

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

**Electronic meeting conducted from
Monday 17 to Monday 24 August 2020**

A G E N D A

1. Formal Business

This meeting will be conducted via email correspondence to enable the Committee to approve items which do 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

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

2.3 Internal Review Reports and Responses Paper C

Final report 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)

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)

14 week response 2019/20:

- Postgraduate Programme Review of Literatures, Languages and Cultures (PGR & PGT provision)

3. For Information

3.1 Subject Benchmark Statement

- [Architecture](#)

4. Date of Next Meeting:

Wednesday 9 September 2020 at 2pm via Microsoft Teams

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

**Electronic meeting conducted from
Monday 17 to Monday 24 August 2020**

**Course Enhancement Questionnaires
Hybrid Teaching Questions**

Description of paper

1. This paper asks SQAC to approve the wording of two free text questions that are to be added to Course Enhancement Questionnaires (CEQs) to generate insights into students' experiences of hybrid teaching and learning in the 2020/21 academic year.

Action requested / recommendation

2. SQAC are asked to approve the wording of the proposed questions.

Background and context

3. This is the last year the University of Edinburgh will be running centrally managed end of course feedback surveys – a review is underway to develop the new approach. To reduce the administrative burden on Schools University Executive have approved the proposal that questions on individual teachers be made optional. Decisions around whether or not to include teaching staff will be made locally.
4. CEQs were suspended (with an option to opt in) in Semester two of 2019/20 as it was recognised that there was a need to reduce burden on Schools during the digital pivot. CEQs currently form part of the University's Student Voice policy so will be reinstated this year as the CEQ Review concludes its work on a new approach to end of course feedback.
5. The Rethinking Student Administration and Support (RSAS) Project Board approved a programme of work focused on collecting student feedback and sharing any insights generated during 2020/21. One element of this work plan was to add a small number of free text questions to CEQs to collect early feedback on experiences of hybrid teaching and learning. This paper asks SQAC to advise on the most appropriate wording for these questions.
6. The Student Analytics, Insights and Modelling (SAI&M) team will analyse student comments to identify any examples of good practice; common themes that are emerging, or issues that are raised across a number of courses and will report these through the RSAS board e.g. access to services / library resources / study spaces.
7. Responses will also be included in Course Organiser reports which are generated as soon as the questionnaire closes and will be included in the end of semester comment extracts which are shared with Directors of Quality.

Discussion

8. A first draft of the questions has been shared with Directors of Quality for comment. Comments received have been incorporated into the final draft below.
9. The proposed questions are:

The University is collecting feedback from students on their experiences of hybrid teaching and learning throughout the year.

- i) Reflecting on your experience of hybrid teaching and learning on this course, what has worked well for you?
 - ii.a) Is there anything else you'd like to tell us about your experience of hybrid teaching and learning on this course?
- OR
- ii.b) Reflecting on your experience of hybrid teaching and learning on this course, what has not worked well for you?

10. One Director of Quality asked if two of the Core questions could be removed but this will not be possible in the time frame. Where Schools choose to remove the teaching staff questions questionnaires will be considerably shorter.
11. The initial question set had a neutral second question but one Director of Quality fed back that it would be better to ask directly what has not worked well. **Please can the committee state a preference for either question ii.a or ii.b.**

Resource implications

12. Resource will be made available in the SAI&M team to analyse student comments and to share insights generated from the analysis.
13. There are no additional resource requirements for Schools.

Risk management

14. N/A

Equality & diversity

15. Student responses to CEQs are anonymous and any comments shared will be redacted to ensure that individual students or staff members cannot be identified.

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

16. The additional questions will be added to all CEQs automatically.
17. Heads of School and CEQ contacts will receive an email notifying them of all the changes to CEQs this year.

18. Findings from the weekly analysis will be shared through the RSAS project board and the Student Voice SharePoint page. SAI&M can also provide updates to SQAC if that is requested.

Author

*Name Paula Webster
Date 14th August 2020*

Presenter

*Name Paula Webster, Head of Student
Analytics, Insights and Modelling*

Freedom of Information

Open paper

•

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

**Electronic meeting conducted from
Monday 17 to Monday 24 August 2020**

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

Description of paper

1. The paper sets out the Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance which includes guidance to support the Hybrid Teaching model

Action requested / recommendation

2. To approve the Operational Guidance.

Background and context

3. The Operational Guidance sets out additional information to support Schools running SSLCs digitally during the period of hybrid teaching.
4. Examples of practice that Schools adopted during the 'pivot' to digital teaching as well as information on intentions for next academic year have been included in the guidance.
5. Approaches to be taken and items for consideration are noted in each principle section.
6. A resource list is available at the end of the document
7. The guidance will be reviewed at the end of semester one 2020/21 to gather good practice and reflect on lessons learned.

Discussion

8. See attached paper.

Resource implications

9. Full student engagement is essential to the enhancement of the student experience

Risk management

10. There are risks associated with ineffectively responding to student feedback

Equality & diversity

11. An Equality Impact Assessment was carried out on the normal process. No additional equality and diversity implications have been identified as a result of the proposed changes.

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

12. The guidance will be made available on the Academic Services and Student Voice webpages. An email will also be sent to key stakeholders to notify them of the updates.

Author

*Gillian Mackintosh
August 2020*

Presenter

Academic Services

Freedom of Information

13. Open

Student-Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance (includes guidance to support the Hybrid Teaching Model)



THE UNIVERSITY
of EDINBURGH

Purpose of Guidance

This guidance sets out the principles and operational notes for Student-Staff Liaison Committees (SSLCs). The guidance was developed in partnership with Edinburgh University Students' Association as one of the ways to support and promote the engagement of our students in their learning and to strengthen the value of SSLCs.

Additional guidance is included to support Schools running SSLCs digitally during the period of hybrid teaching.

Approaches to be taken and items for consideration are noted in each principle section.

A resource list is available at the end of the document.

The guidance supports the Student Voice Policy.

Scope: Guidance is not Mandatory

The guidance applies to all students and staff involved in SSLCs.

Contact Officer

Gillian Mackintosh

Academic Policy Officer

Gillian.Mackintosh@ed.ac.uk

Document control

Dates	Approved:	Starts:	Equality impact assessment:	Amendments:	Next Review:
	03.09.15	01.07.13	11.09.15	01.05.2020	2021/2022
Approving authority	Senate Quality Assurance Committee (QAC)				
Consultation undertaken	The Students' Association, current School Directors of Quality, a group of Academic and Administrative staff supporting SSLCs,				
Section responsible for guidance maintenance & review	Academic Services				
Related policies, procedures, guidelines & regulations	http://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/externalexaminerstaught.pdf http://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/quality/monitoringandreview/annual-monitoring-review-and-reporting https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/iprsubjectareasschoolsstudentinvolvement.pdf https://www.ed.ac.uk/records-management/guidance/enquiry http://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/guidanceschoolcommsrep.pdf https://www.eusa.ed.ac.uk/representation/yourrepresentatives/programmereps/ https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/prog_course_approval.pdf				
UK Quality Code	UK Quality Code, Advice and Guidance : Student Engagement				
Guidance superseded by this guidance	Principles and operational notes for Student-Staff Liaison Committees				
Alternative format	If you require this document in an alternative format please email Academic.Services@ed.ac.uk or telephone 0131 651 4490.				
happen	SSLC, Student-Staff Liaison Committee, Student Representation, Edinburgh University Students' Association, External Examiners.				

