Meeting of the Senatus Learning and Teaching Committee to be held from 2pm on Wednesday 30 January 2013 in the Board Room, Chancellor’s Building, Little France
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Minutes of the Senatus Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) held at 2pm on Wednesday 21 November 2012 in the Lorimer Room, Old College

Present:
Dr Nicholas Adams  Senior Lecturer, School of Divinity (Co-opted Member)
Mr Mateusz Adamski  EUSA
Mr Andrew Burnie  EUSA VPAA
Dr Sarah Cooper  Undergraduate Director, Business School, CHSS
Ms Shelagh Green  Director, Careers Service (Co-opted Member)
Ms Erin Jackson  Distance Learning Manager, School of Law (Co-opted Member)
Ms Nichola Kett (Secretary)  Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services
Dr Tina Harrison (Vice Convenor)  Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance
Mr John Lowrey  Dean of Undergraduate Studies, CHSS
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)
Dr Sue Rigby (Convenor)  Vice Principal Learning and Teaching
Professor Neil Turner  Director of Undergraduate Teaching and Learning, CMVM

In Attendance:
Professor David Marshall  College of Humanities and Social Science
Ms Sheila Williams  Director, Student Disability Service (item 5.4)

Apologies:
Professor Jeremy Bradshaw  Dean of Postgraduate Taught and International, CMVM
Mrs Irene Bruce  Head of Academic Services (University Secretary’s Nominee)
Professor Colin Pulham  Teaching Organisation Director, School of Chemistry, CSE
Professor Graeme Reid  Dean of Learning and Teaching, CSE
Dr Jon Turner  Director, Institute for Academic Development
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 26 September 2012 were approved.

2. Matters arising

2.1 Learning from Internal Review
The Convenor confirmed that the relevant outcomes from the report had been mapped to the Committee’s priorities and no gaps were identified. Dr Harrison advised that the Institute for Academic Development will be running an event to share good practice.

3. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

3.1 Convenor’s Update

National Student Survey

It was noted that the Committee would continue to monitor progress against the agreed action plan, with a report being considered at a future meeting. Obvious local solutions to issues raised should continue to be implemented.
**Innovative Learning Week**

The Convenor advised members that funding for Innovative Learning Week (ILW) had been secured, that bids would be invited shortly, and that an ILW Co-ordinator had been appointed.

4. **STRATEGIC INITIATIVES AND ENHANCEMENTS**

4.1 **Enhancing Student Support Project**

Professor Pirie drew members’ attention to the governance structure diagram, confirming that all strands of the project will ultimately report through the Student Support Implementation Group (SSIG). A number of working groups and brainstorming sessions have been established by SSIG to explore enhancing the support for different types of students, to develop the monitoring, evaluation and enhancement process, and to develop and share good practice. Professor Peter Higgins (Dean of Students, CHSS) is leading the taught postgraduate students working group and has met with the Postgraduate Directors’ Network to discuss the development. At its last meeting, SSIG proposed that Directors of small taught postgraduate programmes would become Personal Tutors and positive feedback on this proposal had been received from the Postgraduate Directors’ Network. Discussions are at an early stage and further consultation would take place.

Professor Pirie confirmed that the same approach as was taken for the implementation of enhanced support for undergraduate students will be taken for taught postgraduate students. That is, core requirements will be agreed and Schools will decide on the approach to implementation.

In terms of evaluation, it was recognised that phases of the project are being developed before previous phases will be fully evaluated. However, the project timescales have been agreed and it will be at least three years before the system fully matures.

| **Action:** | A future meeting of the Senior Tutor Network to focus on further feedback from Phase 1 (Secretary to add to the Network’s forward agenda). |

The enhancement of support for postgraduate research students will be developed in Phase 3 of the project.

| **Action:** | Convenor to write to Heads of School to advise them of project developments in advance of the annual planning round (Secretary to draft letter). |

4.2 **Flexible Pathways**

The Convenor advised that work on this area would commence after the January meeting and that members’ interests had been noted.

4.3 **Continuing Professional Development**

Dr McCune confirmed that work in this area was progressing well and that a substantial report would be presented to the January meeting of the Committee. There will be a more joined up approach with flexible routes that feed into HR procedures such as annual review.
4.4 Resits

Professor Pirie is leading the working group that is developing proposals to reduce the number of resits. The group has met once and discussed removing resits in their current form and replacing them with supplementary assessments to enable students to address deficiencies in learning outcomes. Members reiterated that careful consideration must be given to professional body requirements. Members discussed a number of matters in relation to resits, including assessment design, pass or fail grades with the retention of a ‘silent’ mark, supporting the student within the academic year to avoid failure, and focussing initially on low risk progression-related examinations.

In terms of approval, the Convenor confirmed that the Committee would make a decision on the proposal submitted by the working group at the January meeting and that the Curriculum and Student Progression Committee would then be charged with establishing the regulatory framework to support the proposal.

| Action: | Convenor to write to Student, Admissions and Curricula Systems to advise them of developments in advance of the annual planning round (Secretary to draft letter). |

5. LEARNING AND TEACHING FRAMEWORK

5.1 Learning and Teaching Enhancement Strategies

Professor Pirie had led the working group charged with developing the School Learning and Teaching Enhancement Strategy template and introduced the paper. It was confirmed that the template would take the form of a two part document and that the School of Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences had agreed to pilot the approach. Members agreed the proposed approach and that the template should be piloted within a School in each College.

| Action: | College Deans of Learning and Teaching (or equivalent) to identify a pilot School and notify the Secretary. |

In relation to the College strategies, in line with the Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR) recommendations, members were in agreement that the review of these documents should be harmonised. This will be considered further following the production of the School strategies.

In line with the ELIR recommendations, members agreed that the University’s strategy should be updated to include reference to research-teaching linkages and that the strategy should also be revisited following the production of the School strategies.

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

College of Humanities and Social Science
Mr Lowrey advised members that the plan of work for the College maps well with the work of the Committee. Specifically, the College are very focussed on the National Student Survey and feedback, with an event being held on 5th December and further learning lunches planned. The College has also started planning for Innovative Learning Week.

College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine
Professor Turner informed members that the introduction of the Personal Tutor system had gone well. An initial reluctance from continuing students to fully engage with the system had dissipated and the benefits of the interactions between students and professionals within their area were being realised. Medicine are currently exploring
feedback results and Dr Helen Cameron (Medical Education) has produced a document related to assessment which, although subject specific, contains generic information which Committee members may find useful.

*College of Science and Engineering*
There were no items to report.

### 5.3 Update from EUSA

Mr Burnie advised members of the following developments:

- The Teaching Awards have been launched.
- EUSA are looking for speakers for their Inspiring Teaching Conference. The theme is around community but there will be off-theme sessions also.
- Class rep lunches are taking place and this is proving to be a useful forum for a cross-section of students to discuss matters.
- Enhancing Student Support: only positive feedback has been received in relation to the Personal Tutor system and the work that Schools have undertaken in relation this is greatly valued; EUSA will be running further student synectics (structured group brainstorming) events; and work on the Peer Support strand is developing well with pilots taking place.

In relation to the Personal Tutor system, Mr Adamski noted the importance that the University had been clear on what students could expect and felt that this had contributed to the success.

### 5.4 Equality Act: Adjustments

Dr Harrison introduced the paper which made a proposal to mainstream a number of common adjustments required for disabled students in order to help the University better meet its legislative duty to anticipatorily support disabled students. Members noted the importance of provision being consistent across the University and were concerned that students’ adjustments were not being fully implemented. Dr Harrison informed members that recent findings from the Equality Challenge Unit highlighted disparities between the types of students who disclose their disability, with low numbers from international and taught postgraduate students disclosing. The mainstreaming of adjustments would assist such students.

With reference to the request for further information at the last meeting, Ms Williams advised that (due to the structure of the database) she had been unable to extract information on what the reduction in the number of Learning Profiles issued would be should the most common three adjustments requested be mainstreamed. However, Ms Williams advised that, should the suggested adjustments be mainstreamed, this would drastically reduce the number of individual adjustments within a Learning Profile, although it would still leave the majority of Learning Profiles. This approach would ensure that the adjustments on the Learning Profile would be specific to a student’s disability.

1. **Provide course outlines and reading lists at least 4 weeks before the start of the course.**

Members agreed that this should be mainstreamed.
2. **Provide coursework/assignment questions and deadlines at the start of course.**

Members agreed that this could be mainstreamed if further clarification was provided, specifically in relation to “assignment questions” (possibly substituted to “assignment requirements”).

3. **Order reading lists by priority/relevance.**

Members could not support mainstreaming this adjustment in its current format. This should be revisited to explore what would be possible to mainstream, perhaps with reference to “key” readings rather than a prioritised list.

4. **Provide lecture outlines/PowerPoint presentation slides and other materials used for in-class activities at least 24 hours in advance of the class on the VLE.**

Members could not support mainstreaming this adjustment in its current format without further clarification. This should be revisited to explore what would be possible to enable student engagement without impinging on the pedagogical experience. The Committee noted that students should expect to be informed of what they will be taught so that they can prepare in advance, supporting the notion of students as autonomous learners. Further clarification would also be required regarding the use of PowerPoint (e.g. that it is not a requirement to have a PowerPoint presentation for all classes) and the process for where ‘spoiler’ information is contained within materials.

5. **Provide lists of key technical words and/or formulae at least 24 hours in advance of the class.**

Members agreed that this could be mainstreamed if further clarification was provided to advise “where these are used”. The possibility of expanding guidance for particular subjects was also mentioned.

6. **Ensure that students are notified by email of changes to courses/classes.**

Members agreed that this adjustment should be mainstreamed. It was noted that additional guidance should advise that the official form of communication is the University email system, however, this may be supplemented by other forms of communication.

7. **Permit all students to audio record lectures, tutorials and supervision sessions using their own equipment for their own personal learning.**

Member could not support mainstreaming this adjustment in its current format. The following matters were discussed in detail:
- The recording of lectures by all students is increasing and staff are unable to check during the class if students have a Learning Profile to allow this.
- The potential for recording of classes to change the nature and dynamic of the class.
- The technology currently available within rooms that would allow for recording of classes and distribution of audio material.

