UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE
Raeburn Room, Old College
23 April 2019, 10 am

AGENDA

1	**Minute**	**A1**
	To _approve_ the Minute of the previous meeting held on 19 March 2019.	
2	**Matters Arising & Action Log**	**A2**
	To _raise_ any matters arising.	
3	**Principal's Communications**	**Verbal**
	To _receive_ an update from the Senior Vice-Principal.	

DISCUSSION ITEMS

4	**The Student Experience Action Plan: Update**	**B**
	To _consider_ the paper from the Deputy Secretary Student Experience.	
5	**Strategic Finance & Planning**	
	To _consider_ the papers from the Director of Finance.	
	• **Director of Finance's Report**	**C1**
	• **Planning Round 2019-22 as presented to Policy & Resources Committee**	**C2**
6	**Reputational Due Diligence over Income Sources**	**D**
	To _approve_ the paper from the Vice-Principal Philanthropy and Advancement.	
7	**Internal Audit – Follow Up Actions**	**E**
	To _consider_ the paper from the Director of Legal Services.	
8	**Reviews of Senate Governance**	**F**
	To _consider_ and _comment_ on the paper from the Senior Vice-Principal.	

ITEMS FOR NOTING OR FORMAL APPROVAL

9	**REF2021 Code of Practice**	**G**
	To _approve_.	
10	**Report from Fee Strategy Group**	**H**
	To _approve_.	
11	**Update: Preventing and Responding to Sexual Violence and Gender-Based Violence**	**I**
	To _note_.	
12	**People Report**	**J**
	To _note_.	

13   **Health and Safety Quarterly Report: Quarter 2**   **K**
To _note_.

14   **Email Autoforwarding: Change to Service**   **L**
To _note_.

15   **Orphan Website Suspension Report**   **M**
To _note_.

16   **Resource Lists Framework**   **N**
To _note_.

17   **University Executive Communications**   **Verbal**
To _note_ the key messages to be communicated.

18   **Any Other Business**   **Verbal**
To _consider_ any other matters by UE members.

19   **Date of Next Meeting**
Tuesday 14 May 2019 at 10am in the Raeburn Room.

20   **Future Meeting Dates**
To note: meeting dates in bold may have a particularly full agenda due to alignment with Policy and Resources Committee and Court.

University Executive meeting dates	Policy & Resources Committee	Court
14 May 2019	3 June 2019	17 June 2019
25 June 2019		
30 July 2019		
29 August 2019	16 September 2019	30 September 2019
23 September 2019		
22 October 2019	18 November 2019	2 December 2019
19 November 2019		
17 December 2019		
21 January 2020	27 January 2020	17 February 2020
25 February 2020		
24 March 2020	3 April 2020	27 April 2020
23 April 2020		
19 May 2020	1 June 2020	15 June 2020
23 June 2020		
21 July 2020		

THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

19 March 2019

[Draft] Minute

Present: Peter Mathieson (Convener)
David Argyle, Leigh Chalmers, Eleri Connick, Chris Cox, Hugh Edmiston, David Gray, Lee Hamill, Gary Jebb, Charlie Jeffery, Gavin McLachlan, Wendy Loretto, Theresa Merrick, Dorothy Miell, Dave Robertson, James Saville, Jonathan Seckl, Tracey Slaven, James Smith, Sarah Smith and Moira Whyte.

In attendance: Professor Simon Kelley, Head of GeoScience (for item 4), Fiona Boyd and Kirstie Graham.

Apologies: Gavin Douglas, Richard Kenway, Andrew Morris and Jane Norman.

1	**Minute**	**Paper A1**

The Minute of the meeting held on 19 February 2019 was approved as a correct record.

2	**Matters Arising & Review of Action Log**	**Paper A2**

There were no matters arising and the action log was noted.

3	**Principal's Communications**	**Verbal**

The Principal noted the sudden and tragic deaths of Professor Jason Reese, Regius Professor of Engineering, and PhD students Stuart Elliot and Peter Pukler, with sincere condolences to their family and friends.

He reported the strategic awayday on 11 April 2019 would be a continuation of the planning round discussions for budget holders, with the next University Executive awayday planned for 13 June 2019; an inspiring inaugural lecture by Professor Kev Dhaliwal; a recent Modern Education Conference at Ditchley, an international event which raised a number of issues including the role of technology in education, links between further and higher education, credit transfer, extracurricular activity and wellbeing and the role of philanthropy in the future funding of education; the Augar review was still not published and the continuing uncertainty alongside Brexit and pensions was contributing to a challenging planning round.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

4	**Business Case for the Low Carbon College**	**Paper B**

Professor Simon Kelley spoke to the proposal to further develop the partnership with Shanghai JiaoTong University (SJTU) to establish a Low Carbon College in Shanghai Lingang, China. A conservative business case had been provided based

on three pillars: teaching, research and innovation and executive training. The proposal was presented as providing opportunities across those three pillars in line with international strategy and aspirations rather than focussing on income generation, although it would not be loss making and had the potential to unlock other opportunities.

In discussion the general issue was raised that in future it was hoped to streamline information about international ventures at an earlier stage, whilst accepting the timing issues in this case. There was general consensus that there needed to be a more strategic, joined up approach with a shared understanding of the University's international aspirations and direction to prevent duplication and opportunity cost. It was noted that the outcome of the recent strategic awayday on internationalisation should clarify the route for international ventures.

In relation to the specific proposal, members noted that SJTU was a good choice of partner and the risk was largely being taken by SJTU not the University. Concerns were expressed about the dependence on 'flying faculty' and also discussion on students' English language capability, with both these points recognised in developing the proposal. There was also concern about the small overhead and it was agreed it would be prudent to work with finance colleagues to test some of the financial assumptions in the paper to ensure that surplus generation capacity was being maximised.

Taking into account the need for some further work on the finances, it was agreed that this was an area the University wished to develop and the Executive was content to support the proposal progressing to Policy and Resources Committee and if supported to University Court.

5   Planning Round 2018-22

- **Director of Finance's Report**   **Paper C1**

The Director of Finance spoke to the period 6 Management Accounts and updated on the period 7 position, which showed a reducing draft operating surplus of £17m, which although £5m ahead of the full year forecast for an operating surplus of £12m, is below the finance strategy minimum of 2% of turnover. The report included the Russell Group financial benchmarking analysis for years 2014-15 to 2017-18 which indicated that operating surpluses are reducing across the University's peer group and that Edinburgh's income growth is lower than the peer and Russell Group averages. Internal funding (i.e. cash inflow from operations) of capital expenditure is reducing and Edinburgh had the lowest result in 2017-18 (28%), which is significant in the light of our ambitious capital programme. Although the capital programme has been funded by borrowing, there is a serious message that we are not supporting capital expenditure through our own income generation and there will need to be hard decisions to reduce our cost base and/or grow our income. This was helpful context to take forward into the Planning Round discussion.

- **Planning Round Update**   **Paper C2**

The Executive considered an update on the current business planning cycle, noting this has been accelerated from previous cycles to provide colleagues with time to operationalise plans before the start of the new academic year, with the intention that a synthesis of the plans and the finalised budget proposals will be considered by April Policy and Resources Committee and Court.

The Executive had previously agreed that main budget holders should aim to increase contribution levels (balance of income and expenditure) to produce the equivalent of a 5% underlying operating surplus p.a. over the planning period, however the current plans do not meet that aspiration. The challenges and uncertainties outwith the University's control had been referenced earlier by the Principal, including Brexit, the Augar review and pensions.

The main budget holders and the Senior Leadership Team were continuing discussions to build a collective understanding on whether it will be possible to increase contributions to meet aspirations or if not, to consider areas or activities which might be stopped, reduced/delayed or made more efficient.   It was noted that there was a current prioritisation exercise taking place on the student experience plan, based on the number of students affected and the scale of impact so that by the 11 April Senior Leadership Team away there should be a clear understanding of priorities to inform the discussion.

6   Business Case for Gujarat   **Paper D**

The Executive considered the business case for the University's engagement in a transnational partnership with the Government of Gujarat (GoG) to establish the Gujarat Biotechnology University (GBU). It was noted a previous iteration had been reviewed by the Executive and that the business case had been developed with the support of the International Ventures Group, taking into account the feedback from the Executive.

The proposal was to progress to next stage and a sign an agreement with the GoG to fund the establishment of a new small specialist institution with UoE staff and expertise bought in to develop world-class higher education and translational research capacity. It was noted that the College of Science and Engineering strongly supported the proposal as biotechnology was a major strategic area it was keen to develop internationally and this initiative may also position the College to exploit other opportunities. The Executive agreed there was a need to maximise international opportunities by ensuring connectivity, linking to earlier discussion about the Low Carbon College, where international ventures should not develop in isolation but should be able to benefit from and contribute to wider University knowledge and contacts.   There was discussion about reliance on 'flying faculty', as for the earlier Low Carbon College discussion. It was also noted that further work was required to clarify the relationship of students to the University and the nature of experience and services to be delivered.

Taking this into account, the Executive was supportive of the proposal progressing to Policy and Resources Committee and if approved, to Court.

7   Update on Old College Capital   Paper E

The Executive had previously received information on venture funding which had highlighted the need for a decision on the future of Old College Capital (OCC), the University's own fund that has been in existence for 8 years, received 2 rounds of investment and funded 19 companies. Although there had not been an exit to date, there were indications that there could be a number of exits over the next 12-14 months. The recommendation was that the University continued to invest in OCC as it shows the University's confidence in the quality of its research by supporting intellectual property generation from research through to venture investment. There was discussion of OCC's role in the broader commercialisation activity of the University and the importance of ensuring a balanced portfolio.

The Executive agreed with the proposal for an additional £6m of investment funding over a 3 year period, to be sourced from the University's investment portfolio and requested an update on the OCC and the broader commercialisation activity for a future meeting. This would now progress to Policy and Resources Committee and to Investment Committee.

8   China Merchants Group   Paper F

The Executive considered an update on the development of a strategic partnership between the University and the China Merchants Group (CMG), a large-scale state owned conglomerate in China operating in three core business sectors: transportation, finance and property. CMG had been tasked by the Chinese Government to build a new biomedical campus in Hainan to embrace a modern, international model of healthcare delivery. As CMG has limited experience in the healthcare sector it recognised the need to identify a strategic partner. CMG representatives visited the BioQuarter development in December 2018 and as a result, CMG wishes to partner with the University to replicate the BioQuarter education-research-healthcare-innovation-commercialisation model in Hainan.

The Executive recognised that this was a significant opportunity and welcomed the opportunity to consider it at this stage, where support was requested for an initial 8 month feasibility assessment to develop the proposition and prepare an outline business case. It was supportive of the proposal progressing to Policy and Resources Committee.

There was consideration of the reputation risk of growing the relationship with China and it was agreed that strategic communication needed to be considered. This linked to the broader issue of taking a number of international proposals forward to Policy and Resources Committee and the need to articulate how these align with the overall international strategy.

9   Communications, Marketing and Stakeholder Relations Strategy   Paper G

The Executive considered a proposed strategic approach to communications, marketing and stakeholder relations, with the Director of Communications and Marketing being clear that this would be start of the journey to bring communications

and marketing up to the level the University needed to support its strategic ambitions. Effective implementation of the strategy would will require a number of operational decisions and negotiations to develop a shared understanding across the University.

The Executive welcomed the paper and there was discussion on the balance between proactive and reactive communication; internal and external communication; brand reinforcement and the effective use of social media. It was noted that there was a cost associated in building capability and as there was no additional resource, this would need to be addressed by more effective use of existing resources.

The Executive was fully supported of the strategic approach and endorsed the recommendations set out in the paper.

10   Staff Experience Update   Verbal

The Director of Human Resources provided a verbal update, informing members that the staff experience plan was still being developed. Two papers had recently been considered by People Committee, one on wellbeing and one on taking staff engagement forward. It relation to wellbeing it was agreed it was important to be clear what we are already doing and that there need to be a more co-ordinated and better communicated approach. A task and finish work group had been set up on bullying and harassment and work was ongoing on performance management. The overall governance approach and the role of People Committee was being reviewed to develop a more strategic committee framework appropriately aligned with the University Executive.

In discussion, members noted that there had been a recurrent theme throughout the meeting around joined up decision making and the work to develop a cohesive and coordinated plan was welcomed.

ITEMS FOR NOTING OR FORMAL APPROVAL

11   Leave and Family Friendly Policies Update   Paper H

The Executive approved changes to a suite of Leave and Family Friendly policies, including annual leave, special leave, adoption/surrogacy, maternity, paternity, parental and shared parental leave, emergency time off for dependants, flexible working and flexible retirement as set out in the paper. It was noted that this suite of policies reflected the University's values as a caring employer and that this should be effectively communicated to internal and external stakeholders.

12   Learning and Teaching Spaces Strategy   Paper I

The Executive approved the Learning and Teaching Spaces Strategy and noted an implementation plan was being developed to identify and track the actions required to deliver the strategy.

13   REF2021 Code of Practice   **Paper J**

The Executive noted the near final version of the Code of Practice, and members
were invited to submit any comments before the final version returned for approval at
the next Executive meeting.

14   Social Impact Pledge   **Paper K**

The Executive noted progress in meeting the three pledges made by the University
in 2018, and approved the proposals for pledges for 2019: to establish a Centre for
Homeless and Inclusion Health; to enhance our infrastructure for the support of
Student Social Enterprise with the aim of increasing the number of start-ups and
ensuring their sustainability over the longer term; and to expand our Digital
Ambassadors Service to promote digital inclusion and enhance employability
amongst community groups.

15   Service Excellence Programme Update   **Paper L**

The Executive noted the update and approved the task group to develop options for
the development and evolution of generalist management roles in the University.

16   College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences Reorganisation of   **Paper M**
       Endowments

The Executive supported the proposal that Court was invited to exercise its power
under Ordinance 209 and adopt reforms with regard to the application of endowment
funds which have been held in excess of 25 years in the College of Arts, Humanities
and Social Sciences.

17   Chair of Design Informatics   **Paper N**

The Executive approved the establishment of a Chair in Design Informatics in the
College of Science and Engineering.

18   University Executive Communications   **Verbal**

Communication on staff experience, service excellence and the social impact
pledges was agreed.

20   Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting will take place on Tuesday 23 April 2019 at 10 am in the Raeburn
Room.

B

UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

23 April 2019

The Student Experience Action Plan: Update

Description of paper
1.   This paper presents an update on the previously proposed and University Executive endorsed holistic, multi-strand programme of work to address the student experience at Edinburgh and move rapidly towards a culture in which our students feel cherished and our staff feel energised by their work with and for students.

Action requested/Recommendation
2.   The University Executive is invited to note and discuss the update.

Paragraphs 3-36 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Resource implications
37. Funding is being sought through the planning round to set up and deliver the programme based on the figures set out in the paper.

Risk Management
38. Failure to continue enhancing the student experience and meet student expectations for both learning/teaching and other elements of student life may lead to reputational damage and affect the University's ability to attract the brightest and best students in the future.

Equality & Diversity
39. There may be equality and diversity implications to be considered for new or revised policies or practices required by the plan.