Student-Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance

Student-Staff Liaison Committees (SSLCs) are held in every School and are the main forum for Staff and student representatives to discuss matters relating to degree programmes and the student experience. Staff and student representatives are responsible for ensuring that students are made aware of how their feedback is acted upon after the SSLC meeting.

The following principles outline how SSLCs operate:

1.	Role	SSLCs provide a formal mechanism for communication and discussion between academic and administrative staff and representatives of the student body, relating to all matters connected with improving the degree programmes (at all levels of study including Undergraduate (UG), Postgraduate Taught (PGT) and Postgraduate Research (PGR)) and the student experience. In addition it provides a mechanism to escalate issues that are out with the remit of the SSLC to resolve, to School, College, University or Support Service for further action. No modification under hybrid teaching model
2.	Remit	<p>SSLCs should have a formal written remit which sets out the operation and governance of the SSLC, including where the SSLC sits in relation to other Committees in the School.</p> <p>The remit should also detail the mechanism for escalating issues out with the remit of the programme or School and how actions are reported back to the SSLC.</p> <p>Staff and student representatives are responsible for ensuring that students are made aware of how their feedback is acted upon after the SSLC meeting.</p> <p>The remit should set out the mechanism by which students will be notified on actions taken and expected response timelines. Schools are strongly encouraged to respond to issues in a timely manner, ideally within the same semester as the SSLC.</p> <p>The remit should be published on the School/Subject area/Research Centre/Institute website or equivalent and staff and students notified of its location. No modification under hybrid teaching model</p>
3	Membership	<p>Meetings should be attended by programme representatives for the programmes being discussed, and staff responsible for the leadership and organisation of the programme, including professional services staff as appropriate and relevant to school structure.</p> <p>Please note item for consideration under hybrid teaching model</p>
4	Frequency of meetings	<p>At least one formal meeting should be held in each semester, which should be agreed upon in consultation with School staff and student representatives.</p> <p>Schools must publish the date, time, and location of the meeting, inviting any additional items to be added to the agenda. It is suggested that this happens at least two weeks in advance of the meeting.</p> <p>Please note item for consideration under hybrid teaching model</p>
5	Agenda items	<p>The agenda must be made available in advance of the meeting. Suggested agenda items are listed in section 5.2 No modification under hybrid teaching model</p>
6	Meeting format	<p>Students are encouraged to chair meetings or co-chair with staff.</p> <p>Schools are further encouraged to select a member of staff to support the student chair.</p> <p>Online Learner student representatives and students should have the opportunity to participate virtually during the meeting or input via other electronic means beforehand.</p>

Student-Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance

		Exact format will vary between Schools however, an example of a basic format is described in section 6. Please note approaches to be taken
7	Minutes	Schools must publish minutes and inform students and staff where these are located No modification under hybrid teaching model

1. Role

Student-Staff Liaison Committees (SSLCs) are meetings at which student representatives and staff supporting teaching and learning discuss the student experience which may include issues and activities in courses, programmes, and Schools.

As structures and systems vary between Schools, Institutes or Research Centres, the format of SSLCs may also be different to reflect this. Nonetheless, the principles should remain the same in that the committee provides a formal mechanism for communication and discussion between staff and representatives of the student body relating to all matters connected with the degree programme, and the student experience.

2. Remit

<p>Principle</p> <p>SSLCs should have a formal written remit which sets out the operation and governance of the SSLC, including where the SSLC sits in relation to other Committees in the School.</p> <p>The remit should also detail the mechanism for escalating issues out with the remit of the programme or School and how actions are reported back to the SSLC.</p> <p>Staff and student representatives are responsible for ensuring that students are made aware of how their feedback is acted upon after the SSLC meeting.</p> <p>The remit should set out the mechanism by which students will be notified on actions taken and expected response timelines. Schools are strongly encouraged to respond to issues in a timely manner, ideally within the same semester as the SSLC.</p> <p>The remit should be published on the School/Subject area/Research Centre/Institute website or equivalent and staff and students notified of its location.</p>
--

2.1 Formal Remit

Staff and student representatives are encouraged to review the remit annually to ensure that it reflects current learning, teaching and research matters in the School/Subject area. This could take place at an appropriate forum such as an SSLC meeting.

2.2 Expectations

SSLCs are one way in which students and staff should engage in discussions to improve the student experience at the University of Edinburgh, including the digital learning environment for students not studying on campus.

Student-Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance

Following the launch of the UK Quality Code Advice and Guidance: Student Engagement (November 2018), the code states that ‘the provider actively engages students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience’.

Furthermore, the Code states: ‘Higher education providers, in partnership with their student body, define, promote, monitor and evaluate the range of opportunities to enable all students to engage in quality assurance and enhancement processes’.

Student representatives are expected to gather representative student views to identify good practice and areas for development to enhance the degree programme and student experience.

Students are encouraged to share suggestions with staff so they can work in partnership to enhance the student experience and create a strong academic community within their area.

Staff and student representatives are responsible for ensuring that students are made aware of how their feedback is acted upon after the SSLC meeting.

Schools are strongly encouraged to respond to issues in a timely manner, ideally within the same semester as the SSLC. This could happen at another meeting or via another route. Schools should state what can or will be done as there may be situations where issues cannot be easily or quickly resolved. (See Section 6.3 Communication following the SSLC)

Schools are expected to facilitate communication between student representatives and the students they represent. Schools should either share with student representatives the University student email address of the students they represent or facilitate alternative ways for representatives to contact all classmates e.g. via m-list.

Guidance is available for Schools which outlines the mechanisms by which Schools should share University student email addresses or facilitate alternative ways for student representatives to contact students in compliance with data protection guidelines.

Please refer to [Guidance for Schools regarding communication between Student Representatives and students](#) and the [Policy on Disclosure of Student Information](#)

Hybrid teaching model approach : Communication between student representatives and students

Approaches to be taken:

During this period of hybrid teaching, it is more important than ever that student representatives are provided with mechanisms to communicate with the student body when in-person communication will be limited.

As per the guidance above, Schools should either share with student representatives the University student email address of the students they represent or facilitate alternative ways for representatives to contact all classmates e.g. via m-list.

Schools should confirm with student representatives which mechanism will be used.

Representatives should be encouraged to confirm with the student body which mechanism will be used for their programme.

Items for consideration:

Consideration should be given to new students attending SSLC meetings bearing in mind that returning students have already established a sense of community which can make gathering

Student-Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance

feedback from peers easier. New students may not have the same opportunities for in- person time to create a trusted community of practice.

Consideration should be given to ensure there is a space for development of a community of practice so that representatives are able to gather information from peers.

