

The University of Edinburgh

Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

**Electronic SQAC will commence on Friday 18 May 2018
and close on Friday 25 May 2018**

A G E N D A

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| 1. Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 26 April 2018 | SQAC 17/18 5A |
| 2. Matters Arising | |
| For Information and Formal Business | |
| 3. Thematic Review | SQAC 17/18 5B |
| 4. Update on Actions from College Quality Reports | SQAC 17/18 5C |
| 5. Distance Learning at Scale Update | SQAC 17/18 5D
CLOSED |
| 6. Annual Review of Effectiveness of Committees | SQAC 17/18 5E |
| 7. Knowledge Strategy Committee | SQAC 17/18 5F |
| 8. Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance | SQAC 17/18 5G |
| 9. Internal Review Themes | SQAC 17/18 5H |
| 9. Internal Review Reports and Responses | SQAC 17/18 5I |
| 10. Any Other Business | |
| 11. Date of Next Meeting:
Thursday 27th September 2018 at 2pm (Venue TBC) | |

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

**Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 26 April 2018 at 2pm
in the Raeburn Room, Old College**

Present:

Professor Tina Harrison	Assistant Principal, Academic Standards and Quality Assurance (Convener)
Dr Shereen Benjamin	Associate Dean (Quality Assurance) College of Arts, Humanities and Social Science
Megan Brown	Schools Engagement Officer, Edinburgh University Students' Association
Brian Connolly	Secretary to Senatus Quality Assurance Committee, Academic Services
Dr Gail Duursma	School Representative (Engineering), College of Science and Engineering
Nichola Kett	Head of Quality Assurance and Enhancement Team, Academic Services
Sarah McAllister	Head of Operations & Projects & Assistant Director, Institute for Academic Development
Dr Gordon McDougall	Dean (Quality Assurance), College of Science and Engineering
Dr Claire Phillips	School Representative (Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies), College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine
Dr Inger Seiferheld	School Representative (Business School), College of Arts, Humanities and Social Science
Tom Ward	Director, Academic Services

Apologies:

Bobi Archer	Vice President (Education), Students' Association
Brian Green	Deputy Associate Principal (Learning & Teaching), University of Strathclyde

1. Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 2 February 2018

The Minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

2. Matters Arising

The Committee noted that a report on actions from the last meeting arising from the College Quality Reports 2016-17 would be submitted to the next meeting.

For Discussion

3. Principal, Professor Peter Mathieson

The Principal was welcomed to the Committee and outlined his emerging priorities.

The Principal noted the need for a culture shift at the University to counter the perception that research was valued to a greater extent than teaching and learning. This would not diminish the value of research and the fact that research largely determined a university's international reputation. However, teaching and learning were core elements of the University's mission and whilst recognising that measuring excellence in teaching and learning was more difficult than for research, this did not mean that the University should not seek to do so.

Members noted that data drawn from the University's quality processes, such as the annual school and college quality reports and internal review processes, were currently used to identify good practice. This was then shared at fora such as the Directors of Teaching and Quality networks. The Convenor also noted that the Learning and Teaching Conference in June (to be opened by the Principal) would focus on the theme of Inspiring Learning with a wide range of presentations about learning and teaching from staff and students. The Students' Association Teaching Awards was also noted as a valued mechanism for the recognition of teaching and learning excellence across the University.

Members noted that the annual appraisal (or review) processes for academic staff tended to focus almost exclusively on research with little, if any, consideration given to teaching or administrative duties. It was further noted that whilst the University had mechanisms for the recognition of teaching excellence these did not seem to be systematically applied. The Principal noted that consideration was being given to the introduction of a teaching-only pathway, into which the University could recruit staff with potential and within which it would be possible for someone whose predominant contribution to the University was teaching to see a career pathway leading to full professorship. The Principal also noted an ambition to abolish the term "support staff", which did not adequately describe or value the contributions that such staff members make, and replace it with "professional services".

Members noted that in the context of increasing student numbers and estates developments, insufficient suitable teaching and learning accommodation was highlighted consistently by students and staff as an issue of concern. Members suggested that in this context it was important for new estates developments, such as the new Quartermile project, to include an element of teaching and learning space in order to emphasise the University's priorities in this area.

Action: The Convenor to send the Principal information from the University's quality processes on the issue of space.

The Principal noted the intention to take steps to ensure that the University of Edinburgh was a destination of choice for the most talented students and staff from all over Scotland and the world. For students, this would include aspects of widening participation which could apply to Scottish-domiciled students but also to those from further afield. In this context the Principal welcomed the proposal to focus the next thematic review on support for Widening Participation.

4. Undergraduate Degree Classification

The Committee received the annual report on degree classification outcomes of successfully exiting undergraduates and a paper highlighting sector trends in undergraduate degree classification outcomes.

The Committee noted that the proportion of top (first or upper second) degrees being awarded by UK higher education institutions was increasing, with the increase relating to the proportion of firsts in particular. Explanations for this upward trend were considered such as improved school education outcomes, improved student achievement at university, and changes in degree algorithms and marking practices across the sector. The Committee noted that the increasing trend had provoked political interest (particularly in England) in relation to the possible implications for academic standards. It was also noted that employers had expressed concern that the upward trend in higher degree awards was making it harder for them to differentiate between graduates and therefore devaluing qualifications.

The Committee noted that the University has a number of controls in place to ensure that degree classifications were robust and appropriate. The University operates a consistent approach to degree classification (with minor variations for a small number of subject areas), which has not changed for at least a decade, along with a Common Mark Scheme. The annual School and College quality reporting and Teaching Programme Review (TPR) processes provide institutional oversight, with data on undergraduate degree outcomes a key input. The External Examiner system also provides an independent oversight of the University's assessment and attainment processes.

The Committee discussed options for additional ways for the University to address the issue. It was noted that while most subject areas across the University were broadly in line with Russell Group comparators for their discipline and / or with the University average, there were a few significant outliers which diverged substantially from either the University average or comparators in their discipline. The Committee noted that while there may be good reasons for these areas to have these patterns of degree outcomes, it may be appropriate to clarify the position. The Committee agreed that a specific communication should be sent to each of the four Schools identified inviting them to reflect on their degree classification outcome data and provide an analysis of their context.

The Committee also agreed that a prompt/header should be added to the School Annual Quality Report template requesting a specific reflection on degree classification outcomes to include reasons for these patterns and actions taken to address any inappropriate patterns.

Action: Academic Services to contact the Schools listed above to inform them that they are outliers and that a detailed reflection on degree classification outcomes will be required within their annual quality report. Academic Services to amend the reporting template and communicate changes to Schools and Colleges.

5. Student Support Thematic Review

5.1 2017-18 Review - Progress Update

The Committee received a progress report on this year's Thematic Review of support for Mature Students and Student Parents and Carers. It was noted that the review was currently in the consultation phase and that a number of meetings with students had been held. A number of issues and themes had been identified which would be further explored with stakeholders from across the University support services. It was noted that the review panel would seek to extend this consultation phase in order to ensure that the voices of younger parents and carers and distance learning students were encompassed by the review.

The Committee noted that the review panel would submit a report of initial findings to the next meeting in May identifying 'quick wins' and issues which could be actioned and resolved relatively quickly. A final report identifying good practice and areas for enhancement would then be submitted to the September meeting.

5.2 2018-19 Review – Theme

The Committee discussed the proposal that the next Thematic Review focus on support for Widening Participation in the light of the recent approval by University Court of the new Widening Participation strategy. It noted that the Students' Association was very supportive of the work that the University had invested into Widening Participation.

The Committee **agreed** that the Thematic Review should focus on exploring the University's current position in relation to the aspects of the Strategy relating to the student (as opposed to applicant) experience – that is, the Support to Succeed and Support to Progress sections. It was suggested that, as part of this, the Thematic Review could focus particular attention to dimensions of the Strategy related to the experiences of Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) students.

Action: Thematic Review Coordinator to work with the relevant stakeholders to develop a more detailed proposal for the 2018-19 thematic review for the next meeting of the Committee.

6. Providing Summaries of Student Feedback to School Representatives

The Committee discussed a proposal to pilot the provision of a standard high-level analysis of student feedback report to School Representatives. It was noted that the reports would likely take the form of a short visual representations of student feedback data provided to School Representatives at the beginning of the academic year. The Committee noted that this work may improve Course Evaluation Questionnaire (CEQ) response rates by helping schools to promote the outcomes of these questionnaires with students. Communication with pilot Schools would be managed by Student Surveys, with the Students' Association managing communication with students. The pilot would be evaluated by Academic Services and the outcomes and any resulting actions would be communicated to relevant stakeholders by Academic Services.

The Committee endorsed the proposal. It was agreed that the proposal would be discussed at the next Directors of Quality Network meeting.

Action: Members to help promote the opportunity and seek volunteers in their Colleges and Schools.

7. Committee Planning

The Committee discussed its full set of priorities for the coming 2018-19 academic session and agreed that it would:

- Work with the Students' Association to enhance the Class Representation System;
- Oversee and evaluate the effectiveness of the Personal Tutor system;
- Oversee institutional activities in response to 2015 Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR);
- Oversee initial preparations for the University's next ELIR;
- Embed mid-course feedback for undergraduate students, and develop appropriate mechanisms for evaluating its operation;
- Oversee the thematic review of student support services (topic to be confirmed).

The Committee approved the priorities and also **agreed** that Academic Services should add an item regarding collating information on good practice in relation to developing academic communities.

8. Industrial Action

The Committee discussed the University's approach to monitoring the impact of the recent industrial action on the quality of the student experience.

The Committee noted the steps taken by the Senate Curriculum and Student Progression Committee (CSPC) to assist the University to mitigate the academic impact on students of the recent industrial action while maintaining academic standards. It was further noted that once the impact of the industrial action on students had been addressed, CSPC would reflect on how these temporary arrangements had operated in practice (for example, whether they have been as effective as anticipated in maintaining academic standards and the impact on students has been addressed).

The Committee discussed the guidance issued to Schools and Colleges on 16 April 2018. Members noted issues regarding the arrangements for External Examining set out in the guidelines. The Director of Academic Services confirmed that the guidelines had been devised and approved in line with guidance from Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) recognising that institutions had obligations to their students which meant that they could consider alternate ways of managing assessment and making awards. He emphasised that the temporary arrangements would only allow Boards to operate without the participation of External Examiners for specific points of time in very specific circumstances, and when accompanied by robust internal arrangements to allow the maintenance of academic standards. He noted that CSPC was satisfied that the concessions and guidelines agreed were consistent with the QAA statement, and that, by approving the guidelines prior to

the spring Boards of Examiners diet, it was fulfilling the QAA expectation that institutions should 'confirm decisions regarding temporary arrangements'.

The Committee discussed how the University could use the annual quality review process to review the impact the industrial action may have had on the quality of learning, teaching and assessment. It agreed that a prompt/header should be added to the Annual Programme Monitoring and the School Annual Quality Report templates for 2017-18 requesting a high level statement reflecting on whether the disruption caused by the industrial action had led to any issues regarding the quality of the provision, and, if so, how this had been mitigated. This would also be included in the 2018/19 templates in order to capture postgraduate taught and resit outcomes.

Action: Academic Services to amend the reporting templates and communicate changes to Schools and Colleges.

For Information and Formal Business

9. Analysis of Institutional Annual Statements 2016/17

The Committee noted an analysis, carried out by the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) Scotland, of institutional annual statements submitted to the Scottish Funding Council.

10. Committee Membership

The Committee approved minor changes to the Terms of Reference to align with the other Senate Committees and allow more flexibility in terms of aligning membership with the Committee's priorities.

Action: College Deans to discuss membership of the Committee with School representatives for 2018-19.

11. UK Quality Code for Higher Education – Update on Redevelopment

The Committee noted the new Expectations and practices and plans to develop underpinning advice and guidance. It also noted that, due to time constraints, there would be no public consultation on the advice and guidance.

12. Enhancement Themes

The Committee noted the update on Enhancement Theme (Evidence for Enhancement: Improving the Student Experience) activity.

13. Service Excellence Programme

The Committee noted the update on the work being undertaken by the Student Administration & Support strand of the Service Excellence Programme.

14. Knowledge Strategy Committee

The Committee noted the update on matters considered by the Knowledge Strategy Committee.

15. Internal Review Reports and Responses

The Committee approved the following final report:

- Student-Led, Individually- Created Courses (SLICCs) Review Report February 2018.

The Committee confirmed that it was content with progress for the following responses:

- Postgraduate Programme Review of Chemistry (14 week response 2017/18);
- Postgraduate Programme Review of Engineering (14 week response 2017/18);
- Teaching Programme Review of Social Anthropology (14 week response 2017/18);
- Postgraduate Programme Review of Business (Year on response 2016/17);
- Postgraduate Programme Review of History, Classics and Archaeology (Year on response 2016/17);
- Teaching Programme Review of Art (Year on response 2016/17).

Action: Academic Services to request a more detailed response from Social Anthropology for the next meeting.

16. Any Other Business

There was no other business.

17. Date of Next Meeting:

Thursday 24 May 2018 at 2pm in the Hodgson Room, Weir Building, Kings Buildings

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

Electronic Meeting
18 – 25 May 2018

Thematic Review

Executive Summary

The paper provides the Committee with a progress update on the initial findings of the 2017-18 thematic review and confirms the scope of the 2018-19 review.

How does this align with the University / Committee's strategic plans and priorities?

The paper is relevant to the University's Strategic Goal of 'provide the highest-quality research-led teaching and learning".

Action requested

For information.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

- 1. Resource implications (including staffing)**
Resource implications will be considered as part of the review.
- 2. Risk assessment**
Risks will be considered as part of the review.
- 3. Equality and Diversity**
Equality and diversity would be an integral part of the review.
- 4. Freedom of information**
Open.

Key words

Thematic Review, Mature, Parent, Carer, Widening Participation

Originator of the paper

Brian Connolly, Academic Policy Officer

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

Context

Over the past 40 years the UK Higher Education (HE) sector has undergone significant transformation expanding opportunities beyond the 'traditional' student profile of 18 and 19 year old school leavers. This expansion has been driven by government initiatives to cultivate a highly skilled and globally competitive workforce and promote increased social mobility. These initiatives have led to an increase in mature students and student parents and carers entering higher education with a range of support needs which in some aspects diverge from the provision profile that HE has traditionally been geared towards.

Mature Students

Mature students (defined as students entering university at the age of 21 or older) form 59% of the total UK HE student population (31% aged 25 and over) and 63% of the HE population in Scotland (34% aged 25 and over). Mature students represent 37% of the full-time HE population in UK (10% aged 25 and over) and 42% in Scotland (12% aged 25 and over). However, the numbers of mature students (particularly part-time) across the sector has declined steeply over the last decade with explanations for this trend focusing on changes in funding and increases in tuition fees.

Of the total student population at the University of Edinburgh, 45% were 21 or over at the point of entry in 2017-18. Of these 54% were postgraduate taught students (with 29% postgraduate research and 17% undergraduate) and 60% were in full-time study (with 21% part-time and 19% online distance learning).

Mature students make up 13% of all undergraduate students (compared to 43% across the UK HE sector). The proportion of mature students is particularly high in the Centre for Open Learning 87%, Veterinary Medicine 34%, and Moray House School of Education 34%.

Mature students make up 99% of all postgraduate students (in line with the rest of the UK) with 51% aged 25 and over.

Mature students make up 34% of all full time students (compared to 49% across the UK HE sector). The proportion of full-time mature students is particularly high in the Centre for Open Learning 87%, Veterinary Medicine 34%, and Moray House School of Education 34%.

The figures for Edinburgh are in line with peer institutions in the Russell Group.

Mature students are diverse in terms of age, gender, ethnicity, previous qualifications, work experience, personal and financial circumstances, family and caring responsibilities, and in their motivations for study. However, some general characteristics can be identified:

- **The majority of part-time students are mature** - the overwhelming majority of part-time students at UK universities are mature students. Part-time study appeals to

some mature students because it enables them to balance between academic study, financial commitments and other responsibilities such as paid employment and/or family and caring responsibilities.

- **Mature students are more likely to enrol at modern universities** – modern (post-92) universities tend to focus recruitment strategies more on local populations and offer more flexible study options which is why they have played a key role in broadening the number and range of degree courses that are offered on a part-time basis.
- **There are more female than male mature students** - this reflects historic trends of participation in higher education as well as the higher qualification requirements for professions such as teaching, nursing and social work that remain attractive for some women who are looking to change career or return to work following a career break.
- **Mature students are more likely to have disabilities** - reflecting the fact that students with disabilities tend to face greater barriers to accessing higher education and are therefore more likely to go to university as mature students if they participate in higher education.
- **Mature students are more likely to be from black and minority ethnic (BME) groups** – once again reflecting BME students tend to face greater barriers to accessing higher education and are therefore more likely to go to university as mature students if they participate in higher education.
- **Mature students are more likely to be from more disadvantaged backgrounds** - among students whose backgrounds are known, mature students are less likely to be employed in professional and managerial occupations and more likely be employed in intermediate, semi-routine and routine occupations, compared to the parents of their younger peers.
- **Mature students are less likely to complete their courses** - Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) performance indicators show that mature students are consistently twice as likely as young students to withdraw between the first and second year of study.
- **Mature students may be less likely to obtain 'good' degrees** - variable attainment levels may reflect the diverse qualifications and backgrounds of mature students and the challenges that they may experience along the way. In this context 'distance travelled' may be considered to be a fairer way of measuring outcomes than absolute attainment. However, degree attainment could also be a measure of the success of institutional retention and academic support strategies.

Student Parents and Carers

Data in regard to student parents and carers is limited. As noted government efforts to widen participation have led to an increase in the number of students with children.

