**Meeting of the Senatus Learning and Teaching Committee
to be held from 2pm on Wednesday 20 March 2013
in the Raeburn Room, Old College**

A G E N D A

1.	**Minutes of the previous meeting**		LTC 12/13 4 A
2.	**Matters arising**		
3.	**COMMITTEE BUSINESS**		
3.1	**Convenor's Update**	Oral report	
3.2	**Curriculum for Excellence** Professor Grant Jarvie	Presentation and Discussion	
3.3	**Development of University Equality Outcomes**	Consultation	LTC 12/13 4 B
4.	**STRATEGIC INITIATIVES AND ENHANCEMENTS**		
4.1	**Enhancing Student Support Project**	Report	LTC 12/13 4 C
4.2	**Flexible Pathways**	Oral update	
4.3	**MOOCs Task Group**	For approval	LTC 12/13 4 D
4.4	**Resits Working Group**	Oral update	
5.	**LEARNING AND TEACHING FRAMEWORK**		
5.1	**Learning and Teaching Enhancement Strategy Templates**	For discussion	LTC 12/13 4 E (Appendix 1 – CLOSED)
5.2	**ELIR Year on Response**	For information	LTC 12/13 4 F
5.3	**Student Surveys**	For information	LTC 12/13 4 H CLOSED
5.4	**Updates from Deans of Learning and Teaching (or equivalent)**	Oral report	
5.5	**Update from EUSA**	Oral report	
6.	**EXTERNAL HORIZON SCANNING**		
6.1	**Enhancement Themes** • Supporting and Developing the Curriculum 2011 – 2014	Oral update	
7.	**GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE**		
	Task Group on Tutoring and Demonstrating • Tutoring and Demonstrating Code of Practice	For discussion and approval	LTC 12/13 4 G CLOSED
8.	**Any Other Business**		
9.	**Date of Next Meeting** Wednesday 29 May 2013 in the Hodgson Room, Weir Building, King's Buildings		

N Kett/P Ward, February 2013

Minutes of the Senatus Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC)
held at 2pm on Wednesday 30 January 2013
in the Board Room, Chancellor's Building, Little France

Present:

Mr Andrew Burnie	EUSA VPAA
Dr Sarah Cooper	Undergraduate Director, Business School, CHSS
Ms Erin Jackson	Distance Learning Manager, School of Law (Co-opted Member)
Ms Nichola Kett (Secretary)	Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services
Ms Karen Harris	Assistant Head of Department, Academic Services (for Mrs Irene Bruce)
Dr Tina Harrison (Vice Convenor)	Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance
Dr Velda McCune	Deputy Director, Institute for Academic Development (Director's Nominee, ex officio)
Dr Antony Maciocia	Senior Lecturer, School of Mathematics (Co-opted Member)
Professor Ian Pirie	Assistant Principal Learning Developments (ex officio)
Professor Colin Pulham	Teaching Organisation Director, School of Chemistry, CSE
Professor Graeme Reid	Dean of Learning and Teaching, CSE
Dr Sue Rigby (Convenor)	Vice Principal Learning and Teaching
Professor Neil Turner	Director of Undergraduate Teaching and Learning, CMVM

In Attendance:

Dr Jon Turner	Director, Institute for Academic Development
Mr Mark Wilkinson	Project Manager, Student Support Project (observing)

Apologies:

Dr Nicholas Adams	Senior Lecturer, School of Divinity (Co-opted Member)
Mr Mateusz Adamski	EUSA
Professor Jeremy Bradshaw	Dean of Postgraduate Taught and International, CMVM
Mrs Irene Bruce	Head of Academic Services (University Secretary's Nominee)
Ms Shelagh Green	Director, Careers Service (Co-opted Member)
Mr John Lowrey	Dean of Undergraduate Studies, CHSS
Professor David Marshall	Director of Postgraduate Programmes, Business School, CHSS
Dr Caroline Watt	Senior Lecturer, School of Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences (Co-opted Member)

1. Minutes of the previous meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 November 2012 were approved subject to amendment to the phrasing of item 5.2.

2. Matters arising

2.1 Scottish Funding Council Outcome Agreement

The Convenor informed members that the final decision on the Outcome Agreement was not yet available.

3. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

3.1 Convenor's Update

Senate Committees' Symposium

The Convenor advised members that the Senate Committees' Symposium will take place on Friday 26 April 2013 and requested that members note this date in their diaries. This event will focus on future agenda planning.

Learning Technologies Advisory Group

The Convenor advised members that the remit of the Learning Technologies Advisory Group is currently being reviewed with the aim of articulating the link between Information Services and the Committee.

Seminar

The Convenor notified members that Professor Graham Gibbs will deliver a seminar at the University on Friday 1 March (2-4pm) titled "Improving university learning and teaching in a market - what the evidence suggests we ought to be doing and what seems to be going on." The content of the seminar will likely be extremely relevant to future sector developments and all members have been sent an invitation to attend.

Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs)

Members were informed that over the next year and half the responsibility for the development of MOOCs will move into the domain of the Committee. In order to facilitate this, a small but long-life Task Group will be established to make recommendations to the Committee on the evaluation and future development of MOOCs. Dr Maciocia will lead the group and Amy Woodgate will support the group. Members who are interested in joining the group should notify the Secretary.

Action: Members who are interested in joining the group to notify Nichola Kett (nichola.kett@ed.ac.uk).

4. **STRATEGIC INITIATIVES AND ENHANCEMENTS**

4.1 Enhancing Student Support Project

Professor Pirie highlighted two main aspects of the project. Firstly, in terms of funding, it was confirmed that this is recurrent and has therefore been mainstreamed. Secondly, in relation to postgraduate research students, it was confirmed that phase three of the project will focus on the development of enhanced support for these students without the creation of additional layer of Personal Tutors.

Nichola Kett confirmed that the project deliverables are mostly on track and that action has been taken to mediate those that are not.

Mark Wilkinson confirmed that good progress is being made in the Student Support Project through Task Group work and the employment of staff.

4.2 Flexible Pathways

Members discussed the progression of this work strand and agreed that the working group would explore:

- Flexible entry and exit points.
- Flexibility to enable study abroad.
- Current internal practices (including identifying and categorising areas of strength).
- Articulation.
- Distance learning (existing areas of success and limitations).
- Part-time study.
- External drivers (including the widening participation agenda).

Members noted that there were risks in routinely applying such developments across the University and strongly agreed that the focus should be on identifying areas of strength and where these could be meaningfully developed and applied.

Action: A working group to be established to explore this work strand. Members who are interested in participating to notify Nichola Kett (nichola.kett@ed.ac.uk). Convenor and Secretary to formalise group membership and define timescales.

4.3 Continuing Professional Development for Learning and Teaching

Dr McCune outlined the background to the paper, which proposes an overarching framework for continuing professional development (CPD) relating to learning and teaching. Members commended the content of the paper which allows maximum flexibility whilst still meeting the requirements of accreditation.

There was some discussion about whether the framework will be compulsory for staff. It was confirmed that there is currently no external requirement for recording this information in Scotland, but there was a recognition that this may change in future. It was stressed that the framework is being developed for staff so that recognition can be given for learning and teaching and that whilst external compliance shouldn't drive such initiatives, it is important to remain abreast of external developments. Members recommended that careful consideration be given to communicating developments to staff and that an explanation of why this has been developed should be given. Dr Turner confirmed that further consultation would take place to inform developments.

Action: It was agreed that a report on developments (following the accreditation process and initial engagement) should be presented to the Committee in late spring 2014.

4.4 Resits Working Group

Professor Pirie is leading the working group that is developing proposals to reduce the number of resits. The group has met three times and produced outline recommendations and related proposed work streams as detailed in the paper.