Paragraphs 40-42 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Consultation
43. The proposals in this paper were reviewed by the University Executive Sub-committee (set up to oversee the development and implementation of this plan) earlier in April. The Sub-committee considered the approach taken to development of the programme and evaluation of the projects and were broadly supportive. They highlighted the considerable complexity of the programme and suggested that - at least for communication purposes – it would be necessary to simplify the portrayal of the work involved (which we will do).

Further information
44. *Author & Presenter*
    Gavin Douglas
    Deputy Secretary (Student Experience)
    April 2019

Freedom of Information
45. This paper is closed.

UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

23 April 2019

Director of Finance's Report

Description of paper

1. The paper reports on the latest[1] University management accounts (excluding subsidiaries) position up to the end of February 2019 (period seven) and the potential impact of accounting for USS Pension deficit recovery. Appendix 2 provides a Special Focus Update on the financial performance of the University's subsidiaries at the half year point in 2018-19.

Action requested/Recommendation

2. The University Executive is asked to review and comment on the latest update.

Background and context

3. The paper provides a regular update on finance related issues for the University Executive.

Paragraphs 4-21 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Resource Implications

22. There are no specific requests for resource in the paper.

Risk Management

23. The University manages its financial risk by not breaching the Group risk appetite as described in its financial metrics. A key metric is that our unrestricted surplus should be at least 2% of total income (the current Finance Strategy provides a target surplus range of 3% - 5% to remain sustainable).

Paragraph 24 has been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Equality & Diversity

25. Specific issues of equality and diversity are not relevant to this paper as the content focusses primarily on financial strategy and/or financial project considerations.

Next steps & communication

26. We would welcome feedback as outlined in the discussion above.

Consultation

27. The paper has been reviewed by Lee Hamill, Director of Finance.

---

[1] At time of writing, full March (period eight) accounts were not available.

Further information

28. _Author_   _Presenter_
    Stuart Graham   Lee Hamill
    Head of FIRST (Financial Information,   Director of Finance
    Reporting & Strategy Team)
    5 April 2019

Freedom of Information

29. This paper should not be included in open business as its disclosure could substantially prejudice the commercial interests of the University.

THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE

5 April 2019

Planning Round 2019-22

Description of paper
1. This paper outlines the financial plan for the next rolling 3 year cycle. Individual plans are available for background information on the wiki (https://www.wiki.ed.ac.uk/display/UCC/University+Executive) and an overarching narrative synthesis will be provided to Court. The paper is part of a portfolio of planning round papers which also includes the Director of Finance report and the Capital Prioritisation papers.

Paragraphs 2-31 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Risk Management
32. The key risks identified during the Business Planning round are associated with the uncertainty around the constitutional, funding and policy environment in which the University operates.

33. The University will maintain a positive focus on diversification of income sources and growth to sustain improvements in research, innovation/industry engagement, teaching and international reputation. Each College and Professional Services Group risk register flows into the University's risk register; managed by Risk Management Committee. Senior management also has a number of management levers effectively utilised in previous years to control costs when necessary; including tighter controls on recruitment and extending the phasing of capital costs.

Equality & Diversity
34. Equality and diversity is considered within the plans of the individual budget holders.

Next steps/implications
35. The plan and financial proposals, following input from Policy & Resources Committee, will progress to Court on 29 April 2019.

Consultation
36. The planning round process has included a number of round table discussions between the Main Budget Holders in addition to meetings between the Planning Triumvirate and individual budget-holders. The Main Budget Holders have subsequently discussed and refined the plan proposals and are collectively committed to the proposed surplus levels.

Further information
37. *Authors*
Jonathan Seckl, Vice-Principal Planning Resources & Research Policy
Lee Hamill, Director of Finance

Presenter
Jonathan Seckl, Vice-Principal Planning Resources & Research Policy

Tracey Slaven, Deputy Secretary,
Strategic Planning

Freedom of Information
38. The paper is closed until completion of the business planning round.   At that time, the paper will be reviewed before release, for redaction of commercially sensitive material.

UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

23 April 2019

Reputational due diligence over business, industrial, philanthropic and international government income sources

Description of paper
1.   This paper recommends a process to ensure a more consistent approach to reputational due diligence relating to a range of income sources across the University.

Action requested/Recommendation
2.   University Executive is asked to approve the formation and broad terms of reference of a 'Task and Finish' Group, as summarised under 'Discussion' below, which will bring specific recommendations back to a future meeting of University Executive.

Paragraphs 3-32 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Resource implications
33. There are no direct resource implications.

Risk Management
34. The strategy outlined in this paper is driven by the need to reduce the risk to the University and its academic and wider leadership of encountering unforeseen adverse reputational damage, and potential subsequent damage to wider partnerships and related income.

Equality & Diversity
35. There are no direct equality and diversity issues.

Next steps & Communications
36. If agreed, the Task and Finish Group will consult further and develop specific recommendations for consideration and approval by University Executive, ready for subsequent communication.

Consultation
37. This paper has been considered by University Research Policy Group, Student Recruitment Strategy Group, and the International Ventures Group.

Further information
38. *Author*
    Lorna Thompson
    Director, Research Services
    Chris Cox
    Vice Principal, Philanthropy &
    Advancement
    Tracey Slaven
    Deputy Secretary, Strategic Planning

Presenter
Chris Cox
Vice Principal, Philanthropy &
Advancement

Freedom of Information

39. This is a closed paper.

THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH

UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

23 April 2019

Closure of Agreed Management Actions from Internal Audit Reviews

Description of paper
1. This paper provides an update on the status and process for ongoing management and reporting of closure of agreed management actions arising from Internal Audit reviews.

Action requested/Recommendation
2. The University Executive are requested to note the paper and confirm their approval (or otherwise) on the proposed approach going forward.

Paragraphs 3-7 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Resource implications
8. No significant resource implications.

Risk Management
9. Follow up and closure of agreed management actions arising from Internal Audit reviews is an important element of the University's overall governance and control framework and contributes to the University's overall management of risk.

Equality & Diversity
10. No specific considerations.

Next steps & Communications
11. Subject to approval, the more detailed reporting format will be shared with relevant Executive Team members in order to record progress on the position since March 2019.

12. The updated reporting format will then be reported and considered at the May 2019 and subsequent University Executive meetings.

Consultation
13. Key contacts and owners of agreed actions will be contacted on a regular basis for status updates.

Further information
14. *Author*   *Presenter*
    Paul McGinty   Leigh Chalmers
    Head of Internal Audit   Director of Legal Services

Freedom of Information
15. This paper is closed.

UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

23 April 2019

Reviews of Senate Governance

Description of paper

1.   This paper seeks the Executive's views on two separate reviews which the University has commissioned in the current academic year:

- The review of the Task Group on Senate Committee Structures
- The externally-facilitated review of Senate and its committees, conducted by an external consultant, Dr Jennifer Barnes of Saxton Bampfylde

2.   The reviews have both made proposals concerning the remit of the Senate committees and the way in which they link to the work of Senate and University governance structures more generally. Dr Barnes' report also raises some broader issues, for example regarding the role of Senate.

3.   This paper summarises proposals for changes to the structure and membership of the Senate Committees. Appended to the paper is Dr Barnes's report, which contains a series of recommendations concerning the operation of Senate and its committees, and their place within the wider governance structure of the University.

Action requested/Recommendation

4.   The Executive is invited to consider and comment on the proposals made by the Task Group on Senate Committee Structures, and on the recommendations made by Dr Barnes as part of the externally-facilitated review of Senate.

Background and context

5.   The Principal has agreed that the University should review the structure of the four Senate Committees:

- Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC)
- Researcher Experience Committee (REC)
- Curriculum and Student Progression Committee (CSPC)
- Quality Assurance Committee (QAC)

6.   A Task Group convened by the Senior Vice-Principal is managing this review. Further information on the scope of the review and membership of the task group is available at https://www.wiki.ed.ac.uk/display/UCC/University+Executive

7.   The Task Group is in the process of consulting various stakeholders around the University on a range of options. The Task Group's current recommendations (based on feedback to date) is set out below. A detailed analysis of the main issues regarding the current Committee structures, along with the Task Group's original, detailed, proposals (some of which the Task Group has now decided not to pursue) may be viewed via a separate document at https://www.wiki.ed.ac.uk/display/UCC/University+Executive

8.   Linked to the review of the structure of the Senate committees is the externally-facilitated review of Senate and its committees, which has just been undertaken by a

consultant (Dr Jennifer Barnes) in response to the 2017 version of the Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance, which requires the University to undertake an externally-facilitated review of Senate and its committees every five years. This review included consideration of a range of issues, including the operation and effectiveness of Senate; the effectiveness of the communication between Senate, its committees and their stakeholders across the University; and how Senate can encourage discussion and debate, and provide effective governance.
The report by Dr Barnes (attached at Annex A) has been finalised recently.

9.   The proposals of the Task Group on the Senate Committee Structures should be considered alongside Dr Barnes's report, since there are some interrelationships between the two strands of work, particularly concerning the roles of the Committees, the role of research, and the interplay between the University governance structures.

Discussion
Review of the Structure of Senate Committees: Proposals
10. At its second meeting, on 12 April 2019, the Task Group on the Senate Committee Structures discussed feedback to date from stakeholders (largely from current Senate Committees, but also the Convener of the Research Policy Group and the Deputy Secretary (Strategic Planning)).

11. The key points to date from stakeholders and task group members are set out below:

- ***Governance of postgraduate research student (PGR) and early career researcher (ECR) matters.*** Broad, though not universal, support for dissolving the Senate Research Experience Committee (REC) and transferring its responsibilities for PGR student matters to an expanded Senate Learning and Teaching Committee, and its responsibilities for ECR to Research Policy Group. Stakeholders generally accept that in its current format REC is not providing a sufficiently effective forum for addressing strategic PGR and ECR issues, and that there are good strategic reasons for aligning PGR with taught students, and ECR with broader research issues. Some stakeholders have however emphasised the importance of giving PGR student issues sufficient prominence and attention if considered in the same forum as taught student issues.

- ***Reporting lines for research matters.*** Mixed views regarding the merits of giving RPG a formal reporting line to Senate. Some stakeholders have emphasised that strategic and management decisions regarding research are primarily a matter for the Executive (rather than Senate) and that dual reporting could lead to unnecessary inefficiency and complexity. In contrast, other stakeholders argue not that not only does the Higher Education legislation give Senate a role in relation to research, but giving Senate a clear role in relation to both teaching *and* research may assist the University to maximise the synergies between them. Related to this, Dr Barnes' report into the effectiveness of Senate recommends that the University "consider how the Senate might have a role as the 'supreme academic body' in acknowledging the exceptional research activity of the university and supporting Research."

- ***Governance of broader student experience matters.*** While there could be merits in establishing a formal Committee (potentially reporting either to Senate or both Senate and Court) to provide a strategic forum for discussing broader student experience committee issues (ie issues beyond educational matters such as teaching, learning, supervision, assessment and student support), it would be more appropriate to consider appropriate models for governing the broader student experience once the Vice-Principal (Students) is in place and can feed into discussions, and once the University has finalised and made progress on implementing its Student Experience Action Pan. In the meantime, the University Executive has a sub-committee in place to monitor the implementation of the Action Plan.

12. Taking account of feedback to date, the group has identified the following as its favoured options for addressing the main issues in the review. It will meet again on 6 May 2019 to consider any further feedback from stakeholders and to decide what recommendations to make to the 29 May 2019 meeting of Senate.

13. **Senate Learning and Teaching Committee** – setting the strategic direction on taught and research student matters

- ***Extend its remit to include strategic postgraduate research student matters***, in addition to learning, teaching, assessment and student support for taught students.
  - o To reflect this extension of remit, change the committee's name to 'Education Committee', and extend the membership to include one senior member of staff with responsibility for research student matters from each College.
  - o Draw the Terms of Reference for the Education Committee sufficiently narrowly (for example, making it explicit that it does not have a role in relation to the broader student experience) to ensure there would be sufficient space on the agenda to focus on PGR as well as taught student matters.

- ***Do not extend its remit to include the broader student experience at this stage*** – the University Executive's sub-committee overseeing the development and implementation of the Student Experience Action Plan should fulfil this role in the shorter-term. Meanwhile, the Senate Quality Assurance Committee will continue to have a role in overseeing the effectiveness of student-facing support services.

- ***Amend the membership to include two Heads of Schools*** (at present, while there are two Heads of Schools on the Committee, they are co-opted and there is no requirement to continue to have them).

14. **Senate Researcher Experience Committee**
- Dissolve REC, transferring its responsibilities for strategic postgraduate research student matters to LTC, and its responsibilities for early career researchers to Research Policy Group.

15. **Senate Curriculum and Student Progression Committee** – developing the University's policy and regulatory framework for taught and research student provision

- *Change name to 'Academic Policy and Regulations Committee'* to articulate its core responsibilities more clearly.

- *Amend its membership to include one senior member of staff with responsibility for research student matters from each College*, to assist it to fulfil its role on PGR policy and regulations (to reflect REC would no longer provide expert advice on PGR regulatory and policy matters).

16. **Senate Quality Assurance Committee** – responsibility for developing and overseeing the operation of the University's quality assurance framework for taught and research student provision

- No substantive changes.

17. **Research Policy Group** *(sub-committee of the University Executive)* – research policy and strategy, including strategy for the Research Excellence Framework, and training provision for early career researchers

- *Extend its remit to incorporate responsibility for Early Career Researcher matters.* Review whether to supplement the Group's membership to reflect this extension in remit.

- *Consider whether RPG* should have a reporting line to Senate rather than (or as well as), as currently, reporting to the University Executive.

Externally-Facilitated Review of Senate
18. Dr Barnes's report is attached as an Annex.

Resource implications
19. The operation of Senate and its Committees has resource implications both for the secretariat (provided by Academic Services) and for the members of the Committees. Were the two reviews to lead to an increase or decrease in the number of committees, or a substantive change in the operation of the committees or of Senate itself, this would have a commensurate impact on resources.

Risk Management
20. Effective academic governance assists the University in managing risk associated with its academic activities.

Equality & Diversity
21. The Task Group on Senate Committee Structures will carry out an Equality Impact Assessment when finalising the recommendations following the consultation.

22. Senate will consider the implications for equality and diversity when responding to the recommendations made in Dr Barnes's report.

Next steps & Communications

23. Senate will consider the outcomes of the two reviews at its meeting on 29 May 2019, and will consider whether to approve any changes to its committee structures (as well as whether to make any broader changes to Senate in response to Dr Barnes' report). Following this discussion, during the summer, Academic Services will develop an official response to Dr Barnes' recommendations, together with an action plan, which it will put to both Senate and Court in the autumn. In addition, during the summer, the Task Group would prepare detailed terms of reference for the revised committee structures.

24. One of the Task Group's recommendations is to explore potential changes to the remit of RPG and its reporting lines. These proposed changes, if supported, would require approval from the University Executive as well as from Senate.