Members agreed that a scoping exercise should be undertaken to establish current practice both internally and externally and that the findings should inform the development of the proposal.
8. **Ensure that microphones are maintained in good working order and are worn and used by teaching staff in all lectures regardless of the perceived need to wear them.**

Members agreed that the maintenance of microphones should be demitted to Estates and Buildings. Members agreed that this adjustment should be mainstreamed. It was noted that additional guidance should advise staff to wear microphones wherever they are available and to feedback any maintenance issues to Estates and Buildings.

9. **Provide alternative assessments when requested to do so by the Student Disability Service.**

The Committee fully endorsed this adjustment and noted the importance of its implementation, but did not support the mainstreaming of it as it specially applies to disabled students.

In summary, the Committee were very supportive of mainstreaming adjustments wherever possible and were in broad agreement with the majority of the proposed adjustments to be mainstreamed.

**Actions:**
Ms Williams to send members a link to the Student Disability Service annual report.

A meeting of the Senior Tutor Network to discuss supporting dyslexic students (Secretary to add this to the Network’s forward agenda).

A scoping exercise should be undertaken to establish current practice in relation to adjustment 7 (audio recording) both internally and externally (within the Russell Group and international peers).

A scoping exercise should be undertaken to establish current practice in relation to adjustment 9 (provision of alternative assessments) with the aim of establishing why this currently fails.

Ms Green to explore providing Dr Harrison with assistance with the scoping exercises.

Dr McCune to remain involved in discussions so that any training resource requirements can be identified.

A paper to be presented to the January meeting of the Committee which contains the reworded adjustments and the outcomes of the scoping exercises. Dr Harrison to distribute the reworded list of adjustments to members in advance of the January meeting for comments (a nil response will be assumed to indicate agreement with the proposals). The Committee should agree on the implementation timeline and strategy at the January meeting.

Following approval of the proposal, that the Convenor write to key contacts to advise on the adjustments that should be mainstreamed and provide a reminder of the importance of complying with legislation.

---

6. **EXTERNAL HORIZON SCANNING**

6.1 Enhancement Themes

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

The Convenor informed members that Professor Pirie has taken over as institutional lead for this enhancement theme. Professor Pirie then outlined his proposed approach, which
was to ‘rebadge’ the current institutional team as an advisory Steering Group and to identify representatives from across the University to join the institutional team who would actively work on the enhancements and attend events to share best practice across the sector.

**Action:** Professor Pirie to contact Deans on Learning and Teaching (or equivalent) to discuss representation of the institutional team.

6.2 External Developments

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

  The Committee noted that the chapter had been published and that a mapping exercise would be presented at the next meeting.

6.3 Scottish Funding Council Outcome Agreement

The Convenor advised members that, in line with Government developments, the University had made an application for more Scottish students.

**Action:** Convenor to inform members of the outcome once available.

7. **Any Other Business**

   None.

8. **Date of Next Meeting**

   Wednesday 30 January 2013 in the Board Room, Chancellor’s Building, Little France.
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Summary Report On The Progress Of Phase Two

Personal Tutor System

During semester one the Student Support Implementation Group (SSIG) established a number of task-groups to explore particular issues and contexts to further the development of the Personal Tutor system as follows;

- the specific needs of our international student community
- how students are supported when working off-campus – e.g. placement, study-abroad, Erasmus exchange
- how our online / distance education community are supported

In addition a task-group led by Prof Alan Murray, Dean of Students CSE, was established to explore the developing role of the Personal Tutor in the context of proactively supporting students to reach their potential - ‘Encouraging Excellence’ and as part of this initiative student–focussed / led conferences will be piloted during Innovative Learning Week.

The recommendations from these groups are now being incorporated into the work of SSIG and will inform subsequent enhancements.

Personal Tutors for PGT

A main focus of development for SSIG is the development and rollout of Personal Tutors for Taught Post-Graduate Students. A task-group chaired by Prof Peter Higgins, Dean of Students HSS, has been formed to lead this key strand of work and members of the core team are now presenting initial recommendations and consulting widely across the University with key stakeholder groups such as the Post-Graduate Programme Directors Network.

The outcomes of the consultations will inform SSIG’s recommendations on key issues such as the minimum number and frequency of scheduled meetings and the benefits (or potential conflict) of Programme Directors formally assuming the role of Personal Tutor for PGT students for those Schools who wish to adopt this model.

Post Graduate Research Students

Although enhancing student support for Post Graduate Research students is identified for phase three of the project, a number of colleagues have intimated a preference for accelerating the discussions around PGR. As a result of this a key focus for the afternoon session of the benchmarking event to be held on the 19th February is support, supervision and management of PGR.
Phase three of the project will focus on the development of support for PGR students but it should be stated that it is not intended to create an additional layer of Personal Tutors for this community but to review the current arrangements for providing academic supervision and pastoral support with a view to enhancement.

**Online Resources**

A second ‘Synectics’ event is being held with students on Wednesday 23rd January to explore ideas around the development of ‘student dashboards’ and the types of information and software tools students would find helpful to them during their studies. The use of online resources and software tools for learning management and learning analytics is also a theme that will be explored throughout the benchmarking event on the 19th February.

**IT Tools for the Personal Tutor System**

Early feedback on the use of the online tools is very promising and the statistical evidence demonstrates that, where Schools are actively using the systems features to add notes and comments to a meeting, over 96% of students are subsequently checking the information that has been added to their record. As anticipated the activity patterns mirror the peaks expected for the scheduled meetings with a much smaller but consistent level of activity for students who are requesting additional meetings with their personal tutor or support team. The use and experience of using the IT tools will be reviewed with both students and staff as part of the evaluation scheme currently being developed for the Personal Tutor system.

Incremental developments have continued since the initial launch with new features ‘going live’ as soon as is possible after test. Specific needs of PGT students are currently being consulted upon and an early recommendation from the various stakeholder groups is to maintain as much consistency as is possible within the same system for both UG and PGT – *i.e. additional functionality and features may be added but there would not be a separate system for PGT.*

**Peer Support**

Significant progress has been made in benchmarking with comparator institutions and in producing the information packs to support the introduction of the various models of peer support. EUSA will now be working directly with the Schools to discuss the various approaches recommended and to assist each School to develop a peer support pilot for some of their undergraduate students for session 2013-14. A number of Schools already have well-established peer support programmes and their experience and expertise will inform and assist this development.

**Briefing, Training and Resources**

A consultation group has been formed to work with IAD colleagues to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of the resources produced to support the phase one
implementation of Personal Tutors for undergraduate students. The group will now assist IAD in amending and further developing the resources to support phase two delivery. Wherever possible the resources will be developed to support staff working with students at all levels and exceptionally resources would only be developed for specific levels of study where this was required.

Communications

A substantive communications task-group has been formed to develop and implement an effective and comprehensive communications strategy. The project team and task-group leads have initiated several presentation and consultation sessions to create opportunities for stakeholder groups to participate and are also available to Schools and Departments who wish to arrange for discussions to be held locally. Regular ESS updates are emailed to key networks and colleagues who choose to subscribe to the mailing list and all relevant information and resource links are posted to the ESS project wiki.

Monitoring, Evaluation and Enhancement

The monitoring, evaluation and enhancement task-group are currently developing the model and implementation plans for conducting the review and evaluation of the introduction of Personal Tutors for undergraduate students. The process will commence early in semester one 2013-14 and will comprise an online questionnaire, facilitated focus groups and the use of collated statistical data from online resources. The facilitated focus groups with students will be conducted by a Senior Tutor and Student Support Officers from outwith the students host School. Schools subsequently will be able to use their own information, comparative data from other Schools and participate in the opportunity to share good practice from across the University. The evaluation outcomes should then inform the development of subsequent actions within each School’s Learning, Teaching and Enhancement Strategy.

Student Support Services

Mark Wilkinson joined the University in January 2013 as project manager and will now be responsible for the new initiatives already underway in the student support services. This now represents a significant part of the ESS initiative and a more comprehensive update on progress in the various work strands will be prepared for the next meeting of LTC.

Task Group Leads - for Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Group</th>
<th>Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Tutors for PGT</td>
<td>Peter Higgins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging Excellence</td>
<td>Alan Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Students</td>
<td>Tom Bruce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Education</td>
<td>Jeremy Bradshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Campus Students</td>
<td>Alan Murray</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Continuing Professional Development for Learning and Teaching
Velda McCune and Jon Turner
Institute for Academic Development

Discussions at the Learning and Teaching Committee in September 2012 identified the need to move forward with plans to provide a coherent framework for CPD and accreditation for staff in relation to learning and teaching. Subsequently initial consultation has taken place with stakeholders involved in offering CPD for learning and teaching within the University and the other Scottish Ancient institutions. Draft proposals were also shared with the Institute for Academic Development advisory group in December. This document now sets out more developed proposals for consideration by the committee.

1. The context for CPD for learning and teaching

1.1 There has always been a rich array of CPD opportunities for staff at the University in relation to learning and teaching but uptake is variable and what is on offer could be more coherent, more complete and more consistently taken up.

1.2 There is growing external pressures regarding staff qualifications to teach from, for example:
   - Enhancement Led Institutional Review;
   - Professional bodies;
   - The National Union of Students;
   - Higher Education Statistics Agency return changes.

On this basis, many Universities across the UK are now working to develop coherent frameworks which lead to Higher Education Academy (HEA) accreditation. These institutions include the Scottish Ancients.

1.3 Some of our existing programmes are accredited by the HEA and the HEA now requires a single CPD framework to be presented per institution. These single frameworks can include multiple courses, programmes and other development opportunities. Not all of these opportunities have to carry course credit. Accreditation is benchmarked against the UK Professional Standards Framework. Further details can be found here: http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/accreditation

1.4 The HEA offers accreditation at four levels, set out in the UKPSF. These levels are:
   - Associate Fellow - those with more circumscribed learning and teaching roles e.g. tutors and demonstrators;
   - Fellow - individuals with more substantive teaching and learning roles e.g. some early career academics;
   - Senior Fellow – requires a more sustained record and some leadership in relation to learning and teaching;
   - Principal Fellow – highly experienced staff with strategic leadership in relation to learning and teaching.