There was a substantial discussion of the recommendations, including the following main points:
- Consideration should be given to resources and the benefits for staff and students of reducing resits by examination.
- Off-campus assessment could benefit many different groups of students, including distance learning and MOOC students.
- The end of course examinations as an authenticating method of assessment.
- The possibility of awarding credits on aggregate for students exiting with a non-honours degree.
- The need to take careful consideration of special circumstances.
- Longer-term, it is important to fully explore the methods of assessment rather than simply making small changes to the resit process.
- The recognition that there will likely always be a need for formal resit examinations.
- The challenges of 'fitting in' and spreading different methods of assessment across the academic year.
- Increased usage of formative assessment providing students with ongoing feedback.
- The possibility of developing alternative assessments for those students who have failed a significant volume and who wish to exit with a non-honours degree. .

Recommendations

1. *That we do not attempt to run any pilots in academic year 2012/13 since this would represent a major change in assessment practice within the academic cycle and could potentially put students at risk.*

   Members **agreed** with this recommendation.

2. *That work-streams are set up to develop proposals in each of the categories highlighted, reporting by August 1st 2013 to enable the implementation of pilots in all Schools for academic session 2013/14.*

   Work Streams:

   1. *Undertaking invigilated or online examinations off-campus*

      Members **agreed** that this work stream should be progressed immediately.

   2. *Supplementary assessment/retake opportunities within the academic year*

      Members **agreed** that the issues surrounding this work package be explored. Members noted this approach includes risks in terms of ensuring parity, potentially overburdening students with existing issues, and for courses with professional body/practical requirements.

   3. *Alignment of learning outcomes to assessment tasks*

      Work in this area will be informed by pilots as detailed in recommendation 3 below.

   4. *The regulatory framework surrounding assessment and progression*

      Members **agreed** that this work stream should be progressed immediately. As a priority, the current flexibility within the regulations should be clarified and communicated.

3. *Discussions to take place with all Schools to identify appropriate courses in which to undertake pilots in each of the areas with a view to providing alternative forms of supplementary assessment where there is no PSRB requirement that the assessment method must be undertaken by examination.*

   On the proviso that Schools are invited to take part (rather than all Schools being required to take part), members **agree** with this recommendation. It was hoped that the majority of Schools would participate and that College Learning and Teaching Committees could discuss the outcomes of the pilots. Additionally, the perceived requirement for an end of course examination should be considered in the broader analysis of programme assessment.

4. *That the current Re-sits Working Group remains in place and will now report to CSPC to develop the implementation plans and any necessary amendments to the assessment and progression regulations.*

   Subject to the conditions above, members **agreed** with this recommendation.

5.   LEARNING AND TEACHING FRAMEWORK

5.1 Learning and Teaching Enhancement Strategies

University

Dr Maciocia confirmed that the strategy now takes account of the updated Strategic Plan and makes reference to research-teaching linkages (a requested action from the Enhancement-led Institutional Review). The updated University Learning and Teaching Enhancement Strategy was approved.

School

Professor Pirie had led the working group charged with developing the School Learning and Teaching Enhancement Strategy template and introduced the paper. Members were reminded that the proposal would constitute a longer term strategy accompanied by an annual operational plan. The plan would be web enabled.

It was noted that in the College of Science and Engineering Schools are asked to produce a similar document as that proposed as part of the annual planning round. The Convenor advised that the aim of the strategies is to be able to demonstrate that all Schools are engaging with enhancement activities. It was agreed that consideration would be given to the timing of the production of such strategies (nominally November) and their role in guiding the annual planning round.

5.2 Equality Act: Adjustments

Dr Harrison introduced the paper which addressed all the actions requested by members at the last meeting. Members were reminded that the University has an obligation to make reasonable adjustments for entitled students, unless there is a clearly stated justified pedagogic reason for not doing so. It was noted that the published statistics of adjustments not implemented were a product of student perception and could benefit from clarification and comment by staff (e.g. identifying where it is not possible to implement adjustments).

Recording of Classes

There was some discussion about an early stage initiative to obtain software to enable staff to record and distribute recordings of classes. It was noted that this is not being recommended in the paper presented. The importance of learning driving innovation rather than it being driven by technology was stressed.

Mark Wilkinson had previously worked at Stirling University and was able to talk to members about the policy which has been in place for some time. Members were reassured that this policy had been unproblematic. Professor Reid also informed members that in the School of Biological Sciences, this was the second year of recordings taking place and there had been no issues.

Members **agreed** to approve the mainstreaming of all the proposed adjustments for implementation at the start of academic session 2013/14.

Further areas of work:
- Advise Senate of developments (Dr Harrison).
- Work with the Academic Registry to add the required wording that students agree to upon matriculation.
- It was suggested that an audit of microphone availability is carried out.

- Support for staff with the implementation of the proposal (e.g. communication including a clarifying FAQ document).

5.3 Student Surveys

Dr Harrison informed members that the Edinburgh Student Experience Survey is now open for all non-honours students. It will close slightly earlier than the National Student Survey (NSS) to enable reporting to Court. Members were encouraged to ask colleagues to promote the survey to students.

The Convenor confirmed that she will soon present a mediation strategy on the NSS to the Principal's Strategy Group. The documents relating to this will be circulated to members. The need for allowing individual/local solutions to issues raised by students was recognised.

5.4 Updates from Deans of Learning and Teaching (or equivalent)

College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine
Professor Turner advised members that there were no additional items to report that were not otherwise discussed elsewhere on the agenda.

College of Science and Engineering
Professor Reid advised that discussions with Schools on the NSS and learning and teaching enhancements had taken place. Action plans were being developed and the process will be revisited in a few months time.

5.5 Update from EUSA

Mr Burnie advised members of the following developments:

- A policy on the Higher Education Achievement Record (HEAR) has been developed as students would like to see improvements made.
- A policy on anonymous marking was recently passed and a paper will be presented to a future Committee meeting.
- EUSA continue to work on progressing matters between students and Schools.

The Convenor thanked Mr Burnie for the update and confirmed that the Committee look forward to receiving further information on relevant policies. Whilst the Committee would welcome further discussion on matters and would be responsive to issues raised, it was recognised that it may not be possible to make changes requested for good reason.

6 EXTERNAL HORIZON SCANNING

6.1 Enhancement Themes

- **Supporting and Developing the Curriculum 2011 – 2014**

Professor Pirie is the institutional lead for the theme and advised that there is work currently taking place across the University that fits with aspects of the theme. Consideration will be given to the structure of the institutional team.

Members were advised that the International Enhancement Theme conference takes place on 11-13 June in Glasgow and that two students from the School of Mathematics will be presenting a session under the empowering students strand.

6.2 External Developments

- **Mapping of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education – Chapter B3: Learning and Teaching**

The Convenor confirmed that the mapping demonstrates how our internal policies map on to the Quality Code. Further consideration by the Committee to the areas for further development will be needed.

Action: Secretary to update document and pass to the Convenor for final approval before it is considered by the Quality Assurance Committee.

7   Any Other Business

None.

8   Date of Next Meeting

Wednesday 20 March 2013 in the Raeburn Room, Old College.

Academic Services
31 January 2013

LTC 12/13 4 B

<u>The University of Edinburgh</u>

Learning and Teaching Committee

20th March 2013

Development of University Equality Outcomes

<u>Brief description of the paper, including a statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities</u>

This paper outlines the legal context and the approach being taken to developing University Equality Outcomes by 30 April 2013, to meet the statutory requirement under the Equality Act 2010 (Specific Duties) (Scotland) Regulations 2012, and seeks views on priorities to address.