Consultation

25. The consultation on the Senate Committee structures includes the following key stakeholders. In some cases, feedback has already been received and incorporated into the refined proposals set out above:
   Principal
   University Secretary
   Senate Curriculum and Student Progression Committee
   Senate Learning and Teaching Committee
   Senate Quality Assurance Committee
   Senate Researcher Experience Committee
   University Executive
   Research Policy Group
   Student Recruitment Strategy Group
   Heads of Colleges
   The Students' Association

26. As part of the externally-facilitated review of Senate and its Committees, Dr Barnes has consulted the Principal, University Secretary, Deputy Secretary Student Experience, one Head of College, Academic Services, the Students' Association, Senate Assessors and members of the four Senate Committees.

Further information

27. *Author*   *Presenter*
      Tom Ward and Theresa Sheppard   Professor Charlie Jeffery,
      Academic Services   Senior Vice-Principal

Freedom of Information

28. Open

Externally-facilitated Review of the

Senate of the University of Edinburgh

Dr Jennifer Barnes

March 2019

Externally-facilitated Review of the Senate of the University of Edinburgh

March 2019

This Review is in response to a requirement and a question. The requirement is set out in *The Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance*, introduced in 2013 and revised in 2017. This states that 'The governing body is expected to review its own effectiveness each year and to undertake an externally facilitated evaluation of its own effectiveness and that of its committees…at least every five years. As part of these processes or separately, the effectiveness of the academic board (also known at Senate, Senatus Academicus or academic council) is expected to be reviewed similarly.'[1]

The question is, simply put: to what extent is the Senate an effective part of the governance of the University of Edinburgh?

Background and Context

Substantial changes have been both initiated by, and visited on, the structure and governance of the University of Edinburgh over the past four centuries. Yet since the *Universities (Scotland) Act 1858*, the underlying principles of a tripartite structure have remained: **The Court** is 'the governing body and is the legal persona' of the University and transacts business on its behalf; the **General Council**, a body encompassing past and present members of the University, overseen by the Chancellor, has a remit to 'take into consideration all questions affecting the well-being and prosperity of the University'; while the **Senatus Academicus** is described as 'the supreme academic body of the University'. [2] The principle, that academic content and strategy (or strategies) should be determined by academics themselves is an underlying assumption that governs world-leading universities in the Western hemisphere. Over the decades of the twentieth century a further, substantial source of university governance was developed, in the authority delegate by the Court to the office of Principal and Chief Accounting Officer, and the Executive members that support him or her.

The current definition of the Senate, as set out in section 21 of the *Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act 2016*, reaffirms the Senate as the locus of academic authority in a tripartite governance structure:

Meaning of academic board

(1) In this Part, 'academic board' in relation to an institution means the body which—
(a) is responsible for the overall planning, co-ordination, development and supervision of the academic work of the institution, and

---

[1] University of Edinburgh, *External Effectiveness Review of the Senate and its Committees*, DRAFT Terms of Reference, p.1, 2018.
[2] *Senatus Academicus Governance Handbook 2018-19*, p. 4.

(b) discharges that responsibility subject to the general control and direction of the governing body of the institution.

(2) For the avoidance of doubt, the body described by subsection (1) is the one sometimes known as the Senate, Senatus or Senatus Academicus.'"

Today, this authority of the Senate is largely symbolic. Over time, academic matters have been delegated, both by the Court and the Senate, to Colleges and their Schools. The twenty Schools which reside in three Colleges, take on much of the operational direction through their Boards of Studies and other committees, and have considerable autonomy to take decisions affecting the strategic direction of teaching, research and partnerships in their Schools. In turn, they contribute to College committees, which, while organised differently from each other internally, include committees that address Learning and Teaching, Curriculum Approval, Quality Assurance, and Research. In that sense, over time, they have been delegated authority for issues that were once the province of the Senate, and which are now the delegated responsibility of the Colleges. At present, the Senate has powers through its Standing Orders (last approved by Senatus Academicus 18.09.14), to appoint and abolish committees. Currently, four standing committees, and one joint committee with the Court (Knowledge Strategy), report annually to the Senate in a review of the previous year's activities.

Standing committees which report to the Senate:

- Curriculum and Student Progression (CSPC)
- Learning and Teaching (LTC)
- Quality Assurance (QAC)
- Researcher Experience (REC)

Joint committee of the Court and the Senate:

- Knowledge Strategy

Methodology

The following commentary and recommendations are based on:
- A review of documents directly relevant to the Senate and its recent decisions to restructure its size and members as required by the Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act 2016;
- A review of wider documents and committee minutes which make reference to the role of the Senate in relation to the governance of the University;
- A review of documents that indicate where matters of substantive academic issue are being addressed in Schools, Colleges and in committees that have delegated authority through the Principal, i.e. The Management Committee, known as the University Executive, and its task groups and working groups;
- The first Staff Survey undertaken by the University [2018];

- The Senate Committees Newsletter and its links to committee minutes;
- The Annual Report of the Senate Committees;
- Conversations with key stakeholders in November 2018 and February 2019;
- Attendance at a meeting of the Senate, 6 February 2019.

The University's response to the 2016 Act

The University's response to the 2016 Act was pragmatic. Attendance at Senate meetings, held 3 times a year, is not high. In the February 2018 meeting it was agreed that the Senate would now be 'restricted' to 300 members. In May 2018, the Senate discussed how this would be implemented, noting that 'as things stand, all those interested in becoming members of Senate have been automatically appointed, since there have not been more nominations than vacancies, and it has therefore not been necessary to run the elections as outlined in Ordinance 204.' [3]

Senate meetings; an historical perspective

Historically, the Professoriate met to discuss academic matters and receive Reports from each faculty. While its business ranged from approving new Chairs and approving graduations lists, teaching and research were integral to the views set out by the Senate. For example, in a Report from the Educational Policy Committee to the Senate on 3 June 1949, members were asked 'to note that in the consideration of the proposal for a Chair in Applied (Agricultural) Biology the committee have had their attention directed to the need to co-ordinate the provisions made for teaching and research in the more fundamental aspects of Biology… .'[4]

By 1969, the Senate defined teaching as its primary focus and research more peripheral, while emphasizing the relationship between the two in its advocacy on behalf of the academic community. In a *Statement by the Senatus Academicus on the Matter of Student Representation*, 'The Senate is specifically a "teachers' committee" whose chief functions are to set and maintain academic standards, and to ensure freedom of thought and research'.[5] Today, each College has its own Research Committee. The *Research Policy Group* largely delegates research decisions to the Schools through the Colleges, with the exception of large university-wide funding applications, and the oversight and co-ordination necessary in the preparation for the *Research Excellence Framework* (REF). The Senate has retained overview of the teaching. It could be argued that the devolved structure has built on strong foundations to deliver a period of exceptional, internationally recognized research, which continues to establish the University's reputation as one of the finest in the world. It could also be argued that during this period, structural reforms moved teaching and research further from each other, while the experience of teaching in a university renders the research and teaching as far more intertwined.

---

[3] The University of Edinburgh, *Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act 2016—recommendations for the practical implementation of the agreed Senate model* (S 17/18 3B), 30 May 2018, pt. 30, p.8.
[4] The University of Edinburgh, *Minutes of the Senatus Academicus*, 8 June 1949, p.505.
[5] The University of Edinburgh, *Minutes of the Senatus Academicus*, 12 February 1969 (Appendix IV, 14 February 1969), p.1454.

Today, the Senate meets three times a year and is divided into two parts. Part I is open to all staff and students of the University. Those who attend, do so to hear presentations of interest to the wider community. In the past, when the University faced issues threatening the University, the Senate convened to consult its members. A vestige of an earlier Senate survives in Part II, which is for Senate members only. Here, the agenda is divided into 'Formal Business' and 'Communications', with indications as to whether items brought forth are to be discussed 'For approval', 'For information', 'For formal noting' or 'To make observations.

The Senate Meeting, (Part I), 6 February 2019

The session opened with remarks from the Principal, traditionally withheld until Part II under 'President's Communication'. He updated the group on developments of the Strategic Plan 're-writes', which intend to place a greater focus on people, and which he was discussing in a series of Town Halls with the Schools and Colleges. Brief mention was made of the capital plan, as well as his impressions of a Russell Group meeting focusing on the forthcoming post-18 education review led by Philip Augar, and its implications for Edinburgh University.

There followed a four-part presentation of the *Research Excellence Framework* (REF), introduced and led by the Vice-Principal for Planning, Resources and Research Policy. This was followed by a presentation on the *Student Experience Plan*, led by the Senior Vice-Principal and the Deputy-Secretary Student Experience. The Senate had discussed a *Student Experience Action Plan* that had been presented in October 2018, and had been back to Schools, Colleges and Senate committees. This was now returning to report and seek views. Both presentations were on subjects of importance to the University. Each was well-prepared and informative. The REF presentation incorporated information that had been circulated two days earlier from the Scottish Funding Council. Each presentation included the opportunity to seek views from those assembled, approximately 180 people.

Observations, (Part I):

This meeting served as an open forum to bring institutional strategies to a wider audience. The Principal, as President, presided, while senior officers and academics addressed the questions. Moreover, with the presentation on REF, followed by the update on the *Student Experience Plan*, the meeting addressed two crucial areas for the university's future. In doing so sequentially, the forum generated comments in which synthesized the business of research and its impact on the staff and student experience. Senate members and non-members contributed to a discussion that addressed the value and complexities in integrating research and teaching in a world-leading university.

There were several points raised following each presentation, recorded by the Clerk to the Senate, which appear under the heading 'Discussion' in the *Minutes of the Senatus Academicus*. It may be useful to attach Actions next to these points, as well as indicating which committee will consider the issues raised, to form an update to a subsequent meeting.

It would seem important, therefore, that a newly-constituted Senate retain this kind of forum. As it becomes better known for presentations dealing with pressing issues directly affecting the future of the University, this potentially could re-establish a wider sense of purpose for the Senate.

The Senate meeting, Part II (members only)

There were three items of Formal Business. Many of the straightforward items had been sent previously via an E-Business circulation to Senate members in the weeks preceding the Senate meeting (*Report of E-Business conducted 15-23 January 2019*). Two substantive items were discussed: an update 'for information' from the *Teaching and Academic Careers Project*, and an update 'for formal noting' from the *Enhancement-led Institutional Review* (ELIR) due in October 2020. Each sought the views of members present. Papers appeared 'for formal noting' and 'for information'; this infers that the members present were only able to receive information; in reality, a productive discussion emerged and a record was taken.

The Senate received confirmation that the overarching principles for the *Teaching and Careers Project* had achieved approval by the University Executive. The second presentation updated the Senate on the preparations for the ELIR Review. The meeting was asked to share their views on the four themes proposed as the subject of the forthcoming Review.

Observations (Part II):

The *Senatus Academicus Governance Handbook 2018-19* describes one of the remits of the Senate as: 'setting the high-level policy and strategy on the advice and recommendation of the Senate committees working within the strategic direction contained within the University's Strategic Plan approved by Court and its underlying strategies'. [6]

The item reporting on the *Teaching and Academic Careers Project* outlined the system for approval: the *University Executive* established a task group in May 2018. Their work went to the Senate *Learning and Teaching Committee* in September 2018, and was then presented to the Senate itself in October 2018; draft principles were discussed. That was followed by a consultation period with Colleges and Schools. The 6 February 2019 meeting of the Senate received what was in effect an interim Report on which to comment, prior to a technical review of HR policy and procedures.

The *Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR) 2020*, was designated as 'for formal noting'. During the presentation, the Learning and Teaching Policy Group emerged as an important entity. Convened by the Senior Vice-Principal and including the four Convenors of the Senate Standing Committees, the Vice-Principal (People and Culture), three College Deans, eight Assistant Principals and four senior officers from the Professional Services staff, its remit is to:

- 'Provide leadership and monitor progress on learning and teaching issues.

---

[6] *Senatus Academicus Governance Handbook 2018-19,* p.5.

- Coordinate and prioritise the work of the four Senate standing committees and the Vice-and Assistant-Principals with responsibilities for learning and teaching, including coordinating submissions to the University's planning round'.
- Connect Heads of Colleges' and Schools' priorities with institutional strategic priorities on learning and teaching.
- Advise the Senate Committees and Central Management Group [now University Executive], on how to approach strategic issues regarding learning and teaching, particularly on multi-dimensional issues with implications for multiple Committees and Vice-or Assistant Principals.
- Engage in horizon scanning to anticipate and prepare for new opportunities and likely future developments which may impact on the University and its strategic priorities.'[7]

The Learning and Teaching Policy Group (LTPG) does not have official committee status; it serves in an advisory capacity. The 22 October 2008 Report to the Senate from the *Review Group on Academic Governance*, noted that 'The Abolition of Academic Policy Committee leaves a void in the academic governance framework that can only be filled by Senate itself.'[8]

In June of the following year, *The Summary report on the changes arising from the review of academic governance* sets out the four Standing Committees as well as a Convenor's Forum. The proposed Convenor's Forum would consist of the Convenor of each Senate committee and members from professional services. The current LTPG was established during the academic year 2015-16. As a gathering of key stakeholders and those who can implement policy across the university, it may be that its status and role in relation to the Senate should be reconsidered.

Themes that emerged during meetings with contributors to the Review, November 2018 and February 2019

There was strong support for the Senate to be a respected and more widely-understood part of University governance, specifically its role to present institution-wide academic principles as outlined in its governance remit. Equally, there was an acceptance that the purpose of the Senate is not widely understood, and it is seen as a rather remote body with little evidence of exercising its existing powers. For some, it was a novel thought that the Senate was ever an effective body to gather, determine and disseminate views of the wider academic community to the Court. With the 2016 Act, the Senate will have circa. 300 members, including 10% students as full members, 100 elected professors and 100 elected academic staff. While it is not proposed that this body operate effectively as a management committee, its governance role could be reactivated to strengthen representation of the academic strategies for teaching and research to the Court, through delegating actions to specific committees in the Minutes.

---

[7] The University of Edinburgh, *Learning and Teaching Policy Group remit and membership*, 2016.

[8] The University of Edinburgh Senate, *Report of the Review Group on Academic Governance* (H/02/02/02), 22 October 2008, p.2.

There was support to retain the first part of the Senate meeting, which is currently open to the wider academic community. It was noted that recent presentations were led by senior University members, and the topics were of strategic importance across the University. Technically speaking, the first part is not a meeting of the Senate, but an open forum. Should this forum be retained and recognized as an aspect of the Senate's engagement across the University, alongside a newly-constituted Senate membership? That would imply the topics were ones the Senate generated, i.e. issues of teaching, research and the student experience. However, it may be that this forum should range more widely on issues not in the purview of the Senate. In either case, there was support for it as a consultation mechanism, and therefore an argument for records kept of points raised and actions taken, to be noted either by Senate or the Court.

The Standing Committees of the Senate, which will shortly be the subject of an internal review, provided a mixed picture. The members I met were impressive, perceptive and committed to giving considerable time and thought to ensure the university integrates research-led teaching, delivered by committed academic staff and supported effectively by professional services. The Standing Committees address issues of import across the university. Yet many committee members noted a sense of working in a void. Committee members did not see The Senate as a supportive and powerful entity identifying future ideas for the Standing Committees, but rather a body to receive information, captured retrospectively in *Annual Review of Senate Committees*. Together, these four committees undertake considerable work, yet it was not entirely clear where their efforts had impact across the wider College, School and Management Committee system.