However, institutions are not required to collect information on student parents so there is no exact information on how many student parents there are across the UK. Student carers (defined as students who provide unpaid support to family or friends who could not manage without this help) are part of the 6.5 million carers in the UK, representing more than 10 per cent of the population. The number of people providing unpaid care has grown rapidly in the past decade and the important role of unpaid caring in society is increasingly being recognised. As with student parents, no sector-wide data is collected on the numbers of student carers, but National Union of Students (NUS) estimates are that carers make up between three and six per cent of the student population.

Of the total student population at the University of Edinburgh 7% declared dependents at the point of entry in 2017-18. Of these 58% were postgraduate taught students (with 22% postgraduate research and 20% undergraduate) and 38% were online distance learning students.

Undergraduate students with declared dependents make up 2% of the total undergraduate population with proportion rising to 13% of mature students and 29% of students 25 and over. The proportion of undergraduate students with declared dependents is particularly high in Centre for Open Learning 21% and Moray House School of Education 11%.

Postgraduate taught students with declared dependents make up 17% of the total postgraduate taught population with proportion rising to 32% of students 25 and over. The proportion is particularly high in Biomedical Sciences 40%, Moray House School of Education 39%, Clinical Sciences 38%, and Veterinary Studies 26%.

Postgraduate research students with declared dependents make up 13% of the total postgraduate research population with proportion rising to 23% of students 25 and over. The proportion is particularly high in Moray House School of Education at 51%.

Full-time students with declared dependents make up 2.7% of the full-time population with proportion rising to 19% of students 25 and over. Of the total number of part-time students 28% declared dependents at the point of entry. For Online Distance Learning 32% declared dependents at the point of entry.

The figures for Edinburgh are in line with peer institutions in the Russell Group.

Student parents and carers are diverse and can be mature or young learners, UK or international students, may be accessing social benefits and support or be eligible for none. However, the majority of student parents and carers are also mature students and therefore share many of the characteristics noted above. Student parents and carers are more likely to be women, and due to their caring responsibilities, are more likely to be part-time, attending a local institution and studying for a vocational qualification.

Methodology

The methodological approach agreed by the review panel places more emphasis on qualitative methods than would usually be the case with student consultations at the University. The heterogeneous nature of the student groups involved would make a

traditional quantitative approach, such as a survey, relatively unwieldy. Furthermore, given the degree of survey fatigue within the student body, another survey might prove alienating and make a significant response rate difficult to achieve. Instead the panel opted for a more agile and in-depth approach seeking to drill down under the general issues in order to get a better understanding of the specific, practical problems faced by students at Edinburgh.

The panel utilised recent research from across the sector (conducted by, for example, the NUS and UK Universities) to identify common themes and devise a set of general questions to use as a starting point for discussions with students. The panel then held a meeting with the three Students' Association representatives for Mature Students, Student Parents, and Student Carers who were invited to help identify areas of good practice and issues of concern in the light of feedback they had received in their roles this year. Focus group sessions were conducted with three sets of students asked about the issues of particular importance to them as well as the themes identified by the panel. The panel also received several responses to a general invitation for comments from the student body that went out via the Students' Associations networks of class reps, newsletter, and social media channels.

Feedback from the consultation has provided the panel with insight into what is currently working and issues of concern particularly from a mature student perspective. However, the panel was concerned at the lack of responses from younger parents and carers and distance learning students. Therefore, in order to ensure that these particular cohorts have sufficient opportunity to contribute to the review the panel has decided to extend the consultation phase. To this end, the review panel will now submit its final report to the Committee at the first meeting of the 2018-19 academic session in September.

It should be noted that the number of student responses to the consultation thus far has been relatively low. For example, only seven students attended the focus group sessions, with several others sending apologies for work or caring related reasons. However, it should also be noted that while small, the number of responses to date has not been far off the number of students that previous periodic and internal review panels would expect to meet during traditional formal review days (drawn from larger cohorts than those subject to this review). The review panel, and in particular the external member, is content that the feedback received from the student consultation to date is in line with similar reviews and research across the sector.

This view has been reinforced during the subsequent consultation with key staff stakeholders across the University examining issues raised by students. These meetings are essentially formative, helping the review panel to understand the issues from a service delivery perspective and to seek staff suggestions on existing good practice and possible areas for enhancement. Three meetings have been held to date (with representatives from the Library Service, Timetabling and Examinations, and Edinburgh Global) and in each case staff have recognised the feedback from students and welcomed the opportunity afforded by the review to engage with the issues.

Initial Findings

The consultation has so far identified the following themes and issues:

Induction

The transition into higher education can be challenging for mature students and student parents and carers and it is important that the induction process responds to their specific needs and recognises that it may take longer to adjust to learning and to mastering the standards and practices required in an unfamiliar academic culture.

Students responding to the consultation felt that they had experienced little by way of induction and what had been provided was not particularly relevant to the needs of mature students or student parents and carers. Students suggested enhancements to the induction process such as dedicated open days, specific online guidance (including appropriate quotes/videos/FAQs), better course/programme description providing greater clarity about skills requirements for specific courses/programmes (identify preparatory reading material in order to address specific skills gaps prior to arrival), early study skills workshops or online courses (which again could be used to address specific skills gaps prior to arrival).

The review panel will hold a meeting with Rebecca Gaukroger (Director of Student Recruitment and Admissions) to discuss issues related to induction.

International Students

International students had suggested that the information they received upon arrival could be coordinated better (with as much information as possible delivered at or made available at University run accommodation) and with more practical details in regard to the wider local community (e.g. local childcare provision). Also, international students are often prevented by their visa from coming early to look for housing so they have to arrive quite near the beginning of their studies and find suitable family accommodation which can be very challenging and stressful.

A meeting was held with to discuss the issues raised by international students with **Alison McDonald** (Head of International Student Support), **Dr Jeremy Crang** (Dean of Students for the College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences); and **Brian Connolly** (Review Coordinator).

The review panel noted that information for international [Students with Dependents](#) and specific information for those bringing [children](#) is provided via the website. There is also a [Facebook networking group](#) and an [International Women's Club](#) which is mainly for international female partners of University students (usually international PG level students) or new employees (many of whom have children). Edinburgh Global also produce an [International Arrival Guide](#) with practical guidance for international students and [A Guide to Life in Edinburgh for Dependents](#). These documents had been published and distributed as hardcopies to students (including those in University owned accommodation) but this had now ceased due to resource limitations. It was noted that students had valued the hardcopy format for convenience and ease of reference.

The review panel noted that the number of students with dependents in University accommodation was extremely limited as accommodation was overwhelmingly geared to

single students without dependents. It was further noted that the information made available in University accommodation was dependent on the individual warden responsible for each building. Edinburgh Global endeavour to coordinate induction events with accommodation wardens and the Students' Association but this was not always possible in practice.

The panel noted that changes to Edinburgh Global which are being considered as part of the [Service Excellence Programme](#) may impact on the level of support provided to international students with dependents.

The review panel will hold a meeting with Lynn Duff (Assistant Director, Residence Life) in relation to student accommodation and information.

Flexibility

Mature students and student parents and carers tend to study under significantly different contexts compared to their more traditional entry 18-19 year old peers. The constraints faced by these students while combining academic demands with career or caring responsibilities can result in a greater need for a more flexible approach to study.

The review panel noted that local academic and support staff were regarded as sympathetic and understanding of the needs of students. However, it was noted that students had suggested that more widespread use of lecture recording would provide an additional element of support if and when work or caring commitments prevented attendance (or in the case of international students, to help when language was a barrier).

Action: The review panel will hold a meeting with Melissa Highton (Director of Learning, Teaching and Web Services and Assistant Principal Online Learning) in relation to lecture capture.

The review panel noted that some students seem to regard University regulations as a barrier, getting in the way of local, more flexible and accommodating arrangements. Examples noted included the need for greater flexibility in regard to the number of hours students are allowed to work in relation to specific courses. Mature students feel their greater experience and ability to manage work and study commitments is not taken into consideration. Many mid-career professionals feel they should be allowed to manage and plan their work and study schedule as adults without what they regard as overbearing and constrictive regulations relating to specific programmes of study which seem directed at 18-19 year olds.

Action: The review panel will hold a meeting with Adam Bunni (Head of Regulations and Governance, Academic Services) in relation to University regulations.

Timetabling and Examinations

In regard to Timetabling, students noted that classes, lectures or extra-curricular events seem to be organised and orientated to the needs of unencumbered 18-19 year olds living on or near campus. Students with work or caring responsibilities find early (due to the school run) or late (due to the school run or work commitments) or Friday afternoon (due to

the Edinburgh school half day) compulsory/core course starts problematic. Students also noted that advanced and prompt issuing of timetabling information is vital for those with childcare responsibilities or work commitments. Students noted that this doesn't always happen in practice.

In relation to Examinations, student parents reported struggling with exams on Saturdays due to lack of regular weekday childcare provision. Furthermore, several examples of student parents being denied exam adjustments were cited.

A meeting was held with **Scott Rosie** (Head of Timetabling and Examination Services); **Dr Jeremy Crang** (Dean of Students for the College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences); **Brian Connolly** (Review Coordinator) to discuss the issues raised in relation to timetabling and examinations. The following was noted:

The Head of Timetabling and Examination Services noted that the department worked with schools to ensure that all core curriculum requirements were accommodated within the constraints of wide curriculum choice and the need for increasing estate efficiency. It was noted that the timetabling team had complex modelling software and expertise to support schools to ensure the experience of all their students is as equitable as possible. To this end, the Head of Timetabling and Examination Services would encourage schools to proactively engage with the timetabling team.

The review panel noted that the move to personalised timetables via Office 365 had enabled advanced and prompt issuing of timetabling information. The new system was not comprehensive (some areas of the College of Science and Engineering and the College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine were yet to make the switch) however where the facility was utilised students were able to receive swift notification of any timetable changes.

The Head of Timetabling and Examination Services confirmed that weekend exams were being used as a last resort in response to the constraints on space due to the current phase of estate development. It was also suggested that the exam adjustment issues appeared to be due a training issue with individual invigilators. However, the Head of Timetabling and Examination Services would submit a written response to the review panel once he had the opportunity to consult with the examinations team.

Information

Mature students and student parents and carers are often juggling study with home life, work and dependents. In this context accurate, clear and timely provision of information (such as timetables, reading lists and placement information) is vital so that practical arrangements can be planned. The review panel noted a general perception that there was too much irrelevant communication across the student body which sometimes led to pertinent information (such as changes to timetables) being missed. Students suggested that on matriculation, they should be given the option to opt into mailing lists according to their study pattern and needs which in turn would make it easier for the University to make relevant information available to mature or parent/carer students.

The review panel also noted a demand for better online signposting of information. The central information source for mature students is delivered via the webpages: [Mature Students](#). Information on support for student parents and carers is delivered via a number of sources:

- [Equality and Diversity](#) - webpage includes information on family friendly support for students during their study time with the University.
- The Human Resources - [Health and Wellbeing](#) (related policies and guidance).
- Scholarships and Student Funding - [Students with Children](#) (details on government funding and University Bursaries).
- Edinburgh Global - [Students with Dependents](#) (information for international students including [A Guide to Life in Edinburgh for Dependents](#)).
- Childcare information for postgraduate students - [Childcare](#).
- The [Students' Association](#) provides detailed information for students with children or caring responsibilities.
- [Edinburgh University Young Adult Carers](#) (EUYAC) campaigned for student carers to be given the option to identify themselves on university and further education application forms.

The review panel agreed that better information signposting across the University webpages could be a 'quick win' which could be actioned and resolved relatively quickly.

Action: Review Coordinator to investigate the viability of improving information signposting before the start of the 2018-19 academic session.

Careers Guidance

Students responding to the consultation perceived the Careers Service as geared to the needs of younger students looking for their first job. Students would like more advice on how to use their degree to advance in their current profession or to make a mid-career change.

Action: The review panel will hold a meeting with Shelagh Green (Director of the Careers Service) in relation to careers information and support.

Social

A key aspect of life at University is the sense of belonging that comes from active participation in an academic community. A lack of opportunities for social engagement may give rise to feelings of loneliness and isolation and ultimately disengagement from a course of study or withdrawal from University.

The review panel noted that the students that had responded to the consultation were enjoying the opportunity to study and had not made the decision to attend University primarily for the social life. However, some students noted a lack of opportunities to meet and socialise with students with similar needs or backgrounds. They also emphasised that their social needs tended to be different from those of their younger or unencumbered peers and that this didn't seem to be catered for at the University. It was noted that students, particularly international students, tend to rely on informal peer support networks but that the

opportunity to pair up with more experienced peers at the University would help with both the induction process and socialisation. Students would like more dedicated spaces (either physical or virtual) where they could casually meet other students with a similar backgrounds and better signposting or information on current activities and spaces available which can be booked or utilised. Students would like opportunities for social engagement which are rooted in local accommodation or driven by academic activities are more likely to be embraced and flourish than University wide networks or associations with nebulous ambitions. Student parents also suggested that University organised playgroups would be a great way for student parents to meet each other.

Library

[The Policy for Child Access to the Main Library](#) is regarded by students as an unwelcoming barrier for students with children. Questions were raised as to why an additional policy for children was required instead of students with children being required to adhere to the same standard of non-disruptive behaviour as all other library users.

A meeting was held with to discuss the issue with **Jeremy Upton** (Director of Library and University Collections); **Barry Croucher** (Head of Help Services, Information Services); **Professor Alan Murray** (Review Convenor); **Brian Connolly** (Review Coordinator).

The Director of Library and University Collections noted that the Library had previously identified the policy as in need of revision and it is currently undertaking a review. The policy was devised with a mind to the underlying Health and Safety issues related to public access of library facilities (which include hazards such as a large array of electronic equipment, large and movable book stacks, and open plan stairwells) and minimising risk (particularly in regard to the additional duty of care responsibilities for children on campus). In this context it was also noted that there may be the additional requirement for a Personal Escape and Evacuation Plan (PEEP). It was also noted that the numbers of student parent and carer users were relatively small and that the wider student community continued to place a high value on the quiet and studious environment provided by the Library.

The Library is currently benchmarking with other institutions (such as Glasgow and Stirling) to understand how they approach this issue. However, it was noted that there seemed to be a lack of University information or guidance on how service areas within the institution should approach these matters. The Library would welcome a definitive statement from the University specifically in regard to child access requirements but also more generally in relation child friendly campus aspirations.

The Library is also liaising with the Students' Association to understand how facilities in the Library could be improved for students with caring responsibilities. However, the Library has struggled to find ways to engage and consult with student parents and carers particularly due to the lack of data in relation to these student cohorts. The Library would welcome assistance in sourcing a stakeholder group of student parents and carers to help identify issues and advise on plans.

The Director of Library and University Collections also noted that the Library service is currently restricted by the lack of space in the Main Library building. However, the

impending redevelopment project (which will possibly include an extension of space at ground level) would provide an opportunity to take a more strategic and comprehensive approach to the issue.

Children

Students with children cited 'child-friendly attitudes' as fundamental to their student experience. Students noted that there was a limited number of baby changing and breast feeding facilities across the campus. University Nursery Provision is regarded as expensive and geared to the needs of full-time staff and students. There is a perception that there is little or no flexibility when timetables change or in relation to the needs of part-time students. Furthermore, the centralisation of nursery provision at King's Buildings was not regarded as a positive move as students require easily accessible, localised provision.

Students also noted that the University has no crèche facilities. Students tend to have a lot of last minute or short-period childcare requirements which cannot be fulfilled by a nursery. The Scottish Parliament was cited as an example of good flexible practice where parents can leave their children as long as they stay on the premises (to work in the café, have meetings, see an exhibition, etc.). Students suggested that the University explore the viability of crèche provision with consideration given to: a subsidised scheme students and staff; facilities open to the broader community if demand was insufficient to cross-subsidise the student and staff prices; Co-locating facilities with a business or social enterprise or a nursery (in the Central Area, preferably) or as a stand-alone model.

Students perceive the University childcare funding process as overly bureaucratic, with numerous forms and evidence required before decisions are made. Students must already have a place and be self-funding before they can apply for financial help with costs. Furthermore, childcare funding dates do not align with childcare provider application requirements. Fully funded childcare bursaries have also recently been discontinued.

Action: The review panel will hold a meeting with Richard Kington (Director of Accommodation, Catering and Events) and Helen Ward (Manager of the Arcadia Nursery) in relation to Childcare and Nursery Provision.

Consultation Extended

The review panel will continue the consult with student and staff stakeholder groups during May and June before meeting during the summer to consider the findings and agree recommendations. The final report will be submitted to the Committee at the September meeting.

Brian Connolly
Review Coordinator
May 2018

Thematic Review 2018-19: Widening Participation

Scope

At the previous meeting the Committee agreed that Widening Participation would be the focus of the Thematic Review in 2018-19.

Widening Participation (WP) to higher education is a strategic priority for the UK and Scottish governments, the higher education sector in general and the University of Edinburgh in particular. WP aims to address the discrepancies in the take-up of higher education opportunities between different social groups. The aim is to raise aspirations and educational attainment among students from under-represented groups such as those from lower socio-economic backgrounds and neighbourhoods, low-participation and low progression schools, and those who are the first generation of their family to consider higher education. WP aims to prepare these students for higher education, ensure success on their programme of study, improve their employment prospects and open possibilities and opportunities to return to learning throughout their lives.

In the light of the recent approval of the University's new WP Strategy, the next Thematic Review will focus on support for WP students. The review will specifically focus on exploring the University's current position in relation to the aspects of the Strategy relating to the student (as opposed to applicant) experience – that is, the Support to Succeed and Support to Progress sections. The review will also focus particular attention to dimensions of the Strategy related to the experiences of Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) students.

Preparations for the review will be taken forward by the Convenor of Senate Quality Assurance Committee and appropriate stakeholders across the University during the summer.

Brian Connolly
Review Coordinator
May 2018

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

Electronic Meeting
18 – 25 May 2018

Update on Actions from College Quality Reports

Executive Summary

The paper provides an update on actions from College Quality Reports considered at the February meeting of the Committee.