<u>Action requested</u>

The committee is asked to give its views on priorities to address through the University's Equality Outcomes.

<u>Resource implications</u>

Does the paper have resource implications? Yes - the Equality Outcomes will include action with implications for staff time and financial resources.

<u>Risk Assessment</u>

Does the paper include a risk analysis? No. However, the statutory requirements are set out in sections 9-12.

<u>Equality and Diversity</u>

Has due consideration been given to the equality impact of this paper? Yes. The Equality Outcomes are concerned with advancing equality in the University, and addressing the University's statutory equality duty.

<u>Freedom of information</u>

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes

<u>Originator of the paper</u>

Eilidh Fraser, Deputy Director of HR
12 March 2013

Learning and Teaching Committee

20 March 2013

Development of University Equality Outcomes

Introduction

1. This paper outlines the approach being taken to developing University Equality Outcomes by 30 April 2013, to meet the statutory requirement under the Equality Act 2010 (Specific Duties) (Scotland) Regulations 2012 ('Specific Duties'), and seeks the Learning and Teaching Committee's views.

Legal Context

2. The Equality Act 2010 (Specific Duties) (Scotland) Regulations 2012 place specific duties on the University to enable the better performance of the public sector equality duty[1], or 'general duty'. The general equality duty requires the University, in the exercise of its functions, to have due regard to three **needs**. These are the need to:

    •   Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act

    •   Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a relevant protected characteristic[2] and those who do not, *particularly through*
        o   *Removing or minimising disadvantage*
        o   *Meeting the needs of particular groups that are different from the needs of others*
        o   *Encouraging participation in public life*

    •   Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not, *i.e. tackle prejudice and promote understanding between people from different groups*

3. The Specific Duties include a duty for the University to publish a set of Equality Outcomes which it considers will enable the University to better perform the general equality duty. These Equality Outcomes must be published by 30 April 2013.

4. An Equality Outcome is defined[3] as: a result which we aim to achieve in order to further one or more of the needs mentioned in the general equality duty.

5. The Specific Duties require the University to consider relevant evidence relating to equality groups and communities and to involve them in developing Equality Outcomes.

---

[1] Introduced by the Equality Act 2010

[2] The general equality duty covers the following protected characteristics: age, disability, gender, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief and sexual orientation. It also covers marriage and civil partnership with regard to eliminating unlawful discrimination in employment.

[3] In the Equality and Human Rights Commission's Guidance on the Scottish Specific Duties.

2

Process for developing University of Edinburgh Equality Outcomes

6. In addition to meeting the statutory requirements, it is intended that the preparation and publication of Equality Outcomes will help the University to ensure the right issues are being addressed; make better, fairer decisions; become more transparent and accountable in relation to action to advance equality; and achieve tangible benefits for its community.

7. The following approach is being taken to ensure that our Equality Outcomes are aligned with the University's strategy and objectives and take full account of the available evidence, including the views of equality groups.

8. The Equality Outcomes are being developed with close reference to the University's Strategic Plan and other existing strategies, plans and external requirements, including the University's E&D Strategy and Action Plan and its Athena SWAN Action Plan; and the SFC Outcome Agreement.

9. Senior University management are being involved through consideration by a range of committees, including Staff Committee, CMG and Senate Committees.

10. Statistical evidence is being gathered and considered, using existing mechanisms, particularly the E&D Monitoring and Research Committee (EDMARC) student and staff reports, supplemented where appropriate and feasible. New data on sexual orientation, religion and belief and gender identity for staff will be produced following the staff survey in January. However, data on these characteristics for students is not currently available, which is a matter for consideration for the future.

11. Evidence is also being gathered through consultation with:

    a. University functions, committees and groups with particular expertise or experience in particular equality areas, such as the Student Disability Service, the Chaplaincy and the E&D and Student Disability Committees

    b. Student and staff groups, including EUSA and the trade unions.

    c. Individual staff from particular equality groups (e.g. disabled staff and black and minority ethnic staff), individually and through focus groups.

12. Any suggestions from the Learning and Teaching Committee regarding others who could be consulted, particularly in relation to the student community, would be welcomed.

Equality Outcomes

13. It is intended that the University's Equality Outcomes will address the most relevant and significant equality issues for the University.

14. The Equality Outcomes will be in the form of an action plan, setting out the following for each Equality Outcome:

    a. the issue/challenge/area for improvement we have identified
    b. the Equality Outcome, i.e. the result we intend to achieve

3

c. specific actions/activities and outputs to be undertaken in order to achieve the outcome, with timescales
　 d. the person/office/group responsible for each action
　 e. the 'need(s)' from the general equality duty that is/are being addressed, and the relevant Protected Characteristics (PCs)

15. The table in Appendix 1 gives examples of Equality Outcomes currently being considered.

16. The Learning and Teaching Committee is invited to consider these potential Equality Outcomes and give its views on priorities to address through the Equality Outcomes – particularly in relation to students, and as appropriate to the Committee's remit.

Eilidh K Fraser, Deputy Director of HR
12 March 2013

Examples of Potential University Equality Outcomes

The examples below are being considered as Equality Outcomes. However, the list is not exhaustive and the text is very much in draft.

Issue/ challenge/ improvement	Equality Outcomes	Activities and Outputs	Respon-sibility	General duty 'need' and Protected Characteristic (PC)
Mainstream consideration of equality	Improve account taken of equality impact in decision-making and policy	Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) of all new/revised policies and practices at UoE, College and School/service levels	Heads of College/ Services/ Schools/ committees	All three needs, for all PCs
		Promotion and audit of EqIA	Tbc	
		Specific plans for review of formal student policies and HR policies, to include EqIA.	Tbc (student policies) University HR Services (UHRS) (HR policies)	
		Promote and monitor take up of E&D training and development for all staff	UHRS, IAD and Heads of College and Support Group	
Improve data on PCs and coverage of equality monitoring and reporting to meet the specific duties and support EqIA	Improve data in order to further other Equality Outcomes	Improve availability of data on maternity leave and return, and flexible working. Including developing systems to enable automated reporting on maternity and other parental leave.	UHRS and local HR teams	All three needs and all PCs except marriage/civil partnership
		Improve data on disability, ethnicity, gender identity, sexual orientation, religion and belief for staff and students, to enable better monitoring of impact.	UHRS (for staff) Tbc (For students)	
		Establish and publish regular reports on equality data in relation to recruitment, development, promotion, Annual Review and	UHRS/ EDMARC[4]	

---

[4] Equality & Diversity Monitoring and Research Committee

5

		occupational segregation, expanding on current standard reporting, to support Athena SWAN, Strategic Plan reporting, EqIA.		
		Embed biennial equal pay audits covering all staff.	UHRS	
Embed accessibility in the curriculum	Widen understanding of accessibility in the curriculum and increase the application of good practice	*Suggestion for discussion*		All three needs and all PCs
Remedy the disparity in pay and career progress for women relative to men.	Increase the proportion of female academic staff at lecturer, senior lecturer, reader and professor levels and reduce the gender pay gap for University staff, during the Strategic Plan 2012-16	Majority of STEMM[5] schools achieve Athena SWAN awards by the end of 2014 Achieve the Institutional Athena SWAN Silver award, during the Strategic Plan 2012-16 (incorporating achievement of the University's Athena SWAN Action Plan) Complete and evaluate pilot of Mentoring framework and extend to other areas, by August 2014. To cover academic and professional services staff, and particularly target women.	Heads of STEMM schools UoE Athena SWAN Network UHRS	Eliminate discrimination and advance equality for women
Improve the environment to ensure that LGBT staff and students feel confident about being 'out' at work/in the University	Improve the ability of LGBT staff and students to be comfortable to be themselves in the University	Develop and implement an action plan based on the Stonewall Champion and Gay by Degrees assessment criteria	Senior HR Partner Employee Relations (for staff) Tbc (for students)	Advance equality and promote good relations in respect of Sexual Orientation and gender reassignment
Improve the level, transparency and consistency of support for disabled staff;	Improved staff disability support, with a particular emphasis on mental health.	Implementation of new staff disability policy; improved and clearer services and support for disabled staff. Progress with See Me action plan.	Tbc	All three needs in respect of Disability