Concerns were raised by members representing Schools and Colleges that some Senate committees were reactive, as likely to scrutinize proposals than propose and implement solutions for issues arising in the Colleges. This would be consistent with a committee whose remit has both governance and operational responsibilities. Given the academic calendar, Standing Committees have the potential to become mired in current issues in need of resolution.

Certain committee members were unsure as to the boundaries of their remit. For example, members of the Researcher Experience Committee, which oversees an important community whose issues and challenges range across the Student Experience Plan, the Service Excellence Programme, Colleges and their Schools, and arguably the Research Policy Group, were unclear as to where and how their deliberations were being recognized more widely than within the committee itself. In another example, members of the Learning and Teaching Committee would value a clearer systems approach to their work and that of the Learning and Teaching Policy Group, particularly as there is some overlap in membership.

In contrast, there were those that valued the Standing Committees scrutinizing institution-wide initiatives, proving their value in recognizing limitations in the proposal that had not been taken into account in terms of different governance in different Colleges. In this, they argued that Senate committees were working to ensure initiatives could be successfully embedded across the University by adjusting

aspects of the recommendations to support different arrangements in different Colleges.

A record of the Standing Committees' business can be traced through the Minutes, which form part of the *Senate Committees Newsletter*. Recently, the *Curriculum and Student Progression Committee* (CSPC) produced an analysis recommending a change in the Board of Studies regulations from 1966, devolving specific issues of curriculum oversight from the Court's overview to CSPC. CSPC sent their proposal directly to the Court. This is an anomaly, as the HE Governance Act specifies that arrangements for Boards of Studies require approval by the Court. It could be argued that the CSPC's recent recommendations have mitigated this anomaly by introducing the principle of subsidiarity and bringing the Board of Studies considerations back to a more relevant group, engaged with the issues, under the auspices of the Senate. However, in all this the role of the Senate itself seems to have been somewhat side-lined.

Some mention should be made of both the *Senate Committees Newsletter* and the *Annual Report of the Senate Committees*. These are comprehensive and important documents. Several commented how helpful they found the *Newsletter* in keeping them informed of initiatives and progress of specific programmes. The *Annual Report* provides an excellent, detailed summary of actions undertaken during the past year, and sets out the tasks the committees have identified for themselves for the following year. Taken together they provide the strongest evidence of the committees of the Senate carrying out the implementation and operation of strategies identified by the Senate.

In 2018, the Curriculum and Student Progression Committee minutes 'the possibility of mapping the links between School, College and Senate Committees' (CSPC 18/19 1M). This is a recurring issue. A 2008 Report to the Senate notes, 'the effectiveness of the proposed new structure is dependent on the successful embedding of a different way of working between Senate committees and the colleges that better reflects the maturing devolved structure'.[9] During the 2008 academic governance review, a decision was taken to abolish the Senate committee on Academic Policy, with an option that there be a 'formation of an Academic Strategy Committee'. It goes on to say that 'heads of schools have expressed a desire for a forum in which they can contribute to strategy development, a matter which goes wider than academic strategy.'[10] However, the following year, in a Report summarizing the changes arising from the review, it was reported that 'no replacement for APC [Academic Policy Committee] would be created within the revised Senatus committee structure.'[11]

---

[9] The University of Edinburgh Senate, *Report of the Review Group on Academic Governance* (H/020202), 2008, p.1.
[10] Ibid., p.2.
[11] The University of Edinburgh Senatus Academicus, *Summary report on the changes arising from the review of academic governance* (H/2/2/2), 3 June 2009, p.2.

A decade later, and in response to issues that have emerged which challenge the University's reputation as delivering research-led teaching in a supportive and coherent student environment, the University has created the role of Vice-Principal Students. Due to be appointed in March 2019, this individual will report directly to the Principal, and is a member of the University Executive and Senior Leadership group. Part of his or her role will be 'giving strategic leadership to Senate Committees involved in learning, teaching and student experience'. The Appointment Brief also describes how this individual will be charged with 'developing and reporting on progress against clear targets to the University Executive and the University's governing body, the University Court'.[12] The purpose of this cross-cutting institutional role is to 'raise the standards and quality of the University's interaction with its students to the level evident in its research performance'. This will necessitate a consideration of which committees will support this individual's work. The Senate, as 'supreme academic body', has a role to play, but it remains to be seen how the Vice-Principal Students will determine which entities are most effective in instigating change, and what the role of the Senate in that deliberation might be.

While members of the Standing Committees of the Senate work to their annual tasks, there was less clarity as to where the committees intersected with other groups in the University. When asked what were the key decision-making central groups, the *University Executive* and the *Policy and Resources Committee* (PRC) were frequently mentioned; their membership was recognized as those responsible for delivering the University strategy. The *Academic Strategy Group*, comprised of the Principal and the Heads of Schools, also emerged as a potentially useful group, yet to be defined, but potential to take up the concern expressed in 2008 Review, in their wish to 'contribute to strategy development, a matter which goes wider than academic strategy'. [13]

There was some concern expressed about duplication of efforts between committees and groups. Examples would be:

- The role of the *Learning and Teaching Policy Group* in relation to the work of the *Learning and Teaching Committee* of the Senate;
- Were the members of the *Learning and Teaching Committee* of the Senate informed about the ongoing work in the relevant Schools' committees, and if so, was this mainly reliant on individuals that served on both entities?
- Recognition that, with many of the same individuals sitting on a number of different committees addressing the same issues at School, College and Senate, what structures and mechanism exist to ensure they inform each group or committee on the ongoing work of other committees?
- The Senate Handbook describes the Senate as 'Discussing matters of strategic importance for learning, teaching and research of the University'. This was well-demonstrated by the REF 2021 presentation in Part I on 06.02.19. However, there is no Senate committee representing Research. Instead, the *Researcher Experience Committee* considers the systems to support Post Graduate, PhD and Early Career Researchers. The committee's

---

[12] The University of Edinburgh, *Appointment of Vice-Principal Students*, 2018.
[13] The University of Edinburgh Senate, *Report of the Review Group on Academic Governance* (H/020202), 2008, p.1.

remit is to 'proactively engage with any high level issues or themes…including outcomes from REF and internal Postgraduate programme Reviews.' However, the needs and training of these three postgraduate cohorts differ greatly from one another. In particular, the early career researchers (EAC)[14]

Recommendations

The following recommendations are put forward for consultation and debate. To suggest actions that add a further layer of bureaucracy, or additional reporting lines, would meet with little enthusiasm. Equally, there is no point in arguing for the original operations as set out in 1858; the University has changed beyond recognition since that time. Yet the principal of a Senate as a pillar of governance, alongside the Court and more recently, the Executive, remains compelling. The recommendations therefore necessarily touch on other areas of decision-making, beyond the scope of considering the Senate as it operates today.

Yet the Senate's fundamental purpose in a complex and evolving university remains well-documented. For example, the remit for the Policy and Resources Committee (PRC), a Standing Committee of the Court, acknowledges the role of the Senate: 'To advise on the strategic direction of the University taking cognisance of the interests and responsibilities of the Senate'.[15] The Senate is not bereft of the ability to influence the academic strategy of the University; whether the University choses to invest it as the 'supreme academic body' will determine the next steps.

1. To utilize the 2016 Act as a mechanism to reinvigorate a wider understanding of the role of the Senate as the 'supreme academic body' of the University of Edinburgh. At present the Senate has largely abrogated its right as the voice of advocacy for the academic community.

2. To better integrate the work of the Standing Committees with the emergence of key central groups and committees'

3. To rebuild a system whereby the Senate can recommend to the Court collective agreement on academic policy and strategy, encompassing teaching and research.

4. In the 2008 deliberations, the Standing Committees were set up to be 'both reactive and proactive', with both 'governance' and 'operation' within its remit. Within the newly-constituted Senate, use the forthcoming review of Standing

---

[14] The University of Edinburgh, *Senatus Researcher Experience Committee*, Terms of Reference, 2.6. The REC amalgamation of PG, PhD and early career researchers (EACs) mitigates against specific analysis of the EAC contribution to the research culture and outcomes of the university, and more specifically, REF policies.
[15] The University of Edinburgh, Governance and Strategic Planning, *The Approved Terms of Reference of the Policy and Resources Committee*, pt. 4 (remit).

Committees to define these committees' remits not only within the Senate, but also in the wider university governance.[16]

5. To better define the principle of subsidiarity so that committees are clear when they can take a decision, review a decision, mitigate a decision, approve a decision or refer to committees higher in the committee hierarchy.

6. To use the Senate meeting to open and close University-wide consultations on broader academic strategy. 'The Discussion' part of the Minutes could be enhanced by recording who or what committee will address and progress the issues, prior to forming formal recommendation of the Senate to the Court. *The Annual Report* could then capture explicitly the actions taken by the Standing Committees on behalf of the Senate.

7. At present the Senate committees request permission to set their own annual agendas. These should be integrated within the wider planning process which takes into account the long-term strategies as set by the Colleges, deliberated by the Senate and approved by the Court.

8. To define what role the Senate has in receiving recommendations from their Standing Committee in relation to the Senate's role in recommending proposals to the Court.

9. To clarify the role of Senate Assessors to the Court, and to consider how the Assessors could update the Senate throughout the year, rather than retrospectively, of issues relevant to the remit of the Senate.

10. To consider how the agendas of the Senate and its committee would be involved in planning round discussions, as was noted in the 2016 'light-touch' review of the Senate. This could be an aspect of the Senate Assessors' role, through the Learning and Teaching Policy Group, or by some other mechanism.[17]

11. To clarify the role of professional services colleagues in the reformed Senate and further to define their role in the future Standing Committees.

12. To consider how the role of Vice-Principal Students will impact the work of the Standing Committees of the Senate, and ensure that this individual has

---

[16] In 2016, this was recommended in the 'light-touch' review of the Senate: 'Committees should include a summary of delegation of powers from Senate to the Senate Committees'. *Light Touch Governance Review: Senate and the Senate Committees* (S 15/16 2K), Recommendation 5, 3 February 2016.

[17] 'Learning and Teaching Policy Group should explore how to better align the annual prioritisation of the Senate Commttees' activity with the University's annual planning round', The University of Edinburgh Senate, *Light Touch Governance Review: Senate and the Senate Committees* (S 15/16 2 K), Recommendation 3.

sufficiently robust mechanisms through the Senate or other committees to influence policy and strategy.

13. To use the forthcoming review of the Standing Committees of the Senate to ensure a systems approach between groups and committees to avoid duplication.

14. To consider how the University Executive and other, smaller bodies defined by the delegated authority of the Principal, could integrate the work of the Standing Committees of the Senate more effectively in terms of wider university strategy.

15. To consider when and how the LTPG and the RPG would produce a unified view or request to the Senate and its Standing Committees.

16. To consider how the Senate might have a role as the 'supreme academic body' in acknowledging the exceptional research activity of the university and supporting Research.

Acknowledgements

Jennifer Barnes
March 2019

THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

23 April 2019

REF 2021 Code of Practice

Description of paper
1.   As part of the Research Excellence Framework (REF) 2021 exercise, the University must develop, document and apply a code of practice on determination of who is an independent researcher; and the selection of outputs for the University's submission. The code is designed to adhere to the rules and requirements presented by REF and to ensure that the University can optimise its final submission to the exercise in November 2020. A copy of the code is available as an appendix. References by paragraph number ("CoP #") are made to it throughout this paper. This paper articulates the final version of the Code of Practice for approval by University Executive. University Executive discussed the draft Code at its March 2019 meeting.

Action requested/Recommendation
2.   University Executive is invited to:
   a) approve the Code of Practice for submission to the funding bodies
   b) approve that the Code of Practice may be used to inform decisions within the University, subject to any amendments required by SFC.

Paragraphs 3-17 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Risk Management
18. The performance of the University in REF 2021 influences both our reputation and funding, and in both areas the university has a low appetite for risk. It is important that we take action to minimise risks to our performance. The activities outlined in this paper have the potential to improve the support for the individuals employed by the university, and improve the University's standards in relation to the environment within which staff work. We believe that implementation of this code of practice will ensure the university can optimise its submission to the REF exercise in November 2020.

Equality & Diversity
19. Equality impact assessments are embedded in the code of practice and the University's plans for the REF exercise more generally. EIAs have already been undertaken in relation to the Staff Decisions Framework, and the EIA for the 2018 Mock REF is well underway. Similar to REF 2014, the 2021 exercise will focus on ensuring research staff are given equal opportunity to participate, and there continues to be an emphasis on demonstrating how we are creating a supportive environment for academic staff of all characteristics.

Paragraph 20 has been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Consultation
21. The code of practice was developed through a consultative process including:
   - REF Board

- University HR Services
- VP People & Culture
- UCU Edinburgh and UCU Scotland
- People Committee
- Academic staff community (open consultation, January 2019)
- *Senatus Academicus*
- University Executive at its March 2019 meeting
- CJCNC March 2019 meeting.

22. UCUE and UCU Scotland have been involved in the development of the code since October 2018. There is one issue where UCU disagrees with the university's position, in respect of outputs associated with former staff who have been made redundant, as highlighted in paragraphs 13-16. As we do not require UCU to have signed off on the Code, we do not consider that this is a block to approval of the Code. However, we will consider adding an explanatory statement to our website explaining the rationale for the university's decision.

Further information
23. The University's code of practice in full.

24. *Author*   *Presenter*
   Pauline Jones   Tracey Slaven
   Head of Strategic Performance and   Deputy Secretary, Strategic Planning
   Research Policy   Governance & Strategic Planning
   Governance & Strategic Planning
   15 April 2019

Freedom of Information
25. This paper should not be included in open business as its disclosure could substantially prejudice the commercial interests of the University. The Code will be published once it has been approved by the Scottish Funding Council, anticipated for August 2019.

UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

23 April 2019

Report from Fee Strategy Group

Description of paper
1.   This paper sets out the recommendations from the Fee Strategy Group meeting of 4 March 2019 which the University Executive is asked to approve or note as appropriate.

Action requested/Recommendation
2.   The University Executive is asked to consider and approve unregulated tuition fee inflation and rate proposals outlined in paragraphs 9, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17 and 24 and to note routine fee approvals taken by the Chair of the Fee Strategy Group (paragraph 25).

2020/21 Tuition Fee proposals
Market positioning.
3.   We review the UG International fee and the PGR International and full cost fee, the structure of the PGT fee spine and the minimum fee spine points for PGT programmes for both HEU and International class-based and laboratory-based programmes to maintain our market position and facilitate recruitment of students to meet our intake targets. We consider the following to provide the context for our decisions:

- Competitor behaviour;
- Fee benchmarking (2019/20 fees – the latest available);
- World rankings and their effect on student choice;
- Student demand – applications and enrolment trends; and
- Entrant and Decliner surveys.

4.   In recent years we have positioned ourselves in the top quartile of the Russell Group with regard to tuition fee rates, and will continue to maintain this position for 2020/21. Our entrant and decliners survey demonstrate that many of our applicants also apply to the top Russel Group competitors, and that they are also the chosen destination for a fair proportion of our decliners. However, the top reason for rejecting the University of Edinburgh is high tuition costs for international UG and for Home, EU and international PGT decliners. Decliners regard us as providing markedly less value for money than their chosen institution.