How does this align with the University / Committee's strategic plans and priorities?

The paper is relevant to the University's aim to "provide the highest-quality research-led teaching and learning", and the strategic objective of 'Leadership in learning'.

Action requested

For Information.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. Resource implications (including staffing)

No.

2. Risk assessment

The paper is for information and risk assessment is not required.

3. Equality and Diversity

The paper is for information and equality impact assessment is not required.

4. Freedom of information

Yes.

Key words

Quality Reports, Space, Timetabling, Student Systems

Originator of the paper

Brian Connolly, Academic Policy Officer

Update on Actions from College Quality Reports

The Committee considered the Annual College Quality Reports at the meeting held on Thursday 8 February 2018 and agreed actions in response to issues raised by the Colleges.

Data Dashboards

The Committee noted that some areas continue to report discrepancies between data held centrally (EUCLID, Dashboards and BI Suite) and data on local systems. The following response was received from the Director of Student Systems:

We've had this feedback from CSE and MVM and have asked both to provide examples to enable us to review and comment. Neither have provided further information, if you have a contact, I'd be happy to follow up with CAHSS. I am keen to resolve if a problem exists and end use of local spreadsheets. More significant issues have been raised where the dashboards don't support core reporting against the QA framework and other key areas of MI and planning; this dialogue has been formalised with Academic Services and College heads of Quality to identify, prioritise and progress any such gaps in the data the dashboards. Thus we are currently testing a new dashboard screen that has been developed to analyse course pass/fail rates, and then plan to develop a further screen analysing qualifications and classifications achieved for later in the summer.

The Committee also noted a desire for further data support, training and guidance for Schools to help them to monitor trends effectively. The following response was received from the Director of Student Systems:

There are challenges balancing the growing depth, breath and complexity of both the student data being generated and the demand for it. The team are actively engaging with all three colleges (and with core support services such as GaSP and SRA) about reporting and use of our data generally, particularly AHSS and MVM. At MVM we are currently running monthly reporting surgeries to support general reporting needs and knowledge gaps, and to fill the gap left by the lack of any reporting team in that college. We also work directly with Schools and individual users to answer ad hoc data requests and resolve issues they have understanding or manipulating our data. While broad and flexible in their range of analysis, there are technical and practical limits to the dashboards' scope and usability, and suggestions for new dashboard enhancements often lead instead to new developments in other areas of our reporting provision: for example, the dashboards can't report on WP at any more granular level than distinguishing WP students from other students, but we have answered demand for greater depth of analysis in this area by adding over a dozen more detailed WP characteristics and measures to the student universes available for both MI and operational reporting.

Course Enhancement Questionnaires

The Committee noted concerns in regard to low response rates and the detrimental impact this may have on confidence in the accuracy of the results. The following response was received from the Director of Student Systems:

From a response rate perspective, semester 1 saw a 6% increase from the same period last year. With the impact of industrial action, semester 2 response rates are low. One way to boost response rates could be to incorporate the questionnaire into Learn, this is something we are exploring with a view to running a pilot; the rationale, this would make the evaluation survey part of the course and the person teaching the course would have control over asking students to complete (in a similar way to paper). EvaSys have just released a live response rate tracker; a number of Schools have asked for this type of functionality to have greater oversight of response rates. We can again consider pilot activity. I recognise with current response rates, the data is not deemed credible.

Estates and Space

The Committee noted that in the context of increasing student numbers and estates developments, insufficient suitable learning and teaching and social accommodation was a consistent theme throughout the reports. The following response was received from the Convenor of the Space Strategy Group:

The Space Strategy Group conducted a staff survey earlier this year to identify key concerns about our learning and teaching spaces as well as identify those spaces that are considered optimum for contemporary pedagogical practice. The results of that survey are now being used to prioritise work both within Information Services and through the Teaching Spaces Oversight Group. Each of the issues raised by SQAC were also raised in the survey, perhaps with the exception of private space for Personal Tutors and their tutees, so many thanks for raising that.

The Space Strategy Group is working with short and long term goals and is also currently developing a Learning and Teaching Spaces strategy to promote better synergy between L and T requirements and aspirations with physical and digital space developments. Consultation on this across the staff and student community is just beginning.

Short term actions include improvements to signage (to support movement across the Central Area in particular), furnishings and ambiance, plus the provision of telephones to ensure support is at hand for IT. We are progressing discussions on social space/informal learning spaces as well as study space for PGR students and how we can best support academic communities while meeting the enormous logistical challenge of providing teaching rooms to meet our growing student numbers and specific pedagogical requirements. The Timetabling Unit is developing sophisticated modelling to assess future demand and liaises closely with Schools to meet their needs in the most optimal way possible. There have also been some specific estate developments, with the opening of the first phase of the Lister Learning and Teaching Centre in Roxburgh Place, providing a great improvement to the availability of renovated spaces within easy reach of the Central Area. Estates also has a rolling programme of refurbishments, and uses the staff survey to set priorities. About 30% of the learning and teaching estate has been upgraded over the past few years and we are continuing with that accelerated programme of improvements.

With some short term action as well as an integrated and responsive longer term strategy, we are working hard to improve student and staff experience. We aim to repeat the staff survey in 2019.

Timetabling

The Committee noted issues in relation to sequential classes scheduled in relatively distant locations or entirely different campuses. The following response was received from the Head of Timetabling Services:

We have a travel constraint report which identifies all such cases and is run daily at peak times of the student allocation year. Where possible/necessary, students are reallocated to eliminate the constraint, although this can only be managed at tutorial group level. Analysis confirms that the level of travel constraints typically swings between 0.25% - 1% of all student allocations

The Committee also noted issues in relation to the impact of building work (and associated disruption caused by noise pollution, reduced accessibility etc.) and the allocation of teaching spaces. The following response was received from the Head of Timetabling Services:

Estate development projects work closely with Timetabling and contractors to ensure minimum noise disruption during periods of teaching and exams, but the complete elimination of risk is difficult to ensure. More challenging still is the impact of noise from works etc from construction projects external to the University, with the accompanying reduced level of influence by the University. Timetabling works to find alternative venues, whenever possible, for users experiencing disruption.

Brian Connolly,
Committee Secretary
May 2018

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee
Electronic Meeting
18 – 25 May 2018

Annual review of effectiveness of Senate Committees

Executive Summary

This paper explains that the 2017 version of the Scottish Code for Good Higher Education Governance requires the University to undertake an annual review of the effectiveness of Senate and its Committees, and an externally-facilitated review of Senate and its Committees every five years. The externally-facilitated review will take place in 2018/19.

As part of the annual review (the report of which will feed into the externally-facilitated review in 2018/19), members of the four Senate Committees will be asked to fill in a questionnaire over the summer 2018. The questionnaire will seek to gauge the effectiveness of the composition, support, engagement and impact of the Senate Committees.

Draft questions for the questionnaire are included in the paper.

How does this align with the University / Committee's strategic plans and priorities?

This paper aligns with the University strategic objective of leadership in learning.

Action requested

To note the forthcoming reviews of Senate and its Committees.

Committee members are asked to reflect individually on the draft questions set out in the paper, and they will be asked to respond to these questions via an online questionnaire over the summer.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

The outcome of the questionnaire will be reported to Senate at its meeting in October 2018 and the report of the annual review will feed in to the externally-facilitated review conducted in 2018/19.

The report from the externally-facilitated review will be communicated to Senate Committees.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. Resource implications (including staffing)

If the annual review identifies any potential changes to the operation of Senate's Committees, Academic Services will review the resource implications of implementing them.

2. Risk assessment

The paper will assist the University in ensuring that its academic governance arrangements are effective and will enable the University to manage a range of risks associated with its academic provision.

3. Equality and Diversity

One of the core principles of Senate and its Committees is to ensure that a diverse range of staff is represented on academic decision-making bodies. It is hoped that the questions asked in the questionnaire to all Senate Committee members will identify whether there are any equality and diversity issues in the make-up of the Committees and the way they conduct their business.

4. Freedom of information

Open

Key words

Governance, committees

Originator of the paper

Tom Ward, Director of Academic Services
Theresa Sheppard, Academic Policy Officer

Review of effectiveness of Senate Committees

Requirement to review the effectiveness of Senate and its committees

The 2017 version of the Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance states that institutions are expected to review the effectiveness of their Senate and its committees annually and to hold an externally-facilitated review every five years:

“49. The governing body is expected to review its own effectiveness each year and to undertake an externally facilitated evaluation of its own effectiveness and that of its committees, including size and composition of membership, at least every five years. As part of these processes or separately, the effectiveness of the academic board (also known as Senate, Senatus Academicus or academic council) is expected to be reviewed similarly. These reviews should be reported upon appropriately within the Institution and outside. Externally facilitated reviews should be held following any period of exceptional change or upheaval (allowing suitable time to see the effects of changes made), the usual timetable for externally facilitated review being brought forward if necessary in these circumstances.”

In line with the requirements of the Code, during Spring/Summer 2018, Academic Services is conducting an annual review of Senate and its Committees. The outcomes of this review will be reported to Senate in October 2018.

The University is planning to undertake an externally-facilitated review of Senate and its Committees during 2018-19.

Questionnaire regarding the effectiveness of the Committee

Members of the Senate Committees will be invited to fill in an online questionnaire over the summer 2018 and the draft questions for this exercise are set out below for comment.

Governance Structures

- Are you clear about the Committee's remit and how the committee fits within the academic governance framework of the University?
- Do you feel that the Committee manages its business effectively?
- Is the Committee flexible enough to adapt to changes in priorities?
- Are you happy with your Committee's use of task groups? Is there anything that could be improved?

Roles and Responsibility of Committee and Committee Members

- Are you clear on your role and responsibilities as a Committee member?
- If there is a lack of clarity, do you think there is anything that could improve this?

Composition

- Do you think that the current composition of the Committee enables it to fulfil its remit?
- Is the size of the Committee appropriate in order for it to operate effectively?

Support of the Committees

- Do you feel that the Committee is supported effectively? Are there any things we could improve?
- Are you happy with the volume and layout of the papers/information you receive to make decisions?

Participation of Members

- If you were a new member in 2017/18, were you happy with the induction you were given to the Committee and its business?
- Do you think Committee members participate fully with the Committee?
- Does anything limit your levels of participation with the Committee?

Stakeholder Engagement and Communications

- Does the Committee engage and communicate effectively with stakeholders? For example, is the Senate Committees' Newsletter an effective vehicle?

Making an Impact

- Do you feel that the Committee makes the desired impact based on its remit and priorities?

Equality and Diversity

- Is the composition of Committee members suitably representative of the diverse University population?
- Are you satisfied that equality and diversity considerations are adequately addressed when discussing Committee business?

The University of Edinburgh

Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

Electronic Meeting
18 – 25 May 2018

Report from the Knowledge Strategy Committee

Executive Summary

To update SQAC on certain matters considered by the Knowledge Strategy Committee.

How does this align with the University / Committee's strategic plans and priorities?

Not applicable.

Action requested

SQAC is invited to note the report.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

Not applicable.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. Resource implications (including staffing)

Where applicable, as covered in the report.

2. Risk assessment

Where applicable, as covered in the report.

3. Equality and Diversity

Where applicable, as covered in the report.

4. Freedom of information

This paper is open.

Key words

Knowledge Strategy Committee

Originator of the paper

Dr Lewis Allan, Head of Court Services

KNOWLEDGE STRATEGY COMMITTEE REPORT

1 City Deal Overview

The Assistant Principal Industry Engagement briefed the Committee on the University's participation in the Edinburgh and South-East Scotland City Region Deal and its key role in the ambition to become the Data Capital of Europe. The following points were raised in discussion:

- 300 possible projects in collaboration with public, private and third sector partners have been identified, these should be prioritised and a suitable governance framework established;
- Importance of engagement with secondary schools on data education – a pilot programme with Midlothian Schools will be launched;
- Incorporating the City Deal into 'normal' University activity over time and considering possible links with the City Deal for all new projects reviewed by the Committee; and,
- Ensuring existing data privacy and safeguarding policies are suitable and can be scaled appropriately for City Deal activity – collaborative work with the Scottish Government on data safe havens is underway.

2 Draft Information Services Group Plan 2018-21

The Chief Information Officer summarised the draft Information Services Group plan and investment recommendations for the period 2018-21, noting that this will continue the 10 year strategic programmes set out in 2016 and 2017. The following comments were made in discussion:

- The importance of seeking feedback from Heads of Colleges and Schools on the plans;
- The network replacement programme is a high priority;
- Improvements to the student experience that would benefit existing students should be prioritised;
- Important to engage academic staff if the 'every academic a digital educator' aspiration is to be achieved;
- 24/7 opening of the Library has been very successful and the Library is heavily used – further improvements to enhance the number of study spaces are planned and would be welcomed.

3 General Data Protection Regulation Update

The Data Protection Officer provided an overview of the new General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), its likely implications for the University and work underway to ensure compliance. Members discussed: circulating the online data protection module to the Committee when completed; identifying GDPR local champions across the University – with those appointed typically already involved in data protection work in their area; producing frequently asked questions, case studies and other materials for University staff; and collaboration with the Data

Stewards. The Committee welcomed progress to date and requested that an update be submitted to a future meeting.

4 Information Security Update

The Chief Information Security Officer presented an update on information security activity across the University. It was noted that, although there has been no information security event of the scale of the worldwide 'WannaCry' attacks in mid-2017, malicious activity is continuing. Improving information security awareness and compliance was discussed, with a new Information Security Policy and Framework introduced in January. Access to University networks and systems by staff who have left the University was discussed, with a risk based approach expected to be taken.

5 Network Replacement Procurement Update

The Director of IT Infrastructure provided an update on the current status of the network replacement procurement project. Remedial work will be undertaken as required in the interim before the main network replacement activity is undertaken from January 2019 to January 2020. Scheduling of the network replacement in each building will be determined through consultation with stakeholders, with the work not expected to be intrusive or noisy. The decision of the Schools of Informatics and Engineering to join the University network and interest from the University's Accommodation, Catering and Events subsidiary in joining the network was welcomed, with the historical reasons for the current position discussed. These changes would impact on cost and will require appropriate scrutiny and approval.

The University of Edinburgh

Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

Electronic Meeting
18 – 25 May 2018

**Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC)
Operational Guidance**

Executive Summary

This paper asks the Committee to approve the Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance.

The guidance has been reviewed to reflect the changes to Student Representation from Class Representative to Programme Representative.

How does this align with the University / Committee's strategic plans and priorities?

The paper is relevant to the Committee's responsibility for the quality assurance framework.

Action requested

The Committee is asked to approve the guidance.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

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 guidance.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. Resource implications (including staffing)

The collation of student representative names for the Students' Association and the consideration of meetings with remote participants will involve staff resource. Full student engagement is essential to the enhancement of the student experience.

2. Risk assessment

There are risks associated with ineffectively responding to student feedback.

3. Equality and Diversity

An Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) was carried out on the Principles and Operational notes for SSLCs in September 2015 and identified no major equality and diversity implications. There have been no changes to the operational guidance since the EqIA was carried out.

4. Freedom of information

Open.

Key words

Student Staff Liaison Committee, SSLC, Student feedback, student voice, Student Representation

Originators of the paper

Gillian Mackintosh, Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services

Megan Brown, Academic Engagement Coordinator, Edinburgh University Students' Association

Natalie Hay, Academic Representatives Officer, Edinburgh University Students' Association
18 May 2018

Further Development of the Guidance

The guidance will continue to be reviewed as the Programme Representation model is phased in and developed during 2018/19 and 2019/20. (Senate Learning and Teaching Committee paper: Enhancing the Student Voice through the Student Representation System- [LTC 17/18 B](#))

Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance



THE UNIVERSITY
of EDINBURGH

Purpose of Guidance

This policy sets out the 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.

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: 03.09.15	Starts: 01.07.13	Equality impact assessment: 11.09.15	Amendments: 18.05.18	Next Review: 2018/2019
--------------	------------------------------	----------------------------	--	--------------------------------	----------------------------------

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/tprrprsubjectareasschoolsstudentinvolvement.pdf http://www.ed.ac.uk/records-management/data-protection/guidance-policies/student-information http://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/guidanceschoolcommsrep.pdf https://www.eusa.ed.ac.uk/activities/postgraduate/about/odl/ https://www.eusa.ed.ac.uk/representation/yourrepresentatives/classreps/
---	---

UK Quality Code	UK Quality Code Chapter B5: 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.
---------------------------	---

Keywords	SSLC, Student Staff Liaison Committee, Student Representation, Edinburgh University Students' Association, External Examiners.
-----------------	--



Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance

THE UNIVERSITY
of EDINBURGH

Student Staff Liaison Committees 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 UG, PGT and PGR) and the student experience. It is suggested that SSLCs would benefit from taking a programme-level approach to focus on the learning experience within courses and how they holistically contribute to the degree programme.
2. Remit	SSLCs should be encouraged to have a formal written remit available to students and staff. It is suggested that the remit is published on the School/Subject area/Research Centre/Institute website.
3. Membership	Meetings can be attended by Programme Representatives for the programmes being discussed, Elected School Representatives, Course/Year Organisers, Programme Conveners, School PG Programme Directors, Research Centre or Institute staff, Personal tutors, School Directors of Quality, Administrative staff, School IT representatives & other relevant staff to discuss programme issues.
4. Frequency of meetings	At least one formal meeting should be held in each semester, which should be agreed upon in consultation with School staff and Student Representatives. This should ideally be scheduled to avoid clashing with courses students may typically be taking within the School. All SSLC members should be informed of the date, time, location of the meeting, inviting any additional items to be added to the agenda. Schools are encouraged to publish the dates of the meetings ahead of the meeting and it is suggested that this happens at least two weeks in advance of the meeting.
5. Agenda items	Agenda should be made available in advance of the meeting. Suggested agenda items are listed in section 5.3.
6. Meeting format	Schools are encouraged to have student chairing of meetings or co-chairing 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 virtually during the meeting or otherwise, input via other electronic means beforehand. Exact format will vary between Schools however, an example of a basic format is described in section 6.
7. Minutes	Schools are strongly encouraged to publish minutes on the School/subject area webpages.



Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance

1. Role

Student Staff Liaison Committees (SSLCs; or, Teaching or Programme Committees in some Schools or Postgraduate Research Forums in some Schools) are meetings at which Student Representatives, Programme/Course/Year Organisers, Academic and Administrative staff supporting teaching and learning discuss the student experience which may include issues and activities in courses, programmes, and Schools.

To increase the effectiveness of student representation and support from Schools and the Students' Association, it is suggested that SSLCs would benefit from taking a programme-level approach. This would draw on Student Representatives' feedback and mid-semester feedback to identify areas of improvement within the student learning experience which contribute to the degree programme. Therefore, it is suggested that Schools move from having tutorial- and course-level Student Representatives and instead focus on programme-level student representatives system with approximately one Student Representative per 40-50 students on a programme.

Edinburgh University Students' Association coordinates Student Representation across the University and provides training and support for all Student Representatives (including Programme Representatives and elected School Representatives). Student Representatives should be jointly supported in their role by the Students' Association and Schools. Schools take ownership over their own student representation structures, the recruitment of Programme Representatives, and facilitating communication between Student Representatives and the students in their cohort so that feedback can be representative. Student Representatives work with the students they represent to identify areas for improvement, suggest solutions, and ensure that the views of the students they represent inform strategic decisions within the University. Student Representatives work in partnership with staff to build a stronger academic community and improve the student learning experience.

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 academic staff, administrative staff and representatives of the student body relating to all matters connected with the degree programme, and the student experience.

2. Remit

2.1 Formal Written Remit

SSLCs should be encouraged to have a formal written remit, of which Student Representatives and staff review annually to ensure that it reflects current learning, teaching and research matters in their School/Subject area.

It is suggested that the remit is published on the School/Subject area/Research Centre/Institute website and that all students in that area are made aware of this.

2.2 Student engagement

Following the publication of the UK Quality Code Chapter B5: Student Engagement, the code states that 'Higher education providers create and maintain an environment within which students and staff engage in discussions that aim to bring about demonstrable enhancement of the educational experience'. SSLCs are one way in which students and staff should engage in discussions to



Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance

THE UNIVERSITY
of EDINBURGH

improve the student experience at the University of Edinburgh, including the online learning environment for students not studying on campus.

Furthermore, the code states: 'Higher education providers, in partnership with their student body, share information so that students and staff involved in quality systems have an equally informed voice'. Student Representatives will be expected to gather representative student views to identify best practices and areas of improvement of the delivery, content, materials, assessment and feedback, and share with staff any suggestions so they can work in partnership to improve these areas and create a strong academic community within their area.

3. Membership

3.1 Suggested membership

SSLC meetings are attended by Programme Representatives, Course/Year Organisers, Degree Programme Conveners, School Postgraduate Programme Directors, staff representing Research Centres or Institutes, Personal tutors, School Directors of Quality, Administrative staff supporting teaching and learning, School IT representatives and other relevant staff to discuss programme and course issues. It is suggested that the relevant elected Undergraduate/Postgraduate School Representative is also invited to SSLCs to be given the option to attend, and that they would receive SSLC communications. Some Schools may choose to ask the School Representative to chair the SSLC meeting(s).

3.2 Student Representatives

During the first two weeks of the semester, Year Organisers or Degree Programme Conveners should invite students to become Programme Representatives and, where appropriate, hold elections to select the Representatives with consideration to the ratio of the student cohort. Students should be made aware of the purpose of the Programme Representative role, expectations of Programme Representatives, and that their details will be passed to the Students' Association in order to provide them with training and support.

Recruitment of Programme Representatives should happen as early as possible and no later than the end of Week 2 of each semester. Each School Office will collate details of Programme Representatives and send them to the Students' Association during Week 3. Details of Programme Representatives will not be accepted after Week 4.

The Students' Association holds elections in March (followed by By-Elections in October for postgraduate positions and any unfilled positions) each year to elect Undergraduate and Postgraduate School Representatives. These elected School Representatives should be invited as members of SSLC meetings in their School, or at minimum be informed of the business conducted. Their contact details can be obtained at eusa.ed.ac.uk/representation or by emailing reps@eusa.ed.ac.uk. Where appropriate, presidents of relevant academic societies within the School or subject area could also be invited to SSLC meetings; their details are available via eusa.ed.ac.uk/societies.

Schools should share with Student Representatives the University student email address of the students they represent or facilitate alternative ways for Student Representatives to contact classmates e.g. m-list. Guidance is available for Schools which outlines the mechanisms by which Schools should share University student email address to facilitate alternative ways for Student Representatives to contact students in compliance with data protection guidelines.



Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance

THE UNIVERSITY
of EDINBURGH

Please refer to Guidance for Schools regarding communication between Student Representatives and students and the Policy on Disclosure of Student Information

4. Frequency of meetings

The frequency of SSLC meetings should be agreed in consultation with School staff and Student Representatives. However, at least one formal meeting should be held in each semester. This 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 or programme level depending on their structure.

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

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 should operate whichever system is most appropriate to their structure. Schools are encouraged to publish the dates of meetings on the School/Subject area webpage ahead of the meeting and email all members with this information.

Good Practice

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

5. Agenda items

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 evaluation and review documentation, School Annual Quality Reports, and TPR/PPR 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.

5.2 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).



Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance

THE UNIVERSITY
of EDINBURGH

In partnership with the Students' Association, Senate Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) has agreed that the SSLC is the best forum for consideration of themes arising from External Examiners' reports and summarised responses of Schools/Subject areas.

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.

Consideration should also be given to instances where one External Examiner's report might be relevant to more than one SSLC particularly for joint degrees. Therefore, each School should 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.

The summary reports and responses should be 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 should consider the themes and responses in the summary report and be encouraged to provide comments and suggestions.

However, it should be noted that 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, comments and suggestions should be recorded in the SSLC meeting minutes.

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](#))

It should be noted that individual students and members of staff will not be named in the reports.

5.3 Suggested Agenda items

Agenda items can be suggested by students and by staff and should be used as a focal point through which students can be informed about and be involved in decision making processes relating to:



Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance

THE UNIVERSITY
of EDINBURGH

- student-generated items
- School Annual Quality report - The shorter school annual quality report will lend itself to discussion of themes and actions being taken by the school in student-staff liaison committees at the start of the following academic year
- themes arising from Student Surveys, course evaluation questionnaires
- Internal Periodic Review preparation, where appropriate
- Internal Periodic Review reports, where appropriate
- themes from External Examiner summary reports
- Professional, Statutory & Regulatory Body (PSRB) accreditation reports, where appropriate
- Enhancement Led Institutional Review (ELIR), where appropriate
- standing items
- staff ideas and communications
- Student Partnership Agreement - priorities and any local activities which advance these priorities

Good Practice

Some Schools ask the Reps to suggest items under the headings of Start, Stop and Continue.

6. Meeting format

6.1 Chairing of meetings

Schools are encouraged to have a student chairing the meetings. This could be an elected School Representative or another trained Programme Representative. Where Schools decide not to have a student chair they 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). Some Schools may wish to select a member of staff to support the student chair.

Good Practice

Some Schools have a student chair and a student taking the minutes. It is helpful to assign a member of staff to support the student members and facilitate the student's leadership role within the SSLC.

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

6.2 Example of meeting outline

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. The minutes of the meetings should follow the same structure.

Agenda

Minutes of the last meeting

Matters arising

Agenda items suggested by students and by staff



Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance

Any other business (AOB)

Date of Next Meeting: The date and time of the next meeting should be agreed and recorded by the minute-taker.

6.3 Online Learner (OL) Student participation

At School level, Online Learner (OL) Student Representatives and students should have the opportunity to participate virtually or otherwise input into SSLCs electronically.

Consideration should be given for meetings with remote participants for example, Student Representatives should be able to input into the agenda; receive meeting papers before meetings and minutes afterwards.

Meeting organisers should 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.

A number of options exist for Schools to set up meetings to enable OL students to participate such as Collaborate, Skype or video conference.

Collaborate, for instance, is an IS-supported system designed to support online classes and meetings. Any member of staff or student can set up Collaborate sessions via MyEd, and a wide range of guidance materials is available and accessible online.

- <http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/information-services/learning-technology/communication/collaborate/collaborate-students>

Skype is not centrally supported but is widely used by staff and students, and like Collaborate requires just a computer/tablet and a webcam. Other similarly 'technology light' tools and environments exist and are valued because they are free, and can be used with a lot of flexibility.

- <https://www.wiki.ed.ac.uk/display/mscdetech/11.+Skype>

Video conference three video conference (VC) suites exist in centrally bookable rooms, and other VC suites are situated in Schools around the university. The VC system is hosted by JANET, and requires registration. Online tutorials are available via the JANET VC webpages, and local support is offered via LTSTS.

- <http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/information-services/computing/comms-and-collab/videoconferencing>

Further information for students on preparing for and chairing meetings, is available on the Students' Association Programme Representative Forum on Learn (a closed area for Programme Representatives), and on the Students' Association website at: www.eusa.ed.ac.uk/classreps

6.3 Communication following the SSLC

Students should not be expected to give an immediate response at meetings to all issues or where they would want to consult further; they 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.



Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance

THE UNIVERSITY
of EDINBURGH

Staff and Student Representatives are responsible for reporting back information to the people they represent and taking ownership of any action points agreed at the meeting.

Schools should appoint named academic and support 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) should be kept informed of the contact details of these staff contacts.

7. Minutes

The minutes should follow the same structure as the agenda outline. Schools are encouraged to publish the minutes from meetings on the School/Subject area webpages; Learn; showing clear action points resulting from SSLCs.

Good Practice

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

Some Schools record in the minutes the action point, who will action and the target completion date.

Please note that SSLC minutes can be made available to internal review teams if there is a particular theme from the reflective report to be followed up.

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 online forums or virtual meetings where appropriate.

May 2018



Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Operational Guidance

Student Body	Informal Liaison	Staff
Programme Representatives	Programme level	Staff
School Representatives	School level	School Management
College Committee Student Members <i>(selected Programme and School Reps)</i>	College level	College Management
School Representatives, Section Representatives, Liberation Officers, Sabbatical Officers	University level	University Management
Sabbatical Officers	Governance level	Principal, Vice-Principals and Assistant Principals

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee

Electronic Meeting
18 – 25 May 2018

Internal Review Themes 2016/17 - Update

Executive Summary

The paper provides an update on actions identified from areas for further development arising from teaching/postgraduate programme reviews held in 2016/17.

How does this align with the University / Committee's strategic plans and priorities?

The paper is relevant to the Committee's responsibility for the quality assurance framework.

Action requested

For information.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

The paper provides an update on actions previously remitted and no additional actions are proposed.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. Resource implications (including staffing)

There are no additional resource implications associated with the paper at this point.

2. Risk assessment

Failure to respond to areas for further development would constitute an institutional risk.

3. Equality and Diversity

The paper itself does not require an Equality Impact Assessment. The Equality Impact Assessment for internal periodic review processes is published at:

<http://edin.ac/2xhuy8H>

4. Freedom of information

The paper is open.

Key words

Internal review, TPR, PPR.

Originator of the paper

Nichola Kett, Academic Policy Manager, Academic Services
18 May 2018

Areas for Further Development

Action	Update
Learning and Teaching	
Academic Services to monitor the 2017/18 reports to establish if benchmarking continues as a theme from reviews.	Benchmarking has not continued as a theme from 2017/18 reviews.
Student Support (Personal Tutor system)	
CAHSS Dean of Quality to progress the issue of PT system roles and responsibilities at College level during 2017-18.	The Personal Tutor Oversight Group report submitted to the Committee in November 2017 provided the Committee with an update on actions and the Dean of Students committed to continue to work with schools to address issues relating to the low levels of student satisfaction with the PT system in some areas of the College.
Assistant Principal Academic Support to consider the other recommendations as part of the continuing work to enhance the system through the implementation of the Learning and Teaching Strategy and in response to the last Enhancement-led Institutional Review.	The other recommendations were considered by the Personal Tutor Oversight Group in November 2017. The Enhancement-led Institutional Review theme lead report submitted to the Committee in February 2018 provides an outline of actions.
Space	
Committee Secretary to remit issues in regard to space management and the impact on the student experience to the Space Strategy Group and request a response.	The Committee considered a response via the wiki site in November 2017. The response also covered actions identified from the annual monitoring processes.
Supporting and developing academic staff	
Committee Secretary to remit issues relating to supporting and developing academic staff to Vice-Principal People and Culture.	The relevant School(s) will address the individual recommendations and further consideration will be given to this area should it become a pan-institutional issue (in line with the remit of the Vice-Principal People and Culture).

The University of Edinburgh
Senatus Quality Assurance Committee
Electronic Meeting
18 – 25 May 2018

Internal Periodic Review Report and Responses

Executive Summary

The following report and 14 week responses from Internal Periodic Reviews 2017/18 and year on responses from Internal Periodic Reviews 2016/17:

Final report 2017/18: the paper contains an extract of the commendations and recommendations from TPR of Sociology and Sustainable Development final report

14 week response 2017/18:

Teaching Programme Review of English Literature
Teaching Programme Review of Medicine
Teaching Programme Review of Physics and Astronomy
Teaching Programme Review of Social Anthropology
Postgraduate Programme Review of Clinical Sciences

Year on response 2016/17:

Teaching Programme Review of Design
Teaching Programme Review of European Languages and Cultures
Teaching Programme Review of Islamic and Middle Eastern Studies (IMES)
Teaching Programme Review of Social Work

How does this align with the University / Committee's strategic plans and priorities?

The paper is relevant to the Committee's responsibility for the quality assurance framework.

Action requested

Report: for approval. The Committee is asked to note the following commendations and recommendations.

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

PPR/TPR	Recommendation	Comment
TPR English Literature 14 wk response	All	We look forward to hearing about progress on the recommendations in the year on response
TPR Medicine 14 wk response	All	We look forward to hearing about progress on all the recommendations in the year on response

TPR Physics & Astronomy 14 wk response	All	We look forward to hearing about progress on all the recommendations in the year on response and the steps that the School took to feedback to students on the outcomes of the review
TPR of Social Anthropology 14 wk response	All	We look forward to hearing about progress on all the recommendations in the year on response
PPR of Clinical Sciences 14 wk response	All	We look forward to hearing about progress on all the recommendations in the year on response
TPR Design year on response	2,3,4,6,7,8,9	We look forward to hearing about progress on the recommendations in the School Annual Programme Monitoring report
TPR European Languages and Cultures year on response	All	We look forward to hearing about progress on the recommendations in the School Annual Programme Monitoring report. In addition, we welcome the examples of positive change as a result of the review.
TPR IMES year on response	2,3,5,8,10	We look forward to hearing about progress on the recommendations in the School Annual Programme Monitoring report
TPR Social Work year on response	All	We look forward to hearing about progress on the recommendations in the School Annual Programme Monitoring report

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

Comments on the progress towards completion of recommendations will be reported back to the School/Subject Area. The report and responses will be published on the Academic Services website.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

- 1. Resource implications (including staffing)**
No additional resource implications.
- 2. Risk assessment**
No risk associated.
- 3. Equality and Diversity**
An Equality Impact Assessment was carried out on the internal review process.
- 4. Freedom of information**
Open.