---

[5] Science, Technology, Engineering, Maths and Medicine

6

and encourage openness about disability – especially in relation to mental health.		Extended staff development provision on mental health awareness and related services.		
Mainstream implementation of disability adjustments for students at school level	Mainstreaming of basic, common adjustments in the educational provision.	*The appropriate outcome and detailed actions in relation to disabled students will be discussed with the Student Disability Service and Student Disability Committee.*	Tbc	Advance equality in respect of Disability
Address the disparity in the proportion of black and minority ethnic staff on fixed-term contracts relative to white staff.	Improve understanding of this disparity, and identify measures to reduce it.	Produce deeper analysis of the data.	EDMARC	Eliminate discrimination and advance equality in respect of Race.
Address potential conflict relating to differing beliefs.	Improve mutual consideration and respect, through improved religious literacy	Tbc	Tbc	Promote good relations in relation to Religion and Belief
Address the relatively low proportion of UK domicile BME students	Improve application and admission rates for BME students.	*Suggestion for discussion*		Eliminate discrimination and advance equality in respect of Race.

LTC 12/13 4 C

Enhancing Student Support Project

Brief description of the paper, including a statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities

The paper presents an update on the Enhancing Student Support (ESS) Project.

The paper relates to the University's Strategic Goal of 'Excellence in Education' and the Strategic Theme of 'Outstanding Student Experience'.

Action requested

The committee as is asked to **note** the contents of this paper

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? **Yes** – (being managed through the Project)

Risk Assessment

Does the paper include a risk analysis? **NO**

Equality and Diversity

Has due consideration been given to the equality impact of this paper? **Yes**

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? **Yes**

Originator of the paper

Professor Ian Pirie,
Assistant Principal, Learning and Development

9th March 2013

ENHANCING STUDENT SUPPORT (ESS) - MARCH 2013

Summary report on the progress of Phase Two

Personal Tutors for PGT

Several consultation meetings have now been held across all three Colleges to inform discussions around the development of Personal Tutors for PGT students. Students have consistently confirmed that this development is welcomed and is also broadly supported by staff with the added concern of managing available resources. As highlighted previously, where post-graduate programmes are relatively small (<30) many Programme Directors have intimated they wish to undertake the role of Personal Tutor given that they already in part undertake these duties. There are continued concerns however around the management of workloads and the ratios of Tutees to Personal Tutors which in some cases are significantly in excess of 50 – 1; this was never envisaged as an ideal scenario. SSIG is now undertaking an analysis of PT/Tutee ratios and patterns of allocation across the University to further inform discussion and recommendations on this issue.

Implementation planning is well advanced and is now at the stage of Schools developing their Personal Tutoring Statements to include PGT.

https://www.wiki.ed.ac.uk/display/PESS/Opportunities+to+Contribute

Post Graduate Research Students

Throughout phase two of the project discussions have continued around the enhancement and support required for PGR in preparation for phase three. Given the concerns around resourcing and the pace of current change it has been decided that phase three should be conducted over two academic cycles to give the appropriate amount of consideration and time to conduct a review of the requirements of PGR masters and doctoral students. It is not envisaged that Personal Tutors in their current form would be implemented for doctoral students and that a PGR task group will explore and make recommendations on the types of additional support and enhancements that would be appropriate for this group.

The development of the new framework of supervision and support for PGR will be informed by the UK Quality Code - Part B: Chapter B11 Research Degrees - http://www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Documents/Quality-Code-Chapter-B11.pdf

It is also envisaged that a more comprehensive suite of online tools would be developed and/or procured to manage and support the supervision of research students. The requirements and scope of these would also be developed in parallel as part of the review stage of phase three during 2013-14. The following are links to

examples of the types of online tools and management information already in use at Manchester University and UCL.

http://www.progressplatform.co.uk
https://researchlog.grad.ucl.ac.uk/

Online Resources

A second 'synectics' style creative thinking event organised by EUSA was held with students on 23rd January. The event was very well attended with a good spread of students across all levels of study. The focus was on exploring their ideas around the development of a student dashboard / portal with a view to understanding the types of information students would find most useful. The approach was again highly successful and confirmed current thinking and/or produced some interesting findings; for example that students broadly need the same types of information regardless of the level of their studies *(remarkable consistency)* and that they wish to gain access to all of their information easily from one place – i.e. social as well as academic. One area of particular interest was to receive their own performance marks/grades in context – i.e. 'how well am I performing against the average for my course or my peers'. This information will now be used with further student focus groups and possibly surveys to contribute to the strategic development of the student portal/dashboard.

IT Tools for the Personal Tutor System

The joint student systems partnership (SSP) team have now introduced a number of small scale enhancements to the original set of functions and most recently released the calendar function. This enables appointments to be arranged with the information for the meeting automatically populating the respective electronic personal calendars of students and staff. Significant progress has been made in defining and agreeing the scope and requirements for PGT students and the teams are already building the required relationships and functions in the tools. Unlike phase one where time was severely constrained, testing will occur much earlier and the development teams are already planning the testing phases now to enable sufficient time for staff induction and/or refresher training well in advance of the start of session 2013-14.

What has been highlighted in discussion is the need to introduce opportunities and training for both staff and students to explore how the tools could be used more effectively and/or creatively - i.e. not simply technically how they function. Workshops will be arranged to in support of this.

Peer Support

The second benchmarking event for ESS was held on 19th of February and the morning session focussed on Peer support. Marcia Ody from the University of Manchester provided the keynote and the parallel sessions run throughout the morning provided colleagues with the opportunity to share experiences of the various

models in operation around the University. Very positive feedback has been received on the event itself and has generated renewed efforts to further enhance and develop the peer support strand. Katie Scott, EUSA Development Officer for Peer Support, has produced a 'Toolkit' and comprehensive resources to assist Schools introduce or develop their peer support. All on-campus undergraduates will be able to engage in some form of peer support as an option during session 2013-14 and Schools that previously had no form of peer support will be introducing initial pilots.

During her keynote Marcia Ody confirmed the added value Manchester had found in fully embedding peer support programmes across the University.

Briefing, Training and Resources

IAD have developed a comprehensive schedule of events, training materials and online resources in support of the development and implementation of the Personal Tutor system and this is further augmented and supported by central departments. Building on the experience from the phase one implementation, facilitated events at College level with locally tailored approaches for the Schools to cascade training proved to be most effective. This approach is being adopted again and strengthened in the planning for phase two implementation. The existing online resources are currently being evaluated and enhanced to include materials to support post-graduate level study.

Communications

Communications of project developments remains a critical strand of work within ESS to ensure that key stakeholder groups are appropriately informed and consulted. This however continues to pose a challenge in that communication is not a one-way transmission of information. Despite best efforts the project team in equal measure receive requests to be included in or excluded from the communication channels and clearly there is no ideal position. Current information and resources are available via the project wiki and any member of staff can ask to be included in the communication circulations and/or become directly involved in the project.

The ESS communication strategy is currently being reviewed and updated.

https://www.wiki.ed.ac.uk/display/PESS/Home

Monitoring, Evaluation and Enhancement (MEE)

The initial work of the group is now concluded and members assigned to the three sub-strands to develop the implementation plans.