1.5 We currently have the following programmes in various stage of development which might contribute to the framework:
   - PG Cert in Academic Practice, accredited to level 2 (Fellow) with HEA till August 2016;
   - PG Cert in Clinical Education, under development, aiming for level 2 (Fellow);
   - Clinical Educator Course, has just been accredited by HEA at level 1 (Associate Fellow);
   - Introduction to Academic Practice, under development, aiming for level 1 accreditation (Associate Fellow);
   - The MSc in E-learning may be interested in having a route through some of their courses accredited;
   - It may be possible to include a route through the EdD in the School of Education and through a proposed MSc in Higher Education.

1.6 All new academic staff are currently expected and encouraged to participate in the two-day orientation to Academic Practice and to take part in at least two optional courses within the PG Cert in Academic Practice (in itself this does not meet the requirement for HEA Fellow status). In developing the CPD framework it is essential that we work closely with staff committee and Colleges to ensure that CPD is built into annual review, reward and recognition systems.
1.7 It would be important to have a pathway to accreditation within the University which is meaningful and flexible for more experienced staff and which can be engaged with over an extended time frame according to staff needs, interests and levels of experience. Any framework also needs to be sufficiently open to allow accreditation for staff in roles supporting learning, such as learning technologists. The Aspire model from the University of Exeter is much discussed across the UK. This model involves staff writing up or presenting about their practice against the UK Professional Standards Framework and is accredited by the HEA. Further details can be found here: http://as.exeter.ac.uk/aspire/

1.8 It is also possible for staff involved in learning and teaching to apply directly to the HEA for fellowship through the HEA individual recognition route. The IAD offers support to staff wishing to take this route but it has not seen much uptake and carries a cost per application whereas application through our institutional CPD framework would be covered by our institutional subscription to the HEA.

1.9 Having a complete accreditation framework which incorporates a range of courses, programmes and other provision has advantages beyond the enhancement of learning and teaching and meeting external pressures for the recording of teaching qualifications. Accreditation may be particularly attractive to incoming PhD students and staff who are likely to move on to other roles elsewhere and see accreditation as providing a career advantage. Accreditation of existing programmes may help recruitment to those programmes from outside the University as portable teaching qualifications become more significant.

1.10 The overall principles and priorities guiding the framework would include an emphasis on rich and varied development opportunities which are closely connected with local learning and teaching practices and which are responsive to different disciplinary cultures. Rather than focusing only on events, courses and programmes, the proposed framework also includes, for example: opportunities for peer observation of teaching; incorporating Principal’s Teaching Award Scheme projects and IAD secondments; Action Learning Sets; and reflective accounts of practice in particular learning and teaching roles. The framework supports the inclusion of development opportunities which are offered at the level of Schools and Colleges. It will be important that the development opportunities offered are flexible over time to connect with University and College strategic priorities. The framework should provide excellent opportunities to enhance the collaborative work already happening across Colleges and Support Services to enhance learning and teaching. The provision would be underpinned by relevant research and scholarship and evaluated thoroughly as it develops.

2. The broader picture on CPD within the University

While emphasis in this paper is on CPD for learning and teaching it would be ideal to have a framework which spanned all aspects of staff careers. A special meeting of staff committee on 19th November considered the topic of how best to support University academics in the 21st Century. Sheila Gupta and Jon Turner are preparing a paper for staff committee based on that discussion that will propose a major 3-5 year project that considers all aspects of an academic role and links to annual review, reward and recognition systems.

3. Draft proposals for an accredited CPD framework for Learning and Teaching

Appendices 1 to 6 map out draft proposals for comment by the Learning and Teaching Committee. The intention would be to seek Higher Education Academy accreditation for the entire framework. These proposals include existing programmes and an additional route currently entitled the ‘Edinburgh Teaching Award’. The latter is based on a combination of the Aspire model from Exeter and a CPD points based approach. Appendix 1 maps overall provision against the descriptors within the UK PSF. Appendices 2 to 5 give an outline of possible routes to accreditation via the Edinburgh Teaching Award at each level. Some of the provision included within the framework already exists, other elements would need to be developed. It is proposed that each participant progressing through the Edinburgh Teaching Award should have a mentor to support their engagement with the award and should also receive formative feedback on drafts of work that they produce for their submission for the Award. We propose that mentors would be sought within the Colleges although there are also some IAD staff who could fulfil this role. Feedback could be provided by IAD staff, selected staff from the Colleges and peers.
4. Timetable for implementation and resource implications

Bringing together a coherent submission to the HEA which integrates the required content relating to all of the relevant courses, programmes, CPD provision and related University processes and practices is a substantial task. The resource implications of running the framework and evaluating staff submissions are to some extent dependent on the timetable for the work and the number of staff who would progress through each level. Mentoring staff progressing through the framework and providing formative feedback on their submissions will become a significant demand as larger numbers of participants become involved. A well organised system for peer feedback would enhance the process. Elements of the framework, such as School level briefing, training and support for tutors and demonstrators, are currently patchy in their implementation and there are resource implications linked to offering such provision more consistently. There will also be workload associated with robust recording of participation in CPD events across and beyond the University and in setting up supporting systems. One aspect of the supporting systems should be an online environment for the Edinburgh Teaching Award within which participants can: share draft work with IAD staff, peers and mentors; access guidance about how to approach their submission and information about relevant development opportunities; engage with online development opportunities; and pull together their complete submission. The Edinburgh Teaching Award will require a robust process for accreditation of prior learning to be developed and a panel with external membership will be required to assess submissions.

A recent report to the University from the HEA indicated that currently 12 of our staff are Associate Fellows and 202 are Fellows. The HEA report suggests that we do not currently have any Senior Fellows or Principal Fellows. The HEA suggest that in 2011-12 6.8% of our staff were Fellows as compared with 11.0% across the Russell Group and 25.7% across Scotland. A small group of staff within and beyond the IAD are currently working on applications for Senior Fellowship through the HEA individual accreditation route. The following timetable is suggested to increase the number of staff with accreditation:

Summer 2013:

- Take proposals for a complete framework for CPD for Learning and Teaching to the HEA for accreditation;
- Begin working with a small group of staff toward applications for Principal Fellowship through the individual accreditation route with the HEA.

Academic year 2013-2014:

- Aim to have 8 staff complete the HEA individual accreditation route for Senior Fellow and 6 complete the HEA individual accreditation route for Principal Fellow so that these staff can then act as mentors and advisors in relation to the higher levels of the Edinburgh Teaching Award;
- Offer the Introduction to Academic Practice course (level 1, Associate Fellow) to a pilot group of 20 participants and evaluate the success of the course;
- Offer the level 2 (Fellow) route through the Edinburgh Teaching Award to a pilot group of 20 academic staff and evaluate the success of this aspect of the Award;
- Pilot test and evaluate aspects of the new CPD provision which would form part of other levels of the Edinburgh Teaching Award, participants could then include these with their submission for awards at the other levels in the following academic year;
- Trial approaches to enhancing uptake of the courses and programmes which provide routes to fellowship and evaluate the effectiveness of this work;
- Continue to support staff who are engaging with the individual accreditation routes offered by the HEA;
- Continue to offer existing courses, programmes and CPD opportunities.
The preparation of the submission to the HEA and new CPD provision proposed for academic year 2013-14 can be managed within current and planned IAD staffing and budget levels. Resource requirements beyond this point will depend on staff demand and the level of engagement (e.g. in providing mentors and developing local provision) at a College and School level. A key element of the proposed approach is to embed CPD within learning and teaching practice as well as in arrangements for staff mentoring and review. Options for scaling up and rolling out CPD framework arrangements for 2014/15 and beyond will be developed during summer and autumn 2013.

5. Questions for the committee

5.1 Are the broad approach and timetable proposed suitable?

5.2 Are there additional development opportunities which should be included within the framework?

5.3 There is an opportunity within this model to accredit CPD provision developed by Schools and Colleges within the Edinburgh Teaching Award. What might be developed at the School or College level?
Appendix 1: Overall Framework - DRAFT

UKPSF standard descriptor 1
Associate Fellow

Introduction to Academic Practice*

Clinical Educator Course

Edinburgh Teaching Award Level 1

UKPSF standard descriptor 2
Fellow

PG Cert in Academic Practice

PG Cert in Clinical Education

A PG Cert within MSc E-learning**

Edinburgh Teaching Award Level 2

UKPSF standard descriptor 3
Senior Fellow

Route through MSc in Higher Education or EdD***

Edinburgh Teaching Award Level 3

UKPSF standard descriptor 4
Principal Fellow

Edinburgh Teaching Award Level 4

*This course is currently in development.

** This option is still under discussion.

*** The School of Education EdD is already running and an HEA accredited route may be possible. The MSc in Higher Education is under development but could allow an HEA route.
| UKPSF AA1 | Design and plan learning activities and or programmes of study | IAD tutors and dems enhanced development courses: designing and delivering lectures (5); designing courses (5); planning and reviewing (5). | Short account of design of a learning activity for students or peers (10) | For each relevant event attended (2.5) relevant digital engagement (2.5) relevant School briefing and guidance event (5) | Co-I on a relevant successful PTAS Project (5) | Relevant EUSA teaching award nomination (2.5) or award (5) |
| UKPSF AA2 | Teach and or support learning | IAD tutors and dems orientation courses: effective tutorials intro (5); lab demonstrators intro (5); troubleshooting tutorials (5). | Short reflection on peer observation of teaching (10) | For each relevant event attended (2.5), relevant digital engagement (2.5), relevant School event (5) online tutoring course (10) | Co-I on a relevant successful PTAS Project (5) | Relevant EUSA teaching award nomination (2.5) or award (5) |
| UKPSF AA3 | Assess and give feedback to learners | IAD tutors and demonstrators orientation courses: marking and providing feedback (5). | Short account of improvement to own assessment, feedback practice (10) | For each relevant event attended (2.5) relevant digital engagement (2.5) relevant School briefing and guidance event (5) | Co-I on a relevant successful PTAS Project (5) | Relevant EUSA teaching award nomination (2.5) or award (5) |
| UKPSF AA4 | Develop effective learning environments and approaches to student support and guidance | IAD tutors and demonstrators enhanced development courses: new option to be developed (5). | Short account of perspectives on giving guidance to students or fellow tutors (10) | For each relevant event attended (2.5) relevant digital engagement (2.5) relevant School briefing and guidance event (5) | Co-I on a relevant successful PTAS Project (5) | Relevant EUSA teaching award nomination (2.5) or award (5) |
| UKPSF AA5 | CPD in subjects/ disciplines and their pedagogy, research, scholarship, evaluation of practice | IAD tutors and demonstrators enhanced development courses: recording teaching and routes to accreditation (5). | Write up of an evaluation of practice (20) | Write up of a personal teaching development plan (10) | For each relevant event attended (2.5) relevant digital engagement (2.5), relevant School event (5), relevant student internship (10) | Relevant refereed publication (10), relevant conference presentation (5), Relevant digital profile (5) |
| Synoptic assessment showing learning and experience mapped against UKPSF descriptor 1 (chose 1 option) | Application form plus 20 minute presentation with questions to a panel of assessors | Application process within reflective blog 2 | | | | |
## Appendix 3: Edinburgh Teaching Award Level 2 - DRAFT