5.   We are still seeing growth in UG international applications and entrants, although at a lower rate than the 'golden triangle' Russell Group institutions[1]. International and full cost PhD enrolments are rising slowly (17% over 5 years) but uncompetitive scholarships and high fees are cited as the main reasons applicants decline offers from the University. Although international PGT applications and enrolments have shown strong growth in the last five years, increased demand is mainly driven by applications from China. We are seeing strong competition for Home and EU students in the PGT market.

---
[1] Oxford, Cambridge, UCL, Imperial and Kings College London

6.   Colleges and Schools regularly review their PGT programme portfolio to decide if the market demand and competition position enables specific programmes to be placed on a higher point than the minimum fee spine point.

Tuition fee uplift factor
7.   For 2020/21, FSG considered the methodology for calculating the uplift factor as well as the individual components of the inflationary uplift (staff costs, other costs and 'risk premium') that we apply to unregulated fees. The methodology reflects feedback from previous FSG discussions and includes reviewing recent cost behaviours (taking account of volume growth for pay and non-pay costs) along with considering Government published inflation forecasts and likely risks reflecting current external uncertainties (with safeguards to ensure that we do not compound the same risk factors year on year). FSG agreed that the proposed fee uplift as proposed by the Director of Finance of 5.95% be applied to all unregulated fee rates for 2020/21.

8.   By increasing tuition fee rates in line with expected University costs and risks, we aim to maintain our real income at sustainable levels. However this also reinforces the need to examine the cost base of our programmes as part of our wider business planning.

9.   After considering the above:

UE is invited to approve the tuition fee uplift factor of 5.95% for 2020/21 for all unregulated fees[2].

UE is invited to approve, given the uplift recommended above that there is no adjustment for market position to the fee structure for 2020/21.

Details of the tuition fees proposed are set out in Appendix 1.

MBChB International fee
10. In 2017/18 for the MBChB compulsory 6-year programme we responded to the Scottish Government decision to charge HEIs an annual levy (ACT) for each international MBChB student by increasing the tuition fee for 2017/18 entrants to £32,100 for pre-clinical and the intercalated year (years 1-3), and £49,900 for the clinical years (years 4-6). The fee is fixed for the duration of the programme. As the 2017/18 fee was raised significantly to cover the additional cost of the levy, and to maintain competitive for 2018/19 and for 2019/20 entrants to the compulsory 6 year MBChB programme we charged the same fixed fee as in 2017/18.
16. Our clinical fees are at the second highest in the sector benchmark and for 2018/19 we only recruited 12 international non-closed loop students against a SFC cap of 17.

11. Taking into consideration the increased international competition and the high fees we charge due to the additional costs we incur with the levy on international students we now pay to NHS Education for Scotland:

---

[2] Excluding the International and full cost MBChB and BMV&S programmes which are proposed separately.

> **UE is invited to approve** the fixed fee of £32,100 for years 1-3 and £49,900 for years 4-6[3] for 20120/21 MBChB International and full cost entrants.

BVM&S International and graduate entry fees

12. The international and graduate entry BMV&S programme exists in a very competitive national and international market, and it must therefore pitch its fees carefully in order to remain attractive to applicants. In the most recent two years we have increased the fee by 2.5%, but for 20120/21entrants we consider that the fee can be raised slightly higher to a 4.5% increase.

> **UE is invited to approve** the fixed fee for the international and graduate entry to the BVM&S programme by 4.5% to £32,850 for 2020/21 entrants (£31,450 in 2019/20).

- **Study abroad and placement tuition fees for 2020/21**

13. For 2014/15 we reviewed our policy for year abroad study against an evolving regulatory and policy environment for new regime RUK students studying in Scotland, along with the phased withdrawal of publically funded places for RUK students by SFC. Since then we have aimed for a stable policy on study/work abroad tuition fees while taking into consideration our own policy for study abroad and work abroad within the Strategic Plan 2016.

14. The fees for SEU students are specified by the Scottish Government. For RUK students the fee that we may charge is informed and restricted by a combination of SFC policy and Student Loan Company (SLC) limits on the tuition fee loan available to students, and we set the fees so that no RUK student is charged more than they can borrow from their respective student loan company. For international students there are no restrictions on the fee level we may charge.

15. We have no firm information yet on whether UK students will be able to participate in Erasmus post-Brexit. We are currently assuming this to be the case, but any fees announced will be indicative on continued participation in the scheme.

> **UE is invited to indicatively approve** that the proportion of the respective fees we charge for SEU, RUK and international students on study abroad and work placement remains unchanged in 2020/21, as set out in Appendix 2.

- **Student administration tuition related fees 2020/21**

16. In 2017 FSG agreed that we simplify our annual increase for these fees moving forward and increase all tuition related fees by the same percentage uplift agreed for tuition fees (5.95% for 2020/21).

> **UE is invited to approve** the 2020/21 student administration tuition related fees as set out in Appendix 3.

---

[3] Direct entrants into year 4 would also be charged this fixed fee.

- **European strategic partnerships PhD cohort fees**

17. The University's Regional Plan for Europe includes the development of a small number of high-quality partnerships based initially around joint 4-year PhD studentships with four select European universities[4]. This a strategic development to boost European collaborations and partnerships and has been approved by University Court. This endeavour aims to be the stepping-stones to becoming best in the world in research areas collaboratively through creating critical mass leading to joint staff appointments and eventually joint institutes. Sixty PhD students will be recruited in joint programmes with the four European Universities. As the University of Edinburgh will be contributing half of the costs, and the fee will be funded internally, there is no net effect on income. To ensure equality between European and International students, and between disciplines we propose that we apply the Home/EU fee to all PhD students on these joint partnerships.

> **UE is invited to approve** that all PhD fees for students on this partnership are charged at the Home/EU rate.

- **Scholarship agreement with Ashinaga**

18. Ashinaga was initially set-up in 1963 to support orphaned Japanese children[5]. Ashinaga's stated Mission is to provide comprehensive support and education to orphaned students so that may become compassionate citizens of the world who have the determination and ability to contribute to the betterment of humankind, and over the last 20 years has progressively moved to a more-international focus, supporting orphans from around the world, including those from Uganda and Somalia.

19. In 2014, Ashinaga established their Ashinaga Africa Initiative, a project "aimed to alleviate poverty in Sub-Saharan Africa by supporting the higher education of young orphaned students with the desire to make a difference" and to empower a generation of future African leaders.

20. The University of Edinburgh has been working with Ashinaga UK-office since 2016. The relationship initially supported Edinburgh students to access summer work placements, but more recently has moved to support students from across Sub-Saharan Africa to enter Higher Education – principally through the Mastercard Foundation Scholars Program.

21. We are in the final stages of finalising a Memorandum of Understanding with Ashinaga. Our aim is to continue to work with them beyond the current Mastercard Foundation grant, for which our final undergraduate entry will be September 2019. Ashinaga is one clear option by which we can secure additional pathways for low-income students from Sub-Saharan Africa to be able to access the University.

---

[4] KU Leuven, the University of Helsinki, Leiden University and Copenhagen University.
[5] Ashinaga has to date raised an estimated $1 billion and helped over 95,000 students graduate from high school, university and vocational school.

22. In line the University's current Africa Plan, a partnership with Ashinaga would positively impact two Key Objectives:

- Key objective 2: Continue to recruit more students, from a wider range of backgrounds, and a wider range of SSA countries
- Key objective 5: Encourage more sponsors to engage with the University to create more scholarships for African students

23. The MoA with Ashinaga will agree to fund the fifth year of 4 student entrants from 2019/20 (years 1-4 funded by Mastercard Foundation) and from 2019/20 to 2023/24 will fund two entrants per year with a proposed 20% scholarship for tuition fees.

Academic Year	Ashinaga Students at UoE	Expected Total Fee scholarship	Expected Fee Income not including scholarship
2019/20	4	£0*	£83,200
2020/21	6	£10,400	£124,800
2021/22	8	£28,800	£166,400
2022/23	10	£31,200	£208,000
2023/24	10	£52,000	£208,000
2024/25	8	£41,600	3166,400
2025/26	6	£31,200	£124,800
2026/27	4	£20,800	£83,200
2027/28	2	£10,400	£41,600
Total		**£218,400**	**£1,206,400**

*For 2019/20, the 4 incoming undergraduate students will be funded by the Mastercard Foundation Scholars Program – it wouldn't be until 2023/24 when Ashinaga would pay for their 5th year of study that the scholarship contribution from the University would start. Assuming a fee of £26,000 (2019/20 lab based international fee).

24. By supporting the Ashinaga scholarship programme the University would demonstrate our commitment to continuing to recruit scholars from low-income Sub-Saharan Africa to our undergraduate programmes.

> **UE is invited to approve** a scholarship of 20% of tuition fees for students recruited on the Ashinaga scheme.

- **Fee Strategy Group Chair's Action for noting**

25. Since its last report to the University Executive in March 2018, the following routine fee approvals for 2018/19 have been approved by the Chair:

College	Programme	Spine point	Fee
CAHSS	MSc Carbon Finance (fee for 2019/20)	SP11	£18,800 (Home/EU)
		SP14	£21,600 (international)
	MSc in Korean Studies	SP1	£10,100 (Home/EU)
		SP13	£20,500 (International)
	MRes in Korean Studies	N/A	£7,900 (Home/EU)
		SP14	£20,500 (international)

CMVM	MSc Ancient Worlds (online)	SP5	£13,100 (HEU and International)
	MSc in Critical Care (online)	SP7	£15,500 (HEU and International)
	MSc by Research Regenerative Medicine and Tissue Repair	N/A	£8,300 (Home/EU)
		SP19	£26,600 (International)

Resource implications
26. There are material resource implications for the proposed tuition fees and are highlighted in paragraph 5. The proposals seek to maintain the University's real term income from tuition fees in the future.

Risk Management
27. The proposals for fee rates included in the paper takes into account the University's appetite for financial risk as well as student experience and reputation.

Equality & Diversity
28. Equality and diversity issues are considered as part of the on-going monitoring of fee levels by the Fee Strategy Group and its Secretary. We do not consider that an EIA is required.

Next steps & Communication
29. Once endorsed, the fees will be published by Scholarships and Student Funding Services and on School and other websites as well as in promotional literature.

Consultation
30. The paper has been reviewed by Tracey Slaven, Deputy Secretary Strategic Planning

Further information
31. Further information can be obtained from Peter Phillips, Deputy Director of Planning, GaSP (tel: 50-8139, email: Peter.Phillips@ed.ac.uk)

32. *Author*   *Presenter*
    Peter Phillips   Tracey Slaven
    Governance and Strategic Planning   Governance and Strategic Planning
    15 April 2019

Freedom of Information
33. This paper should be closed and disclosure would substantially prejudice the commercial interests of the University until the fee rates are published.

Appendix 1

Undergraduate Home/ SEU and RUK fees

- Scottish/EU fees: set by the Scottish Government
- Rest of the UK fees: informed by the Scottish Government.

		Continuing Home/SEU		RUK		
		2019/20	2020/21*		2019/20	2020/21**
Undergraduate		£1,820	£1,820	Pre-17/18 entry	9,000	9,000
				17/18 entry onwards	9,250	9,250
MBChB years 1-2	Pre-12/13 entry	n/a	n/a	Pre-17/18 entry	9,000	9,000
	12/13 entry onwards	£1,820	£1,820	17/18 entry onwards	9,250	9,250
MBChB years 3-5	Pre-12/13 entry	£2,985	£2,985	Pre-17/18 entry	9,000	9,000
	12/13 entry onwards	£1,820	£1,820	17/18 entry onwards	9,250	9,250

*To be confirmed by the Scottish Funding Council.
** Indicative – to be confirmed.

Undergraduate International / full cost

- Overseas/full-cost fees: a fixed fee is set for the duration of the programme.

	International/full cost			
	2019/20		2020/21	
Entry year	Pre 14/15	2019/20*	Pre 14/15	2020/21*
Band 1 Classroom	£18,100	£19,800	£19,150	£20,950
Band 2 Laboratory	£23,900	£26,000	£25,300	£27,550

* Fixed fee for duration of student's degree set by entry year (as per FSG Policy June 2013)

Postgraduate Research Masters fees – home/EU

Category	2019/20	2020/21
Classroom	£8,300	£8,750
Laboratory	£8,300	£8,750

Note: this denotes the minimum fee, fees can be set higher.

Postgraduate Doctorate Research fees – home/EU

Set at RCUK rate –usually increased annually by GDP deflator

Home/EU	2019/20	2020/21
Classroom	£4,327	£4,327*

*Indicative – actual fee to be confirmed by RCUK

Postgraduate Doctorate research fees – International/full cost

International/ full cost	Entry year	2019/20	2020/21
Classroom	Pre 2018/19	£16,400	£17,350
	2018/19	£19,000	£20,100
Laboratory	Pre 2018/19	£21,400	£22,650
	2018/19	£22,200	£23,500
Clinical	All years	£36,200	£38,350

Non-standard fees

All non-standard fees will be increased by 5.95% in line with expected costs.

Taught Postgraduate fee spine	Fee spine point	2019/20	2020/21 2019/20+
			5.95%
	P0	10,200	10,800
Home/EU classroom	P1	10700	11,300
	P2	11,500	12,150
Home/EU laboratory	P3	12300	13,000
	P4	13,000	13,750
	P5	13,800	14,600
	P6	14,700	15,550
	P7	15,500	16,400
	P8	16,400	17,350
	P9	17,100	18,100
	P10	17,900	18,950
	P11	18,800	19,900
	P12	19,700	20,850
	P13	20,700	21,900
International/full cost classroom programmes	P14	21600	22,850
	P15	22,600	23,950
	P16	23,500	24,900
	P17	24,500	25,950
	P18	25,500	27,000
International/ full cost laboratory programmes	P19	26600	28,150
	P20	27,500	29,150
	P21	28,600	30,300
	P22	29,600	31,350
	P23	30,700	32,500
	P24	31,800	33,700
	P25	32,800	34,750
	P26	34,000	36,000
	P27	35,000	37,100
	P28	36,200	38,350
	P29	37,300	39,500
	P30	38,300	40,550
	P31	39,400	41,750
	P32	40,500	42,900
	P33	41,700	44,200
	P34	42,700	45,250
International/full-cost clinical programmes	P35	43900	46,500
	P36	45,100	47,800
	P37	46,300	49,050
	P38	47,500	50,350
	P39	48,700	51,600
Indicates minimum entry spine point			

2020/21 study abroad fees

Fee status	Year of entry	Type	Erasmus	Other exchange	Non-exchange	Work placement
SEU*	Any	Full	100%	50%	50%	50%
		Part	100%	100%	100%	100%
RUK**	2012-13 onwards	Full – mandatory	15%	50%	50%	50%
		Full - optional	15%	50%	SEU fee***	50%
		Part – mandatory	15%	67%	67%	67%
		Part - optional	15%	67%	67%***	67%
International	2013/14 or earlier	Full - mandatory	SEU fee*	SEU fee*	SEU fee*	SEU fee*
		Full - optional	50%	50%	50%	50%
		Part – mandatory and optional	100%	100%	100%	100%
	2014/15 or later	Full – mandatory	75%	75%	75%	50%
		Full - optional	75%	75%	SEU fee***	50%
		Part – mandatory	100%	100%	100%	100%
		Part - optional	100%	100%	100%***	100%

* Subject to confirmation of the HEU fee by SFC (£1,820 for 2019/20).