Key words

Postgraduate Programme Review, Teaching Programme Review, PPR, TPR, year on response, 14 week response, final report

Originator of the paper

Gillian Mackintosh
Academic Policy Officer,
Academic Services
18 May 2018

Internal Review reports 2017/18

PPR/TPR	No	Commendations	Recommendations	Responsibility
TPR Sociology & Sustainable Development	1.	The pioneering nature of the Sustainable Development Degree	That Sustainable Development review the resources required to maintain, and the sustainability of, the current provisions of the Sustainable Development Degree.	Subject Area
	2.	<p>Personal Tutor System, Teaching Organisation Staff and Student Support Officers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The support and professionalism of Teaching Office staff to staff and students alike. • The Personal Tutors and Student Support Officers for ably fulfilling their commitments and duties to an extremely high standard. • The quality and standards of support available to all students 	That consideration be given to the way in which funds allocated to tutoring could be spent in the diversity of differing tutor models, taking into account risk to the institution, the administrative burden and the repeated new workload associated with new tutors. The School Executive, in consultation with the subject groups, should consider alternative ways of optimal allocation. Consideration should be given to alternative ways in which this resource could be better used, such as studentships with attached teaching requirements, or teaching fellows, for example.	School Management Team and Subject Area
	3.	The subject group for how they have effectively coped with a significant increase in student numbers since the last review.	That individuals in key Personal Tutor (PT) and Student Support Officer (SSO) roles require access to private and confidential spaces, and that these spaces need to be readily available.	Subject Area, School Management Team
	4.	The quality of teaching and provision that students received from Sociology and Sustainable Development.	The implementation of a School wide strategy for management of non-honours programmes with a view to coping with increasing numbers of students, and reflecting on the relative value of pre-honours courses and the distribution of core School staff, and a review of the provision of first year Sociology in particular. The School should consider the provision of alternatives for those who are on programme and off programme, where the Fundamentals course is incorporated into on programme Sociology.	School Management Team
	5.	The work of Postgraduate Tutors in the Subject Area.	That the Subject Area engage further with their designated Admissions representative in order to establish clearer and more regular communication channels between the School and Central Admissions to ensure that information is disseminated through the subject groups for transparency, awareness and agreement of student numbers so that the School and Subject Area might be better able to effectively plan resourcing.	Subject Area

	6.	The significant efforts and engagement with Widening Participation.	That a review of current restrictions on who can be tutors be undertaken, with consideration of the option of opening up recruitment to applicants from outside the School of Social and Political Science	Subject Area in conjunction with School Management
	7.	The use of weekly newsletters, SocPALS, SDPals, and SD Families in encouraging and growing a sense of a cohesive cohort.	That the Head of School liaise with the appropriate contact in the College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences so that they might be provided with transparent data on how target contribution figures have been, and are being, arrived at, and the relationship between those and income generation schemes with particular focus on Undergraduate student intake.	Head of School and Director of Professional Services
	8.	The offering of the Edinburgh Teaching Award in house, and the planned expansion of this programme to support and facilitate PG tutors in acquiring associate fellowships and encourage new and existing staff to engage with the upper fellowship levels	That a mapping of assessments across core curricula take place, including highlighting and improving where necessary the diversity of forms of assessment and types of writing. As part of this mapping, the subject area should consider forms of assessment which facilitate marking to fit within workload allowances	Subject Area
	9.	The use of Staff Health and Wellbeing Surveys, and example of good practice.	That minutes of Student Staff Liaison Committees be discussed by the relevant team at a suitable meeting, with these discussions being fed back via a written response to the students in order to help to 'close the loop'	Subject Area

The University of Edinburgh

Internal Periodic Review

14 week response report

TPR of: English Literature

Date of review: 23-24 November 2017

Date of 14 week response: 7 May 2018

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

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

Recommendation no	Recommendation	Timescale for completion	Comment on progress towards completion and/or identify barriers to completion	Completion date
1	Review approach to recruitment, induction, support and remuneration of Guaranteed Hours tutors	Ongoing	We continue to develop our departmental induction and training for GH tutors. We also continue to operate a mentoring system. Issues of recruitment and remuneration are organised at School level.	Ongoing
2	Convene a group to develop a strategy for community-building within Subject Area	End of 2018/19 session	We will establish a working group within the department, and include colleagues from Student and Academic Services, to discuss ways of ensuring the subject area's presence within the building and more generally increased forms of communication between the subject area and students.	Ongoing
3	Consider breadth of EDI issues in developing a revised pre-Honours curriculum	3 years	Our application for a PTAS award to help with the development and implementation of a redesign of the pre-hons curriculum, taking into consideration of EDI issues, was rejected. Nevertheless we have decided to appoint, as a departmental managerial role, someone to drive this forward over the next three years, starting from Sept 2018.	End of academic year 20/21
4	Examine the Personal Tutor system to address perceived inconsistencies	Ongoing	The PT system is administered and run at School level, so perceived inconsistencies will need to be addressed there. PTs are required to meet their tutees at least twice a year (1 st and 2 nd years) or once a year (3 rd and 4 th years). As elsewhere in the School, all PTs make themselves available to students in their posted office hours on a weekly basis, or at other arranged times.	Ongoing
5	Consider ways to encourage greater in-person interaction between students and professional services staff	Ongoing	HoSA and UG director will meet with professional services staff to discuss ways of improving the ways in which colleagues in the office are able to interact with students. The move to 50GS has	Ongoing

			had an impact of the kinds – and frequency – of communication now possible.	
6	Consider making greater use of Personal Tutor group meetings	Ongoing	We will discuss, in consultation with colleagues from other subject areas in the School, how we might establish larger PT meetings of students in the same degree programmes, to address shared concerns and issues.	End of academic year 18/19
7	Improve communication with Schools/Subject Areas with which joint degrees are offered	End of 2017/18 academic session	The College Office is currently addressing a number of issues around joint degrees. The Dean of Undergraduate Studies and Head of Academic and Student Administration are collating data on joint honours students and information on named contacts responsible for joint degrees in each subject area, which can be provided to School colleagues to aid communication. In addition, the College is exploring ways of using admissions data to gauge projected intake for some of our larger joint degree programmes and allocations to individual courses, to support subject areas in their planning. These initiatives are in the early stages of development, but the College will continue to work with the Schools to find ways of improving the operation of our joint honours degrees.	Ongoing
8	Provide year abroad students with access to learning materials from Year	Academic year 2018/19	We will look to offer year abroad students read-only access to the online learning materials for a number of our 3 rd year honour courses.	End of academic year 18/19
	Please report on steps taken to feedback to students on the outcomes of the review	Once the next academic session begins we will circulate the TPR report to the SSLC for its comments, observations and suggestions.		
For Year on response only	Any examples of a positive change as a result of the review			

TPR of Edinburgh Medical School: UG Medicine (MBChB)

Date of review: 27th and 28th November 2017

Date of 14 week response: 1st May 2018

Date of year on response:

The School/Subject Area is responsible for reporting on progress with all recommendations, including those remitted to other areas of the University for action. If any recommendation has been fully addressed please record the action taken and date completed. Any barriers to progress should be highlighted on this report.

Recommendation no	Recommendation	Timescale for completion	Comment on progress towards completion and/or identify barriers to completion	Completion date
1.	The review team recommends that the senior leadership team engage with NHS Education Scotland (NES), Regional ACT Groups and NHS Boards to ensure ACT funding is used appropriately to support academic and administrative delivery and co-ordination of placement based medical education. There is a need for a step change in the approach to resourcing administration of clinical modules to enhance the student experience.	Minimum 12 months	This remains a complex issue. The difficulties in the transparent allocation of ACT funding and expenditure is not unique to Edinburgh Medical School. Talks are underway within NHS Lothian to address the need for transparent financial management at Module level in relation to undergraduate teaching. Both the Medical School and the NHS Medical Director are committed to making this process clearer and more efficient. The Director of Teaching and Head of Administration are holding meetings with all Modules to discuss curriculum developments, quality management and administrative support needs. Any additional support will require an increase in resource allocated from College and ACT funding.	ongoing
2.	The review area expressed concerns to the review team about marginalisation of consultant time for undergraduate teaching. The review team recommends that the senior leadership team engage with NHS Education Scotland (NES) and NHS Boards to address this resource issue.	Minimum 12 months	Senior Medical School staff will continue to work with the relevant NHS Boards, to ensure that the ACT funding model (which identifies potential funding based on teaching activity using the NES national model principles) can be implemented successfully at Module/Specialty level and that adequate time for undergraduate teaching is agreed with Clinical Directors across all specialties. Improved transparency of the ACT embedded funding and improved job planning for teaching commitments in health boards continues to be a national priority across Scotland.	ongoing
3.	The review team recommends that there is a need to strengthen the administrative resilience of programme	6 months	The Medical School is currently restructuring the professional services functions. The merger of the Centre for Medical	December 2018

	organisation and delivery. This should include clarification of Human Resource, Information Technology and Finance support, and support to develop resilience in the Year Co-ordinator roles.		Education and the Medical Teaching Organisation will highlight any areas of strength and weaknesses. A proposal for the new Medical Education structure (including additional posts) has been submitted to College and discussions will be held with College to clarify available resourcing for the new structure.	
4.	The review team recommends that the subject area strengthens academic (including clinical academic) capacity on the programme, to enable the effective delivery of the programme and maintain and enhance its quality.	12 months (ongoing)	The need for additional academic input is in line with College strategy. The Medical School is planning a curriculum restructure for 2020 (focusing on the early years of programme) and at this point, bids for additional academic support will be made to College. The College is introducing the Workload Allocation Module in Sept 2018 which will clarify time allocated to teaching.	Sept 2020
5.	The review team recommends that the subject area continue with their plans for expansion of the use of clinical skills within the programme, and endorse their current plans to expand the physical resource in this area.	12 months (ongoing)	Plans to expand the clinical skills facilities have been included in the designs for the new Medical School. The team has been expanded since the review.	
6.	The review team strongly endorses the plans that the review area have for re-considering how best to assess non-academic attributes at admission and selection stage, and recommends that the review area looks for evidence in support of the various different models before taking a decision on the way forward. This should encompass enhanced systems to genuinely widen participation on to the programme.	12 months (ongoing)	The new Director of Admissions has started investigations into new admissions processes including selection, widening access and communication methods. It is hoped that implementation of these changes can impact on 2020 entry. As an interim, the Medical School has worked to ensure that WP students are made early offers, and are encouraged to attend the offer days, with financial support for travel costs.	March 2019
7.	Technology enhanced learning is expanding, and the review team recommends that there is a need to ensure that all tutors and Module Organisers and Year Co-ordinators have equal access to the Virtual Learning Environment LEARN (including appropriate editing rights), and that sufficient training is provided to enable this.	May 2018	Module Organisers can now request access to edit their module page(s) in the Virtual Learning Environment (Learn). Bespoke MBChB training sessions have been designed and scheduled and, following attendance at one of these session, Year Directors can approve the access requests. A similar model will be rolled out for Programme Theme Leads following scheduled updates for 2018/2019. Support is still provided by the Year Coordinators when required.	Sept 2018
8.	The review team recommend that the review area enhance the quality assurance process with a particular focus on obtaining feedback from students in relation to the support they receive from Personal Tutors/Clinical Teaching Associates.	6 months (reviewed annually)	The Director of Teaching and Associate Director (Quality) have started to review quality processes. The Quality team work with central University services to develop with use of Course Evaluations. Student Wellbeing are developing ways in which they can request additional information on support	Sept 2018

			mechanisms, without over burdening the student (creating survey fatigue).	
	Please report on steps taken to feedback to students on the outcomes of the review	The outcome of the TPR was published on the programme wide Learn page. The report has also gone through all UG medicine committees. The MSC have been asked to report on any student comments and feed this back to the School. There comments so far have been very positive about the review and the work planned to enhance the programme.		
For Year on response only	Any examples of a positive change as a result of the review			

The University of Edinburgh

Internal Periodic Review

14 week response report

TPR of: Physics & Astronomy (UG & PGT)

Date of review: 7th & 8th November 2017

Date of 14 week response: 4th May 2018

Date of year on response:

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

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

Recommendation no	Recommendation	Timescale for completion	Comment on progress towards completion and/or identify barriers to completion	Completion date
1	While mindful that the number of students seen was relatively small, the responses from the students seen were sufficient to concern the review team that they could not be confident that students would turn to their Personal Tutors in times of crisis. Moreover, at present, Personal Tutors are encouraged but not required to undertake any training associated with student mental health. It is therefore recommended that the University reconsiders the role of the Personal Tutor in its Student Mental Health Strategy.	During AY 2018/19	<p>Response from Gavin Douglas, Deputy Secretary, Student Experience.</p> <p>The Assistant Principal (Academic Support) and the Deputy Secretary (Student Experience) are jointly reviewing the University's approach to student support through both the Personal Tutor system and the Student Support Officers.</p> <p>The AP (Academic Support) will be bringing a proposal for a revised approach to the management of Personal Tutors (including training and development) initially to Learning and Teaching Policy Group committee in May 19.</p> <p>The Deputy Secretary (Student Experience) will oversee (as programme sponsor) a review of professional services student support, both centrally and in schools, as part of the Service Excellence Programme in 2018/19.</p> <p>In the interim the training for personal tutors in supporting students in crisis continues to be offered every two weeks on a school by school basis; this will be augmented in 18/19 by the introduction of short "bite sized" training online in collaboration with the Charlie Waller Trust</p>	
2	The review team notes that a number of other Schools have designated Student Support Officers (or		Based on the available evidence, ¹ we do not consider that appointing SSOs (in line with the model commonly used in	Apr 18

	<p>otherwise similarly named) to advise on Special Circumstances and extension applications, direct students to appropriate sources of mental health support, and provide cover for absent Personal Tutors, for example. It is recommended that the School considers adopting alternative models of best practice in this area.</p>		<p>other Schools) would enhance the support that we offer students. One key difference between our model and that used in many Schools is that our PTs are selected based on their suitability for and interest in the role. This perhaps means that there is less need for a 'back up' provision via SSOs. Our model is also based on the underlying principle that PTs offer a first port of call for students; and that an integral part of their role is to advise students on matters such as SCs and direct them to sources of help as appropriate. We are concerned that moving to a PT/SSO based model would dilute this relationship.</p> <p>However, we agree it is essential that cover is provided for absent PTs; we address this in point 11 below.</p> <p>1. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our NSS ratings for student support are consistently above average for the University; in 2017 we received a score of 92% for 'I am satisfied with the support provided by my Personal Tutor', compared to the University average of 68%. - Our 2016 ESES scores for 'Overall, I am satisfied with the academic advice and support I have received' and 'I found my Personal Tutor approachable and willing to help' were 80% and 87%, respectively. - PTs from the School have won the EUSA 'Best Personal Tutor' award in 2016 and 2018. 	
3	<p>The School notes that it has the highest number of students in absolute and proportional terms in this University with learning profiles related to autistic spectrum disorder. Current School policy is that the student's Personal Tutor will usually also act as the student's Named Contact. However, some staff report feeling inadequately prepared to support these students and provide them with the best learning experience and would appreciate additional training to improve their skills in this area. While the Student</p>		<p>Response Feb 2018: Sheila Williams, Director, Student Disability Service</p> <p>The Student Disability Service (SDS) currently has 7 Disability Advisors and 2 Assistant Directors who work to provide support to disabled students across all schools in the University. The Advisory staff currently have some, admittedly limited knowledge about how each School's structure and programmes operate.</p> <p>However, as each School now has a Senior Disability Contact, as proposed by the recent Disability Review, it is hoped that</p>	Feb 2018

	<p>Disability Service is on hand to provide guidance, there are no advisors at the Student Disability Service who provide expertise in physics in the School, and the view of the School is that these students may not be adequately supported. The review team recommends that the Student Disability Service review its provision and support in this area.</p>		<p>SDS/schools liaison will be enhanced and developed going forward. At the time of writing, a meeting is being arranged for mid-march for all Schools Disability Contacts and SDS staff.</p> <p>In the meantime, training has been carried for named contacts in the past and additional training for Physics can be arranged.</p>	
4	<p>The review team heard evidence from students that many are going home to study, and since their University accommodation is in the central area and transport links to King's Buildings campus are not considered adequate, they are therefore choosing to study at home and are not returning to campus for lectures. It is recommended that the School and the Space Strategy Group considers what can be done to address this issue and provide additional study space.</p>	Sept 2019	<p>The School of Physics & Astronomy School Space Steering Group is responsible for the development and prioritisation of space plans for space occupied by the School within JCMB. The provision of study and social space for our students within JCMB is high priority for this committee, however we are constrained by the amount of space available in JCMB and by competing demands on this space from other Schools in SCE (e.g. for decant and/or overflow).</p> <p>The School (jointly with the School of Mathematics) has submitted a plan to College to reconfigure our current occupation of JCMB and extend this, following the departure of EPCC next AY. This plan would allow us to create a pre-Honours student room to complement the existing study rooms that we provide for Jun Hons, Sen Hons/IM and MSc students. We are currently waiting to hear the outcome of this proposal for additional space.</p>	
5	<p>It is also recommended that the University seeks to ensure that the integrity and cohesiveness of the School's learning and teaching environment is preserved as its future plans for further development of the King's Buildings estate are implemented.</p>	On-going	<p>Response from Professor Sarah Cunningham-Burley, Convener of the Space Strategy Group (SSG)</p> <p>This recommendation was discussed at the April SSG meeting and with the College Registrar, CSE. Although SSG is happy to be made aware of issues such as those raised by the TPR of Physics and Astronomy, it is the view of the group that these have to be raised directly with the College Offices: indeed, our recommendation is that is what should happen along with informing the School so they can feed into these plans. The College has an estates plan and is trying hard to</p>	

			mitigate the shortfalls in current provision in the context of increased student numbers. It is a challenge as space is being taken out of commission due to refurbishment. The provision at Murchiston House will provide some relief in the next AY. It is also crucial that phase 1 of the KB Nucleus is ready by 2021/22.	
6	It is noted that the School has set up a working group to consider [exam load in the May diet] in greater detail, the recommendations from which will be considered by the School Board of Studies in November. It is recommended that the findings and outcomes of this working group are reviewed and implemented as swiftly as possible once available.	August 2018	<p>This remit of this working group was confined to Sen Hons/IM courses, as pre-Hons and Jun Hons courses are examined at the end of the semester in which they are taught. The working group has concluded its work and its recommendations have been approved by the School Board of Studies. These will be implemented in AY1819.</p> <p>In summary, the main recommendations were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Exams for SH/IM compulsory courses should not be moved from their current diet (Dec or May). - Teaching Committee and the School Board of Studies should look favourably on requests to move exams for Sem 1 SH/IM optional courses from May to Dec (to date, the exam for one course has been moved). - The School should continue to look for ways to reduce the overall exam load in SH/IM years. 	
7	The transition into third year is one that is recognised as challenging; students are aware of this but the review team saw evidence that students entering third year may still not feel adequately prepared for the year ahead. It is recommended that the School considers ways to support students in this transition period, such as providing preparatory reading over the summer before third year, or recordings of lectures on concepts of key concern in third year, for example.	Jul 2018	We will encourage COs of Jun Hons courses to post course notes and/or information on recommended text books as early as possible over the summer. However, we are reluctant to prescribe preparatory work over the summer vacation as this could disadvantage certain groups of students, for example those who have to undertake full-time work for financial reasons, or who have caring responsibilities.	
8	The Physics Peer Mentoring Scheme, in which Honours students provide peer advice and support to pre-Honours students, is commended by the review team. It is recommended that the School considers	Dec 2018	We would be happy to consider extending the Peer Mentoring Scheme to Jun Hons. The success of such a scheme is clearly critically dependent on student support, so as a first step we will discuss it at the next meeting of SSLC	

	whether this scheme might be extended for Senior Honours students to provide support to students entering Junior Honours.		(in Oct 18). We will invite a student representative from the Physics Peer Mentoring Scheme committee to attend that meeting.	
9	The review team recommends that robust processes are put in place to support Teaching Assistants, particularly in the moderation of assessment, uniformly across all courses to ensure that the Course Organiser takes appropriate responsibility for the marks awarded	Sept 2018	<p>School policy is that Course Organisers must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hold a briefing / training session for TAs at the start of the course. - Provide TAs with model answers / marking schemes for where appropriate, e.g. for handin problems. - Provide TAs with guidance on common problems e.g. by email, meetings, office hours. - Monitor coursework marking to ensure consistency of marking and quality of feedback <p>We will remind COs of these responsibilities at the start of year teaching update meeting (normally held in early September).</p> <p>We will also remind TAs that they should speak to the relevant CO if anything is unclear; and that if they have any concerns over the support they are receiving from the CO they should raise this with the TA coordinator.</p>	
10	The review team heard evidence that students are eager to follow their lecturers' current research, and would be keen to attend research seminars or other similar events if pitched at an appropriate level for undergraduate students. It is recommended that the School investigates other such opportunities to develop academic community.	April 2019	<p>We agree. Actions currently planned include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We intend to hold an undergraduate research conference next AY. This will take place at the end of Sem 2 and will be an opportunity for final year students to showcase their MPhys / Sen Hons research projects to the undergraduate student and staff community. - We have a long-standing General Interest Seminar series aimed at undergraduate students. Traditionally these have been given by external speakers, but this year some seminars were given by our members of staff (and also by students). These were very popular with students and we plan to expand this next year. - We have a School calendar of events and seminars (see https://www.ph.ed.ac.uk/events) and have also added 	