3. Membership

Principle

Meetings should be attended by:

- Programme representatives for the programmes being discussed
- Staff responsible for the leadership and organisation of the programme
- Professional services staff as appropriate and relevant to school structure.

Hybrid teaching model approach

Items for consideration:

The flexibility of digital forums may enable a larger number of students to participate.

The relevant elected Undergraduate/Postgraduate school representative may attend SSLC meetings in their School as they see fit, and at a minimum be informed of the business conducted. Their contact details can be obtained at <https://edin.ac/3gODPZP> or by emailing reps@eusa.ed.ac.uk

Where appropriate, presidents of relevant academic societies within the School or subject area may attend SSLC meetings; their details are available via eusa.ed.ac.uk/societies

4. Frequency of meetings

Principle

At least one formal meeting should be held in each semester, which should be agreed upon in consultation with School staff and student representatives.

Schools must publish the date, time, and location of the meeting, inviting any additional items to be added to the agenda. It is suggested that this happens at least two weeks in advance of the meeting.

The frequency of SSLC meetings may vary between Schools depending on their size and structure as well as in terms of undergraduate and postgraduate provision.

For example some SSLCs may operate at School, subject area or programme level depending on their structure.

At undergraduate level it may be more appropriate to meet once per semester whereas for postgraduate taught level it may be more appropriate to have additional meetings spread over the year.

Student-Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance

Some subject areas and Schools may meet formally once a semester but may operate a more informal system throughout the year in terms of students having access to other meetings such as Director of Teaching meetings, School Undergraduate Learning and Teaching Committee meetings and meetings taking place at different levels (e.g. programme; subject area; school).

Therefore, Schools are expected to operate whichever system is most appropriate to their structure.

Good Practice

Some Schools list the dates of the meeting on the representative student timetable. Students receive a note in their student timetable encouraging them to communicate with their representative.

Some Schools schedule two meetings per semester; during week 3 /4 to discuss immediate issues at the start of semester, and towards the end of semester to feedback on actions.

Hybrid teaching model approach

Items for consideration:

Some Schools are considering holding a formal SSLC more than once a semester.

5. Agenda items

Principle

The agenda must be made available in advance of the meeting. Suggested agenda items are listed in section 5.2

5.1 Sharing information

Staff are expected to share information with students. This could include information such as themes arising from student surveys, themes from External Examiners reports, Part 3 External Examiner reports (Postgraduate Research), course and programme evaluation and review documentation, School Annual Quality Reports, and Internal Periodic Review reports. Student representatives and staff should collaborate to identify trends, areas for improvement and suggestions to enhance the student experience. Students' views should be sought on new programmes and courses as well as on changes to existing ones and the SSLC could provide a forum for this type of discussion. (see [Programme and Course Approval and Management policy](#))

5.2 Suggested agenda items

Agenda items can be suggested by students and staff. Although the exact format of meetings will vary between schools, this is an example of the basic format which many follow, in the order that they occur.

- Minutes of last meeting including update on actions
- Agenda items suggested by students
- Standing items: School, College or University wide issues and any updates from School Representatives
- School Annual Quality report
- Themes arising from Student Surveys, course enhancement questionnaires

Student-Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance

- Themes from for mid-course feedback
- Internal Periodic Review preparation, where appropriate
- Internal Periodic Review reports and responses, where appropriate
- Themes from External Examiner summary reports
- Professional, Statutory & Regulatory Body (PSRB) accreditation outcome reports, where appropriate
- Enhancement Led Institutional Review (ELIR), where appropriate
- Staff communications
- Student Partnership Agreement: priorities and any local activities which may be of relevance
- Any other business (AOB)
- Date of Next Meeting

5.3 External Examiner summary reports at SSLCs

Schools must provide an opportunity for student representatives to view themes extracted from External Examiner reports and the School's summarised response to these themes (section 68 External Examiners for Taught Programmes Policy).

In order to streamline material being presented to SSLCs, Schools are encouraged to summarise points from External Examiner reports and group them into themes, together with the response from the School/Subject area/Programme and highlight areas of good practice.

In some Schools, the School-level SSLC may not be the most appropriate forum for discussion of themes and responses as this will take place at department or programme level rather than as part of the School as a whole.

There may be instances where one External Examiner's report may be relevant to more than one SSLC particularly for joint degrees. Therefore, each School is expected to decide which SSLC is most appropriate to their structure for the consideration of the summary reports.

Undergraduate External Examiner reports are received after the summer exam diet. For undergraduate students, the summary reports should be submitted to the first SSLC meeting of the academic year.

Postgraduate Taught External Examiner reports are received at the end of November and the summary reports will be submitted for consideration at SSLCs in the second semester.

It is expected that the summary reports and responses are emailed to SSLC members ahead of the meeting and in good time to allow members to prepare responses for discussion.

The consideration of summary reports is an opportunity to be involved in discussion of potential improvements to courses and programmes recommended by the External Examiners. During the SSLC meeting, students are expected to consider the themes and responses in the summary report and be encouraged to provide comments and suggestions.

However, there may be occasions when an External Examiner makes a suggestion or recommendation that is not possible/practicable for the University to implement. The response from the School to the External Examiner should demonstrate that the University has given full and serious consideration to the comments made and indicates the reason that action cannot be taken forward.

Following consideration of the themes at the SSLC, it is expected that comments and suggestions are recorded in the SSLC meeting minutes.

Student-Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance

Depending on recommendations, ongoing actions would be reported to SSLC meetings later in the academic year and ultimately through subsequent External Examiner reports.
(Section 68.1- 68.4 External Examiners for Taught Programmes Policy)

Individual students and members of staff will not be named in the reports.

Good Practice

Some Schools ask the student representatives to suggest items under the headings of Start, Stop and Continue or by theme.

6. Meeting format

Principle

Students are encouraged to chair meetings or co-chair with staff.

Schools are further encouraged to select a member of staff to support the student chair.

Online Learner student representatives and students should have the opportunity to participate digitally during the meeting or input via other electronic means beforehand.

Exact format will vary between Schools however, an example of a basic format is described below.

Hybrid teaching model approach

Approaches to be taken:

During semester one 2020/21, SSLC meetings should be held digitally.

University Supported Tools/ Virtual Learning Environments (VLEs): for digital meetings

IMPORTANT:

- Only tools/VLEs for digital events supported by the University's Information Services should be used for digital SSLC meetings. These are listed at: <https://edin.ac/3fKUA6U>
- All other documentation and correspondence related to the SSLC should be managed using University email accounts.
- All information relating to the SSLC should be managed in accordance with data protection, freedom of information and records management legislation.

General:

- Schools/Deaneries are encouraged to use the tool that students and staff are most familiar with.
- The functionality of the various tools should be considered, e.g. breakout rooms, sharing screens, capacity.
- Information Services [Online & Digital Events Service](#) provides information on which tool is most suitable for your digital meeting.