** Subject to confirmation of fee regulations by SLC.

***Students are also liable for all tuition fees charged by the host institution

THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH

Appendix 2: <u>Student Administrative Services Tuition Related Fees 2019/20</u>

	Undergraduate	Taught and Research Masters	Research Doctorate	Higher Degrees (DD,DLitt,LLD,DSc DMus, DArts) PhD by Publication	Higher Professional Degrees (DVM&S, DDS and MD Old Regs)		Fee Levels 2019/20	Proposed Increase (5.95%) 2020/21
Matriculation	N/A	N/A	Charged for a one year period after supervised study. Also charged to cover a period of up to one year for minor revisions to thesis submitted.	N/A	N/A		£150	**£160**
Continuation	N/A	N/A	Charged to students who fail to submit their thesis within the normal maximum period of study. When granted authorised extension, students charged pro rata to annual fee.	N/A	N/A		£720	**£770**

	Undergraduate	Taught and Research Masters	Research Doctorate	Higher Degrees (DD,DLitt,LLD,DSc DMus, DArts) PhD by Publication	Higher Professional Degrees (DVM&S, DDS and MD Old Regs)		Fee Levels 2019/20	Proposed Increase (5.95%) 2020/21
Re-assessment	Charged to students for entry to re-examination diet and/or coursework or practical re-assessment.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		£130	**£140**
Re-submission	N/A	N/A	Payable when a student required to complete major revisions to thesis and attend a further oral examination.	N/A	N/A		£720	**£770**
Submission	N/A	N/A	N/A	Payable by students on their first submission of thesis.	N/A		£2,110	**£2,240**
PhD Reinstatement	N/A	N/A	Payable upon submission of thesis.	N/A			£2,110	**£2,240**

	Undergraduate	Taught and Research Masters	Research Doctorate	Higher Degrees (DD,DLitt,LLD,DSc DMus, DArts) PhD by Publication	Higher Professional Degrees (DVM&S, DDS and MD Old Regs)		Fee Levels 2019/20	Proposed Increase (5.95%) 2020/21
Registration, Annual and Examination	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Candidates are charged a registration, annual and examination fee.		£2,110	**£2,240**

THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH

UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

23 April 2019

Update: Developing a University Strategy: Preventing and Responding to Sexual Violence and Gender-Based Violence

Description of Paper
1.   This paper updates the University Executive on:
   (i) activity by the University in respect of both preventing and responding to sexual violence and gender-based violence; and
   (ii) the work of the University taskforce, established following approval from the University Executive in April 2018 with the remit of reviewing and refreshing the University's strategic approach to tackling sexual violence and gender-based violence (hereinafter referred to as 'sexual violence' for brevity) across the whole University community including when staff are involved (the "Taskforce").

Action Requested/Recommendation
2.   The University Executive is asked to: (i) note the update; and (ii) comment on current activity and future plans.

Background and Context
3**.**   Sexual violence and misconduct, gender-based hate crime and harassment remain significant challenges for universities worldwide. Work continues in the sector following a Universities UK report[1], published in October 2016 (the "UUK report"), which recommended that universities tackle violence against women, harassment and hate crime affecting university students.

4.   A "one year on" update of the UUK report[2], published in March 2018, highlighted that many universities still need to develop strategies and programmes of work in order to respond effectively to gender-based violence and sexual violence ensuring that such strategies tackle sexual violence relating to staff as well as students.

5.   The Equally Safe in Higher Education (ESHE) Toolkit, a Scottish Government funded initiative was launched in early May 2018, and provides universities with a "trauma-informed" framework for tackling sexual violence.

6.   As reported to the University Executive in April 2018[3], working in partnership with the Students' Association, the University identified the following 3 objectives as part of its strategy to prevent and respond to sexual violence and misconduct; to
   • encourage more students to disclose to the University that they are survivors of sexual violence;

---

[1] UUK, Changing the Culture, October 2016
[2] UUK, Changing the Culture: one year on – An assessment of strategies to tackle sexual misconduct, hate crime and harassment affecting university students, March 2018
[3] The paper was also presented to the Policy and Resources Committee on 4 June 2018 and to the University Court on 18 June 2018. Both PRC and Court welcomed the paper and noted the content.

- reduce incidences of sexual violence over time through education and culture change; and
- support survivors better,

and undertook a number of measures to work towards these objectives. In addition, the University Executive approved the establishment of the Taskforce

Discussion

7.   The Taskforce, chaired by Vice-Principal Jane Norman, met for the first time on 22 August and is convened on a quarterly basis. As the University Executive is aware, Vice Principal Jane Norman will be leaving the University at the end of May and the Taskforce would like to record its thanks for her excellent leadership of the Taskforce, and to welcome the Director of Legal Services, Leigh Chalmers (a current member of the Taskforce) as the new chair.

8.   The Taskforce has clear lines of governance and accountability and operates within the framework of the ESHE toolkit. Membership comprises representatives from across the University community, including the Students' Association, academic colleagues, professional services, the unions, accommodation and HR – supporting the adoption of an "institution-wide" approach.

9.   The remit of the Taskforce has ensured that it has the ability to create, support and encourage implementation of a holistic strategy and to provide a platform from which the University can look critically at its policies, processes and procedures to ensure that staff and students are supported when incidents of sexual violence and misconduct are reported.

10. It is important to note that significant activity has been and continues to take place within the University[4] providing the Taskforce with a platform to influence the University's strategy in this area.

11. Four work-streams have been constituted by the Taskforce which report to the quarterly meetings of the Taskforce. These work-streams cover:
   (i) Shaping policy, procedures and knowledge exchange (Taskforce 1);
   (ii) Support and publicity of services (Taskforce 2);
   (iii) Prevention, generating culture change and disclosure training (Taskforce 3); and
   (iv) Reporting (Taskforce 4).

12. The Taskforce has oversight of all activity within this area, and the following measures have been undertaken/implemented by areas of the University since the last report to the University Executive in April 2018:

Training and Guidance
- Commencement of a review of the online guidance for staff and students on how support should be provided for survivors of sexual violence (and on-line training on responding to disclosures of sexual violence continues to be available to all University staff);

---

[4] Colleagues in Student Experience Services, HR and EUSA continue to drive significant prevention and response activity to sexual violence.

- Over 600 student leaders (Residence Assistants, Society Presidents and Sports Club Captains) received introductory training on consent and the bystander approach in September 2018, and this initiative is being scaled up to 1000 student leaders for 2019/20;
- The Consent Collective have engaged with 600 staff and students from the University community in face-to-face sessions, focusing on a range of matters such as consent, support power and relationships, the bystander approach, investigations etc.;
- Within the ESHE framework, Rape Crisis Scotland delivered an initial half day session on tackling GBV in March 2019 to 30 staff from University Schools, Accommodation and Security services;
- Gender-based violence information support cards have been given to all staff working within the University (within the framework of the Equally Safe in Higher Education initiative).

Campaigns and Initiatives
- In partnership with the Student's Association, a refreshed and relaunched communications campaign for 2018-19, "#NoExcuse"[5];
- The launch of the "Don't Cross the Line" campaign in early 2019;
- The University continues to play a leading role in the development of "Fearless Edinburgh", a regional initiative which has strengthened partnerships with the other FE and HEIs in Edinburgh, Police Scotland, NHS Lothian, National Union of Students, the City of Edinburgh Council and Rape Crisis in tackling sexual violence in Edinburgh.

University Policies and Procedures
- The University's Disclosure of Intimate Relationships Policy was been implemented in February 2019.
- The University's student conduct procedures continue to be considered and revised to support the handling of allegations of sexual violence and misconduct.

13. There continues to be much work to do and in the short to medium term the University, as overseen by the Taskforce, is focusing on the following:
- Continuing to roll out training as highlighted in paragraph 12 above;
- Continuing to carry out reviews and lessons-learnt sessions in relation to reported incidents in order to identify where improvements can be made to support our students and staff and to support the development of handling expertise amongst professional services staff;
- Reviewing the interface between the student complaints procedure and the staff disciplinary procedure to reflect the sensitivity required in handling a student complaint of harassment or assault by a University staff member and to represent best practice in the sector and reflect UUK guidance referred to above;
- Publishing student focused guidance aimed at helping students, and others, to understand the support available and what to expect throughout the

---

[5] The previous campaign was #No-one asks for it – 2016-17

complaint investigation process all helpfully informed by close partnership working with the Students' Association;

- Continuing to develop mechanisms to provide better support for those staff against whom complaints are made and those who investigate complaints;
- Developing and improving the University's existing web-content on tackling sexual violence, including promoting the full range of activity currently being undertaken more effectively;
- Exploring opportunities to lead on and participate in research projects regarding GBV and sexual violence (including the ESHE Research Project, co-ordinated by the University of Strathclyde);
- Commissioning of a multi-layered training programme for staff and students for 2019/20, including developing a model for cascading training on tackling GBV to all students living in University accommodation;
- Identifying how the University can support survivors better, including looking at the potential introduction of the Sexual Violence Liaison Officer role and working in partnership with Edinburgh Rape Crisis.

Resource Implications

14. Student Experience Services, part of the University Secretary's Group allocated circa £35k in 2018/19 to cover the cost of the increased training and #no excuse campaign referred to above.

15. There are potentially significant resource requirements for the proposed work programme being recommended by the Taskforce and discussions with budget holders will be required[6]. In addition to staff time to develop actions, there are also time demands arising from participation in training and development (moving forward, this could apply to large numbers of staff across all grades and roles). Ongoing funding is required for training programmes and communication and publicity campaigns, as well as the production of leaflets, guides and other resources.

16. An increase in disclosures is also likely to have a significant impact on staff time in terms of both investigation and support (see paragraph 18 for comments on the likelihood of an increasing number of disclosures).

Risk Management

17. There is a significant likelihood that the volume of disclosures of sexual harassment and sexual violence will continue to rise within the University community due to campaigns, better advice and guidance. The University has seen increased numbers of cases reported since 2016/17[7], and believes this is partly due to the introduction of campaigns and improved reporting systems. However, in common with other universities across the UK, it is likely that there is still significant under-reporting of such incidents. In order to tackle this issue comprehensively the University needs to facilitate disclosures where individuals wish to make them. A low

---

[6] The Student Experience Action Plan will continue to seek financial resource for identified activities to address the University's strategy for the prevention and tacking of sexual violence.

[7] In 2016/17, 35 cases were reported (please note these figures do not represent a full academic year, as reporting began when the webpage "Supporting students who report sexual harassment or assault" went live in November 2016. In 2017/18, 73 cases were reported, and so far, for 2018/19 there have been 29 cases reported.

number of disclosures would not necessarily reflect low incidences of assault but could instead suggest reluctance to disclose.

18. There is the potential for negative media coverage in the event of increasing numbers of disclosures. However, the view of many leading work in this area (including the current President of UUK, Dame Janet Beer) is that, given the widely acknowledged under-reporting of incidents of sexual violence, it is a positive sign when an institution can start to report increased numbers.

Equality & Diversity
19. There are likely to be significant positive implications with regard to the discharge of our equality duties arising from such a programme of work.

Next steps/implications
20. It is the intention that the Taskforce has a short-term life-span .The Taskforce will continue to drive forward and co-ordinate current activity within the University relating both to staff and students (including the short to medium term objectives outlined above), and will oversee the development of the University's longer-term sexual violence prevention strategy and implementation plans. The Taskforce will plan for ending its work at some point before the end of academic year 2019-20 with a view to mainstreaming ongoing priorities and commitments into existing programmes of work within the University. Many of the Taskforce recommendations will require budgetary commitment and consequently consideration of prioritisation by appropriate budget holders.

21. Reporting on the University's strategy, in relation to preventing and responding to sexual violence and misconduct, will be made to the University Executive.

Consultation
22. This paper has been produced with input from Leigh Chalmers, Director of Legal Services, James Saville, Director of HR, Andy Shanks, Director of Student Wellbeing and Gavin Douglas, Deputy Secretary, Student Experience.

Further information
23. *Author and Presenter*
    Leigh Chalmers, Director of Legal Services.

Freedom of Information
24. Open paper

UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

23 April 2019

People Report
(Incorporating work of People Committee and Human Resources)

Description of paper
1.   This paper provides an update on people related matters being taken forward by Human Resources and other University departments.

Action requested/Recommendation
2.   The Committee is requested to note the content of this paper.

Background and context
3.   This paper provides a summary of the matters considered at the last meeting of People Committee on 27 February 2019. It is a slight update on the paper presented to Policy and Resources Committee on 5 April 2019, together with a report on progress since the last meeting of University Executive on other people related issues being taken forward by Human Resources.

Paragraphs 4-18 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Resource implications
19. Resources will be met from within existing budgets unless outlined in the paper.

Risk Management
20. The University has a low risk appetite for both compliance risks and people risks.

Equality & Diversity
21. Equality issues will be considered on a case by case basis for each individual project/piece of work.

Next steps/implications
22. Future reports will be presented to each meeting of University Executive.

Further information
23. *Author and Presenter*
    James Saville
    Director of Human Resources
    12 April 2019

Freedom of Information
24. This paper is closed.

THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH

UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

23 April 2019

**Health and Safety Quarterly Report: Quarter 2:
1 December 2018 – 28 February 2019**

Description of paper
1. This paper provides a summary of health and safety related incidents that took place during the period 1 December 2018 to 28 February 2019, as well as relevant health and safety issues and developments, to provide information and assurance to the University Executive (UE) on the management of health and safety matters.

Action requested
2. UE is asked to note the contents of the report.

Recommendation
3. That UE notes the statistics included in the Appendices as illustrative of the University's accident and incident experience, and notes the issues and developments which are also described in the Report for this Quarter.

Paragraphs 4-22 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Risk management
23. The University has a low risk appetite for both compliance risks and for people risks. Monitoring of health and safety accidents, diseases and incidents ensures that risks to health are being managed and provides an early warning of more serious issues.

Equality & Diversity
24. This report raises no major equality and diversity implications.

Consultation
25. This paper, with minor alterations, will also be presented to the next appropriate meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee.

Further information
26. *Author*   *Presenter*
    Suzanne Thompson   Hugh Edmiston
    Director of Health and Safety   Vice-Principal Business Development
    8 April 2019   and Director of Corporate Services

Freedom of Information
27. This paper is closed as its disclosure would substantially prejudice the legal interests of any person or organisation.

UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

23 April 2019

Email Autoforwarding: Change to Service

Description of paper
1.   This paper sets out the service change to staff and postgraduate research student (hereafter referred to as staff) email that prevents the automatic forwarding from University email accounts to external email accounts. This will mitigate the information security and GDPR risk of disclosure of confidential or personal data, that was identified by Heads of School.