			<p>undergraduate students to the relevant mailing lists. However, we will look at whether there are alternative ways that we can disseminate this information more effectively to students e.g. via social media.</p>	
11	<p>The review team heard evidence that Personal Tutors and academic staff may not always notify students or administrative staff when travelling away from the University. While it is not suggested that approval mechanisms for leave need to be established, it is recommended that a robust system is established to ensure that students (particularly Personal Tutees) and Teaching Office staff are notified of any absence of more than one day from the University, particularly where contact with the Personal Tutor will not be possible during the period of absence</p>	Sept 2018	<p>In our view, it is unnecessary for members of staff to inform the TO and students of every absence of > 1 day. It would also be very cumbersome to administer such a scheme. It is standard practice for our students to contact their PT by email in the first instance (and vice versa); we do not, for example, have a system of office hours (experience has shown that students' relatively high number of contact hours and diverse timetables makes such a system unworkable). This means that staff who are absent from the University for a short period will normally continue with their PT duties, e.g. by email and/or skype, in a relatively seamless manner.</p> <p>However, it is clearly essential that students receive a timely response to emails sent to their PT. School policy is that if PTs are going to be out of email contact, they are expected to inform the Senior Tutor, who will make alternative arrangements for their tutees. The TO should also be notified.</p> <p>PTs will be reminded of this policy at the start of year meeting.</p> <p>The School student Information portal includes details of what to do if students cannot make contact with their PT; namely that they should contact the TO if they do not receive a response from their PT within three working days.</p>	
	<p>Please report on steps taken to feedback to students on the outcomes of the review</p>	<p>School asked to provide further information</p>		
For Year on response only	<p>Any examples of a positive change as a result of the review</p>			

The University of Edinburgh

Internal Periodic Review

14 week response report

TPR of: Social Anthropology

Date of review: 1st and 2nd November 2017

Date of 14 week response: 28th March 2018

Date of year on response: 1st February 2019

The School/Subject Area is responsible for reporting on progress with all recommendations, including those remitted to other areas of the University for action. If any recommendation has been fully addressed please record the action taken and date completed. Any barriers to progress should be highlighted on this report.

Recommendation no	Recommendation	Timescale for completion	Comment on progress towards completion and/or identify barriers to completion	Completion date
1.	That the Subject Area devotes time to developing and emphasising a fresh strategic vision for its learning and teaching to both help attract students and guide and inform future decision-making.	Ongoing- Nov 2018	Little progress due to strike disruption. No plans yet, as a 'strategic vision' implies a major undertaking that requires careful and radical thinking detached from routine business, and we have not yet found an opportunity for that.	
2.	<p>Equality and Diversity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the Subject Area continues to support students' exploration of a decolonising agenda by developing an overarching and long-term strategy for the implementation of its ideas into the curriculum • That an additional session of the 'Teaching in a Diverse Classroom' training is run for those Postgraduate Tutors who have not previously been able to attend. • That Student Recruitment and Admissions consider the potential value of providing Subject Areas with additional management information about those students who have entered the University through widening participation routes with a view to enhancing support. 	<p>Aug 2018</p> <p>Sept 2018</p> <p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Moderate revisions to most reading lists in time for 2018-19</p> <p>Series of student-led workshops held Dec-April. Training of existing PG teaching assistants conducted by 4 Soc Anth lecturers in January. Similar anticipated in new PGT training</p> <p>Response from Dr Katrina Castle, Head of Widening Participation (maternity cover) Regarding additional management information on students from widening participation backgrounds, at the moment this is something that is not available at an individual student level due to sensitivities around the level of confidential, individual student data that can be shared.</p> <p>The Widening Participation Strategy was approved by Court in April 2018 acknowledges the need for more granular analysis and sharing of data, and this something that we will be working on moving forward. At the moment, there are some reports available via BIS and the student dashboards that give overall WP</p>	

			data at a cohort level for Schools, and we could signpost you to the relevant links on BIS.	
3.	<p>Assessment and Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the Subject Area reviews its assessment practices and ensures that it is not over-assessing. • That criteria for assessing tutorial participation are reviewed. • That moderation procedures are reviewed. • That procedures for considering undergraduate extension requests are reviewed. • That Social Anthropology continues to communicate with students about what constitutes feedback. 	<p>Aug 2018</p> <p>Aug 2019</p>	<p>All course assessment regimes, including tutorial participation criteria, to be reviewed during course preparation June-Aug 2018</p> <p>Lighter-touch moderation to be considered for some courses 2018-19, e.g. moderate marks only for minor coursework</p> <p>The Special Circumstances and Coursework Extensions Blueprint and Business Case has been discussed at the SA&S Board, with further detailed next steps considered at SEP Board level. It has been agreed to extend the time given to the project; allowing for further detailed consideration and agreement with academic stakeholders of how the proposed team would assess the impact of any special circumstances case and communicate that back to the Board of Examiners. As a result, the implementation date has been delayed to August 2019. The SA&S Team are currently planning this next phase of work, identifying stakeholders and meeting dates to support further discussion.</p> <p>The College will also be involved in the Board discussion and further planning during the next stage of the project.</p> <p>All course handbooks to include guidance on feedback</p>	
4.	<p>Personal Tutor System:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where the Subject Area is not able to offer a student the same Personal Tutor for the duration of their studies, that any alternative arrangements put in place are clearly communicated. • That the Subject Area ensures that there is consistency in the student experience of the Tutor-Tutee relationship whilst adhering to the Workload Allocation Model. • That IT support for Personal Tutors and timetabling support in particular is referred to the Service Excellence Programme (SEP) for further consideration. 	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Continue induction training of new PTs every year as required</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>We have already been doing our best to ensure this, and we are confident that the system is working well.</p> <p>No specific basis discerned for any appeal to the SEP. PTs to be advised to use DRPS but not PATH for timetabling advice.</p>	
5.	Supporting and Developing Staff:			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the policy and procedures around entitlement to sabbatical leave in cases where individuals have had a period of extended leave or research buyout are clarified. • That Social Anthropology develops detailed grade descriptors for academic administrative roles, and undertakes a gender and grade analysis of the Subject Area's Workload Allocation Model to ensure that these roles are distributed equitably. • That the Subject Area considers providing Postgraduate Tutors with additional guidance on the content of individual tutorial sessions for some courses, and investigates remuneration models at institutions where tutors are paid to attend lectures for the course on which they tutor. • That the College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences' Human Resources team seeks to bring clarity to the implementation of the 'Policy for the Recruitment, Support and Development of Tutors and Demonstrators'. 	<p>Sept 2018</p> <p>New SPS WAM some time during 2018-19</p> <p>Start of each semester</p>	<p>Sabbatical leave policy is agreed at School level and procedures are clearly advertised.</p> <p>Collection of info to develop descriptors for academic admin roles is ongoing at SPS level as part of the annual review process Soc Anth have undertaken a provisional gender and grade analysis of the WAM. A new WAM will be piloted in SPS in 2018/19, therefore a more detailed analysis will be undertaken next academic year</p> <p>Yes, content advice to be given to all tutors during course-specific training/induction</p> <p>Head of Human Resources (CAHSS) has confirmed that the College (and the Schools within it) and HR in CAHSS are all following the University policy. College HR have followed up with the School separately to clarify the expectations of the policy</p>	<p>April 2018</p>
<p>6</p>	<p>That the Subject Area seeks to secure funding for the undergraduate dissertation to ensure that all students wishing to undertake original research are able to do so, regardless of their financial circumstances.</p>	<p>Nov 2018</p>	<p>Dissertation preparation course is being revised and will include clearer advice on realistic costing and on sources of financial support where this is needed. There is, however, no prospect of us changing from our current approach to the dissertation as regards 'field' research: for many years we have made it clear that this is an option and not a requirement, and that excellent dissertation research is possible without primary ethnographic fieldwork. Also, for those who choose to conduct primary field research, there is no requirement to incur major costs by traveling to exotic locations. So as in other subject areas in SPS, there is no need for dissertation projects to incur extra costs, and there is no evidence that students could gain an unfair advantage by being able to finance exotic travel.</p>	
<p>7.</p>	<p>Employability and Graduate Attributes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the Subject Area presses ahead with producing the in-house film in which Social 	<p>Nov 2018</p>	<p>Response from Shian Holt, Student Development Office (SDO) and Jennifer Steven ,Careers Service (CS)</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anthropology alumni will reflect on the links between their degrees and their various careers. • That consideration is given to the ways in which the various services operating within the Subject Area and School to support employability and graduate attribute development might be better integrated to avoid duplication of effort. • That the Subject Area maps and makes more visible to students the transferable skills that exist across programmes. 		<p>Following recommendation 7, UoE Careers Service (CS) and Student Development Office (SDO) will continue to offer skills, training and employability support for Social Anthropology students. CS and SDO welcome the opportunity to better integrate with the subject area to avoid duplication of effort.</p> <p>In response to this recommendation CS and SDO are proposing a bi annual communication with a named contact in Social Anthropology requesting any specific student careers, skills or training requirements and outlining the programmes on offer from each service. The named contact/s should then disseminate the information to the different year groups to ensure that staff at all levels are aware</p>	
	Please report on steps taken to feedback to students on the outcomes of the review	Reported to all undergraduates in Dec 2017		

The University of Edinburgh

Internal Periodic Review

14 week response report

PPR of: The Deanery of Clinical Sciences

Date of review: 10th-11th October 2017

Date of 14-week response: 4th April 2018

Date of year on response: due 20th December 2018

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

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

Recommendation no	Recommendation	Timescale for completion	Comment on progress towards completion and/or identify barriers to completion	Completion date
1	It is recommended that the teaching contributions of NHS colleagues are formalised, both through allocated time for teaching and with the introduction of more dedicated teaching posts.	The small group meeting will occur in June 2018 and this will then be tabled at the following EMS executive meeting.	This is an important issue that has been highlighted in the PPR and the next step will be for Prof Critchley (Dean of Clinical Sciences) to take this up with the Edinburgh Medical School Executive Group. This is the correct forum for this discussion in order to involve the two other heads of the Deaneries as it involves staff in their areas too. Furthermore the other important party in this discussion will be the NHS itself because this may involve contractual issues. The Dean has convened a small group meeting to plan how we move this forward through taking considered suggestions to EMS executive.	
2	The Review Team strongly recommends that resource planning be aligned to Deanery growth strategy.	Grouping items 2,3,4, the DoQ has drafted a framework for clustering programmes and the Deanery Management group will consider this proposal in June/July.	Growth strategy and resource planning are aligned within the Deanery, discussed by the Deanery Management Group and at the Edinburgh Medical School. This recommendation is strongly related to recommendations 3 and 4, which are discussed further below.	
3	The Review Team recommends that pragmatic consideration is given to the resourcing of courses and programmes within the Deanery.		We have given pragmatic consideration to this, as per the recommendation and are underway with actions in response to this recommendation, described in more detail under 4 and 5.	
4	To assist planning for growth it is recommended that the Deanery consider a more holistic, transparent approach,	On-going	This recommendation finds alignment with recommendations 2 and 3. The "siloes" approach to business plan management partly reflects the historical origins of programmes that developed	

	<p>rather than the current programme-based, siloed approach which was identified by the Review Team.</p>		<p>within the Deanery and partly reflects the ongoing requirement for programmes to demonstrate financial sustainability to the College Board of Studies during the approval process. Nevertheless, the Deanery is in broad agreement with this recommendation: Annual review identified a perceived lack of transparency concerning financial aspects of individual courses as a significant source of stress to programme teams, who additionally view this as an impediment to growth. The Deanery Management Group are reviewing options for clustering programmes as a pragmatic solution to improve resourcing and transparency of resource management. The exemplars for this approach are the surgical suite of programmes and those programmes based at the Edinburgh Dental Institute. In active discussion is the idea to bring one other programme (Internal Medicine) into the Surgical Cluster. Similarly, on-campus MSc programmes based at Little France can be clustered to improve efficiency of process (e.g. shared exam boards) and asset management (e.g. a unified administrative support team); the unified administration could also extend to ODL programmes. The DoQ has developed a strategy that will be presented first to the PG management group and- following iteration- to the Deanery Management Group. It is anticipated that the year-on response will provide a deeper, structural insight into the alignment of resource and programme development.</p>	
5	<p>The Review Team recommends that the perception amongst teaching staff that teaching activity itself is not generally regarded as beneficial for promotional opportunity within the University is reviewed by the Deanery, the College and the University.</p>	<p>The Principal's recent "80-days" statement emphasises the importance of this recommendation. By the year-on report, the Deanery will have established whether or not there is an evidence base for this perception and will present a strategy to</p>	<p>Comments from University Director of HR : <i>We are committed to the promotion of the value of teaching and to ensuring that teaching is given equal recognition with research. Described below are some of the work, both complete and on-going, that we have done to support this agenda.</i></p> <p><i>In 2013 we developed and published "Exemplars of Excellence in Student Education" to provide guidance to colleagues applying for promotion on how they can evidence their individual achievements in teaching and learning. These were identified as an example of good practice by the Royal Academy of Engineering and captured in a case study in their report on the role of excellence in teaching in promotions processes for academic engineers.</i></p> <p><i>In 2016 we:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •started to publish case studies to illustrate the route through the promotions process taken by recently 	

		<p>address the perception.</p>	<p><i>promoted colleagues and we are committed to updating this annually by 31 December each year following each Academic Promotions round.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ●<i>updated the criteria for promotion to Readership to enable promotion to Reader on the basis of teaching as well as on the basis of research</i> ●<i>produced and launched a number of videos to support the Annual Review process including videos focussing on supporting staff to talk about teaching (quality as well as quantity) and leadership of teaching in Annual Review discussions.</i> <p><i>In 2017 we published the Academic Recruitment Toolkit to support the assessment of teaching ability and commitment for posts that include, or are likely to include, a significant element of teaching. Having launched the Toolkit in 2017 as “recommended” but optional there are plans to roll out the requirement of compulsory assessment of teaching ability for all posts that include or a likely to include a significant element of teaching during 2018.</i></p> <p><i>During 2018 we will be implementing a process at College and Central Academic Promotions panels to capture and collate information on the basis for promotion for each academic promotion case – e.g. balance of teaching and research, primarily teaching, primarily research.</i></p> <p><i>We have also been working with the Senior Vice Principal, the Vice Principal People and Culture and the Vice Principal and Head of College for CAHSS on reviewing the appetite for, implications of and options for a specific Teaching only academic track with the University. There has already been some discussion on the topic at Senate and we will be working with the VP People and Culture and Head of College CAHSS on developing a further discussion paper setting out proposals for a Teaching-only Academic track to be taken to Senate by 31 July 2019.</i></p> <p><i>The IAD launched the “Teaching Matters” website and associated blog, which the University contributes to.</i></p> <p>Deanery Comment: Teaching is identified by The University as an unequivocal, business-critical activity. Nevertheless, the</p>	
--	--	--------------------------------	--	--