Guidance for those organising meetings:

Student-Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance

For School/Subject area

- The meeting organiser will be encouraged to appoint a deputy chair to take over should the chair be unable to participate in a meeting.
- Consideration should be given to attendees' working environments (including any caring responsibilities and/or time zone issues) and how they can be supported to participate.
- The overall length of the meeting will be discussed and agreed with the School/Subject Area and student representatives. Ideally, meetings are limited to 50 minutes. If meetings last over an hour, a break of 10 minutes is scheduled, with the planned break communicated to participants in advance.
- Slides outlining solutions to common IT issues e.g. audio/video settings could be shown at the start of meetings to help participants.
- Participants are encouraged to arrive five minutes before the official start to ensure any issues can be addressed and the meeting can start promptly. It is helpful if the meeting secretary is available five minutes before the start also.
- It is helpful to agree how meetings with staff and students will be managed in terms of the options with the tools (see also technology considerations and meeting etiquette). This may differ for different participants and also the number of participants in a meeting.
- In meetings with a higher number of participants, it may be helpful to identify another member of staff to support the meeting secretary to facilitate the meeting (e.g. admitting participants if required and keeping an eye on participants indicating that they wish to speak).
- Digital meetings should not be recorded.
- Depending on the tool used, participants may need to be admitted to the meeting.
- Try to stick to the scheduled time for meetings, allowing time for introductions and any technical issues at the beginning of each meeting.
- If a meeting looks likely to run over the time allocated, it is important to check with participants if they can continue for a period of extra time. Make this period of extra time clear and have a cut-off point.

Technology considerations

- The meeting chair and secretary should test the tool being used for digital meetings in advance and become familiar with the main functions. Allow time for this.
- Consider how technology issues during the digital meeting will be dealt with.

Guidance for those participating in SSLC digital meetings

- Please access the meeting on time, ideally about 5 minutes before the official start time, to ensure any issues can be dealt with and the meeting can start promptly.
- The meeting will begin with an explanation on how it will be managed e.g. if participants should mute their microphones when not speaking, when the hand-raising feature should be used, and how the meeting will be chaired.
- As with in-person meetings, it is important that meetings keep to time and everyone has a chance to have their say.

Items for consideration:

One School has reported success in using a combination of digital tools and platforms to facilitate student feedback and Questions & Answer sessions.

Student-Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance

Some Schools are noting a preference for using Collaborate due to its functionality e.g. moderator function, easier sharing of the screen and breakout rooms which is useful.

Attempting to organise a meeting which happens synchronously in a room on campus and brings in others who are participating digitally may be complicated to set up. Opting for a digital meeting approach will be easier and less resource intensive for those responsible for organising.

Some Schools found that Drop-in and Town Hall style meetings worked well after the pivot to digital teaching as a mechanism of gathering feedback and for general communications.

6.1 Chairing of meetings

Students are encouraged to chair meetings. This could be an elected school representative or another trained programme representative. Schools may wish for the chair person to be neutral (e.g. not a student on-programme, Programme Director or Course Organiser teaching on the programme which is being discussed). Schools are encouraged to assign a member of staff to support the student chair and facilitate the student's leadership role within the SSLC.

Further information for students on preparing for and chairing meetings, is available on the Students' Association programme representative resource area (a closed area for programme representatives), and on the Students' Association website at: www.eusa.ed.ac.uk/programmereps

Good Practice

Some Schools may choose to ask the school representative to chair the SSLC meeting(s).

Some Schools organise a welcome event at the start of semester so representatives have a clear understanding of the role and expectations and to make them aware of the staff who can offer support.

Hybrid teaching model approach

Approaches to be taken:

Meeting etiquette – tips for the meeting Chair

In advance

Agree how meetings will be managed in terms of the options with the tools (see also technology considerations). This may differ for different participants and also the number of participants in a meeting. Things to consider:

- Generally, it is good practice to ask participants to mute microphones when not speaking and to ask them to use the hand raising function when they wish to speak. This approach may not be necessary for smaller SSLC digital meetings.
- If Wi-Fi or broadband speed is an issue, participants can be asked to turn off videos to improve connections.
- What action will be taken if a participant's connection, video or audio is lost? Ideally, the meeting should continue and, should the participant be able to re-join, they should be provided with a short recap of the discussion missed. If a number of participants have connection issues, the Chair can consider how to follow-up with those affected.

Student-Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance

During the meeting

- Once everyone is present, begin the meeting with a welcome, introductions and confirmation of how the meeting will be managed.
- Pause periodically to ask if participants wish to comment or ask questions.
- Participants may need to come and go during the meeting due to other commitments. Allow time for these transitions and consider using tool functions such as lobbies to support this.
- Ensure regular breaks are taken and stick to timings wherever possible.
- Meetings may be interrupted and/or postponed – be flexible and agree on follow-up actions.
- Agree how any follow-up will be managed e.g. how action points will be taken forward and responded to.
- Thank participants as they leave and at the end of the meeting.

6.2 Online Learner (OL) Student participation

<https://www.ed.ac.uk/studying/online-learning/postgraduate>

At School level, Online Learner student representatives and students should have the opportunity to participate digitally during the meeting or input via other electronic means beforehand

Online Learner (OL) student representatives are expected to be able to input into the agenda; receive papers before meetings and minutes afterwards.

Meeting organisers are expected to consider the following when arranging the timing of meetings:

- the availability of students who have work commitments,
- time zone considerations,
- allow students plenty of notice of the meeting,
- ensure in advance that students can access whichever system is being used.

Schools/Deaneries are encouraged to use the tool that students and staff are most familiar with. The functionality of the various tools should be considered, e.g. breakout rooms, sharing screens, capacity.

Information Services [Online & Digital Events Service](#) provides information on which tool is most suitable for your digital meeting.

6.3 Communication following the SSLC

Students and staff are not expected to give an immediate response at meetings to all issues or where they would want to consult further. Students may feel it necessary to consult with students in the cohort or with students in other parts of the School. Most important of all, if any action is called for and agreed upon it should be promptly reported back to students via student representatives. Staff and student representatives are responsible for reporting back information to those they represent and taking ownership of any action points agreed at the meeting.

Schools are expected to appoint named academic and professional services staff contacts in each School for student representatives to discuss any additional issues as they arise or request additional meetings if required. Student representatives and the Students' Association (reps@eusa.ed.ac.uk) are expected to be kept informed of the contact details of these staff.

Student-Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance

Good Practice

Some Schools prepare a 'You Said, We Did' response, post it on Learn and inform students via announcements and email.

The School of Physics & Astronomy lists the suggestions/issues raised by students and the responses/actions on a wiki page which is updated regularly :

<https://www.wiki.ed.ac.uk/display/PALiaisonCommittee/SSLC+Actions>

Hybrid teaching model approach

Approaches to be taken:

As in-person communication will be limited under the hybrid teaching model, Schools/Deaneries should inform students of how the closing the feedback loop mechanism will operate in the digital environment.

Items for consideration:

One School reported that student representatives were invited to submit comments in writing about any issues/concerns they would have raised or addressed at the meeting.

Comments were forwarded to key committee members (convenor, Director of Undergraduate Studies, Undergraduate Manager etc.) who formulated responses. Comments and responses were collated, along with any updates to previous action items, and distributed to all members. This document was then finalised as the committee minutes.