Complete 40 points in total with at least 1 option from each row plus one synoptic assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UKPSF AA1</th>
<th>PG CertAP: Designing Courses (10)</th>
<th>Short account of course or programme design role (10)</th>
<th>For each relevant event attended (2.5) relevant digital engagement (2.5)</th>
<th>Successful completion of relevant PTAS project as PI (30) or as Co-I (5)</th>
<th>Successful completion of relevant IAD secondment (30)</th>
<th>Relevant EUSA teaching award nomination (2.5) or award (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design and plan learning activities and or programmes of study</td>
<td>MSc E-learning: Introduction to Digital Environments for Learning (30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UKPSF AA2</th>
<th>PG CertAP: L and T Online (10); Engaging students in Autonomous Learning (10)</th>
<th>Short reflection on peer observation of teaching (10)</th>
<th>For each relevant event attended (2.5), relevant digital engagement (2.5), online tutoring course (10)</th>
<th>Successful completion of relevant PTAS project as PI (30) or as Co-I (5)</th>
<th>Successful completion of relevant IAD secondment (30)</th>
<th>Relevant EUSA teaching award nomination (2.5) or award (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teach and or support learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UKPSF AA3</th>
<th>PG CertAP: Assessing students (10)</th>
<th>Short account of an improvement to assessment, feedback (10)</th>
<th>For each relevant event attended (2.5) relevant digital engagement (2.5)</th>
<th>Successful completion of relevant PTAS project as PI (30) or as Co-I (5)</th>
<th>Successful completion of relevant IAD secondment (30)</th>
<th>Relevant EUSA teaching award nomination (2.5) or award (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assess and give feedback to learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UKPSF AA4</th>
<th>PG CertAP: Course Organisation and Management (10); Engaging with Student Diversity (10)</th>
<th>Short account of learning in a relevant role (10)</th>
<th>For each relevant event attended (2.5) relevant digital engagement (2.5)</th>
<th>Successful completion of relevant PTAS project as PI (30) or as Co-I (5)</th>
<th>Successful completion of relevant IAD secondment (30)</th>
<th>Relevant EUSA teaching award nomination (2.5) or award (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop effective learning environments and approaches to student support and guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UKPSF AA5</th>
<th>PG CertAP: T and L Within and Beyond Disciplines (10); Understanding Student Learning and Studying (10); Working with PG Students (10)</th>
<th>Write up of an evaluation of practice (20)</th>
<th>For each relevant event attended (2.5) relevant digital engagement (2.5)</th>
<th>Successful completion of relevant PTAS project as PI (30) or as Co-I (5)</th>
<th>Successful completion of relevant IAD secondment (30)</th>
<th>Relevant refereed publication (10), relevant conference presentation (5), Relevant digital profile (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPD in subjects/ disciplines and their pedagogy, research, scholarship, evaluation of practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Synoptic assessment showing learning and experience mapped against UKPSF descriptor 2 (chose 1 option)</th>
<th>Application form plus 20 minute presentation with questions to a panel of assessors</th>
<th>Application process within reflective blog 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UKPSF AA1</th>
<th>Design and plan learning activities and programmes of study</th>
<th>Board of Studies chair training (10)</th>
<th>Short account of course or programme design role (10)</th>
<th>For each relevant event attended (2.5) relevant digital engagement (2.5)</th>
<th>Successful completion of relevant PTAS project as PI (30) or Co-I (5)</th>
<th>Successful completion of relevant IAD secondment (30)</th>
<th>Relevant EUSA teaching award nomination (2.5) or award (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UKPSF AA2</td>
<td>Teach and or support learning</td>
<td>Action Learning Set participation for leadership role (20)</td>
<td>Short reflection on innovative learning week (10)</td>
<td>For each relevant event attended (2.5) relevant digital engagement (2.5)</td>
<td>Successful completion of relevant PTAS project as PI (30) or Co-I (5)</td>
<td>Successful completion of relevant IAD secondment (30)</td>
<td>Relevant EUSA teaching award nomination (2.5) or award (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKPSF AA3</td>
<td>Assess and give feedback to learners</td>
<td>Board of examiners chair training (10)</td>
<td>Short account of assessment and feedback strategy (10)</td>
<td>For each relevant event attended (2.5) relevant digital engagement (2.5)</td>
<td>Successful completion of relevant PTAS project as PI (30) or Co-I (5)</td>
<td>Successful completion of relevant IAD secondment (30)</td>
<td>Relevant EUSA teaching award nomination (2.5) or award (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKPSF AA4</td>
<td>Develop effective learning environments and approaches to student support and guidance</td>
<td>Successfully lead a TPR or PPR for a subject area (20)</td>
<td>Short account of student support leadership e.g. senior tutor role (10)</td>
<td>For each relevant event attended (2.5) relevant digital engagement (2.5)</td>
<td>Successful completion of relevant PTAS project as PI (30) or Co-I (5)</td>
<td>Successful completion of relevant IAD secondment (30)</td>
<td>Relevant EUSA teaching award nomination (2.5) or award (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKPSF AA5</td>
<td>CPD in subjects/disciplines and their pedagogy, research, scholarship, evaluation of practice</td>
<td>Write up teaching leadership development plan (20)</td>
<td>Write up of an evaluation of practice (20)</td>
<td>For each relevant event attended (2.5) relevant digital engagement (2.5)</td>
<td>Successful completion of relevant PTAS project as PI (30) or Co-I (5)</td>
<td>Successful completion of relevant IAD secondment (30)</td>
<td>Relevant refereed publication (10), relevant conference presentation (5), relevant digital profile (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Synoptic assessment showing learning and experience mapped against UKPSF descriptor 3 (choose 1 option)

- Application form plus 20 minute presentation with questions to a panel of assessors
- Application process within reflective blog 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active commitment to and championing all dimensions of the UKPSF</th>
<th>Short account of work championing the UKPSF within and/or beyond the University (10)</th>
<th>For each relevant event attended (2.5) relevant digital engagement (2.5)</th>
<th>Relevant refereed publication (10), relevant conference presentation (5), relevant digital profile (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Successful strategic leadership to enhance student learning</td>
<td>Action Learning Set participation for leadership role (20)</td>
<td>Short account of strategic leadership role (10)</td>
<td>For each relevant event attended (2.5) relevant digital engagement (2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish effective organisational strategies for supporting and promoting others in delivering high quality teaching and support for learning</td>
<td>Action Learning Set participation for leadership role (20)</td>
<td>Short account of role in establishing organisational strategies to support high quality teaching and learning (10)</td>
<td>For each relevant event attended (2.5) relevant digital engagement (2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Championing an integrated approach to academic practice</td>
<td>Short account of work championing the integration of teaching, research, scholarship and administration (10)</td>
<td>For each relevant event attended (2.5) relevant digital engagement (2.5)</td>
<td>Relevant refereed publication (10), relevant conference presentation (5), relevant digital profile (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A sustained and successful commitment to, and engagement in, continuing professional development</td>
<td>Write up of an evaluation of practice at a strategic level (20) or of development offered to colleagues (10)</td>
<td>For each relevant event attended (2.5) relevant digital engagement (2.5)</td>
<td>Relevant refereed publication (10), relevant conference presentation (5), relevant digital profile (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synoptic assessment showing learning and experience mapped against UKPSF descriptor 4 (choose 1 option)</td>
<td>Application form plus 20 minute presentation with questions to a panel of assessors</td>
<td>Application process within reflective blog 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6: Explanatory Notes for the Edinburgh Teaching Award

The Award framework is shown mapped against the Areas of Activity from the UKPSF. The Core Knowledge and Professional Values from the UKPSF would be shown within participants’ engagement with the relevant Areas of Activity and must be demonstrated explicitly in the final submission for the award. The final submission and other elements of the application would be expected to show a critically reflective approach, incorporating reference to the literature on learning and teaching.

Teaching in the Edinburgh Teaching Award is defined broadly as including any work which enhances the quality of the student learning experience. This can incorporate, for example: personal tutor roles; PGT and PGR supervision; roles involving leadership in relation to learning and teaching; roles involving ‘developing the developers’ or ‘training the trainers’ in relation to learning and teaching; roles supporting learning such as learning technologists; involvement in assessment and feedback.

It is quite possible that an experienced participant applying for an award at a particular level may have more than 40 points. This would allow such participants to select some aspects of their CPD to submit for their current level of award while retaining others to be part of future applications to a higher level. Any given CPD activity can only be counted once in applications to the Edinburgh Teaching Award scheme. CPD engagement over and above the points required at particular levels could also be noted and valued within annual review.

Points for relevant conference presentations and publications would only be awarded where the work relates directly to the participant’s involvement in enhancing the student learning experience. So simply publishing in the general area of student learning research in higher education would not be sufficient. A maximum of 20 out of 40 points within any submission could come from attending relevant events.

There would be an Edinburgh Teaching Award panel with external membership which would assess final submissions. This panel would also validate the list of relevant events and other CPD opportunities which could be counted within the framework to maintain alignment with the UKPSF. Relevant events could be within or beyond the University and within the University would including offerings outwith the IAD. This would allow the inclusion of events offered by Schools and Colleges and other relevant provision such as Learn or Collaborate training.

