.	ITEMS FOR INFORMATION / NOTING
5.1	Committee Administration: • APRC Membership • APRC Terms of Reference The Convener noted that the 26/27 APRC membership went to Senate on Tuesday and was approved. Committee Priorities 2025/26: To note • Development of curriculum framework arising from Learning and Teaching Workstream • Scheduled review of policies The Convener noted that a paper went to Senate on Tuesday requesting to disband the Standing Committee priorities and was rejected. AQS will be reviewing the Committee priorities over the summer and will be brought to the next ordinary meeting on Senate and APRC.
6.	Any Other Business The Committee expressed its gratitude to the outgoing Convener, Dr Emily Taylor and the Vice Convener, Professor Linda Kirstein for their contributions to APRC, including their diligent and considerate handling of concession requests. The Committee recorded thanks to Kayta Amott, outgoing EUSA VP Education, and Dr Matt Bell and Dr Valentina Ferlito, attending their last APRC meeting as elected Senate members.

Date of 2026/27 dates (provisionally)	
All meetings hybrid and 2-5pm– venue TBC.	
• September 2026 • November 2026 • January 2027 • March 2027 • May 2027	