Action requested/Recommendation
2.   The University Executive is asked note this service change.

Background and context
3.   Prior to the introduction of Office365 the University supported a number of different staff email systems. As getting work emails on other devices was not always a straight forward process, some staff chose to auto forward emails to their personal accounts. The University did not formally recognise nor approve this practice. Furthermore, this practice places the University at risk of regulatory censure and/or adverse publicity if any data handled in such a way were compromised in transit or when stored by the third party.

4.   Advances in technology have made this an obsolete requirement as staff can now access their work emails on any device 24/7/365. However, there is one area where there is a need to continue the current practice of auto forwarding email from the University accounts of former academic staff, where this has been formally approved by the School. The service change outlined in this paper will require a minor amendment for this specific user group to ensure that no internally generated emails are automatically forwarded. Further information can be found in section 7.

Service Change
5.   The majority of staff access their University emails via Office 365. This provides access to email from any location, on any device 24/7/365. Two Schools, Physics & Astronomy and Informatics, with a small and diminishing number of staff using staffmail. It is anticipated that these Schools will complete their move to Office365 within this academic year.

6.   A technical change will be made to Office365 that disables the automatic forwarding to external mail services for all mail received. This does not prohibit the manual forwarding of emails or internal automatic forwarding. There are currently 595 Office365 staff users who automatically forward some or all email to external mail services.

7. Auto forwarding of emails to personal accounts is available for some former academic staff who have left the employment of the University. It is proposed that automatic forwarding only applies to incoming email (i.e. **not** generated by University staff or systems). It is intended that internal University mail to the former staff

member's address can be returned with an 'out of office' style message containing the forwarding address. There are currently 629 former staff members who have this in place.

8.   The service change will also apply to Research students as they are considered as staff.

9. It is recognised that there may be some cases where auto-forwarding is required, but these will be the exception, for example research collaborations. The process for securing an exception would be carried out locally by the appropriate College or Professional Services Group who will undertake a full risk assessment, in conjunction with the Information Security Directorate.

Resource implications
10. There are no additional resource implications from this action as the controls required to implement this change are within those already paid for and provided within Office365/Exchange. Technical configuration changes required will be absorbed within existing headcount. Communications will be required to notify users of this change, notably those who currently have this facility in place. This too will be managed within existing resources.

Risk Management
11. The acceptance of the proposals detailed in this paper will help to reduce the residual information security risk by closing a route of potential data loss.

Equality & Diversity
12*.* There are no equality or diversity implications from this paper.

Next steps & Communication
13. The technical implementation plan will be developed and tested, alongside support processes for managing the change and ongoing exception management and won't be implemented before 1 August 2009.

14. A communications strategy will be developed, targeting users who currently forward emails as well as those who authorise ongoing access to email, this will include support mechanisms and guidance on how to add @ed.ac.uk email to personal devices so that an individual can access this remotely, potentially on same device as their other email clients. Both implementation plan and communications strategy will be agreed with College IT Leads/CIOs.

Consultation
15. This service change has been requested by a number of Schools and has been endorsed by the IT Committee.

16. The initial request to implement this change came from CSCE and both CAHSS and CMVM have confirmed that they support this move. The Chief Information Security Officer and the University's Data Protection Officer fully support the change.

17. We have consulted with the Joint Unions (Feb 2019) and they had no objections to the change.

Further information

18. *Author*   *Presenter*
    Alex Carter   Gavin MacLachlan, VP CIO
    Service Management,   Information Services Group
    IS Applications

    Jo Craiglee
    Head of Knowledge Management & IS
    Planning
    28 February 2019

Freedom of Information

19. This paper is Open

UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

23 April 2019

Orphan Website Suspension Report

Description of paper
1.   The purpose of this paper is to provide an update on activity to manage orphan websites across the University's Web Estate.

Action requested
2.   The University Executive is asked to:

- note the outcomes of the orphan website suspension process as noted in the report (**Appendix i**)
- note the actions that are being taken to further improve the management and quality of the Web Estate

Background & context
3.   The Web Estate Register contains websites that are owned and/ or operated by the University, but not part of the University Website (www.ed.ac.uk/*) had a significant issue with orphan websites – those for which an accountable person is not recorded. In August 2018, 42% of University websites did not have a centrally recorded business owner and 20% did not have an allocated level two business area (College or Professional Services Group).

4.   The Web Estate risk register reflects these gaps in corporate knowledge, with 'red' risks in the areas of compliance with privacy and data legislation (such as the General Data Protection Regulation) and the potential exploitation of security vulnerabilities.

5.   A proposal was approved by the University Executive in August 2018 that websites without a named owner by the end of the calendar year should be suspended in January 2019. The Head of Web Strategy & Technologies led this programme in collaboration with colleagues from across Colleges and Professional Services Groups.

Discussion
6.   The core objectives of the activity is for all University websites to have the website owner, contact email address and level two business area against the record in the Web Estate Register. Level three business area (such as School or functional unit) have been deemed a secondary requirement to identifying business owner and will form part of the next stage of activities.

7.   There was excellent support for the activity throughout the period, from senior leaders in the University through engagement with committees and other forums, and College and Professional Services Group staff.

8.   The results are overwhelmingly positive, with only two websites recommended for suspension as a result of an owner not being allocated. The full results are in the table beneath:

	August 2018	January 2019	Change
Number of websites	1,723	1,491	-13%
%age with named owner	58%	99%	+41%
%age with level two business area	80%	100%	+20%
%age with level three business area	63%	86%	+25%

9.   During the course of the activity a number of websites that are no longer active were discovered, allied to some websites being identified as no longer required by owners. This has led to a 13% drop in the overall number of websites.

10. The disparity in level two and level three business area, while a concern, is addressed in the recommendations and seen as a priority for the next phase of activity. In the case of Non-Specific Units, no level three business area is identified.

11. The two websites recommended for suspension were in the Information Services Group and College of Science & Engineering respectively. There is little-to-no risk to the University in suspending these websites and this has now been approved.

12. There are a series of recommendations to follow this activity that are detailed in the report:
- Upload the Web Estate Register to the newly-procured Website Scanning Tool and begin using the tool to monitor web estate performance
- Conduct a further phase of investigation to populate missing level three business area and further quality assure information gathered to date
- Embed the process for website addition/ record amendment
- Develop a process and agreed technology approach for archiving websites

Resource implications
13. No additional funds are required. Budget for the recommendations and activity detailed in the plan has been allocated as part of the internal ISG Planning Round.

Risk management
14. A definitive register of websites, allied to implementation of the website scanning tool, will allow the University to better manage security, legislative, reputational and financial risks through enhanced corporate knowledge.

Equality & diversity
15. An Equality Impact Assessment has been completed.

Next steps/ implications
16. Following endorsement from WGG in January 2019, the recommendations detailed in the plan are in the process of being implemented and further briefing has been conducted with relevant stakeholders.

Consultation
17. Consultation has taken place with colleagues from across the University, including Strategic Programmes; College IT Teams; Information Security; Internal Audit; and Professional Services Groups. Full details are available in the Web Strategy Wiki – visit https://edin.ac/2LBvjBh for further information.

Further information

18. *Author*   *Presenter*
    Colan Mehaffey   Gavin McLachlan
    Head of Web Strategy & Technologies   VP CIO
    Learning, Teaching & Web Division
    Information Services Group
    17 March 2019

Orphan Website Suspension Report

Author: Colan Mehaffey, Head of Web Strategy & Technologies

Version: 1.1

Date: 17 March 2019

1. Introduction

This report outlines the results and recommended actions of the Orphan Website Suspension activity, conducted in the second half of 2018 following approval by the University Executive. This activity was driven by the need to significantly close the gap in the number of University websites without a named owner and has been overwhelmingly successful.

Only two websites remained without a named business owner across the web estate, which totals 1,491 websites. This comes from a starting point in August 2018 of more 1,700 websites, 42% of which did not have a named owner. The two websites were recommended for suspension with the relevant Business Owner, per the original plan approved by the University Executive.

This report also contains recommendations to further enhance the corporate knowledge around the web estate and, ultimately, better manage risk and improve the experience for website users.

2. Background & context

An audit was conducted by Information Services Group (ISG) in late 2017 to understand the size and operational health of websites owned and/ or operated by the University (the 'Web Estate'). In August 2019, the known University's Web Estate consists of 1,723 websites. The EdWeb-based University Website (www.ed.ac.uk) counts as a single website for this purpose.

This information forms the basis of the Web Estate Register. The register contains websites that are owned and/ or operated by the University, but not part of the University Website (www.ed.ac.uk/*) which runs on the EdWeb Content Management System.

There was a significant issue with orphan websites – 42% of University websites did not have a centrally recorded business owner and 20% did not have an allocated level two business area (College or Professional Services Group).

The audit also identified that almost half of the web estate carries 'amber' risk indicators, requiring further investigation in areas such as security, technology and accessibility. This exposes the University to reputational, legislative or financial risk.

A proposal was approved by the University Executive in August 2018 that websites without a named owner by the end of the calendar year should be suspended in January 2019. The Head of Web Strategy & Technologies led this programme in collaboration with colleagues from across Colleges and Professional Services Groups.

3. Outcomes
3.1. Objectives

The core objectives was for all University websites to have the following information against the record in the Web Estate Register:

● Website owner
● Contact email address
● Level two business area (as defined in the University organisational hierarchy[1])

Level three business area (such as School or Functional unit) have been deemed a secondary requirement to identifying business owner and will form part of the next stage of activities.

---

[1] Full organisational hierarchy can be seen at: https://www.org.planning.ed.ac.uk/browser/

3.2.   Ancillary benefits & challenges

On the whole, there was excellent support for the activity throughout the period, both from senior leaders in the University through engagement with committees and other forums and College and Professional Services Group staff.

Many staff used the exercise as an opportunity to enhance their local business area knowledge and are in a better position of assurance as a result. Some redundant websites were identified and deactivated in an appropriate manner. There was also strong engagement with the University's Web Strategy and Governance as a result of the activities.

There were challenges in terms of the high level of manual intervention and returns from some areas were not possible in the first phase of activity, putting more pressure than desired in the triage phase.

As noted in the recommendations, while there was a significant impact in the knowledge of level three business areas associated to websites. This was a secondary objective and was already in planning to be revisited. The validation of information supplied or discovered in the exercise could only be lightly tested and this will require further interrogation in the next phase of activity.

3.3.   Results

The activity has been successful in closing gaps in named business owner and level two business area. The full results are detailed in table below.

	Number of websites	Named business owner	Known level three business area	Websites discontinued or no longer active	Website suspended due to lack of owner
CAHSS	437	437	381	30	
CSE	440	439	408	22	1
CMVM	310	310	200	27	
ISG	147	146	132	29	1
CSG	70	70	69	4	
USG	35	35	34	2	
NSU	52	52	52	12	
Total	**1491**	**1489**	**1276**	**132[2]**	**2**

Comparatively there has been a significant shift in the overall number of websites and the information attached to websites.

	August 2018	January 2019	Change
Number of websites	1,723	1,491	-13%
%age with named owner	58%	99%	+41%
%age with level two business area	80%	100%	+20%
%age with level three business area	63%	86%	+25%

During the course of the activity a number of websites that are no longer active were discovered, allied to some websites being identified as no longer required by owners. This has led to a 13% drop in the overall number of websites.

---

[2] The Level Two Business Area of websites that were discontinued or no longer active was not known in every case. This is an estimation based on the distribution by Business Area in August 2018.

The disparity in level two and level three business area, while a concern, is addressed in the recommendations and seen as a priority for the next phase of activity. In the case of Non-Specific Units, no level three business area is identified.

4. Recommended actions approved by Web Governance Group

4.1.   Begin use of the Web Estate with the new Website Scanning Tool

A Website Scanning Tool was procured in November 2018 for the purpose of ongoing monitoring of the Web Estate. The tool is provided by [Little Forest](#) and a number of workshops were conducted in December to configure the tool to the University's needs.

The configuration is anticipated to be signed off by mid-February, at which point a first full upload will be made. The process of configuration and testing can then begin with a view to soft launch and invite-only release in March. A full release to a nominated person in Schools and relevant functional areas is anticipated for the start of the 2019 academic year.

4.2.   Conduct second phase of website investigation

There remains a significant gap in level three business area and a need to further assure the validity of information. It is recommended that the Web Audit Assistant is re-engaged to pursue and close these gaps, and conduct quality assurance when uploaded to the new Website Scanning Tool.

4.3.   Embed process for addition of websites to the Web Estate Register

A process for adding websites and amending entries to the Web Estate Register has previously been approved by the Web Governance Group and distributed. However, this is not in popular use and websites are being added on the basis of information supplied by the ISG Hosting Service and domain management service.

It is recommended that this process is redistributed to the web publisher and practitioner and community with the results of this activity.

4.4.   Develop a process and agreed technology approach for archiving websites

The secure and appropriate archiving of websites is a priority. The complexity of this lies in defining what should be archived as carrying institutional value and what should be deleted. Options will also be analysed for a suitable technology for the archiving of websites.

N

THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

23 April 2019

Resource Lists Framework

Description of paper
1.   This paper provides a revised version of the Resource Lists Framework which has been produced following consultation with Schools, Colleges and EUSA. This paper was presented to Library Committee in October 2018 and to Knowledge Strategy Committee on 22 March 2019.

Action requested
2.   The University Executive is asked to note the introduction of the Resource Lists Framework as a route to increasing adoption of the Resource Lists service. The Resource Lists Framework will be published in March 2019 for use in preparations for session 2019/20.

Background and context
3.   Resource Lists are online reading lists. The reading list system used to provide the service is called Leganto. The Library uses Resource Lists to manage the provision of library materials for teaching and to provide students with easy access to core teaching materials in a consistent way.

4.   There are currently 1,900 published Resource Lists. This represents approximately 40% of courses active in Learn.

5.   The Resource Lists Framework was developed in response to the Acquisitions Audit Report published in September 2017. The report recognised the benefits of Resource Lists in improving the student experience of using Library resources, in increasing the efficiencies of library workflows and in delivering best value for money. The report also recommended mandatory use of Resource Lists across the University.

6.   However, the Library would prefer that Course Organisers respond to the benefits of the service and willingly choose to use Resource Lists in their teaching. It is recognised that Resource Lists may not be suitable for all courses. The proposed Resource Lists Framework clearly states how the Library expects the provision of course materials to be managed and provides a useful tool to promote adoption of the service.

7.   A draft of the Resource Lists Framework was presented to both Library Committee and Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) in 2018.

Discussion
8.   Consultation with Learning and Teaching Committee, Library Committee, College and School equivalents, the Resource Lists Service Board and EUSA was undertaken during Semester 1. Committees were also asked to circulate the Framework to colleagues for comment and feedback.

9.   Consultation was undertaken with EUSA Vice-President Education and Vice-President Services and Activities. Specifically, EUSA VPs were asked to review and

comment on the section: 'Resource Lists are most helpful to students when they are…'

10. Feedback was also sought from:
   • Academic Support Librarians
   • The Course Collections Group
   • The School Representatives Forum

11. The Resource Lists Framework has been updated and revised in response to feedback received.   *See Appendix 1: Resource Lists Framework*

Summary of feedback
12. Outside the various committee meetings relatively little feedback was received from individuals. The main themes emerging from the consultation are highlighted below.