The Teaching Award could be set up within an online space within which participants can: share draft work with IAD staff, peers and mentors; access guidance about how to approach their submission and information about relevant development opportunities; engage with online development opportunities; and pull together their complete submission.

CPD points within the Edinburgh Teaching Award are not equivalent to University course credit and do not have to carry credit.
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RE-SITS WORKING GROUP

1.0 Summary Overview and Recommendations

The group met on three occasions to discuss and establish a ‘way-forward’ to achieve the removal of and need for a re-sit exam diet in August.

It was established early in discussions that this task was complex and that it was unlikely that the intended aim could be achieved in one step. As a result the group adopted a holistic approach to exploring the problem and has identified a number of options that could significantly reduce the need for re-sits in August while working towards the original goal of complete removal.

The group was also mindful that managing this change could potentially pose a number of challenges and that any solution(s) needed, for example, to ensure that there was no unintentional consequences such as a significant increase in the resources required to manage assessments or that students were placed under increased pressure due to further compressing the duration of assessment periods.

A desirable aim is in the ability for students to be re-assessed for only those learning outcomes that they had failed and not be required to undertake the whole assessment again. One of the main challenges identified in achieving this is the ability to explicitly articulate the link between the assessment task(s) and the learning outcome(s) achieved. Until this is made possible for each course this remains a barrier to providing supplementary assessments for only the learning outcomes a student has failed to achieve. The changes required to achieve this would need to take place in the context of developments in the curriculum along with revised approaches to assessment design and therefore would need to occur over a longer and potentially defined period of time.

Given that the alignment of assessment to learning outcomes would take time, a number of complementary options were explored with a view to reducing or removing the need for re-sits during the August period and that could be introduced relatively quickly as an intermediate stage.

The following proposal is believed to be a viable way-forward and if supported by L&TC the re-sits task group will then work closely with CSPC to develop implementation plans and any required amendments to the current regulations.
1.1 Recommendations

I. 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.

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

III. 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.

IV. 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.

1.2 Proposed Work Streams

1) UNDERTAKING INVIGILATED OR ONLINE EXAMINATION OFF-CAMPUS

- Would continue to meet PSRB requirements
- Would address issues for incoming study-abroad students who had failed assessments in Edinburgh
- Could potentially assist home students when on placement / study-abroad where a re-sit opportunity was required.

*Work Stream lead - Craig Shearer*

2) SUPPLEMENTARY ASSESSMENT / RETAKE OPPORTUNITIES WITHIN THE ACADEMIC YEAR

- The opportunity to address Semester 1 failure during Semester 2
- The opportunity to address Semester 2 failure in the subsequent Semester
- Timing and number of examinations and assessment diets

*Work Stream lead - Antony Maciocia*

3) ALIGNMENT OF LEARNING OUTCOMES TO ASSESSMENT TASKS

- This work-stream would explore the issues and potential benefits in moving towards a more constructively aligned approach in assessment design to enable the re-assessment of disaggregated learning outcomes
- Work to be conducted in parallel with the developments in assessment and feedback across the University
N.B. Moving in this direction (in most cases) will require significant change and could only be achieved over a number of years

Work Stream Lead – John Lowry

4) THE REGULATORY FRAMEWORK SURROUNDING ASSESSMENT AND PROGRESSION

- CSPC to re-visit the current progression regulations to explore potential options to accommodate the desire to minimise or remove the need for a re-sit exam diet in August.

Work Stream Lead – Ian Pirie

The Re-sits Working Group would be responsible for developing the brief, scope, deliverables and timeline for each of the work-streams and would form sub-groups with additional membership drawn from all three Colleges to progress the implementation plans.

Ian Pirie,
Assistant Principal, Learning Developments.

Convener, Re-sits Working Group

20th January 2013
2.0 RE-SITS WORKING GROUP

The following outlines the approach taken and issues discussed by the Re-sits Working Group to inform the recommendations given above.

2.1 Initial Task

Learning and Teaching Committee

The Convener advised members that there is an internal aspiration to reduce the number of re-sits. In terms of operation detail, it was not proposed to remove the facility for students to remedy failure over the summer vacation, but instead to move away from examinations as a method of re-sit. Educationally, students should be given an opportunity to demonstrate that they have met the learning outcomes of a course, which needn’t be assessed in the same way as the first attempt. For example, where students fail practical assessments and they do not have the opportunity to repeat that form of assessment, they are assessed using a different method.

2.2 Action:

That a working group of members be established to explore the dimensions of this strand. Matters to be considered include: flexibility of assessment; re-sits as pass/fail; the time needed to advise on the benefits of reducing re-sits; the needs of accrediting bodies; the feasibility of piloting the approach in this academic year with a small cohort of students; the likelihood of strategic failure tactics in exam-averse students; and the University’s regulatory framework. The group should include EUSA Advice Place staff. The group will report to CSPC for consideration of the information, who would then make final recommendations to the Committee by the end of the academic year.

Sue Rigby, Vice Principal Learning and Teaching,
Chair of Learning and Teaching Committee

2.3 Context

The group discussed and clarified the rationale for the proposal to remove the examination diet in August and in the paper outlines the potential benefits, barriers and concerns around a number of key issues.

To inform the discussions of the initial meetings some benchmarking of practice in comparator institutions has been undertaken but this will need to be conducted in greater depth as the proposed solutions are developed.

It has been established, for example, that several institutions enable international students to undertake re-sit examinations in their home country under the auspices of the British Council and in some cases this extends to home students while on
study abroad and/or placement. One of our Scottish Universities is also in the process of removing the ‘automatic right’ to a re-sit opportunity. This in part has been triggered as a result of fewer than 30% attendance at their August exam diet of eligible candidates.

As an outcome of seeking to remove the August examination diet, any solutions should be beneficial to both students and staff where possible. The current approach is particularly unhelpful to international students who may travel back to Edinburgh to undertake an examination that they may also fail and for which potentially little academic guidance and support was available to them during the intervening period.

Undertaking a re-sit during August is also potentially stressful for many other students if continued progression is dependent upon it. Reducing stress levels was seen as a key aim by the group to ensure students had the best opportunity to perform to their potential.

The group was also concerned to ensure that any alternatives to the August exam diet did not unintentionally increase the staff resources required to provide and administer the supplementary assessments.

One of the main drivers for the review of our approach to managing 're-sits' is to explore the potential in providing students with alternative means of addressing failed learning outcomes other than by re-taking the whole examination or assessment again.

- The anticipated benefits for all students is that the focus of the supplementary assessment concentrates on addressing the identified deficit and does not unnecessarily reassess learning outcomes that have already been evidenced and successfully achieved.
- If the supplementary assessment is conducted via a mode of assessment other than by examination on campus in Edinburgh this would be of particular benefit to international students and would most likely be welcomed by all other students.

All possibilities need to be explored very carefully. There is a need to be consistent and rigorous to ensure that any change both benefits students and continues to assure academic standards.

The following topics have been explored and discussed by the group and the scope of the task clarified. In order to achieve a significant reduction in the need for re-sits and the potential removal of the re-sit exam diet in August any proposed solutions should examine the issue holistically and explore the changes and interventions that could occur earlier in the academic cycle to reduce wherever possible the need for re-sits.
The context of the discussions also highlighted the following that must be considered in any recommendations and proposed solutions(s);

- any change to the current arrangements for undertaking re-sits should aim to be cost neutral and ideally achieve a reduction in the use of staff time and resources

  *N.B. unless additional resource is to be made available*

- that the involvement of Academic Registry would be required to support any alternative form of assessment to address failure to ensure that the arrangements and organisation of the assessment opportunity is synchronised for each student and to ensure no scheduling conflicts

- that any proposed solution does not further increase stress for students through any reduction in the current duration of the assessment or examination period

*Issues to Consider*

3.0 IMPACT OF REMOVING THE AUGUST RE-SIT EXAM DIET

What is the direct impact of removing the re-sit examination diet in August?

This was discussed in the context of how students could then be supported to address any failure from their first examination/assessment diet.

Removing the August exam diet would have an immediate impact on the following;

- When exam/assessment results and progression information would need to be available – *i.e. much sooner than is currently the case*

- Current progression regulations regarding the options available for students to progress with and subsequently address failure

The following options were all considered viable but would require significant consideration and development prior to implementation.

*Potential Solutions*

1. That Schools take ownership of scheduling and managing all of the examinations / assessments for their courses

   *N.B. care would be required to ensure that there were no scheduling conflicts where examination as the assessment mode is still required. It is likely that Academic Registry oversight/management would be required.*
2. Provide supplementary assessment opportunities (to address failure) within the academic year

3. Provide modes of assessment during the summer period that do not require students to return to Edinburgh for a re-sit examination.

4. Provide the opportunity for international students (home address not in the UK) to undertake a re-sit examination overseas – e.g. within the British Council or other approved agency.

4.0 STRUCTURE OF THE ACADEMIC YEAR (WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF RESITS)

Are there changes that could be made to the structure and pattern of the academic cycle that would enable students to address any failure ‘in-year’ and with academic support?

The current pattern and cycle of activity was explored to ascertain what if anything could be altered to reduce or remove the need for a re-sit examination diet in August.

The following was identified as having the potential to improve upon the current position;

- provide students with a scheduled opportunity to retrieve Semester 1 failure during Semester 2 and Semester 2 failure in the subsequent Semester.

- review the timing of assessments / examinations, availability of course results and progression decisions with a view to providing all assessment / re-assessment opportunities ‘in-year’ - this potentially would have the advantage of students being academically supported through all assessment periods.

This solution has significant potential and would still enable examination as a mode of assessment where this is deemed essential – e.g. as a PSRB requirement.

As an example where a 1st yr student has failed a course which is not deemed core or pre-requisite they could automatically progress to 2nd yr with an assessment opportunity mid Semester 2.

N.B. this would require considered development and would only occur within prescribed and permitted volumes of failure.

5.0 REASONS FOR RESITS

To consider whether the need for a subsequent assessment opportunity (beyond the first attempt) should be treated the same in all cases?