    1) *Semi-Structured Focus Groups*
    These will be developed by IAD in conjunction with College representatives
    and an external consultant and will seek to understand what students desire

and/or are expecting in areas such as academic advice and guidance, a more personalised experience and belonging to a community of learners.

2) *PT Online Questionnaire*
This will be developed by the College Deans with responsibility for QA in conjunction with the Survey Unit and will build upon the recent ESES internal questionnaire with a specific focus on the issues around the Personal Tutor/Tutee partnership, academic and personal support.

3) *Learning Analytics*
This will be developed by AP Learning Developments, College Deans of Students and SACS. This strand represents a relatively new area of exploration for the University and is intended to illuminate and enhance our understanding of the varying levels of student satisfaction in relation to their patterns of engagement, performance and overall learning experience.

Training and resources will be developed as appropriate for the various strands and available prior to the commencement of the next academic session.

Student Experience Project

The review of central services carried out in phase one of ESS has developed several strands of work as previously highlighted and now represents a significant part of the enhancing student support initiative. This principle strand of ESS has been re-named the Student Experience Project to more clearly reflect the range of initiatives. Also given the scale of these developments I have suggested to the project manager that a more comprehensive update on each of the task-group strands is prepared for LTC to receive in May 2013.

For information as follows:

Student Experience Project	Mark Wilkinson - PM	m.wilkinson@ed.ac.uk
Induction and Pre-arrival	Ruth Stewart - Lead	Ruth.Stewart@ed.ac.uk
Student Information Points	Sarah Purves - Lead	Sarah.Purves@eusa.ed.ac.uk
Student Communication	Janet Rennie - Lead	Janet.Rennie@ed.ac.uk
Online Resources	Shelagh Green - Lead	Shelagh.Green@ed.ac.uk
Emergency Response	Bruce Nelson - Lead	D.B.Nelson@ed.ac.uk
Enhanced Selection	Rebecca Gaukroger - Lead	Rebecca.Gaukroger@ed.ac.uk
Survey Unit	Tina Harrison - Lead	Tina.Harrison@ed.ac.uk

Professor Ian Pirie
Assistant Principal, Learning Developments

9th March 2013

LTC 12/13 4 D

Learning and Teaching Committee

20 March 2013

Task Group: Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs)

Brief description of the paper, including a statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities

The paper outlines the proposed remit and membership of the MOOCs Task Group.

Action requested

For consideration and discussion

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? No

Risk Assessment

Does the paper include a risk analysis? No

Equality and Diversity

Has due consideration been given to the equality impact of this paper? No

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes

Originator of the paper

Antony Maciocia
Philippa Ward
March 2013

Senatus Learning and Teaching Committee

Task Group: Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs)

- **Remit**

The University of Edinburgh currently has a contract with Coursera to contribute MOOCs to its system to run for three year cycles. Six were started in January 2013, and a further ten or so are planned for 2013/14.

The current approval and QA mechanisms are very light touch through SCSPC and SQAC, bypassing the usual School and College committees, and the pedagogical oversight is currently in the hands of the VP Knowledge Management. In the longer term, this will need to be taken over by the Senatus Learning and Teaching Committee (SLTC).

The world of MOOCs is a rapidly changing one, and there are a large number of potential opportunities opening up for their use. There are also dangers and risks involved with any level of involvement.

This Task Group is being set up under the auspices of SLTC to provide evidence, and make proposals for a way forward.

- **Activity**

  - Examination of data from the January 2013 round of MOOCs, and collection of evidence from relevant individuals involved in course creation, IS support for MOOCs within the University of Edinburgh, Coursera, and other experts both inside and outwith the University of Edinburgh.
  - Exploration of funding mechanisms and identification of potential sources of income generation.

- **Deliverables**

A range of proposals for a way forward, to include:

  - which VLE or VLEs to use;
  - direct and indirect funding mechanisms;
  - description of articulation with on-campus courses, and possible mechanisms for attaching credit if appropriate;
  - suggestions for uses of MOOCs to tackle widening participation issues;
  - course approval mechanisms and criteria;
  - course QA descriptors with KPIs.

Costings to be included with each proposal wherever possible, and identification of appropriate return on investment.

- **Timescales**

The Task Group will report by July 2013.

- **Membership**

  The Task Group will be composed of a small group of individuals, including representation from each College.

Antony Maciocia / Philippa Ward

March 2013

LTC 12/13 4 E

<u>The University of Edinburgh</u>

Learning and Teaching Committee

20th March 2013

Learning and Teaching Enhancement Strategy Templates

<u>Brief description of the paper, including a statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities</u>

This is a follow up paper to the LTES proposal which was approved in principle at LTC on 30th January. The paper seeks additional guidance from LTC prior to piloting the use of the templates.

<u>Action requested</u>

LTC is asked to **discuss** and **approve** the level of detail required and terminology used within the LTES templates

<u>Resource implications</u>

Does the paper have resource implications? NO

<u>Risk Assessment</u>

Does the paper include a risk analysis? NO

<u>Equality and Diversity</u>

Has due consideration been given to the equality impact of this paper? NO

<u>Freedom of information</u>

Can this paper be included in open business? YES

<u>Originator of the paper</u>

Professor Ian Pirie,
Assistant Principal, Learning and Development

10th March 2013

School Learning and Teaching Enhancement Strategy Template

At the Learning and Teaching Committee held on 30th January 2013, the proposal for the development of a template for Schools' Learning and Teaching Enhancement Strategies was approved in principle subject to an initial pilot being conducted by three Schools drawn from each of the Colleges.

The pilot group has subsequently met and discussed the merits of various approaches to devising the templates and as a result would welcome further guidance from LTC regarding finalising the template prior to the pilots being undertaken.

The issues requiring guidance are as follows;

1) The terminology used in the current University's Strategic plan was felt to be in-part confusing – i.e. lack of clarity around the use of Goals, Aims and Objectives.

   The intention had initially been to use the same terminology in the Schools LTES template as is used in the University's strategic plan to assist with demonstrating alignment between School strategies and key University priorities.

2) The University's strategic plan adopts the language of 'Targets' and 'KPIs' as indicators and measures of progress and success.

   The group felt that if alternative language or terminology was used to identify and evidence success that this was likely to gain greater adoption and 'buy-in' from the academic community – e.g. enable greater flexibility for Schools to indicate what the intended benefits and impacts might be and how the success of these would be evidenced.

A draft template is attached with different options for PART 2B that indicates the annual enhancement activity in each School and guidance from LTC would be welcome on the level of detail expected and terminology to be used.

Also attached for information is the learning and teaching development plan currently in use for the MBChB in MVM and an extract from 'Implementing Learning and Teaching Strategies – a guide to good practice', from the HEA sector-wide study on the effective use of strategic plans to enhance learning and teaching.

Appendix 1 - Learning and Teaching Development Plans, MBChB, MVM

Appendix 2 - Extract from 'Implementing Learning and Teaching Strategies'

http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/documents/networks/cetl/Implementing_Learning_and_Teaching_Strategies.pdf

Professor Ian Pirie,
Assistant Principal, Learning and Development

9th March 2013

School Learning and Teaching Enhancement Strategy: 2013-16

PART 1

School:		Head of School:	
Date:		Director of Learning and Teaching:	

Strategic Goals: 2013 - 16

Overview and context

Learning and Teaching Enhancements: 2013 - 14

PART 2A

School:		Head of School:	
Date:		Director of Learning and Teaching:	

Enhancement Priorities: 2013 - 14

Rationale and context

Aims: 2013 - 14

Learning and Teaching Enhancements: 2013 - 14

PART 2B

School:		Head of School:	
Date:		Director of Learning and Teaching:	

Projects and Initiatives: 2013 - 14

No.	Topic	Staff Lead / Team	Deliverables	Ref.