One School is intending to host the SSLC on Learn and widen the membership from the student reps to include all on programme.

The School will use this platform to host information for students including the SSLC remit, what feedback can be actioned through this forum, themes for development and setting expectations.

When students raise an issue, they school will ask reps to take a quick poll on how wide spread the issue is, to avoid a smaller number of student voices determining the work of the SSLC.

In addition, the School will compliment digital meetings on Collaborate for student reps, with questions and requests for student feedback happening from the beginning of the academic year and throughout.

Students will now be able to feedback through different channels including discussion boards on Learn and emailing reps directly.

One School is considering an approach whereby queries and concerns are collated beforehand (and potentially responded to) and then a virtual debrief via Collaborate will be held to discuss the matters raised further and to allow for any additional feedback. The School would look to open up the meeting to a greater number of students.

7. Minutes

Principle

Schools must publish minutes and inform students and staff where these are located

It is expected that the minutes follow the same structure as the agenda outline.

Student-Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance

The person nominated to write the minute is expected to identify agreed action points and assign them to specific individuals, with a target completion date.

It is normally the responsibility of a member of staff to write the minute, and students would not be expected to carry out this task. However, where a student member volunteers or is nominated to write minutes, it is expected that they would be supported by a member of staff to ensure that actions are directed appropriately.

Schools must publish the minutes on the School/Subject area webpages or equivalent.

It is expected that minutes are made available as soon as possible after the meeting.

Minutes can be made available to Internal Periodic Review teams if there is a particular theme from the reflective report to be followed up.

Minutes may be reviewed by Senate Quality Assurance Committee and/or College Quality Committee in relation to themes emerging from the escalation of issues

Good Practice

The Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies provides a student representative starter pack detailing an example of clear and helpful style of minutes and flowchart detailing the pathway of the minutes.

Examples from Schools who publish minutes on website:

History, Classics and Archaeology:

<https://www.ed.ac.uk/history-classics-archaeology/information-current-undergraduates/your-studies/your-degree-programme/student-liaison/committee-structure>

Philosophy: <https://www.ed.ac.uk/ppis/philosophy/current/undergraduate/student-representation>

<https://www.ed.ac.uk/geosciences/teaching-organisation/ug-students/student-representation/sslc>

Engineering:

<https://www.wiki.ed.ac.uk/display/etohub/Peer+Support+and+Student+Representatives>

Centre for Open Learning:

<https://www.ed.ac.uk/lifelong-learning/students/student-representation/programme-representatives/student-staff-liaison-committee>

8. Equality

Schools should determine appropriate mechanisms for ensuring that all student representatives have an opportunity to participate. It is suggested that Schools consider the use of digital forums/meetings where appropriate.

Student-Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance

Resources

- Online and digital events service: <https://www.ed.ac.uk/information-services/computing/desktop-personal/off-site-working/online-meetings>
- Advice and guidance on online and hybrid events: <https://www.ed.ac.uk/information-services/computing/comms-and-collab/online-meetings-and-events/advice-and-guidance>
- Examples of online events and good practice : <https://www.ed.ac.uk/information-services/computing/comms-and-collab/online-meetings-and-events/user-stories>
- University supported Virtual Learning Environments (VLEs): <https://www.ed.ac.uk/information-services/learning-technology/virtual-environments>
- sparqs COVID-19 hub - sector resources: <https://www.sparqs.ac.uk/page.php?page=888>
- Strathclyde University Students' Union How to be an Effective Rep Online: <https://www.strathunion.com/pageassets/voice/studentreps/represources/How-to-be-an-Effective-Rep-Online.pdf>
- National Student Engagement Programme: Quick Guide on Hosting Online SSLCs <https://studentengagement.ie/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/Quick-Guide-on-Hosting-Online-Staff-Student-Committees.WEBpdf.pdf>

August 2020

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

**Electronic meeting conducted from
Monday 17 to Monday 24 August 2020**

**Internal Periodic Review
Reports and Responses**

Description of paper

1. The following 14 week and Year on responses from Internal Periodic Reviews 2018/19 and final reports from Internal Periodic Reviews in 2019/20 are published on the Committee wiki:

<https://www.wiki.ed.ac.uk/display/SQAC/Electronic+SQAC+17+-+24+August+2020>

Action requested / recommendation

2. 14 week/Year on responses: For comment and consideration of the recommendations. The Committee is asked to confirm that they are content with progress.

Final reports: For Approval. The Committee is asked to note the commendations and recommendations.

Background and context

3. The following final reports from Internal Periodic Reviews 2019/20 are published on the Committee wiki:
 - 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)

14 week response 2019/20:

- Postgraduate Programme Review of Literatures, Languages and Cultures (PGR & PGT provision)

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)

IPR	Comment
Literatures, Languages and Cultures 14 wk response	We look forward to hearing about progress in the year on response on the recommendations that are still to be actioned and we note the impact that the Covid-19 pandemic is having on progressing with some of the recommendations.

College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine (PGR provision) year on response	<p>We look forward to hearing about progress on the recommendations in the School Annual Programme Monitoring report and we note the impact that the Covid-19 pandemic is having on progressing with some of the recommendations.</p> <p>We are interested to learn about the positive change noted in the response as a result of the review</p>
GeoSciences (PGR provision) year on response	<p>We look forward to hearing about progress on the recommendations in the School Annual Programme Monitoring report and we note the impact that the Covid-19 pandemic is having on progressing with some of the recommendations.</p> <p>We are interested to learn about the positive change noted in the response as a result of the review</p>
History of Art (UG provision) year on response	<p>We look forward to hearing about progress on the recommendations in the School Annual Programme Monitoring report and we note the impact that the Covid-19 pandemic is having on progressing with some of the recommendations.</p> <p>We are interested to learn about the positive change noted in the response as a result of the review</p>

Discussion

4. See attached paper.

Resource implications

5. No additional resource implications

Risk management

6. No risk associated

Equality & diversity

7. An Equality Impact Assessment was carried out on the internal review process

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

8. The reports will be published on the Academic Services website and circulated to those who have been remitted recommendations.