The following categories encapsulate the reasons why students would require a supplementary assessment opportunity;
1. Special circumstances

Where a student has failed as a result of special circumstance the recommendation is that (as currently) they must not be penalised academically and that decisions taken by the examination board must reflect this regarding the opportunity to re-take examinations or submit coursework as if at the first attempt – *N.B. this may mean allowing the student to re-sit by examination (and not by an alternative form of assessment) to ensure parity of opportunity.*

2. Academic failure

Where students have fully participated in the course and attempted the first assessment opportunity but have failed, that a supplementary assessment opportunity be given.

**To consider**
- Should the opportunity of retrieval be automatic?
- Should the mark/grade be capped?
- Should there be a permitted level of failure that could be condoned?
- Should the student be permitted (as an option) to re-attend the course the following year?
- Should credit be awarded on aggregate pass?

3. Strategic selection

Where students have elected to selectively take examinations and/or choose not to participate in assessment (e.g. not submit coursework) and no special circumstances are presented, should this category be treated differently?

**To consider**
- Should the opportunity of retrieval be automatic?
- Should the mark/grade be capped?
• Should there be a permitted level of failure that could be condoned?
• Should the student be permitted or required to re-attend the course again during the following year?

It was felt that there was no benefit in treating the ‘Strategic selection’ category any differently from academic failure since in practice the student cannot gain any benefit from this and simply places themselves at greater risk having missed the first opportunity for assessment.

To treat this differently would also increase the use of staff resources for no benefit.

6.0 INTERVENTIONS THAT MAY REDUCE THE NEED FOR RESITS

The group felt that potential alternatives to the traditional approach to addressing failure by providing an examination diet in August should be viewed holistically.

Interventions to minimise the numbers of students failing and therefore requiring to take supplementary assessment is therefore beneficial.

To consider
• Increasing the use of formative assessment and feedback
• Making progression decisions earlier may be beneficial to both students and staff regarding which options may be available to address failure

In both cases this would require substantive work to be undertaken around course and assessment design to enable more formative assessment to be introduced along with potential changes to assessment schedules and meetings of examination boards.

7.0 SUPPLEMENTARY ASSESSMENTS AND A LEARNING OUTCOMES APPROACH

The proposal to address only those learning outcomes that the student had failed to evidence at the first attempt via supplementary assessment is understood.

It is felt however that currently in the majority of courses there is unlikely to be sufficient direct alignment of assessment tasks to the specified learning outcomes to make this viable as a solution in the short-term.

The following would need to be considered and developed to enable this approach to work in practice;

• Each learning outcome would need to be individually articulated and clearly identified within each Course Descriptor
- Course descriptors would need to identify which assessment tasks were aligned to each learning outcome – *e.g. a number of different assessments could contribute to evidencing each learning outcome*

- Assessment design would need to enable the disaggregated assessment of each specified learning outcome

- The need to ensure that students have the opportunity to evidence and attain the required learning outcomes regardless of the mode of assessment

- Where students can evidence the same learning outcome(s) by different modes of assessment what approach is followed – *e.g. if the student fails to evidence the learning outcome in one form of assessment but is successful in another what is the assessment outcome overall.*

The above is not an exhaustive list and represents a substantive body of work if the University wished to move in this direction. The benefits could however be substantial and would provide the opportunity to increase the use of ‘assessment for learning’ which is much sought after by our students.

### 8.0 ALTERNATIVE MODES OF ASSESSMENT - i.e. other than by examination

- Which modes of assessment may be most applicable?
- Which if any mode of assessment may need to be restricted?
- Likelihood of strategic failure tactics in examination-averse students?

Care would be required to ensure that all forms of assessment were equally rigorous and that students did not have the opportunity to select one over another – i.e. encouraging strategic selection of which assessment to participate in.

On balance the group felt that strategic selection (although a real possibility) should not inhibit the development and introduction of multiple forms of assessment to test various learning outcomes and that students be guided appropriately regarding the ‘risks’ attached to selectively engaging with and participating in their required assessments.

### 9.0 RESITS RECORDED AS PASS/FAIL ONLY

*What would be the benefit or disadvantage of recording a PASS / FAIL for supplementary assessment to address failure?*

- Impact on progression
- Impact on honours classification / merits / distinctions
- Algorithms for honours classification / merits / distinctions
- Impact on transcripts - *e.g. HEAR*
- Impact on current systems configuration
Even if a Pass/Fail was recorded the assessment would still have to be conducted rigorously and a grade/mark given. Students would benefit from and would also have a right to know what mark/grade was actually achieved.

Understanding the difference between awarding credit and mark/grades is regarded as important.

It was felt that there was no resource benefit to recording a PASS/FAIL and adopting this approach would not impact on transcripts, HEAR or our current systems configuration.

10.0 PSRB REQUIREMENTS

Are there particular issues that need to be considered regarding PSRB requirements?

To consider
- Re-sit arrangements where PSRBs require a particular mode of assessment
- Whether PSRB constraint only applies to final summative assessment

PSRB requirements would have to be met in any of the proposed solutions and a number of students may still be required to undertake a re-sit by examination where the form of assessment is a stipulated requirement and the course is classified as core and a pre-requisite for progression.

11.0 HOLDING EXAMINATIONS ONLINE AND/OR REMOTELY OFF-CAMPUS

Is there potential benefit in providing a re-sit opportunity by examination off-campus or online as an interim measure?

- International students could take their re-sits in their home country under the auspices of the British Council or other approved agency
- Online mediated examination
- How should we treat study-abroad, exchanges and students on placement overseas?

It was felt that the University should re-visit this as an option in the short-term. The ability to undertake invigilated examinations off-campus and away from Edinburgh would benefit a significant number of students primarily but not exclusively from our international community.

There may always be a requirement to undertake a re-sit assessment by invigilated examination (e.g. PSRB requirement) and introducing this relatively quickly will provide an interim solution while different approaches to providing alternative forms of supplementary assessments are being developed.
12.0 FEASIBILITY OF PILOTS IN AUGUST 2013

When should the pilots of any proposals be undertaken?

To consider
- Likely impact on continuing and exiting students
- Agreement required by each cohort of students
- Consultation with EUSA
- Consultations with Schools

The introduction of any pilots would need to be conducted with the full consent of students and would need to be ‘low-risk’ if introduced during an academic cycle.

As a result of the concerns raised by both student and staff group members, it is not recommended that we introduce pilots for the end of this academic year 2012/13 but aim instead to have comprehensive pilots of each of the options in each School for academic session 2013/14.

13.0 CONSTRAINTS OF EXISTING REGULATIONS

The group felt that some changes to the existing regulations would be required but that this could also be an opportunity to ensure consistency of practice across the University.

Importantly that the development of progression regulations and opportunities for supplementary assessments and/or re-sit could be different from ‘year-to-year’ to maximise the beneficial impact – e.g. pre-honours progression requirements are already different from honours years.

To consider
- Existing regulations in the context of the above proposals
- Timeline for changes to existing regulations for academic session 2013-14

The 50% progression threshold and the relationship between this and the assessment regulations would need to be considered and variations across Schools would need to be taken into account.

14.0 EQUALITY, IMPACT AND RISK ASSESSMENT

What do we need to consider in any new proposals?

- Ensure no one is being disadvantaged
- Resource implications
- Academic performance and progression data

To ensure that any changes to the existing approach does not unintentionally
increase stress in our students, for example through compressing the examination period during the April/May diet, central oversight, organisation and support currently provided by the Academic Registry will continue to be required to ensure that there is no scheduling conflict when setting supplementary assessments.

Any alternative forms of assessment must also ensure that they do not mitigate against any particular learning need or adjustment and are designed to be fully inclusive.

A risk assessment would need to be conducted to capture any unintentional negative impact of removing the August examination re-sit diet and of the introduction of alternative replacement solutions.

15.0 FOR INFORMATION

Benchmarking with other Universities:

Initial desk research:

- University of Dundee
- University of Glasgow
- University of Durham
- University of Cardiff
- University of Nottingham
- University of Newcastle
- University of Manchester
- University of Birmingham
- University of Essex
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Learning and Teaching Enhancement Strategies
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## University Learning and Teaching Enhancement Strategy

### Contact Officer
Susan Hunter, Academic Policy Officer, Susan.Hunter5@ed.ac.uk
Nichola Kett, Academic Policy Officer, nichola.kett@ed.ac.uk

### Purpose
The policy contains the strategy for learning and teaching enhancement in the University of Edinburgh, supporting the University’s strategic goal of excellence in learning and teaching education.

### Overview
The University Learning-and Teaching Enhancement Strategy aligns with the University Strategic Plan and complementary Learning and Teaching Strategies in each College. It outlines the chief aims, underpinning principles and institutional strategic priorities objectives for enhancing learning and teaching within the University. The 2010-2012 institutional strategic priorities are employability, assessment and feedback, student guidance and support and enhancement infrastructure.

### Scope
The strategy applies to all students and staff in the University. It is overseen by the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee.

### The Policy
The University Learning-and Teaching Enhancement Strategy (LTES) comprises three facets: chief aims, underpinning principles, and institutional strategic priorities objectives for the period 2010-2012 2012-2016. These three facets are of equal importance and closely interrelated.

Responsibility for the University LTES lies with the Learning and Teaching Committee of Senatus. Each College also has its own LTES Learning and Teaching Strategy (LTS), for which it is responsible. University and College LTES’s and LTS’s seek to be contiguous and to work in synergy, as part of an institutional approach to enhancement which is intentionally devolved.