Learning and Teaching Enhancements: 2013 - 14
PART 2B

School:		Head of School:	
Date:		Director of Learning and Teaching:	

Projects and Initiatives: 2013 - 14

Nos	Topic		Staff Lead / Team	Measures of Success	Ref.
	Objectives				

Nos	Topic		Staff Lead / Team	Measures of Success	Ref.
	Objectives				

Nos	Topic		Staff Lead / Team	Measures of Success	Ref.
	Objectives				

'Implementing Learning and Teaching Strategies – a guide to good practice'

Professor Graham Gibbs

The following characteristics were identified in the study as weaknesses in developing an effective approach to the creation, adoption and implementation of learning and teaching strategies.

Extract states;

Weaknesses

1. poor focus on national priorities by some institutions

2. poor focus on student retention by many institutions

3. very weak specification of SMART targets by many institutions

4. limited emphasis on evaluation, including limited evidence of learning from implementation of the strategy to date

5. many small institutions still have weak learning and teaching strategies

6. it is common to exclude learning and teaching development needs and priorities of franchise and partner institutions

7. rhetoric concerning the strength of teaching being built on research strengths is often without any accompanying justification or convincing action that is designed to strengthen this link

8. some funded activity is weakly linked to the rationale of the strategy, poorly specified and inadequately costed

9. it is sometimes difficult to see how departments and academic staff would 'buy in' to the strategy, given that much activity is centrally driven. There is a weak understanding of the consultation and debate required. There is little evidence of implementation that involves a cycle of central and departmental identification of goals and activities.

http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/documents/networks/cetl/Implementing_Learning_and_Teaching_Strategies.pdf

University of Edinburgh

Enhancement-led Institutional Review 2011-12

Year-on Response

Introduction

The University of Edinburgh welcomes the ELIR Report and the positive comments. The ELIR Report has provided us with an opportunity to consolidate enhancement plans and make significant progress in a number of key areas identified in the Report. The Report has been helpful in structuring and providing a focus to those activities.

Immediately following receipt of the ELIR Report the document was analysed by Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance in conjunction with the Senate Committee Conveners and Academic Services to identify the key recommendations and actions. These 34 separate actions were developed into a three-year planning document[1] to ensure that significant action is taken before the next ELIR. Priorities were attached to each action taking into account the strength of the recommendation made in the ELIR Report, ongoing University priorities and existing resources. The highest priority actions are receiving immediate attention in 2012/13, whereas the lower priority actions may not begin to be addressed until 2013/14, depending on resources, and the time taken to complete them may extend over a longer period. Regardless of the priority, we expect to have made significant progress against all actions over the three year period from 2012/13 to 2014/15.

In assigning priorities to actions we were mindful of the comment made in the ELIR Report [paragraph 88] that notes: "The University has been slow to fully address a number of the matters contained within the 2006 ELIR report, particularly those relating to the management of the student experience [e.g. pastoral and academic support and feedback]... The University is asked to ensure that it addresses all of the outcomes from the current ELIR in a timely manner". As a result, all actions relating to the student experience, student support and feedback have been prioritised as a matter of urgency and immediate action is being taken in this year followed by a programme of action over the next two years.

In order to address the recommendations in a meaningful and manageable way, a themed approach is being taken to ensure the alignment of ELIR themes with key themes in the University's Strategic Plan and with core enhancement activities supported by Academic Services, thus ensuring that the ELIR recommendations are addressed as part of an integrated planning process. The purpose of integrating the ELIR recommendations with University objectives and priorities is to align activities in a way that maximises the meaningfulness of the ELIR to the institution, promotes

---

[1] http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/academic-services/quality-unit/institutional-review-elir/2011

ownership of ELIR outcomes and subsequent progress, and helps enhance the impact of the actions taken. Both Academic Services and EUSA are key partners in this process.

The 34 separate actions have been grouped into six key substantive themes, approved by Senate Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) at its meeting on 24th May 2012[2] and at the 6th June 2012 meeting of Senate[3]: Curriculum Development, Enhancing the Student Experience, Student Engagement in Quality, Collaborative Provision, Quality Assurance Framework and Continuing Professional Development, and a final overarching theme of Institutional Oversight and Consistency that cuts across the other themes.

Each substantive theme constitutes a specific work package with an identifiable lead from the Senior team and, in some cases co- and sub-leads. The theme lead is responsible for the development of the project plan, timelines and deliverables and for providing regular progress updates to QAC for monitoring and reporting purposes. Management of the overall process is being undertaken by Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance and Senate Quality Assurance Committee will have responsibility for monitoring and reporting. In compiling this year-on response, Theme Leads were requested to provide a report on progress by completing a table for each action indicating the work accomplished to date, a forward plan and timetable of further action, the effectiveness of action taken to date or plans to evaluate the effectiveness. The following paragraphs provide an overview of this information.

Enhancing the Student Experience

The majority of recommendations from the ELIR Report were made in this area and relate primarily to: implementation and ongoing strategic oversight of the Enhancing Student Support Project; provision of feedback to students; Learning and Teaching Strategies, and postgraduate study space.

The ELIR Report strongly encouraged the University to prioritise the implementation of the revised arrangements for pastoral and academic support that were in the early stages of development at the time of the review. This work is being undertaken under the remit of the Enhancing Student Support (ESS) project (led by Assistant Principal, Learning Developments). The project aims to ensure that students have access to a framework of guidance and support that builds on the best of current practices, meets contemporary needs, and is of a quality and consistency appropriate to a university of high global standing. The University has committed a total new investment of around £7.5 million to the project across two key areas: development of a Personal Tutor System supported by a range of IT tools (approx.

---

[2] http://www.docs.sasg.ed.ac.uk/AcademicServices/Committees/QAC/2011-12/20120524AgendaandPapers.pdf
[3] http://www.docs.sasg.ed.ac.uk/AcademicServices/Committees/Senate/2011-12/20120606AgendaAndPapers.pdf

£4m) and enhancement of a range of centrally provided student support (approx. £3.5m).

Developments are being phased in from academic year 2012/13 and delivered over a period of four years[4]. Since the ELIR significant progress has been made including, but not limited to, the following key actions.

The Personal Tutor System has been fully implemented since the start of academic year 2012/13 for all undergraduate campus-based students, providing all students at School level with a dedicated Personal Tutor from the academic staff and Student Support Teams providing administrative support. Students and Personal Tutors are supported by a network of Senior Tutors across Schools and overseen by a Dean of Students in each College. Interim IT tools to support the Personal Tutor system were introduced in August 2012 ahead of the start of the semester, with small-scale enhancements being implemented during 2012/13. IT tools will continue to evolve with the phases of the project.

The University's Standards and Guiding Principles for Academic and Pastoral Support were revised in May 2012 and fully detailed roles and responsibilities for all key roles and for students have been developed and implemented. Each School has also developed its own statement of student support arrangements.

Building on the existing good practice within a number of Schools, peer support systems are currently being piloted in 2012/13, with the aim that every undergraduate student will have access to peer support for AY 2013/14. Pilot systems are being implemented in 2012/13 earlier than anticipated.

A review of central student services was completed in June 2012 resulting in a range of actions related to enhancing centrally provided student support. This has led to a number of project strands to support the entire student journey and responds to the needs of the changing student population. The project covers five key strands: enhanced selection before and after application; pre-arrival and induction support; the introduction of student information points (to provide a single front-line point of information to students); improved online services for students; enhanced student communications.