Author

*Gillian Mackintosh
August 2020*

Presenter

Academic Services

**Freedom of Information
Open**

Internal Periodic Review reports 2019/20

IPR	No	Commendations	Recommendations	Responsibility
Divinity (UG provision)	1	The Review Team commends the collaborative, mutually supportive ethos demonstrated by the Senior Management team and commend their openness and imagination in discussing different possible configurations of formal responsibility and strategic decision-making to manage undergraduate teaching.	The review team accepted the strategic and organisational considerations behind changing the School structure for the management of undergraduate teaching and supported current plans to dissolve subject areas as administrative structures. However, at the same time the review team recommends that the School also identify, implement and/or preserve clear DPT-defined pathways that support disciplinary progression and integrity, in order to address the above-noted staff concerns highlighted at the review. This means that the School should collectively examine and confirm that current DPTs would remain fit for purpose in this regard after the dissolution of Subject Areas as administrative structures. In instances where uncertainty or reservations around this question might arise, the School should be open to making changes to current DPTs necessary to underwrite staff confidence, for example, looking at programme-specific instances where new and/or additional DPT pre-requisites would be needed to support disciplinary progression and integrity.	Head of School and Director of Undergraduate Teaching
	2	There was a discussion about the impact of anticipated University-led curriculum review and changes resulting from the Service Excellence Programme. The review team commended extensive School awareness and engagement with wider University initiatives and conversations around all aspects of learning, teaching and student experience.	The review team recommends a holistic review of the School's entire UG course provision to ensure appropriate consistency, diversity, timing, constructive alignment, and cumulative volume of assessments across the curriculum. This would include consideration of the impact of assessment practices on all stakeholders (students, academic staff and professional services) when conducting this review and arriving at its conclusions.	Head of School, Director of Undergraduate Teaching
	3	The review team commended the foresight of the School in securing the services of an embedded learning technologist so as to progress digital education initiatives for both on-campus and online learning enhancement. Anticipated developments in MOOC provision and partnerships with external organisations such as the Church of Scotland suggest that this Learning Technologist role was likely to expand and any such expansion would also benefit wider considerations that relate to the School's public mission and profile.	The review team strongly supported the proposed strengthening of the UG Studies Committee to undertake strategic decision-making in relation to curriculum development and provision and recommended that this change was undertaken as soon as possible.	Head of School and Director of Undergraduate Teaching

4	The Review Team commends the effectiveness of the operation of the Personal Tutoring system at the School of Divinity. All role holders (Senior Tutor, Personal Tutors and Student Support Officers) demonstrated an empathetic culture with mutually respectful relationships between academic and professional services colleagues clearly evident.	The review team acknowledges feedback received on strong aspects of community identity, but recommends that the School formally consider how best to preserve and further enhance existing levels of inclusivity, bearing in mind all student voices, identities and experiences (e.g. BAME, carers, LGBTQ+ and WP).	Head of School, Director of Undergraduate Teaching and Senior Tutor
5	The review Team commends the outstanding work of the current Director of Undergraduate Teaching for her leadership in enhancing the learning and teaching culture across UG provision	The review team recommends that the excellent local practice in personal tutoring currently demonstrated in Divinity is preserved in any forthcoming system transformation. This will be the responsibility of colleagues leading the joint University-SEP review of the personal tutoring system, who should consult directly with Divinity on this matter.	Service Excellence Programme and Personal Tutor Review Project Team
6	The Review Team commends the vision of the School in appointing to the role of PG Tutor coordinator. We also commend the work and initiative of the PG Tutor Coordinator for fulsomely achieving that vision through her recruitment, training, support and evaluation of the PG Tutoring community.	In relation to commendation 6 above, the Review Team recommends that the wider University formally examines the local arrangements put in place within Divinity, in order to identify aspects of best practice that might be scalable across the wider institution more generally.	IAD and the College Dean of Postgraduate Education to take forward with the College Deans in MVM and CSE to share practice
7	The review team commends the Teaching Manager for her effective leadership of the Professional Services team and for establishing a student centred and mutually supportive team ethos.	It was recommended that the College develop further guidance, guidelines and support for PG Tutors and demonstrators contributing to teaching and assessment of online courses and programmes. The review team recognises that this is a College-level responsibility, however, given the outstanding culture of tutor and demonstrator mentoring and support within Divinity we consider the School would be well placed to contribute to this work.	College Dean of Postgraduate Education and the IAD.
8	The review team commends all aspects of the Professional services team's work – their support of each other, their academic colleagues, and the wider student community. Students and academic colleagues spoke consistently highly about the Professional Services team's effectiveness and person-centred approach throughout the review.	It was noted that the College Dean of Undergraduate Education was undertaking work to harmonise issues experienced by students on joint programmes across the College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences. This would include the designation of Programme Directors linked to the programme in counterpart Schools. In light of the significant proportion of UG students enrolled on joint programmes, the review team recommended that the	College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences Dean of UG Education

			College Deanery continue this work to further align processes and student experiences across these programmes.	
	9		The review team recommends that the School make explicit their vision for graduate attributes and how this relates to programme design, with particular emphasis on making explicit the link between assessment and skills building: for example, articulating the ways in which academic skills such as critical thinking also prepare students for the world of work. This recommendation will overlap and interact with those recommendations made elsewhere within the review that relate to documenting potential pathways through the programmes and the strengthening of the UG Studies Committee.	Head of School and Director of Undergraduate Teaching
Chemistry (UG & PGT provision)	1	Recent investment in leadership training for Academic and Professional Services staff is commended.	<u>Curriculum:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is strongly recommended that Chemistry gives careful consideration to the content of the Year Three curriculum. It is strongly recommended that the School works towards embedding its skills and careers' development within the core curriculum, and that a mandatory, assessed reflective portfolio for Year Five students and more reflective elements for earlier years are introduced. 	School
	2	The School has a commendable and globally recognised research reputation.	<u>Supporting and Developing Staff</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is recommended that pedagogical training is rolled out for all Postgraduate Tutors and Demonstrators as soon as is practicable. It is recommended that Chemistry takes steps to professionalise the Tutor and Demonstrator roles by introducing a selective recruitment process. Once in post, Tutors and Demonstrators should be regarded as University staff members. It is recommended that Demonstrators are required to work through all pre-lab exercises and experiments in advance of teaching classes and that they are paid fully for their time. 	School

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is strongly recommended that the School produces detailed assessment criteria and marking rubrics for each assignment, and clear information about this should be published in course handbooks. The review team recommends that the School sets more ambitious targets for EdTA participation and completion; continues to build on the work started through the Teaching Forum to discuss innovative approaches to teaching and learning and share best practice; and ensures that teaching activity is a key focus in Academic Staff annual review processes. 	
3	The recent appointment of a Marketing Manager is commended.		<p><u>Assessment and Feedback:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is recommended that the School reviews the quantity and types of assessment used across all years. It is recommended that the School develops a more systematic and explicit approach to providing formative feedback opportunities for all undergraduate courses. It is recommended that Chemistry ensures that Course Organisers take full responsibility for all aspects of their course's assessment. 	School
4	Chemistry's work since the 2014 internal review to streamline and enhance its portfolio of programmes is commended.		<p><u>Teaching Delivery:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is recommended that the School considers ways in which it might reduce its reliance on traditional lectures and diversify teaching approaches. 	School
5	Recent changes made to Years 4 and 5 of Chemistry's undergraduate programmes are commended.		<p><u>Student Support</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is recommended that the School considers ways in which elements of the one to one relationship between Personal Tutor and student that exists under the current model of student support is retained, whilst taking full advantage of the opportunities afforded by the enhanced Professional Services Student Experience Team that will exist under the University's new model. It is strongly recommended that the School works towards developing standard templates for all programme and course handbooks and ensures that handbooks are a comprehensive source of information for students. 	School