			<p>perception persists that teaching activity is not “valued” and annual review provided evidence- necessarily anecdotal- that programme teams are frustrated by a lack of promotional opportunity compared to research-intensive staff. Clearly there is a disconnect between the unambiguous prioritisation of teaching by the institution and the feeling “on the ground”. It is not clear to what extent this disconnect is evident in other parts of the University. Within the Deanery, we are addressing this in multiple ways. The Deanery Management Group provides a platform to communicate to Heads of Research Centres and Divisions and reinforce the concept that teaching is an essential aspect of University business and must be embedded within the P&DR process. The Deanery is advanced with developing a workload model and this will help inform line-managers of promotional opportunities for those engaged in innovative teaching activities. Our first action point is to review recent promotions within the Deanery to assess whether or not the perception is evidence based.</p>	
6	<p>The Review Team recommends that the Deanery engage a Postgraduate Student Experience Officer (SEO).</p>	<p>Year-on report to update in the context of a resource review for PGT within DCS</p>	<p>Edinburgh Medical School has designed job descriptions for a Head of Postgraduate Researcher Experience and a Head of ECR experience. Currently, two senior members of the academic staff- both within the Deanery of Clinical Sciences- are seconded to these roles, part time. The Deanery has been discussing this recommendation, potentially through a post to support the postgraduate manager. However, in January the PG manager was seconded to the University’s Service for Excellence Plan, for a period of 18 months and progress stalled while the new manager (Moira Henderson) settled into the role. This transition period now complete, this recommendation will be revisited.</p>	
7	<p>The review team recommends that the University consider a review of acceptable fee levels with a view to maintaining an ethical commitment to global equity in access.</p>	<p>We view this as completed at institutional level, with further comment after annual programme monitoring (ie in year on report)</p>	<p><i>This was remitted to UoE Fee Strategy Group and on 22nd December 2017 DCS received the following comments from GaSP: The tuition fee structure is set centrally, and for PGT programmes (both on campus and ODL) there is a fee spine that gives flexibility for Colleges/Schools to select an appropriate fee for individual programmes;</i></p> <p><i>All new programmes are reviewed by FSG Chair’s action using an agreed template and Colleges/Schools propose a fee for each new programme. The fee is approved by FSG Chair’s action so long as it meets the following requirements:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• The programme is financially sustainable;</i> 	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The fees are benchmarked against competitor organisations and there is evidence of sufficient market research to assess likely demand; and</i> • <i>The programme aligns to the College and University's strategic goals.</i> <p><i>GaSP also noted that CMVM approached FSG in February 2017 and again in June 2017 with proposals for scholarships within programmes for students from low income countries. The FSG Minutes recorded that "The 50% discount/scholarship proposed raised concerns, including the rationale for charging different fees for students in different geographical regions, the lack of integration with Edinburgh Global schemes, the exclusion of the fees from NPRAS and the perceived benefit to the College and University. FSG concluded that if CMVM strongly felt that substantial scholarships should be made available to a subset of international students, then the resource should be found from within CMVM". GaSP do not see the value in CMVM going back to FSG to review this issue further so soon after a detailed discussion.</i></p> <p>This will be discussed at Deanery Management groups and will also be cascaded to programme teams for comment.</p>	
8	<p>It is essential that locally-developed applications, in particular Labyrinth, are fully integrated with the Learn VLE before full migration takes place so that teaching is not affected by the transition. The Review Team therefore recommends this as a priority.</p>	<p>The College Roadmap will be produced within 6 months. Once we have reviewed that, then a realistic timeframe to completion can be provided. If the roadmap is produced as stated, then our response will be in the year-on report.</p>	<p>This recommendation is hugely significant to programmes in the Deanery. It is a contentious issue raised during annual review and articulated by programme teams during the PPR. We are working closely with IS to ensure that transition does not impinge up teaching quality. This recommendation was remitted to Information Services who have responded thus:</p> <p><i>Integration between Labyrinth and other important CMVM teaching resources and the Learn VLE is being carefully considered as part of each VLE migration project. IS are committed to ensuring that these important resources continue to be available in a suitable manner that supports teaching and learning and work to date indicates that this can be achieved.</i></p> <p><i>However, it should also be noted that the Labyrinth system in particular is now quite old and some components of it could be considered as close to 'end of life'. This was flagged in the review of CMVM eLearning Services carried out 4 years ago, and a potential redevelopment project has been on the CMVM Learning and Teaching roadmap since then, albeit not prioritised over</i></p>	

			<p><i>more acute issues. This has been raised with the new College Head of IT Services and a roadmap outlining plans for Labyrinth and a number of other end of life services will be produced in the next 6 months for College prioritisation.</i></p> <p>Deanery Comment: It is reassuring that our activities will be supported in the short term since this is a priority recommendation of the PPR. Long-term, the Deaneries within Edinburgh Medical School continue to press College to prioritise this redevelopment, using the EMS Executive Group as the forum through which to do this.</p>	
9	The approach of having self-taught clinicians supporting the Deanery VLE is unsustainable and the review Team therefore recommends that the Deanery consider establishing a Digital Education Unit (similar to the model found in the University of Edinburgh Veterinary School), with some local learning technologist support.	Longer term: beyond the year-on report	This is an important recommendation and is one of the main drivers of a need to cluster the programmes more effectively, as discussed above. It is not planned that the Deanery operate a single DEU, rather it is likely that clusters of programmes will have the financial ability to recruit learning technologists to support programme curation and development as currently happens in the Surgical suite of programmes. We have made no progress on this and it will follow the restructuring of programme management in response to recommendations 2, 3 & 4.	
10	The Review Team recommends that the University continues to review the fit between existing frameworks and the needs of ODL programmes.	The recommendation is clear (“continues”) that this is an ongoing process.	<p><i>This was remitted to Academic Services.</i></p> <p><i>The report highlighted a few areas where the Deanery felt that the University’s policies and regulations do not work too well for its programmes, including special circumstances / coursework extensions, the Personal Tutor system, English Language testing and the Student Partnership Agreement.</i></p> <p><i>Over the last few years, Academic Services and relevant Assistant Principals and Senate Committees have been in dialogue with the University’s community of staff involved in online learning provision, including colleagues from the Deanery, on a range of issues (including issues raised in the report) to ensure that the University’s academic policies and regulations meet the needs of ODL programmes as well as those delivered on-campus. This includes:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• CSPC has taken account of views from the Deanery’s ODL community when agreeing to change the criteria for Coursework Extensions to include exceptional employment commitments, and has also considered the views of the Deanery’s ODL community when considering other aspects of Coursework Extensions policy.</i> 	

- Various discussions with the Deanery regarding the Personal Tutoring system, at which the relevant Assistant Principal clarified that there is sufficient flexibility to tailor the system to take account of the distinct needs of ODL students.
- The requirement to include a dissertation/project as part of MSc programmes (currently under review by CSPC, again taking careful account of views from the College's ODL community, including colleagues in the Deanery)
- Moving the key date for upload of course results for January / February Boards of Examiners backwards to take account of the timescales for PGT Boards (with particular reference to those in Clinical Sciences)
- Several year ago, the Senate Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) agreed specific guidance on how student representation arrangements operate for ODL students.

The Deanery continues to be represented in these discussions directly and also through Dr Shelia Lodge, College Head of Academic Administration, and College representatives on the relevant Committees and groups. Dr Lodge has recently left the University and the College awaits appointment of a successor.

In addition to the issues that Academic Services has discussed with the Deanery, the University more broadly is taking account of the particular needs of ODL programmes:

- *The Service Excellence Programme's Student Administration and Support (SA&S) strand is developing proposals for a new approach to managing special circumstances and coursework extensions. The SA&S Board has representation from CMVM, and will be able to take account of the views of the Deanery on this issue.*
- *During 2017-18, the English Language Teaching Centre has piloted an online English Language test for ODL programmes (as an alternate to the standardised tests such as IELTS) with a small number of areas. It plans to roll the test out more broadly (including all MVM's ODL programmes) in September 2018, subject to approval from the Student Recruitment Strategy Group.*

Earlier in the session, Academic Services invited Sheila Lodge to inform us of any other aspects of the University's academic policies and regulations where there are concerns regarding fit

			<p><i>with the requirements of ODL programmes. While nothing was reported to us, we would be happy to discuss any other issues that may arise.</i></p> <p><i>The report suggests that the Deanery feels that the student Partnership Agreement is less relevant for its online provision than for on-campus students. We would find it useful to understand why the Deanery holds this view. In principle the values in the SPA (e.g. Excellence, Inquiry) and the specific priorities highlighted in it (e.g. Academic Support, Student Voice) appear as relevant to online as on-campus students. As we consider the theme and priorities for 2018/19, the University will continue to be mindful of the needs of the online student community and ways in which we can engage students and staff in the implementation of the partnership agreement.</i></p> <p>Deanery Comment: We note that Sheila Lodge has been the conduit between the Deanery and Academic Services. Dr Lodge has recently left the University and the position is not yet filled. We view this role as a vital route through which to work with Academic Services as we continue to review the fit between existing frameworks and ODL requirements, as per the recommendation.</p>	
11	It is recommended that the Deanery consider how best to enable more timely feedback to students on assessed work.	In part complete; review for the year-on report after annual programme monitoring	We are reviewing this across programmes, accessing student viewpoint through SSLCs and assessing the performance of programmes during the annual review. As an example of action, an issue of repeatedly late feedback was identified with an on-campus programmes. The DoQ and Head of PGT reviewed the complaints with the students and identified this as a priority action point for the programme team. This action is underpinned by involving the Head of Centre in the programme review, resulting in an uplift of performance. The view is that feedback is best co-ordinated at the programme level. Going forward, the DoQ will ask for feedback times ahead of programme review and exemplars of the feedback given to students in order to assess the detail.	
12	It is recommended that mechanisms are devised and formalised for the local sharing of practice among teaching teams within the Deanery.	Complete and ongoing	In light of this recommendation, we are requesting that the College programme directors' forum continue once the Dr Lodge's post has been filled. Our incoming PG Manager will continue with the Administrators forum, which has been an effective means of sharing best practice and resource. This plan has not yet progressed due to a change in the Deanery Postgraduate	

			Manager. We note that the Deanery has previously convened local meetings of PG directors and programme leads but this was not viewed as useful/productive since it “doubled-up” on College-level meetings.	
	Please report on steps taken to feedback to students on the outcomes of the review.	The Deanery gave a debrief to all staff and students that were engaged in the PPR. We have not circulated the report to those staff; rather the Director of Quality will abstract key commendations and recommendations from the report to be made available through the Deanery’s website. This will be completed by the year-on report.		
For Year on response only	Any examples of a positive change as a result of the review.			

The University of Edinburgh

Internal Review

Year on response report on recommendation actions

TPR of Design

Date of Review: 15-16 Feb 2017

Date of 14 week response: 10th October 2017

Date of year on response: 8th May 2018

The subject area is responsible for reporting on progress with all recommendations, including those remitted to other areas of the University for action. Please report on progress towards meeting each recommendation. Any urgent recommendation should be highlighted along with a deadline for response. If any recommendation has been fully addressed please record the action taken and date completed. Any barriers to progress should be highlighted on this report.

Recommendation	Timescale for completion	Comment on progress towards completion and/or identify barriers to completion	Completion date
1. It is recommended that work be done to consider the timetable for implementation, addressing the balance of core to elective courses and how these will be timetabled throughout the working week both within Design and across the University. Consideration should be given to the consequences of flows in and out of the Subject Area and how these might need to be addressed, for example through quotas.	18 months	<p>The School of Design held workshops at the School Away Day in early September and an Away Day in April dedicated to final preparations for the new curriculum commencing in September 2018.</p> <p>First and second year new curriculum timetables are currently being mapped by the Timetabling Unit in readiness for the roll out of the new curriculum in September 2018. All Design courses will be following the on-line timetable.</p>	Complete
2. It is recommended that the Subject Area devise a nuanced spatial strategy that supports its studio ecologies, recognising similarities and differences between disciplines.	36 months	<p>An ECA-wide space strategy has been developed, and moves arising from this are currently being carried out. This includes space for studio-electives as well as providing cohorts of students such as Film with their own designated space. One new elective space (room 3.23 Evolution House) has been introduced in September 2017. Building work to all main spaces within ECA presents logistical difficulties for the next 2 -3 years as spaces are refurbished and reopened and others are closed in order to be refurbished.</p> <p>MA Product Design and the new MA in Design for Change (D4C) will put pressure on studio space in Evolution House</p>	Ongoing February 2020

		<p>2018/19 but this may be resolved as Design Informatics moves out to the Bayes Institute. Shared workshops continue to be oversubscribed, accessed by students across programmes.</p> <p>As of April 2018, a Design School space planning group has been convened, which will liaise with the ECA strategy group.</p>	
<p>3. It is recommended that a nuanced understanding be reached of a Design-specific work allocation model based around the University model, which reflects an understanding of the distinctive qualities of the Subject Area and the activities that are inherent in and central to its teaching</p>	18 months	<p>A Design-specific WAM is now in place for use in the 2017-18 Annual Reviews. The new curriculum will enable a clearer allocation for individual disciplines within the subject area.</p> <p>This action will feed into the strengthened dialogue with CAHSS and the University (below) on staff student ratios and ecologies of space and learning environments. Design's distinctive portfolio of Programmes in diverse making traditions will be supported by a rich cohort of academic and specialist staff.</p>	Ongoing
<p>4. It is recommended that the School review its Personal Tutor model (with due regard to the University model) in light of the need to support students who may choose significant engagement in courses outside Design as part of their learning journey</p>	12-14 months	<p>The ECA Senior Tutor is currently addressing Personal Tutor provision across ECA, including the further development of a robust training programme for PTs to assist them with supporting students in course selection.</p> <p>The ECA Senior Tutor and support colleagues will run a series of workshops for School of Design academics in Semester 2 of the 2017/18 academic cycle. A series of similar workshops were held for School of Art PTs in 2016/17 and positively received.</p>	Ongoing – this has now been scheduled for June 2018.
<p>5. It is recommended that consideration be given by ECA and the Students' Association to providing more localised access to student advice and welfare services, and to development of Peer Assisted Learning Schemes (PALS) or Academic Families, since the enhanced support would complement more formal academic support structures and community-building within the Subject Area.</p>	10 months	<p>ECA has an office specifically designated for use by University student services such as Disability Office, Counselling and Careers service. We will work with the Students' Association to promote this more widely and explore how the range of advice and welfare services might be expanded.</p>	December 2017 Complete

<p>6. It is recommended that the School review the external examiner system with a view to establishing a mechanism to regain the critically supportive element to external examining which existed previously</p>	<p>18 months</p>	<p>The new curriculum will present individual programmes for Examination (rather than the single programme currently offered). External Examiners will be appointed to oversee the individual programmes in line with University Regulations. This process will take place in consultation with ECA-level Directors, including Quality, and UG</p>	<p>Commencing 2018/19 academic session and ongoing</p>
<p>7. It is recommended that ECA initiate a stronger dialogue with the University with regard to the apportioning of student numbers and possible targets and caps on numbers. This dialogue should help to ensure that the delicate ecology of space is not compromised, which will in turn serve to balance student expectations.</p>	<p>24 months</p>	<p>ECA is in dialogue with University CAHSS and Estates on these matters through development of our estate master plan which includes careful and detailed planning and discussion of student numbers and forecasts in relation to space ecology and student experience. ECA has also established a Recruitment and Admissions Strategy Group with the following remit which will help to strengthen our student intake planning and join up with other resource and space planning -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To further develop and articulate an ECA recruitment and admissions strategy • To develop and articulate the 'ECA offer'; oversight for management and sustainability of portfolio of programmes • To develop and oversee ECA's approach to, articulation of and implementation of a widening participation strategy • Oversight and sign-off of annual and other strategic planning for recruitment and admissions strategy core goals including annual student intake and population profile projections (and directions) • To utilise management information, insight reports, trend information and analysis to inform and review strategy • Strategic oversight of recruitment, admissions and ongoing conversion activities • To liaise with other relevant CAHSS and ECA committees and role holders (e.g. CAHSS RASC; ECA Management Group both as a group and in individual roles; Programme Directors) 	<p>Ongoing</p>

		In addition, this action will be reflected in ongoing staff planning through the WAM in the School of Design, to support student numbers and diverse spaces of learning and teaching.	
8. It is recommended that the Subject Area develop a progressive strategy with regard to international partnerships, building on the model created with Donghua and SCF.	18 months	Design continues to have a strong Outreach ethos and create and build connections with international partners. The SCF partnership remains strong and will be reviewed as part of its 10 year collaborative partnership agreement. This review will involve UOE International office, CAHSS, ECA and Design.	Ongoing September/October 2018
9. Since the Subject Area is about to enter a period of intense change, it is recommended that a strategy for communication be developed, building consensus among staff for change and building students' engagement and voice in the conversation.	12 months	Currently, high email traffic, and large numbers of part-time staff within Design hamper attempts to bring all colleagues together for discussion. However, we have implemented regular staff meetings for 2017/18, twice per semester. Design Management Group is also introducing a regular 'Design Newsletter' to keep colleagues apprised of changes Design Management is currently investigating incentives to encourage students to attend student-staff liaison meetings. Year group Welcome Week meetings have now been implemented where year groups are informed of any forthcoming changes which may affect their studies.	2017/18 academic session Ongoing An ECA-wide Initiative is in Progress and will encompass this. Ongoing
10. It is recommended that ECA seek to maintain continuity in the Director of Quality post, in line with the University guidelines on the School Director of Quality role.		The current Director Jill Burke has agreed to continue in Post.	Complete
Please report on steps taken to feedback to students on the outcomes of the review	12 months	The initial outcomes of the review have been communicated to student reps via the student-staff liaison committees. As the School of Design implements the changes outlined above we will continue to update students via these committees.	February 2018 Complete

The University of Edinburgh

Internal Periodic Review

Year on response report

TPR of: European Languages and Cultures

Date of review: 20th & 21st February 2017

Date of 14 week response: 28th July 2017

Date of year on response: 16th May 2018

The School/Subject Area is responsible for reporting on progress with all recommendations, including those remitted to other areas of the University for action. If any recommendation has been fully addressed please record the action taken and date completed. Any barriers to progress should be highlighted on this report.