Student information points and officers have been in place since the start of academic year 2012/13. New appointments have also been made for an Induction Development Planner and a Student Communications Officer to oversee respective strands of work, and appointment of a Student Support Manager to oversee the entire project.

The ESS project is being led by Assistant Principal, Learning Developments and implemented via the Student Support Implementation Group that comprises representatives and stakeholders across the University. The project is managed by a

---

[4] https://www.wiki.ed.ac.uk/display/PESS/Home

project manager, working with an implementation timeline and prioritised deliverables, all of which have been met to date. Phase 2 of the project, currently in development, will ensure the roll out of the Personal Tutor System to all PG students from the start of AY 2013/14.

It has not been possible to conduct a detailed evaluation of the effectiveness of the ESS project at this early stage of implementation, but a monitoring, evaluation and enhancement process is under development to be finalised by Spring 2013 for implementation in Semester 1 of academic year 2013/14[5]. In the meantime, feedback has been sought from staff and students through various committees and networks (including the Senior Tutor Network and the Student Support Team Network). Management information has also been available from the IT tools. Early indications suggest that the new Personal Tutor system is working well and has been well received by students. An early 'high-level' evaluation of the impact of the Personal Tutor system will be possible from the undergraduate student experience survey (reported later) that is due to close in March 2013, and from the NSS data; although this is expected to provide initial base-line data at this early stage. The Enhancing Student Support project addresses all recommendations arising from the ELIR Report in relation to pastoral and academic support.

In relation to feedback to students a number of actions have been taken led by Vice Principal Learning and Teaching. The University Court endorsed in September 2012 a package of work strands to address feedback and the wider student experience. To better understand feedback as part of the student experience, we are implementing a university-wide survey of all non-final year undergraduates to complement the NSS, PTES and PRES surveys. The survey is running from January-March 2013 and will provide data on feedback and the new Personal Tutor System alongside the wider student experience. A separate strand of qualitative research, based on focus groups, is being undertaken in an effort to understand what students understand by feedback and how to improve it. The creation of the post VP Assessment and Feedback since the start of the academic year 2012/13 is providing a dedicated focus on enhancement and sharing good practice in feedback, along with the development of award recognition with EUSA.

To address the ambiguity and inconsistency of feedback on examinations, the Feedback Standards and Guiding Principles were revised in semester 1 2012/13 to make explicit reference to the provision of feedback on examinations and to set out what students can expect in this regard. As part of the annual school quality assurance cycle, a feedback monitoring survey was issued to all schools throughout semester 1 to audit feedback practice against the Feedback Standards and Guiding Principles. A report on this will be available at the April meeting of the Senate Quality Assurance Committee.

In relation to Learning and Teaching Strategies, a revised version of the University Learning-Teaching Enhancement Strategy was approved by Senate Learning and

---

[5] http://www.docs.sasg.ed.ac.uk/AcademicServices/Committees/QAC/2012-13/20120906AgendaandPapers.pdf

Teaching Committee (LTC) at its 21st November 2012 meeting to include reference to research-teaching linkages. At the same meeting the committee agreed that the review schedules of the University and College Strategies should be harmonised, but will be considered further following the development of School level Learning and Teaching Strategies. A working group was established in Semester 1 2012/13 to develop a template for School level strategies which reported to the 21st November LTC meeting. The template is currently being piloted in a small number of schools, following which it will be evaluated and, where appropriate, modified before rolling out to all schools.

In relation to postgraduate study space, the ELIR report noted variation in the provision of study and office space for postgraduate students across schools and colleges. A Task Group was set up under the remit of the Senate Researcher Experience Committee (REC) to explore the variation in provision. The Task Group reported to REC in October 2012 and concluded that most postgraduate research space design corresponds to discipline conventions; the most sociable spaces were found in disciplines that cultivate sociable ways of working. There is no desire for a centralised postgraduate research study facility. The task group found that postgraduate research students are increasingly being encouraged to think and work collaboratively, and that this is well represented in many areas.

The Task Group made a number of recommendations to enhance postgraduate study space and share best practice including holding three one-day workshops for academic staff and postgraduate research students during 2012/13, so that students from one College experience the working culture in another College. Reports from the workshop will be made to the Learning and Teaching Spaces Advisory Group (LTSAG) to take into consideration in the design of spaces. 2-3 short life experiments will be tried whereby staff and students will be co-located for a limited period of time. The effectiveness will be evaluated via a survey on postgraduate research space usage and run in 2012/13 by Estates and Buildings in collaboration with LTSAG and will report to LTSAG and REC for further action as appropriate. The recommendation that access to the wireless network, Eduroam, should be extended beyond the University boundary will be coordinated by Information Services (IS) and reported to REC. The Code of Practice for research students and supervisors will be reviewed and updated by Academic Services to reflect the diversity of study space available to students across the University. This will be undertaken as part of a wider review and update of the Code of Practice during the next academic year.

Student Engagement in Quality

Under this theme, the ELIR report asked us to focus on three key areas: to continue working in partnership with EUSA to enhance student representation, particularly at the College and School level; to consider the consistency of approach to the class rep system; to consider the consistency of approach to feedback from students. The theme lead is Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance.

Recent developments by EUSA will assist in strengthening the student rep system and the student voice. The single Student Council has been replaced by three separate councils: Academic Council, Welfare Council and External Council. This structure now provides a dedicated space through the Academic Council where student reps can meet with Sabbatical Officers to discuss academic matters. Specifically at the College level, colleges have been exploring ways of improving student engagement in 2012/13. The College of Humanities and Social Science (HSS) has established a Student Innovation Forum, in conjunction with EUSA, which reports directly to the College Quality Assurance Committee. It has also established a cross committee working group to focus on coordinating student engagement and communication work. The College of Science and Engineering (CSE) is also developing a similar forum building, building on the good practice in HSS.

In order to address inconsistency in the class rep system new guidelines for class reps have been implemented[6]. Additionally, a set of Student-Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Principles are being developed throughout 2012/13 for implementation at the start of Academic year 2013/14. These key principles will set out the key roles and responsibilities of SSLCs and student reps and will ensure a degree of consistency in operation and reporting whilst also allowing for necessary flexibility to account for school-level issues.

A mapping of UoE policy and practice to the UK Quality Code Chapter on Student Engagement has been completed and identified an opportunity to develop a joint EUSA-University Student Engagement Statement. This statement was approved at the December 2012 meeting of QAC and was launched on 14th March 2013.

In relation to the promotion of a consistent approach to gathering and analysing student views and feedback across the institution, a new student survey project has been established and a Student Surveys Co-ordinator appointed to oversee the development of the work on a phased basis over the next three years. A priority in 2012/13 has been the development of a new survey of all non-final year undergraduates to provide an overview of the student experience primarily in years 1, 2 and 3 of the degrees. The survey will provide valuable data to evaluate the effectiveness of a number of the new initiatives, including student support, feedback and student engagement. During 2013/14 the project will focus on bringing together the data from all relevant external and internal surveys including the analysis of the surveys and key insights generated from them in order to provide a holistic overview of the student experience. In the final year of the project (2014/15) the focus will be on developing a mechanism for the standardisation of course-evaluation surveys to allow for benchmarking and aggregation of data from the course level, to understand the contribution of courses to both the overall student experience and University KPIs. Some early work on this has already started in 2012/13. An evaluation of the new survey will be conducted towards the end of 2012/13 to

---

[6] http://www.eusa.ed.ac.uk/representation/classreps/info/responsibilities/

assess the effectiveness of the approach and whether changes need to be made before implementation in 2013/14.