### CHIEF AIMS

1. to strengthen and enhance the quality of students' experiences of university study wherever necessary, appropriate and practicable

2. to sustain an environment in which excellence in learning and teaching can thrive and where refinements and innovations in practices are prized and promulgated

3. to encourage everyone involved in teaching and supporting learning to play their part in enhancing as well as ensuring quality

### UNDERPINNING PRINCIPLES

The University's Learning-and Teaching Enhancement Strategy is underpinned by the following principles:
a. it is well-aligned to the University's strategic goals, mission and ethos

b. it complements the learning and teaching strategies of the three Colleges

c. it is forward-looking, engaging with evolving needs and circumstances and addressing prospective challenges and opportunities

d. it is inclusive, encompassing the full range of levels of study (UG, PGT, PGR undergraduate, taught postgraduate and postgraduate research) and patterns of provision at Edinburgh

e. it continues to value initiatives by individuals, course teams and subject groups to enhance local practices

INSTITUTIONAL STRATEGIC PRIORITIES OBJECTIVES, 2010-2012 2012-2016

1. Employability
   Focusing, coordinating and strengthening efforts to prepare students for the challenges of the 21st-century graduate workplace and optimise their employability

2. Assessment and feedback
   a. Improving the quality and consistency of feedback to students
   b. Encouraging and supporting the continuing evolution of assessment practices and policies to address 21st-century needs, challenges and opportunities

3. Student guidance and support
   Strengthening the framework of academic and pastoral guidance and support to students

4. Enhancement Infrastructure
   Developing structures and processes that support, facilitate and sustain the strategic enhancement of learning and teaching

Aim
To stimulate in our students a lifelong thirst for knowledge and learning and to encourage a pioneering, innovative and independent attitude and an aspiration to achieve success within and beyond the University.

Objectives
To meet our aim we will:
- use our globally leading strengths in research to underpin and inform our teaching
- guide and support our students through University of Edinburgh degree programmes
- develop each student’s capacity to learn by enquiry, through the in-depth study they undertake, particularly at Honours and Postgraduate level
- foster a climate in which teaching is highly valued
- embed graduate attributes and employability in all our curricula, and equip our students to compete in the global marketplace
- facilitate flexible learner journeys.

Keywords
Learning, teaching, enhancement, strategic priorities
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Equality Act: Adjustments

Developing an Accessible and Inclusive Curriculum
Proposal for the Mainstreaming of Adjustments

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

This paper sets out a proposal for the mainstreaming of a small number of common adjustments for the benefit of all students. The paper was produced in response to a request from LTC and was presented in its original form at the 21st November 2012 meeting of LTC (Paper LTC 12/13 2 D). Following discussion at the meeting we were asked to revise a number of elements of the paper to include: rewording of some of the adjustments, provision of guidance on the implementation of the adjustments and to conduct a scoping exercise to establish current practice both internally and externally (specifically in relation to the recording of lectures). This revised paper responds to the additional requests from LTC.

Action requested

Members are asked to discuss and approve the proposal.

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? No more than the resource implications already associated with the implementation of adjustments

Risk Assessment

Does the paper include a risk analysis? No, but there are potential risks of legal action if (disabled) students are disadvantaged in future.

Equality and Diversity

Does the paper have equality and diversity implications? Yes, equality and diversity is inherent to the paper.

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes.
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Tina Harrison, Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance
Sheila Williams, Director, Student Disability Service
Hazel Marzetti, EUSA Vice Principal Activities and Societies
Developing an Accessible and Inclusive Curriculum
Proposal for the Mainstreaming of Adjustments

Introduction

This paper sets out a proposal for the mainstreaming of a small number of common adjustments for the benefit of all students. The paper was produced in response to a request from LTC and was presented in its original form at the 21st November 2012 meeting of LTC (Paper LTC 12/13 2 D). Following discussion at the meeting we were asked to revise a number of elements of the paper to include: rewording of some of the adjustments, provision of guidance on the implementation of the adjustments and to conduct a scoping exercise to establish current practice both internally and externally (specifically in relation to the recording of lectures). This revised paper responds to the additional requests from LTC. Members of LTC are now asked to discuss and approve the revised proposal for an Accessible and Inclusive Learning Policy.

What do we mean by mainstreaming?

‘Mainstreaming’ in education means the systematic consideration of the effects of teaching, learning and assessment practice and policy on students at the point of planning, implementation and evaluation. The ultimate goal of mainstreaming is equality; mainstreaming is a process that aims to achieve this goal. Hence, mainstreaming ensures that equality considerations are “built-in” not “bolted-on”.

Currently we “bolt-on” a number of adjustments to accommodate specific learning requirements of students. These adjustments whilst related to disability would also be of benefit to other students, for example international students whose first language is not English.

The mainstreaming of adjustments is consistent with the ethos outlined in the University’s Accessible Learning Statement:

"We aim to help students maximise their academic potential and get the most benefit from their programme of study and university experience. In line with our strategic goal of excellence in learning and teaching, we seek to enhance the student experience by creating a learning and teaching environment, and culture, that is dynamic, accessible and inclusive."

The Student Disability Service (SDS) recommends that a student’s learning environment be “adjusted” based on robust information and assessment. Over the recent years that the SDS has been recommending adjustments and learning profiles (list of support recommended for an individual student), a number of frequently
utilised adjustments and trends are discernible. These trends have been reported annually in the SDS Quality Assurance Report and were reported to LTC at its September 2012 meeting. Three key adjustments represent over half of all adjustments recommended. Hence, mainstreaming just a small number of adjustments would significantly reduce the overall number of adjustments recommended.

The University has an ‘anticipatory duty’ towards disabled students in respect of the Equality Act 2010. This means we should be planning ahead and anticipating the needs of disabled students and the adjustments they might need. We now have enough evidence to suggest that there are a small number of areas where the same adjustments are being made that we could consider mainstreaming. The benefit of mainstreaming a small number of adjustments is that we can: ensure that adjustments are being implemented; we can meet out legal obligation; and also enhance the learning experience for all students at the same time.

Proposal

Set against this context, it is proposed that we seek to increase the accessibility and inclusivity of learning and teaching for all students by mainstreaming a small number of adjustments, and we do this by proposing the following Accessible and Inclusive Learning Policy.

We propose that, unless there is a justified pedagogic reason\(^1\) for not doing so, the Accessible and Inclusive Learning Policy will apply to all courses.

This proposal has been revised to take account of requests for: (1) changes to the wording of a number of adjustments\(^2\) (2) guidance on the implementation of the adjustments, and (3) a scoping exercise to establish current practice both internally and externally, with regards to the recording of lectures. The scoping exercise, conducted by John Locke, revealed that there is considered discussion in the sector around lecture recording. We focus only on the recording of lectures concerning the whole student population, not specifically disabled students. Disabled students are protected by the legislation: if a disabled student has been deemed eligible by the Student Disability Service to record lectures, they must be allowed to do so to comply with the law.

---

\(^1\) A justified pedagogic reason must be made clear to students in advance in the course handbook. For example, for some subjects it may not be possible to put some material on the VLE because it is confidential or sensitive (i.e. information relating to patients in medicine). In other subjects it may be necessary that students prioritise reading lists for themselves – in such cases this should be reflected in the learning outcomes of the course and should be assessed, otherwise it is not justified.

\(^2\) The appendix provides a direct comparison between the wording of adjustments in the previous paper and the revised wording in this paper.
The scoping exercise revealed that there is considerable discussion taking place across the sector regarding the recording of lectures for whole student populations, and there are some examples where universities have taken the decision to allow access to recorded lectures. Many Institutions have focused on making lecture capture standard. This has advantages because it gives greater control to the lecturer in editing the materials, but requires the technology to be available in all classrooms in order to make it work. Other universities have taken the step to give the control to students to record lectures (and often other classes) under clearly defined conditions. Within the University, the School of Biological Sciences has already permitted students to audio record lectures and has established a mechanism for doing so that regulates the use of the recorded material and affords protection to teaching staff. Following are some very good examples from comparator universities.

**Dundee University** allows all students to audio record any lectures given by any member of staff, but does not permit video recording without the explicit permission of the lecturer and others involved. **St Andrew’s University** acknowledges that other students who do not have a disability, record lectures to supplement their own notes to ensure they attain the best outcome from the lecture. **Warwick University** allows students to record lectures but only with permission of the lecturer and on explanation of the reason for wishing to record. **Stirling University** has permitted all students to make audio-recording of all lectures, tutorials, seminars, practical sessions and workshops delivered as part of the University’s taught programmes of study since June 2003 and has an explicit policy for audio-recording. The guidance that follows is based on the good practice from these examples.

**Accessible and Inclusive Learning Policy**

- Course outlines and reading lists shall be made available at least 4 weeks before the start of the course.

**Guidance:**

This means providing an outline of the course in terms of the indicative content, nature of assessments and indicative reading. Reading lists at this stage may focus on the core texts only (where they are used). Additional reading may be provided nearer to the start date of the course (see following point). The provision of this information will facilitate course choices, where available, and provide students with an early opportunity to engage with the course requirements and familiarise themselves with the reading. This information is likely to be communicated in course handbooks or on the appropriate VLE. It should be stressed that this is an outline and further course details will be
• Reading lists shall indicate priority and/or relevance.

**Guidance:**
Where reading lists are provided to students these should clearly indicate to students those readings that are considered to be key to the course or particularly relevant to a session or theme within the course. It is not necessary for the whole reading list to be ordered. Neither is it expected that students should read only from the reading list provided; they will be expected, through their own research, to identify further readings. In some subjects, the compilation of a reading list may be central to the assessment task. Where this is the case it shall be signalled clearly to students as there may not be a set reading list provided.

The key purpose is so that students can prioritise their own reading.

[Ref: Teaching and Learning Adjustment no.106]

• Lecture outlines or PowerPoint presentation slides for lectures/seminars shall be made available to students at least 24 hours in advance of the class.

**Guidance:**
Where Powerpoint (or similar) presentation slides are used as the basis for the lecture/class, these shall be made available to students 24 hours in advance of the class, preferably on the appropriate VLE, for all students to access as required. Where a VLE is not used, students must be informed of how to access the materials. Teaching staff will not be expected to produce Powerpoint slides if these are not normally used. In other cases an outline of the lecture will be required. This may take the form of a bullet-pointed list of the key themes/content of the lecture/class: it is not required that detailed notes are provided. Judgement will need to be exercised in such cases where confidential or ‘spoiler’ information is contained within materials so as not to compromise confidentiality or impinge on the pedagogical experience. In such cases students should be informed of the presence of such information and may only be provided with partial Powerpoint slides in advance of the class; the full materials to be made available following the class.