Recommendation no	Recommendation	Timescale for completion	Comment on progress towards completion and/or identify barriers to completion	Completion date
1	The learning journey and School vision are promoted more explicitly during induction and monitored throughout the programme	September 2017 for Stage 1; June 2018 for Stage 2	<p>This issue has been addressed more widely by the School with the creation of the 'Support for Success in LLC' Learn page which is accessible to all students and brings together key information on life in the School. It provides students with clear information about their studies, as well as answers to common questions, information on key academic skills, details of how assessment and feedback work in LLC, lists of useful software, and information on student support. It also provides opportunity for students to feed in suggestions to improve the page.</p> <p>Given that the Year Abroad is an important part of the journey for all DELC students, an interactive DELC page has been developed with more complete/relevant information aimed at DELC students only (see point 7) to complement the LLC Studying Abroad page.</p> <p>We have also provided further feedback in our Degree Programme tables related to how the year abroad credits are distributed within the Year 4 courses.</p> <p>DELC will continue to explore ways of guiding its students through all stages of their learning journeys, with a particular focus on programme level transitions</p>	September 2017 for Stage 1; May 2018 for Stage 2
2	The Department considers ways of developing the PT system (within the framework of the School's PT statement) towards a relationship which is more proactive throughout Y1 – Y4 and uses it as a means of inculcating a more cohesive vision of the learning journey as a whole.	June 2018	DELC would still like this to be implemented but is bound by School and College rules. The HoD takes an active part in consultations but changes to the PT system cannot be implemented on a department-wide basis.	Ongoing

3	DELCL builds upon its work on improving programme transparency and documentation around the progression from Y3 to Y4.	September 2017 for Stage 1; January 2018 for Stage 2; then ongoing	The DELC Year Abroad app has been developed and is now live. It enables students to access documentation and information relevant to their stage of the journey and to see how the Year Abroad fits in their degree (See also points 4 and 7).	Stage 1: September 2017 Stage 2: January 2018
4	Further reflection is given to a rebalancing of the dissertation preparation element during Y3, the introduction of an oral exam at the end of Y3, and the feasibility of using SLICCs as a credit-bearing option during Y3.	July 2018	<p>The dissertation requirements have been rebalanced to put greater emphasis on the Dissertation Proposal (Year 3 element) which now constitutes part of the final mark. Year 3 language courses for all DELC Languages have been approved by the BoS and will go live in September 2018. While the possibility of an Oral exam at the end of Year 3 was rejected at the first 2017-18 DELC meeting, DELC has convened an Orals Working Group to consider the feasibility and desirability of an end of semester 1 Oral in Year 4.</p> <p>A new SLICC has also been approved by the BoS and will launch in September 2018. While this is aimed at second year students, it involves collaboration with local Schools and may be developed later to include a Year 3 follow-on course once it has been 'tested' over the next couple of years.</p>	June 2018-September 2018
5	A teaching-learning forum is established to facilitate cross-pollination of ideas.	Ongoing	The Teaching Forum was re-established in September 2017. 4 sessions ran this year and have been very popular with staff. It is supported by a DELC-specific LEARN page, which complements the 'Support for Teaching in LLC' page. It has been extremely useful in sharing best practice, in introducing and assessing new assessment methods and in identifying Tutors' needs and offering training where necessary (for eg, 4 Smart Board training sessions have been run in May 2018 and will most likely be repeated in September if there is further demand for it)	Ongoing
6	The structures for joint programme management are formalised by the establishment of joint committees	Ongoing	<p>Given the number and variety of DELC-run joint degree programmes and the fact that many of those are run in collaborations with departments outside LLC, the aim was to establish a realistic roadmap for change by the end of the academic year 2017-18. This has taken longer than expected but was raised at the last School Planning Committee and has been taken up by the Head of School.</p> <p>The creation of a 'joint-degree officer' who would act as a liaison between LLC and other Schools is under discussion.</p>	Ongoing

7	The Department take the initiative in pushing for the enhanced sharing of student records, to facilitate communication between University departments about students on Year Abroad	Ongoing	The working systems and practices of Edinburgh Global are currently under review at University level. The way DELC works with Edinburgh Global will change as a result of this review, and we are working to ensure our students' needs will be provided for by the new systems. In the meantime, DELC has created new, interactive Year Abroad pages for its students (http://www.delc.ed.ac.uk/year-abroad/). The creation of the Year 3 Online Courses for DELC Languages has also led to a new DPT structure which will commence in September.	DELC app: September 2017 Ongoing
8	Efforts are made to ensure that students know whom to turn to when GH tutors are not available for consultation	September 2017; then ongoing	Recommendations about this have been included in Handbooks and this is flagged up in First Class Meetings. It should be pointed out however that this is still not a satisfactory solution given the heavy reliance on GH tutors in some language areas. It is hoped that a number of new appointments across DELC will go some way towards solving this problem.	September 2017 and ongoing
9	Continued attention is given to improving lines of communication between GH tutors, SACs and course organisers	September 2017; then ongoing	As in point 8, above, the HoD is working in conjunction with SACs to maintain effective lines of communication. This includes beginning of year meetings between COs and GH tutors, in addition to the School's GH tutors Induction Days.	September 2017 and ongoing
Please report on steps taken to feedback to students on the outcomes of the review		Students in Edinburgh have been provided with feedback via staff-student liaison meetings in S1 of 2017-18. The recommendations have also been shared with all students – in Edinburgh and abroad via LEARN in September 2017.		
For Year on response only	Any examples of a positive change as a result of the review	DELC has made efforts to foster a culture of communication and community across languages. Students have commented positively on the DELC app and several working groups have been formed as a result of the Teaching Forum (on Orals and DELC Common Courses in particular). In order to foster a sense of community 'DELC Creative' was launched this year: it is an addition to the DELC online pages which will host projects involving students from all language areas and working in collaboration with staff. The first issue of Babble (DELC Creative writing magazine) was launched on 29 th March 2018. Further projects for 2018-19 include an interactive map of Europe through which students will be able to access podcasts from students currently abroad, an archive of the language plays, a photo exhibition about the Year Abroad, etc. All of those initiative have been extremely well received by both staff and students		

Internal Review

Year on response report on recommendation actions

TPR of: Islamic and Middle Eastern Studies
Date of Review: 28th February & 1st March 2017
Date of 14 week response: 16th August 2017
Date of Year on response: 3rd May 2018

The subject area is responsible for reporting on progress with all recommendations, including those remitted to other areas of the University for action. Please report on progress towards meeting each recommendation. Any urgent recommendation should be highlighted along with a deadline for response. If any recommendation has been fully addressed please record the action taken and date completed. Any barriers to progress should be highlighted on this report.

Recommendation	Timescale for completion	Comment on progress towards completion and/or identify barriers to completion	Completion date
<p>1. The review team recommends that the Subject Area brings courses in line with University policy, in particular, ensuring that lecture outlines or PowerPoint presentation slides for lectures/seminars are made available to students at least 24 hours in advance of the class as a matter of course and furthermore that course outlines and lists of core readings are made available at least 4 weeks before the course starts. As part of the University's policy to mainstream common adjustments this should be effected as soon as possible.</p>	<p>AY 2017/2018</p>	<p>All colleagues were reminded of the ppt requirements in staff meetings and TRM.</p> <p>IMES Administration will follow up with all staff to ensure that core readings and outlines are available on EUCLID at least 4 weeks before the courses commence.</p> <p>April 2018 Update: The measures detailed above have been put in place.</p>	<p>April 2018</p>
<p>2. It is recommended that the Subject Area pays particular attention not to overextend the curriculum thereby risking diversion of resources away from the core and risking a loss of coherence</p>	<p>September 2019</p>	<p>IMES is planning a comprehensive review of all aspects of its UG programmes in 2017-18, led by IMES UG Officer.</p> <p>April 2018 Update: this is an ongoing and gradual process that has been discussed at various local meetings including the Language Committee Meeting, the Teaching and Language Committee Meeting, and the UG Meeting.</p> <p>It was decided that the best way to take this forward is to involve the teams that deliver UG programmes, in line with best practice. It was also decided to draw on University resources, particularly the Edinburgh Learning Design Roadmap (ELDeR), for help in reviewing UG programmes. To enable this, IMES has now secured funding from the school (LLC) to support a review for one of our joint programmes. The tools and lessons learned</p>	

		<p>from this participation will then be mainstreamed to other programmes as necessary. The timeline for completion is thus subject to ELDeR availability (not available for bookings as at April 2018).</p> <p>The department has looked at the courses on offer and introduced team-taught courses in 2018-19 as well as rotating some of the other option courses to avoid overstretching of resources.</p>	
<p>3. The team notes that the range of subjects offered makes the Subject Area potentially vulnerable to key staff changes and fluctuations in resource availability. The review team recommends that the Subject Area keeps this point under review</p>	September 2019	<p>IMES is reviewing resource availability along with the measures noted above, point 2.</p> <p>April 2018 Update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A teaching fellow was appointed in 2017/2018 to help in running and organising several courses, including Arabic - A new method of dividing Arabic language students into smaller groups was introduced following discussions at the Language Committee meeting - Staff were encouraged to be creative in designing and delivering courses such that they maximise their use of locally available expertise, spread the workload, and protect against staff fluctuations. Such a team-taught course has now been created (“History and Culture of Iran”) - A new lectureship was created to support teaching and scholarship in IMES, still to be advertised 	April 2018
<p>4. It is recommended that the Subject Area review the Arabic 1 course, with a particular focus on class size in comparison to other institutions and mixing IMES students with non-IMES sub honours students</p>	AY 2017/2018	<p>This review is ongoing, and under discussion with the School.</p> <p>April 2018 Update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A new method of dividing Arabic language students into smaller groups was introduced following discussions at the Language Committee meeting. - In 2018-19 Arabic 1 will be divided into 6 groups with each having no more than 20 students. 	April 2018
<p>5. It is recommended that the Subject Area review whether assessment and feedback mechanisms are consistent, fit for purpose and support progression. Evidence from students suggested that some feedback was excessively based on format and presentation rather than on content, and that there was substantial variation in the timeliness and level of detail in feedback. In addition, the Subject Area should assess the contribution that other forms of learning including self –assessment, informal peer assessment, and e- learning can add to learner journey</p>	September 2019	<p>See above point 2.</p> <p>April 2018 Update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - UG and Exams officer reviewed marking procedures in IMES, producing new and detailed guidance that was circulated to colleagues - Feedback and assessment mechanisms were discussed in the UG Committee and Staff meetings, staff were encouraged to diversify assessment techniques and ensure timely turnaround of feedback - New course, “Gendering the Middle East”, takes assessment diversity on board by introducing innovative 	

		<p>formative and summative assessment (still to run).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New course on offer in 2018-19, "Islam Through the Arts" will also introduce new and innovative forms of assessments. - A feedback meeting to discuss current practice and highlight best practice was planned in March 2018 but postponed due to the UCU industrial action. This will now be rescheduled. 	
<p>6. To further enhance the student experience the review team recommends a closer connect between the YAC and the PTs to ensure that all pertinent information about the student is recorded, should cases of Special Circumstances arise, and in addition the YAC should be offered Personal Tutor Training. This is particularly relevant to ensure that there is an awareness of current training courses and support tools such as Mental Health and Wellbeing training</p>	<p>AY 2018/2019</p>	<p>The need to bring in PTs where students abroad are facing difficulties, and for PTs to stay in touch with students abroad, have been highlighted at recent staff meetings; PT Peer is involved in maintaining this. All colleagues are encouraged to attend Mental Health training. Discussions with the School about PT training for YACs have begun.</p> <p>April 2018 Update: This has now been completed through support offered to YACs by the IMES PT Peer. All colleagues are encouraged to attend Mental Health training.</p>	<p>April 2018</p>
<p>7. The review team recommends that the University explores ways to improve career development opportunities for Teaching Fellows and new ways to recognise and recompense their contribution, as successfully implemented at other comparable institutions.</p>		<p>Response from Professor Jane Norman (Vice-Principal People and Culture): This recommendation has been discussed with the Director of HR and also the Deputy Secretary Student Experience. There is activity going on at University level about GH staff, some of which are teaching fellows. This work has been prioritised through wide discussion and will be reported through the usual channels.</p> <p>April 2018 Update (from IMES): The Principal's latest email on this has assured colleagues that there will be new routes of career development for Teaching Fellows which is a very welcome announcement.</p>	
<p>8. The review team recommends that the Subject Area, School and College review the offering of joint programmes and the processes of managing joint programmes.</p>	<p>September 2019</p>	<p>These are ongoing through discussions with partner subjects but a more systematic review will be undertaken as in point 2, re. programme review by Dr Andreas Goerke.</p> <p>April 2018 Update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - See above point 2. - Reformation of joint IMES-DELC programmes is underway, with revisions to the programmes passed by Board of Studies in 2017/2018 - The processes of managing joint programmes are revisited in the annual QA reports submitted to the LLC QA Committee - The School is in the process of reviewing all joint-programmes. 	

9. It is recommended that the Subject Area further explore formal training for PhD tutors.	AY 2017-18	<p>This is under review at both department and School level; it will be taken up in the IMES Postgraduate Committee in S1 2017-18.</p> <p>April 2018 Update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - IMES PhD tutors can draw on the IAD for teaching training and resources - IMES PhD tutors are encouraged to participate in the PGCAP and gain accreditation for their teaching 	April 2018
10. The review team recommends that the Subject Area explores further opportunities and in particular the Edinburgh Award as a means to formally recognise non-assessed and extra-curricular activity.	September 2019	<p>How best to develop further recognition of extra-curricular activities will take place in the review of UG programmes noted above, and will also be taken up by the IMES Careers Officer in S1 2017-18.</p> <p>April 2018 Update: This is an ongoing goal for IMES. IMES Students won the Edinburgh Award in March 2018.</p>	
11. The review team recommends that the Subject Area explore ways to maximise access hours to the subject specific library.	AY 2017-18	<p>This will be taken up by the Library Officer for 2017-18; calls for assistance with the library will be made to 4th years and PGs in Welcome Week</p> <p>April 2018 Update: Limited resources and access restrictions do not allow for out-of-hours or paid monitoring of the library. However, student volunteers have enabled the library to be open for extended and consistent periods of time in IMES in 2017/2018. IMES will continue to support the library and manage its volunteers.</p>	April 2018
Please report on steps taken to feedback to students on the outcomes of the review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Students were invited to a feedback meeting that was open to all students on staff on the day of the TPR. The purpose of the meeting was to feed back on the broad themes of the review along with the key commendations and recommendations that will be included in the report. - The review report was circulated to the internal student mailing lists. 		

Internal Review

Year-on response report on recommendation actions

TPR of: Social Work

Date of Review: 20 & 21 February 2017

The subject area is responsible for reporting on progress with all recommendations, including those remitted to other areas of the University for action.

Please report on progress towards meeting each recommendation. Any urgent recommendation should be highlighted along with a deadline for response.

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

Recommendation	Timescale for completion	Comment on progress towards completion and/or identify barriers to completion	Completion date
<p>1. The review team recommends that the School and subject area work together to ensure progress achieved in practice learning work is sustained, in particular by maintaining and developing the Practice Learning Fellow role. (School and Subject Area)</p>	<p>September 2018</p>	<p>The post-holder commenced in September 2017. The new Practice Learning Co-ordinator is reviewing and revising the subject area's practice learning strategy and working to enhance our relationships with practice colleagues in the field.</p> <p>In addition, the Grade 4 Professional Services post to support practice learning has been uplifted to Grade 5.</p>	
<p>2. The review team recommends that the School and subject area review and extend existing mechanisms of support for postgraduate tutors to achieve a more consistent experience for both postgraduate tutors and students, and to ensure that all postgraduate students have undertaken sufficient training before taking up tutoring roles. (School and Subject Area)</p>	<p>June 2019</p>	<p>Work has been continuing at School and subject level on this recommendation towards the June 2019 timescale. Points below re-iterate earlier progress, with some updates.</p> <p>The School has defined a plan for the general induction, training and support of PG Tutors. A teaching and student development fellow has been appointed and an explicit part of their job description is to work on cross-school initiatives around tutor development. As part of this, the graduate school have now started a policy for 2017/18 allowing subject areas to offer 3 hours of subject-specific tutor training.</p>	

		<p>The graduate school are continuing to look at how tutor training can result in some form of accreditation to help tutors in their future careers. The Director of Quality Assurance is leading on this. Our aim is that 50% of tutors will complete the Edinburgh Teaching Award, in house in SPS.</p> <p>At the Social Work Subject Area level, each UG non honours course organiser facilitates three meetings per course with PG tutors in order to provide specific course induction and to provide support and guidance to each tutor. Often this will involve an assessment/marking and feedback session. In general, we aim to engender a collegiate and supportive culture for our PG tutors. As course organisers we support PhD students to progress their teaching careers, including writing references to support PG Tutors submissions towards the Edinburgh Teaching Award.</p>	
<p>3. The review team recommends that the subject area and School consider how the work on assessment and feedback and learning can be enacted, and integrated into School-level strategic planning. (School and Subject Area Learning and Teaching Committee)</p>	<p>June 2019</p>	<p>This recommendation has been on the agenda of the Subject Area Learning and Teaching Committee, the graduate school (through programme directors groups), under-graduate schools and relevant School level committees in 2017/18. The School has advertised for a Deputy Head of School (DHoS) to work with the Directors of Under-Graduate and Graduate Schools to further develop comprehensive services and reviews of teaching and learning provision across the school.</p> <p>At subject level progress has been made, but has been somewhat limited as the L&T committee has met sporadically in this academic year due to staff changes, transitions and the recent industrial action. A named Social Work staff member has been appointed to chair the committee for 2018/19 and this will be a key agenda item to progress.</p>	

<p>4. The review team recommends that the School consider how the subject area can be further supported and integrated; for example, the School undergraduate and postgraduate offices should continue to consider ways to harmonise operations where possible, and the School could support the subject area in its development of internationalisation in the curriculum. (School Management Team)</p>	<p>June 2018</p>	<p>Progress has been made in integrating support functions for the social work subject area into both teaching offices. This includes the coursework elements of practice learning, which both offices will assume responsibility for during the 2018/19 academic year.</p> <p>The new Centenary Chair and Head of Social Work commenced in January 2018. The subject has convened an internationalization working group to develop a working paper for internal agreement on strategy by June 2018. Planning has commenced to launch two new programmes in 2020 in International Social Work and Global Mental Health following a market scoping.</p> <p>At School level, the new Deputy Head of School will have responsibility for harmonizing teaching administration. The DHoS post would commence with a review of processes and ways in which we can further harmonise our provision, and thus enhance student experiences whilst addressing ways in which we might refine administrative procedures.</p>	
<p>Please report on steps taken to feedback to students on the outcomes of the review</p>	<p>Emails sent thanking students for their contribution and informing them of the outcomes.</p> <p>Dissemination via student-staff liaison committees.</p>		