Quality Assurance Framework

This includes a package of work that builds on the developments over the last two years in the Quality Assurance Framework (QAF) to develop QA systems to provide improved quality intelligence and institutional ownership of trends in key data, and to create stronger links with quality enhancement. This includes: improving consistency in information used for annual monitoring (part of the ongoing work with Governance and Strategic Planning (GaSP) to produce statistical reports); mapping of internal practice to the external QAA UK Quality Code in order to identify gaps for the development of new policy/practice and to identify opportunities to exceed external expectation; increased university oversight of internal review outcomes (now under QAC oversight); oversight of external examiner report feedback; oversight of feedback from students. The QAF lead is Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance.

The enhancements to the internal review (TPR and PPR) monitoring have been implemented and are working well. All internal review reports, the 14 week response and the year-on report come to QAC for approval. In addition, QAC has oversight of an annual thematic paper that highlights key issues arising from the reviews and areas of good practice. These feed into an annual event organised by the IAD. The first of these to take place in April 2013 will focus on sharing good practice and building capacity in two key areas: graduate attributes/employability and student engagement.

We are continuing with the mapping of UoE policies and practice to the chapters of the UK Quality Code as they emerge. All published chapters have been mapped. This is proving to be a useful exercise in highlighting areas for enhancement.

Continuing Professional Development (CPD)

The ELIR Report asked us to consider a number of areas around staff training and development, the University's expectations, compliance with the expectation and the effectiveness through the appraisal system. Specific items include: staff induction, supervisor briefing, tutor training and development, peer observation of teaching. This theme is led by Vice Principal Learning and Teaching with the Director of Human Resources (HR) and the Director of the Institute for Academic Development (IAD) as co-leads.

A number of actions have been taken already to address the points raised in the ELIR Report. In particular a new set of supervisor briefings was introduced for 2012/13 aimed at being more attractive to staff who have already attended one briefing. In relation to recording and monitoring compliance with expectations, HR has initiated a project through IS to look at the recording of CPD activity in 2012/13.

The ELIR recommendation has provided an opportunity to consider the role and format of continuing academic professional development at Edinburgh. On this theme, a discussion at a special meeting of the University Staff Committee on 19th November 2012, led by the Director of HR and the Director of IAD, considered how best to support academics in the 21st Century at the University of Edinburgh and indicated a proposal for taking a long term (3-5 year) project-based approach to shaping and implementing new academic development arrangements. Central to the proposed approach is that it should consider all dimensions of an academic career and role. A key requirement for the success of this approach is that the development opportunities provided are fully integrated with other University systems, policies and processes (from recording and reporting, to grade profiles and promotion, and local arrangements for orientation, annual review and academic career paths), as well as links to University strategic plans and priorities (including major enhancement projects). A formal project proposal and initial work plan is being developed for consideration and endorsement by Staff Committee in early 2013.

In the meantime, the Chancellor's Fellows project[7] is being used to investigate and document current variations in practice, understand (new) staff requirements, propose and pilot new CPD and review arrangements. In 2013/14 we will take lessons from the Chancellors Fellows project and begin the next stage of implementation for all staff (including monitoring of effectiveness and impact of changes made - one of the KPIs would be evidence of more consistent practice across the University that is tailored to local/individual requirements). During the second half of 2012/13 we will begin work on designing and developing an overall CPD framework for staff involved in teaching and learning. We plan to apply for HEA accreditation for this framework in the second half of 2013.

Collaborative Provision

Specifically under this theme the University was asked to address three key areas: ensure the consistent implementation of the Code of Practice for University of Edinburgh Students Studying Abroad; monitor the student experience to ensure all students receive support as intended; and give consideration to the introduction of a consistent approach to the arrangements for recognising grades and awarding academic credit for study abroad opportunities.

The Code of Practice was introduced in revised form in 2011/2012 and was therefore relatively new at the time of the ELIR. At the start of this academic year further communication of the Code to Schools and relevant roles has been undertaken, including at the annual Directors of Quality induction. Early indication from the Year Abroad Progression Committee, held in September 2012, suggests that the Code is being implemented widely as evidenced by the very small number of issues arising from the year abroad compared with previous years. A review of the Code is due to take place early 2014/15, following three full years of implementation to ensure its ongoing fitness for purpose. In the interim feedback from returning year abroad

---

[7] http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/institute-academic-development/research-roles/fellows/about

students (the second key area) will provide an ongoing evaluation of the Code in practice. The International Office gathers feedback from returning year abroad students to monitor their experiences. This feedback will be reported to QAC annually to draw out key trends, evaluate the Code and inform actions to enhance the year abroad experience and support of students.

The final area, relating to the arrangements for recognising grades and awarding academic credit, will be the focus of a Task Group of LTC throughout AY 2013/14. A scoping paper was discussed at the December 2912 meeting of QAC. For the most part the University recognises credit and not grades from the year abroad. This is achieved via a University-wide Year Abroad Progression Committee that ensures a consistent approach across all programmes involving a year abroad. There are a small number of exceptions to this approach that relate specifically to language degrees where the year abroad is managed via the relevant School examination board. This approach has worked very well in the past, but we are aware that other Universities take a different approach and we wish to take time to reflect on our approach with a view to learning from the best practice across the sector. We are also keen to introduce single semester study abroad opportunities where possible to increase the appeal and opportunity for students to study abroad. This will require us to revisit the structure of our degrees and the relationship to the degree regulations. This also needs to be considered alongside the broader curriculum developments that are planned to occur.

Curriculum Development

This package of work, led by Vice Principal Learning and Teaching, will take a strategic and planned approach to the associated curricular developments and adjustments to the academic environment to meet the needs of a changing student population. At the same time, it will also rely on external enhancements and directions, for example from the SHEEC focus on internationalisation, the Scottish Government focus on flexible curricula, and the effect of Curriculum for Excellence on the nature of our first year experience. Due to on-going external developments in this area, this theme represents a forward-look to the major areas where development at Edinburgh will occur, and the agencies by which this will be achieved.

Our main developments in this area will focus on:
- Developing enhanced support for students pre-arrival and at induction, to ensure that students from non-typical backgrounds are prepared for study and that our expectations of students are clear and can be met. Finances have been allocated for this as part of the Enhancing Student Support project and individuals have been appointed.
- Developing flexible entry and exit points to the curriculum, as required by the Scottish Government, and associated preparation for Curriculum for Excellence. Discussions are being channelled through LTC from January 2013.
- The development of the curriculum to reflect a more global outlook, through the agency of our 'Global Citizen' initiative and the expansion of 'Our Changing World'

course into an online mode to permit blended learning on campus. Developments will take place at the course level, but channelled through LTC.

- Enhanced language support for international students and an enhanced focus on staff training to ensure we make the most of our diverse student body. The English Language Teaching Centre (ELTC) and the IAD will lead on this under the auspices of LTC.
- An on-going focus on assessment and feedback, including evaluation of existing initiatives and engagement with new ones, for example the HEA 'Marking time' development. IS and VP Assessment and Feedback will lead on this under the auspices of LTC.
- Bringing pedagogical learning from MOOCs into our main curriculum and rethinking the use of e-learning on campus. A subcommittee of LTC will be set up in early 2013 to engage with this issue.

Various modes of evaluation will be set up to assess the effectiveness of the above initiatives and will be reported through LTC.

Summary

This Year-on response outlines the actions taken by the University of Edinburgh to address the recommendations in the ELIR Report. We have taken a three-year project-based approach according to themes. Within the last 12 months we have made significant progress in the priority areas addressed in the ELIR Report in relation to the Personal Tutor System, feedback and the student experience. We have also engaged in significant planning in the other areas that are still to be addressed. We are confident that our phased approach over the next three years will deliver enhancements to the student experience and that we will be able to demonstrate the effectiveness of these actions by the time of the next ELIR.