6	Chemistry's existing PGT programmes and PGT expansion plans are commended.	<u>Student Voice</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is recommended that the School takes steps to ensure that all students know when and how to raise concerns about Postgraduate Tutors and Demonstrators. 	School
7	The planned introduction of a Year Two course in Computational Thinking is commended.	<u>Quality and Standards</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is recommended that Boards of Examiners' discussions and decisions about action to be taken for students with special circumstances are based only on the judgements provided by the Special Circumstances Committee. 	School
8	The School's laboratory programme, which facilitates excellent, progressive development of technical and research skills across the five years of the programme, is commended.	<u>Management</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is recommended that the School gives further consideration to succession planning for teaching-related roles and wherever possible, adheres to the principle that roles should be held for a fixed-term, five year period. 	School
9	A reduction in the number of compulsory laboratory reports in Year Two to provide space to assess in alternative ways is commended.	<u>University Shuttle Bus</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The review team recommends that the University Shuttle Bus service continues until the KB Nucleus development is complete. 	Emma Crowther, University Transport & Parking Office
10	The provision for PGT students of continuous feedback on the literature reviews they undertake is commended.		
11	The sense of community within Chemistry is impressive and commendable.		
12	The excellent, one to one relationship that exists between Personal Tutor and student under Chemistry's current Personal Tutor system is commended.		
13	The administrative support provided by the Chemistry Teaching Organisation (CTO) is commended.		
14	Chemistry's Laboratory Technicians are commended.		
15	The work of the Director of Postgraduate Teaching is commended.		
16	Chemistry is commended for being highly responsive to the student voice.		
17	Work to enhance the BSc student experience is commended.		

	18	The School's overall awareness of and approach to issues of equality and diversity is commendable.		
	19	Chemistry is commended for the low differentials seen in its degree results when these are broken down by gender and ethnic origin.		
	20	The work of Chemistry's Careers Consultant is commended.		
	21	The pedagogical training that has been introduced for Postgraduate Demonstrators is commended.		
	22	Current engagement amongst Academic Staff with the Edinburgh Teaching Award (EdTA) and the International Accreditation Association for Higher Education (AHE) is commended.		
Centre for Open Learning (UG provision)	1	The Centre is highly commended for developing such an ambitious strategic plan and vision for the future. It is commended for the work that has been carried out through its Governance and Academic Structure Project (GASP). The Review Team fully endorses the aims the Centre places at the heart of its plans and actively encourages it to pursue those goals, while it begins to involve a wider group of staff and students in those discussions.	The Review Team recommends that the University's Senate Education Committee create opportunities for the Centre of Open Learning to fully embed its activities and broad range of expertise in language teaching, adult education and widening access into the fabric of the institution. The Committee should ensure that COL has a voice in institutional discussions about key projects and planning and help raise its profile within the University, ensuring that the excellent progress made by the Centre's own marketing team can be developed to help it grow sustainably.	University Senate Education Committee
	2	The Centre is commended for 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. The Learning Technologists are also commended for their work in this area.	The Review Team recommends that Student Systems and Administration, Information Services and other key University stakeholders continue to work with the Centre's Senior Management Team to find a viable solution for better integrating the Centre and its students into the University's systems. This should facilitate the collection of essential data on student admissions, retention and progression, helping to support the Centre's plans for growth. Where students cannot be integrated into the University's existing systems, it is recommended that the Centre receives the required support and funding to develop existing systems for handling admissions and on-programme tracking of students across all provision.	Student Systems and Administration and Information Services

3	The Review Team found clear evidence of high satisfaction amongst the students across all provision in the Centre and highly commends staff for pursuing this as one of the key priorities.	The Review Team recommends that the Centre engage staff at all levels in the development of its strategic vision for the future, particularly when developing the theme of community and identity. Staff should be consulted through staff forums and workshops, with additional events set up to engage students in these themes.	Senior Management Team
4	Professional Services and teaching staff are highly commended for delivering such a dedicated and consistent level of support to students in the Centre, showing leadership and resilience during a period of significant change	The Review Team recommends that the Centre set up a short-life working group to outline the existing challenges with estates and buildings (including those relating to accessibility) and explore the various options for development through an evidenced report. This will help to identify specific areas that require escalation, while also helping to establish a structured dialogue between staff and students about community and identity in the Centre.	COL Senior Management Team
5	The Centre is commended for developing a strong working relationship with the Edinburgh University Students' Association (EUSA) and for its dedication in creating and embedding an effective system of student representation across all provision.	The Review Team recommends that the University Estates department support the Centre to establish greater ownership of its learning and teaching spaces. Estates should support the School to develop the space in Paterson's Land to help create a sense of identity in the building for staff and students. The lower ground floor space in Paterson's Land should also be made available to COL for use as the Centre sees fit.	Estates
6	The Centre is highly commended for the excellent local outreach activity and its promotion of inclusivity and accessibility across all provision.	It is recommended that the Timetabling Unit continue work with the Centre for Open Learning to ensure that classrooms assigned are suitable for the teaching needs of each class. The room booking system should also be reviewed and enhanced to ensure that it does not disadvantage the Centre when assigning rooms shared with other Schools.	Timetabling Unit; Senior Management Team
7	The Centre is commended for placing staff community at the forefront of its plans for growth and change. The Review Team endorses the excellent progress in this area, including the all staff newsletter, the Away Days and other events, and encourages the Centre to continue building on these successes.	The Review Team recommends that Learning Technology Support (LTS) develop an out-of-hours support model with clear routes for escalating immediate and longer term technology support issues, which is available to staff teaching evening classes in the Centre.	Learning Technology Support (LTS)
8	The Senior Management Team is commended for its dedication to the continuing professional development of staff in the Centre, and initiatives including the planned	In recognition of the type of language support the Centre offers students from a wide range of backgrounds, it is recommended that the three College Offices find ways to	College Offices

		addition of recognised time for CPD activity (5%) and citizenship (10%) in roles and the workload allocation model.	facilitate deeper collaboration between the Centre and individual Schools, particularly in the areas of ELE and Languages for All.	
	9	Centre for Open Learning staff are commended for introducing a system of peer observation. The project that devised the system helped to facilitate cross-Centre working partnerships that connect staff based in IFP, Access and Short Courses and helped to build community.	The Review Team recommends that the Head of the Centre, the Director of Professional Services and College Registrars in each of the three Colleges explore the options for developing a revised funding model for English Language Education pre-sessional and in-sessional support to ensure future plans for growth can be carried out sustainably in the face of increasing demand.	Head of Centre, Director of Professional Services; College Registrars
	10	Staff in the Centre are commended for trying to use the space available in Paterson's Land creatively, by creating exhibition space and upgrading staff common spaces.	The Review Team recommends the Centre develop a more structured collaborative working relationship with the Institute for Academic Development (IAD) to ensure language and skills support for students, can be developed and delivered with optimal efficiency drawing on the wide pool of expertise in both areas.	Director of Learning and Teaching; Institute for Academic Development
	11	The Centre is highly commended for the progress made in developing effective governance structures and Quality Assurance processes including Boards of Studies, Boards of Examiners and External Examiners with access to the reporting system.	The Review Team recommends that the Centre develops an internal CPD framework for academic staff using the existing Edinburgh Teaching Award. This should incorporate a mentoring support model and should be facilitated with the help of the Institute for Academic Development (IAD).	Senior Management Team; Institute for Academic Development
	12		It is recommended that the Centre review the rationale and deadlines for the course registration process across Short Courses and Languages for All. The Centre should continue to streamline the process where possible, communicating deadlines and reasons for closure in advance of course registration closing, supported by a clear and consistent policy.	School Teaching Office; Director of Professional Services
Politics & International Relations (UG provision)	1	The review team commends the work being undertaken by the School to reflect and enhance current working practices including the review of governance structures and the review of the Postgraduate tutor role.	The review team recommends that the School consider the following measures to improve the working conditions and support offered to Tutors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a more robust training programme which includes topics such as facilitating tutorials, a formal mechanism to allow tutors to feedback on 	School