The key purpose is to inform students of what they will be taught so that
they can prepare in advance in their own time.
[Ref: Teaching and Learning Adjustment no.102]

- **Key technical words and/or formulae shall be provided to students at least 24 hours in advance of the class.**

  **Guidance:**
  Where technical words/terms and/or formulae are used in class, these should be made available at least 24 hours in advance of the class that they are being used in, preferably on the appropriate VLE. Where the VLE is not used, students must be informed of how to access the materials. In many cases technical words/formulae are likely to be embedded in the lecture/class presentation and are likely to be covered by the provision of lecture outlines/PowerPoint slides (see point above). In other cases it may be necessary to produce a supplementary handout for students. The use of technical words/terms and/or formulae will not affect all subjects and judgement needs to be exercised.
  **The key purpose** is to ensure that students fully understand the terms/formulae in use in the class and to facilitate their participation.
  [Ref: Teaching and Learning Adjustment no.108]

- **Students shall be notified by email of changes to arrangements/announcements such as changes to courses/room changes/cancellations.**

  **Guidance:**
  Students should be notified of changes to courses/classes as soon as possible. The official form of communication is the University email system and should be the primary method of communication. This may be supplemented by other forms of communication (such as plasma screens, lecture announcements etc.) as available and appropriate.
  **The key purpose** is to ensure students do not miss important information and have sufficient time to respond to changes.
  [Ref: Teaching and Learning Adjustment no.201]

- **Students shall be permitted to audio record lectures, tutorials and supervision sessions using their own equipment for their own personal learning.**

  **Guidance:**
  Students may make audio-recording of all classes that they attend that are delivered as part of the university’s taught programmes of study,
provided that:

- The recording is only used by the individual student for the purposes of personal study (it shall be a disciplinary offence to use the material for any other purpose, or to distribute the material).
- Video recording shall not be permitted without the explicit permission of the member of staff involved.
- All Intellectual Property Rights in the recording remain with the University and the lecturer.
- The recording is done in an unobtrusive manner by the student using their own equipment.
- The recording is destroyed once its purpose has been met (this will always be before the student leaves the University and shall normally be by the end of the exam diet to which the course relates).
- Teaching staff have the right to insist that recording stops in certain circumstances (for example to protect confidentiality where sensitive or personal information is being discussed).
- Students agree to these terms and conditions as part of the contract between the University and its students and assent to it on matriculation.

**The key purpose** is to act as a supplement to lecture attendance, to facilitate note-taking, facilitate review of complex concepts/discussion, and aid revision. Recorded lectures build on the value of the lecture and should not be used in place of lecture attendance. The lecture/class experience is far more than the spoken words of the lecturer; active participation is essential.

[Ref: Teaching and Learning Adjustment nos.121 & 135]

- All teaching staff shall ensure that microphones are worn and used in all lectures regardless of the perceived need to wear them.

**Guidance:**

Where radio microphones are made available in teaching rooms these must be worn and used by all teaching staff regardless of the perceived need to wear them. Table-top microphones are not always sufficient on their own, particularly when lecturers walk around whilst talking. The benefit of amplified sound reduces the effort involved in concentrating in the class for all students, not only students with a hearing impairment, and improves attention.

Maintenance of the microphones is the responsibility of the Learning and Teaching Spaces Technology Section.

[Ref: Teaching and Learning Adjustment no.866]
Existing good practice

This proposal should not be taken to indicate that some, if not all, of the above adjustments are not already being mainstreamed in some Schools/Subject Areas. For example, many Schools already provide lecture outlines/PowerPoint slides on the VLE in advance of lectures as a matter of course, but it is by no means happening in all Schools. The School of Biological Sciences has already permitted students to audio record lectures and has established a mechanism for doing so that regulates the use of the recorded material and affords protection to teaching staff. This proposal is intended to ensure that we build on the existing good practice and experiences of colleagues in this area and provide a means of enhancing the learning experience for all students.

Why is it important?

The strategic and legislative imperative for revisiting our approach and practice is supported by a number of initiatives, including:

- **The University’s Strategic Plan 2012-2016**
  
The proposal is consistent with the University’s Strategic Goal of ‘Excellence in Education’ and strategic themes of ‘Outstanding Student Experience’ and ‘Equality and Widening Participation’.

- **The University’s Equality and Diversity Strategy and Action Plan 2011-2012**
  
The University is committed to embedding Equality and Diversity across all its work, including learning and teaching. The University has set targets at University Strategic level as well developing a single equality action plan to address our duties under the Equality Act 2010 encompassing all nine protected characteristics. There are specific actions in the Action Plan that this proposal directly aims to achieve: “**4.14.2a** Fully implement course adjustments for students. **4.14.4** Continue to work towards an inclusive environment for disabled students. **4.14.5a** Reduce overall number of specific adjustments recommended on students’ learning profiles in favour of “mainstreamed” approach”.

- **Increasing diversity among the student population**
  
  Our student population is diverse and this diversity is set to increase. One third of our students are international, almost 10% of students have declared a disability.
• **The Scottish Government’s Widening Participation agenda**

The WP agenda will further increase the diversity of the student population. This diversity will enrich the student experience but may also increase the need for support for students.

• **The legal imperative of the Equality Act (2010) and the public sector Equality Duty**

The Equality Act encompasses more groups who are more likely to be discriminated against and encompasses and supercedes the Disability Discrimination Act (and the race and gender legislation) which existed pre-2010.

In addition to protecting disabled people from discrimination, the Equality Act also includes 8 other protected characteristics.

All 9 protected characteristics are listed below:

- age
- disability
- gender reassignment
- marriage and civil partnership
- pregnancy and maternity
- race
- religion and belief
- sex
- sexual orientation.

We need to ensure as a University we have effective methods to meet our public duty under the Equality Act 2010 and develop inclusive cultures to enhance the student experience and promote an institution-wide understanding of equality issues and responsibilities. The Public Sector Equality Duty requires public bodies to consider all individuals when carrying out day-to-day work in shaping policy and in delivering services.

We are required to have due regard to the need to:

1. Eliminate discrimination
2. Advance equality of opportunity
3. Foster good relations between different people when carrying out their activities.
• To improve the student experience
There is a real opportunity to improve the student experience for ALL students and raise the reputation of the University. Based on research among students conducted by EUSA it has been found that although a significant number of students are comfortable declaring their disability, it is likely that there are more students living with disabilities that either do not feel comfortable disclosing them or who simply have not yet identified that they have a disability. Mainstreaming adjustments enables all these students to have their learning supported equally, as well as having a positive impact on the rest of the student population’s learning. The proposed adjustments simply mean that it is easier for students to manage their time, prepare successfully for their lectures and tutorials and fully understand academic material. In turn this increases their confidence with material, making students feel more able to participate in classes and therefore able to find their place in the academic community.

The evidence for action

In addition to the legal and strategic imperatives outlined above, there is also mounting evidence of the need for action with regards mainstreaming:

• The proportion of students declaring a disability is rising

In the UK HEI\(^3\) sector the proportion of students declaring a disability in 2009/10 was 7.6%. The proportion within the University of Edinburgh is higher at over 9% in academic year 2011-12. In both cases over half of the disabled students declared a specific learning difficulty (e.g. dyslexia).

• The propensity to declare a disability is not equally distributed

Creative arts students are more than three times likely to declare a disability (14.4%) than business students (4.5%). FT UG students are twice as likely to declare a disability than PG students. Chinese students are much less likely to declare a disability than white students: 3.6% of students respectively across UK HEIs compared to 9.2%.

• The attainment gap between disabled and non-disabled students is widest in Scotland

The attainment gap between students declaring a disability and those with no known disability is the widest in Scotland at 7%, compared with 2.9% in Wales.

• The number of adjustments issued by the SDS is rising

Within an academic year the Student Disability Service recommends around 14,000 adjustments; almost 5,000 of these are new adjustments each year and that number is rising in line with the year on year increase in the volume of disabled students.

- **Not all adjustments are being implemented.**

The percentage of SDS survey respondents reporting they had “received all adjustments in all courses” reduced from 61% in 2010-11, to 49% in 2011-12% (SDS evaluation 2011-12). Failure to comply with a duty to make reasonable adjustments is classed as a form of discrimination under the Equality Act, exposing the University to serious legal risk.

**Benefits**

There are a number of benefits to mainstreaming adjustments for students, staff and the wider University.

- Reduces the need for students to ensure that adjustments are being implemented
- All students benefit from mainstreamed adjustments – not just disabled students.
- Has the potential to contribute to a more positive student experience for all students that may influence NSS results.
- Mainstreaming the adjustments benefit staff in the long-term by building them into course design rather than responding to the needs of many individual students.
- Ensures compliance with the external legal environment.

**Tina Harrison**, Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance  
**Sheila Williams**, Director Student Disability Service  
**Hazel Marzetti**, EUSA Vice President Societies and Activities
Appendix

This table shows the change in wording of the adjustments from the original paper to this current version, taking into account the comments made by LTC members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original adjustment wording</th>
<th>Revised adjustment wording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide course outlines and reading lists at least 4 weeks before the start of the course.</td>
<td>Course outlines and reading lists shall be made available at least 4 weeks before the start of the course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide coursework/assignment questions and deadlines at the start of course.</td>
<td>Removed — it is not one of the SDS adjustments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order reading lists by priority/relevance.</td>
<td>Reading lists shall indicate priority and/or relevance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide lecture outlines/PowerPoint presentation slides and other materials used for in-class activities at least 24 hours in advance of the class on the VLE.</td>
<td>Lecture outlines or PowerPoint presentation slides for lectures/seminars shall be made available to students at least 24 hours in advance of the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide lists of key technical words and/or formulae at least 24 hours in advance of the class.</td>
<td>Key technical words and/or formulae shall be provided to students at least 24 hours in advance of the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that students are notified by email of changes to courses/classes.</td>
<td>Students shall be notified by email of changes to arrangements/announcements such as changes to courses/room changes/cancellations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit all students to audio record lectures, tutorials and supervision sessions using their own equipment for their own personal learning.</td>
<td>Students shall be permitted to audio record lectures, tutorials and supervision sessions using their own equipment for their own personal learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that microphones are maintained in good working order and are worn and used by teaching staff in all lectures regardless of the perceived need to wear them.</td>
<td>All teaching staff shall ensure that microphones are worn and used in all lectures regardless of the perceived need to wear them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide alternative assessments when requested to do so by the Student Disability Service.</td>
<td>Removed at request of LTC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>