			<p>courses to enhance course content, enhanced marking guidance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a Tutor Convenor role at School level to act as the key contact for the tutors with responsibility for academic development as well as a point of contact for HR and Administrative matters. - formal 'Guidance and Feedback' hours for tutors to include payment to enable tutors and students to discuss questions after tutorials and answer student emails. The review team recognise there are implications around ensuring feedback hours are used for that purpose rather than as a pastoral support for students, which tutors are not trained to provide. In addition, recognition of the challenges around allocation of office space to carry out these feedback hours. - a review of contracts to ensure they adequately reflect appropriate time for marking and to consider any additional remuneration <p>The review team recommends that a dedicated space is considered to enable tutors to do marking, to meet with students and to meet as a group to facilitate opportunities to share practice.</p> <p>The review team recommends that tutors are involved in the review process if this has not already been agreed.</p> <p>The review team recommends that the conclusions from the internal periodic review feed into the School review</p>	
	2	<p>The review team commends the Subject Area for the importance given to building community and the commitment to revising, enhancing and diversifying the curriculum to meet student needs and preferences.</p>	<p>The review team recommends the School review their assessment and feedback procedures and consider ways to streamline these procedures to ensure timely return of materials to students and to reduce the administrative burden associated with assessment. Such changes might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -using more efficient online software so that staff can directly access and mark course assessments once these have been submitted by the students. Alternative mechanisms such as Turnitin or systems developed by 	School

			<p>other Schools such as Physics and Astronomy could be considered.</p> <p>-a review of the moderation processes used for course work in the School with a view of making these processes less burdensome. For Honours modules marked by a single member of staff the School could consider returning course work before moderation to ensure timely feedback.</p>	
3	The Subject Area is commended for its approach to enhancing learning and teaching.	<p>Students suggested a number of ideas to improve community building and enhance communications. The review team recommends that the Subject Area and School consider these suggestions.</p> <p>The review team recommends that the Subject Area consider seeking opportunities such as the Course Choice Options sessions for community building.</p> <p>The review team recommends that the School consider ways in which current study and teaching spaces can be improved to enhance the student experience and consider where any unused spaces could be used as social spaces for students to come together. The Student User group should be involved in these discussions if not already invited to do so.</p>	School and Subject Area School School	
4	<p>The review team commends the commitment to reducing student numbers in Honours courses which is recognised as an example good practice.</p> <p>The Subject Area is commended for the changes to the curriculum which has resulted in reduced class sizes</p>	The review team recommends that the School and Subject Area review communications to ensure that all students are aware of the location of the SSO office and the mechanisms to book appointments and rooms confidentially.	School and Subject Area	
5	Students were appreciative of the pre-honours course structure which is question and issues based. This is recognised as an example of good practice and is commended by the review team.	The review team strongly recommends that the School considers additional resources for Student Support in terms of office space and placement and additional Student Support Officer staffing resources as well as additional staffing resource to support the PIR SASO	Head of School and Director of Professional Services	
6	Students were very positive about the courses that specifically relate to a lecturers' particular area of research. They reported the noticeable enthusiasm demonstrated during these classes and felt this created	The review team recommends that the Timetabling Unit consider the allocation of teaching rooms across campus to reduce transition time between classes. This could have a positive impact on community building between students	Timetabling Unit	

		good student-staff engagement and this is commended by the review team as an example of community building.	and staff by enabling and encouraging after class conversations. The review team also recommends that the University Estates' Space Management Group are mindful of the factors noted above and the impact that the pressures on the School estate is having on the student and staff experience	University Estates' Space Management Group
	7	The review team commends the commitment to research led teaching which is recognised in much of the sector as an example of good practice in curriculum development and innovation.	Whilst the review team acknowledges the pedagogical rationale for this approach, it recommends that the School and Subject Area consider their approach to lecture recording for equality and diversity reasons.	School and Subject Area
	8	The Subject Area operates within the framework of the Personal Tutoring statement. It is conscious of the need to support students at all stages of the student journey and is commended for its commitment to student support.	It is recommended that the School and Subject Area review communication channels to enable collaboration in areas that are School wide issues to ensure that practice and enhancements are consistent.	School and Subject Area
	9	The Student Support Officers and the Subject Area Support Officer are very highly thought of by the Personal Tutors and students and are commended for the excellent support they provide to staff and students.	The review team recommends that the Subject Area continue to diversify their curriculum and build on the good work that has been done to decolonise and expand course offerings and course reading lists.	Subject Area
	10	To further support students and enable good working practices, the Teaching Office are keen to introduce monthly meetings with the Senior PT to flag students that may be causing concern and the review team commends this approach.	The review team recommends the Subject Area reviews the format and content of the fundamentals course.	Subject Area
	11	The review team commends the PIRPALS scheme, the commitment of the student leaders and their approach to enhancing the curriculum and the contribution to community building.	The review team recommends that the coursework extension policy is reviewed to consider and reflect on the negative impact the process is having on feedback timelines and staff workload/ time management across the board.	Service Excellence Project (Extensions and Special Circumstances project board)
	12	Staff and students highlighted a number of examples which contributed to community building and these are commended by the review team:	The review team recommends that the School consider ways in which additional financial assistance and support could be provided, e.g. provision of space. In addition, access to relevant Learn pages to be granted to the leaders.	Head of School

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Transatlantic Seminar Series which is run by the Subject Area. - PIR Distinguished Scholar Lecture Series (This is recognised as an example of good practice) - School Choir which was established to break down barriers between Subject Areas and meets on a weekly basis. - Annual 4th year Dissertation retreat. 		
	13	The review team commends the existing initiatives to support widening participation activity and the current consultations to explore further links.		
	14	The review team commends the Subject Area and the Careers Service on the provision of tutorials on graduate attributes and career preparations.		
	15	The review team commends the Subject Area for their approach to the annual review process.		
	16	The current Student Support Officers, Subject Academic Support Officer and Teaching Office staff are highly valued and the Subject Area are keen to retain them. The review team commends their commitment and the excellent support that they provide to both students and staff.		
	17	The review team commends the School for recognising the urgent need to review and address growth and space options		