Broadly supportive
13. Overall feedback from Committees was positive and broadly supportive of the Framework and the Library's aim to increase adoption of Resource Lists. There was a notable shift from asking why the Library is using Resource Lists, to asking what can be done to encourage adoption of the service. In fact, a number of Schools and programmes have already introduced policies which require the use of Resource Lists.

14. However, feedback was clear that the Library should acknowledge that use of Resource Lists will not be suitable or add value to courses from certain Schools, or in certain subject areas, where for example, only one core textbook is used or where the use of Library materials in teaching is limited.

15. As a result, there was a suggestion that the Library should ask programme or course leads to declare 'non usage' with this information being recorded and reported as part of the standard set of Resource List data.

Research skills
16. Some Course Organisers believed increase usage of Resource Lists would have a negative impact on the development of students' research skills. This was articulated most strongly at College Postgraduate Studies Committees (approximately 40% of lists are for postgraduate courses). At several committees it was observed that 'copying and pasting from a reading list to DiscoverED' cannot be considered as developing research skills.

17. The issue of 'spoon feeding' students was raised explicitly with EUSA representatives who, in response, were keen to point out that students develop research skills when writing assignments and dissertations. Students understand that Resource Lists provide an introduction and entry point to a subject and that further, independent research will need to follow if they are to gain a deeper understanding of their subject.

18. The Library recognises that Resource Lists and Research skills are complementary. Promoting Research Skills alongside Resource Lists may help address concerns about 'spoon-feeding' and would also help raise awareness of available Research Skills services.

'Required purchase' tag

19. There was considerable response to the proposed introduction of a new tag, 'Required purchase'. Various committees along with EUSA representatives recognised the need for greater clarity on what students are asked to purchase. EUSA commented that students should have information on whether a book will be used over several years and, if they are expected to purchase a book, that they are made aware in advance in a consistent way e.g. in course handbooks.

20. Although Schools could use Resource Lists to highlight recommended purchases in a consistent way, agreeing a definition, ensuring consistent usage and communicating this new tag in a timely fashion to comply with Consumer Protection Legislation, is beyond the ability of the Library's Resource Lists Service to implement at this time.

21. As a result, all references to purchasing books have been removed and the Framework now advises Course Organisers to communicate required purchases to students as per existing University guidelines.

22. The Library will continue to liaise with the College of Arts, Humanities & Social Sciences Library & Information Strategy Committee to support the development of guidance for Course Organisers on managing the provision of materials for teaching and when guidelines are finalised, will revisit the introduction of the 'Required purchase' tag.

Duplication of effort

23. The need to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort and adding to the administrative burden of Course Organisers was highlighted. Indicative reading lists are provided for some, but not all, courses. There were several conversations about which version of a reading list is considered the 'golden' copy and how ideally, lists should be created once and re-used across systems. Also highlighted was the need to keep all versions of a reading list consistent and up to date to avoid providing inaccurate information to students.

Further reading

24. Based on current purchasing guidelines, if a book is prioritised as 'Further reading' the Library will not automatically purchase copies. While there is no limit placed on the number of resources added to a list (which could be 1-1000), the Library cannot make a blanket commitment to purchasing everything on a list within the constraints of the current materials budget. However, Course Organisers can request purchase of 'Further reading', or additional copies of an 'Essential' or 'Recommended' text, on a title by title basis via a Resource List.

25. It became clear during consultation that the option to request copies of 'Further reading' and/or additional copies needs to be communicated more effectively to Course Organisers.

Resource implications

26. Increasing adoption of Resource Lists will impact on Library resource. Additional funding has been allocated to Resource Lists to increase staffing to support the growth of the service. Increased adoption of Resource Lists may also impact on the Library materials budget. The purchase of Resource List materials will continue to be monitored to assess demand, review budget allocations and request further funding

if required. Although the Library operates an e-preference policy for the acquisition of resources, many resources are still purchased in print format where appropriate e-content is not available. If significant quantities of new print materials are purchased, there may be pressure on space across library sites.

Risk Management

27. Risks were identified and monitored as part of the Reading List Procurement and Implementation project. The majority of these risks were closed. Outstanding risks have been carried over to the Resource Lists Service Board. The members of the Board will continue to monitor outstanding risks and identify and monitor new risks. The Service Board meets twice a year. Resource requirements will be monitored to ensure increases in funding for staff and materials are requested to support the meeting of targets.

Equality & Diversity

28. Equality and diversity has been considered and an Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) completed and published as part of the procurement process: http://www.docs.csg.ed.ac.uk/EqualityDiversity/EIA/IS-Reading_List_IT_Procurement_Project.pdf

29. An updated EqIA is in progress and will be published in Quarter 1 2019. The Information Services Disability Information Officer continues to be actively engaged with the service, monitoring accessibility and providing feedback to the reading list system supplier, Ex Libris.

Next steps

30. The Library will:
    a. Liaise with EUSA to publish the Framework with their seal of approval;
    b. Consider a process for capturing and recording non-usage of Resource Lists;
    c. Circulate the approved Resource List Framework to chairs of Library Committees and equivalents;
    d. Promote existing services to support Research Skills and explore new initiatives to encourage the development of student Research and Information Literacy skills;
    e. Continue to liaise with student systems to explore options for linking to Resource Lists from EUCLID/DRPS
    f. Develop a comprehensive communications plan to raise awareness of the Resource Lists service and increase adoption;
    g. Review existing guidance documentation and revise in response to feedback received (it is evident that some elements of the service and system functionality need to be more effectively communicated);
    h. Explore training options and needs, in particular, alternatives to 'classroom' sessions and introduce short refresher sessions for Course Organisers;
    i. Review existing points of discovery for Resource Lists and identify new routes to accessing and promoting the Resource Lists service;
    j. Continue to liaise with LISC to support CAHSS guidelines on managing the provision of teaching materials and revisit the introduction of 'required purchase' tag at the appropriate time;
    k. Annually review and revise the Resource Lists Framework in response to service developments and staff and student feedback.

Consultation

31. Learning and Teaching Committee, Library Committee, College and School equivalents, the Resource Lists Service Board and EUSA. Jeremy Upton, Director Library & University Collections and Hannah Mateer, Head of Collection Services.

Further information

32. _Author_   _Presenter_
   Angela Laurins   Gavin MacLachlan
   Library Learning Services   VP, CIO and Librarian to the University
   11 January 2019

Freedom of Information

33. Open paper.

Appendix 1: Resource Lists Framework

The Framework has been developed by Library & University Collections in consultation with and is supported by, Learning and Teaching Committee, Library Committee and EUSA (TBC).

1. Purpose of the Framework

The purpose of this Framework is to:

- Set out how the Library works with colleagues across the University to ensure students have access to key reading materials and other library resources;
- Support University strategy and policy including Learning and Teaching Strategy, Board of Studies and the Accessible and Inclusive Learning Policy;
- Communicate key information to staff on use of the Resource List service;
- Outline the responsibilities of the Library and Course Organisers in the provision of library resources for teaching;
- Manage students' and Course Organisers' expectations in the provision of library resources.

2. Introduction

The Library supports the provision of teaching materials for all taught courses through use of the Resource Lists service. Resource Lists help to highlight and provide access to the Library's existing collections and provide a route to request new materials. The Resource Lists system used is called Leganto.

2.1 Teaching materials may include Library materials such as print books, e-books, copyright compliant scans, journal articles, as well as other licensed and openly available content such as videos, blogposts and audio recordings.

2.2 The Resource Lists service is the University's preferred route for:

1. Course Organisers to request purchases of new or additional print books or e-books;
2. Course Organisers to request copyright compliant scans (of chapters and articles);
3. Course Organisers to request the location of print copies across loan periods (HUB Reserve /Reserve, Short and Standard Loan).

2.3 Benefits of Resource Lists include:

1. Improved student experience;
2. Consistent access to key course reading across all University modules;
3. Timely provision of Library resources for taught courses;
4. Single, simplified route for Course Organisers to request materials for teaching;
5. Efficient Library workflows.

2.4 The Library's strategic objective is to work towards providing an online resource list for 75% of all taught courses. However, the Library recognises that Resource Lists may not be suitable or add value to courses in certain subject areas, for example, where only one core textbook is used or use of Library materials in teaching is limited.

2.5 Resource Lists are not intended to provide the whole Library experience for students. Resource Lists should be used together with information and literacy skills teaching to develop students' Library research skills.

3. List visibility

Resource Lists are published using a Creative Commons licence and are openly accessible by default, allowing access for pre-entry and prospective students and supporting the University's wider commitment to open access. Resource Lists can be restricted to staff and students of the University on request.

4. Resource Lists are most helpful to students when they are:

1. **Easy to access** - access is provided via the Resource List tool in Learn or Moodle and is therefore consistent across courses, regardless of discipline.
2. **Clearly laid out** - section headings indicate when and what students are expected to read, for example: lists may be organised by theme, week, lecture or seminar topics.
3. **Prioritised and annotated -** items are prioritised using, 'Essential', 'Recommended' and 'Further reading' so that students can understand clearly what they are expected to read and can manage their reading accordingly. Notes are added to highlight relevant chapters and pages and to provide other useful information.
4. **Up to date** - lists are regularly reviewed taking into account feedback from students, usage data and availability of resources. Students are confident their Resource Lists are current.
5. **Realistic -** consideration has been given to how many resources students can reasonably be expected to read over the course of a semester and how key materials will be accessed. Where possible, key texts are provided digitally, as e-books or copyright compliant scans. Separate bibliographies may be created using Resource Lists to encourage students to explore a subject or carry out their own research.
6. **Collaborative** - Course Organisers make use of system functionality to allow students to suggest relevant texts, which creates a collaborative dialogue between staff and students.
7. **Made available to the Library in good time -** to allow sufficient time for the order/delivery of books and for copyright compliant scans to be made available to students in time for the start of semester.

5. Provision of resources for teaching

5.1 Resource Lists budget
A ring-fenced budget from the centrally allocated library materials budget is available to purchase materials on Resource Lists. Expenditure is monitored and reported to the University Library Committee and College Library Committees or equivalents.

5.2 How the Library purchases resources
5.2.1 The Library has an e-preference policy. If a suitable e-book is available, it will be purchased in lieu of any print copies.

5.2.2 The Library encourages Course Organisers to use digital resources to provide the largest number of students with access to key materials. Where a suitable e-book is not available, the Library may be able to provide copyright compliant scans of chapters/pages.

5.2.3 The number of copies purchased automatically is based on the priority of an item and student numbers. Course Organisers can request additional copies of texts, via Resource Lists, if required.

5.2.4 If a resource is used on multiple courses, the number of copies purchased will be based on total student numbers.

6. Prioritised reading
6.1 Resource Lists should indicate the priority of all materials on a list, enabling students to manage their course reading. All items on Resource Lists must be prioritised using the following:

1. Essential
2. Recommended
3. Further reading

6.2 There is no maximum number of items that can be added to a category or to a list. However, the Library will assess how best to manage longer lists (400+) in consideration of space, budget and resource.

7. Definitions

7.1 Essential

Definition: Resources students are expected to read, view or listen to in order to understand the subject and to be able to fully participate and benefit from weekly seminars and lectures.

- 'Essential' means 'must read' and not 'must buy'. If Course Organisers expect students to purchase a book or resources on a Resource List, this should be clearly communicated as per existing University guidelines.
- Any print books prioritised as 'Essential' will automatically be purchased to the ratio of 1 copy per 20 students. A maximum of 15 copies of any one 'Essential' title will be purchased for a single course.
- Print books, prioritised as 'Essential', will be located in HUB Reserve/Reserve collections. A maximum of eight copies of any single title will be located in Reserve. Additional copies will be distributed across Short and Standard Loan.
- Priority will be given to providing copyright compliant scans for 'Essential' resources.

7.2 Recommended

Definition: Resources which complement 'Essential' teaching materials and help students to expand their knowledge of a subject. It is expected that students will read, view or listen to some of this material.

- Print books prioritised as 'Recommended' will automatically be purchased to the ratio of 1 copy per 40 students.
- If no copies are held and student numbers are less than 40, a single copy (or e-book) will be purchased.
- Newly purchased 'Recommended' print books will be located in Short Loan.

7.3 Further reading

Definition: Resources which help students to broaden their understanding of a subject and may include readings beyond the subject necessary to provide context. Further reading may be used for bibliographies or to provide suggested reading for assignments or to encourage students' own research.

- Any print books prioritised as 'Further reading' will not be purchased automatically.
- Course Organisers can request purchase of 'Further reading' items on a title by title basis via a Resource List.
- Further reading will be located in Standard Loan.

8. Digitisations (copyright compliant scans)

8.1 The University's licence from the Copyright Licensing Agency allows scans of book chapters and journal articles to be provided for teaching where items to be scanned are covered by the licence. Scans will be linked to the corresponding citation in a Resource List by the Library.

8.2 If a title is not available as an appropriately licensed e-book, Course Organisers should consider requesting a copyright compliant scan in order to provide access to the most essential chapter (or pages) of a text to students. Limits apply to what can be scanned. For more information, refer to: https://www.ed.ac.uk/information-services/library-museum-gallery/using-library/request-resources/ereserve

8.3 Course Organisers should not scan materials under copyright or upload scanned content to Learn, Moodle or a Resource List unless the material is out of copyright, they have explicit permission from the copyright holder or they hold the copyright for the work. If in doubt, please check with the Library.

9. Editions

The most recent edition of a title will be added to the Resource List unless otherwise requested by the Course Organiser.

10. Out of Print books

The Library will source a single copy of a book if it is out of print. Course Organisers will be notified if a title is out of print and if the Library is able to purchase a single copy. Course Organisers are encouraged to request copyright compliant scans of essential chapters/pages to provide students with access to essential content or to consider a more readily available alternative.

11. Online Learning

The Library will not purchase multiple print copies of print books for Online Learning courses. However, single copies may be purchased in order to provide copyright compliant scans. When selecting course reading for online courses, Course Organisers should ensure essential texts can be made available digitally. The Library can provide guidance on resource availability.

12. Deadlines

The Library publishes deadlines for each semester to allow sufficient time for materials to be made available in time for the start of teaching. The Library cannot guarantee that materials requested after the deadlines will be available in time for the start of each semester. Outwith semester deadlines Course Organisers can send their Resource Lists to the Library to be reviewed or created at any time throughout the year.

13. Summary of responsibilities

13.1 What the Library will do:

- Provide training and guidance to Course Organisers and ensure appropriate webpages are up to date;
- Create or review Resource Lists as requested and check current Library holdings for resource availability;
- Automatically purchase new or additional copies of print books or of suitable e-books based on student numbers and resource priority and add new purchases to Resource Lists;
- Check and/or confirm availability and access to electronic journal articles and other online resources;
- Alert Course Organisers where there could be a problem providing appropriate access to materials;
- Provide copyright compliant scans and link scans provided to the corresponding citations;
- Locate new or additional copies in the relevant site library and across loan periods;
- Annually (in June), rollover lists to the new academic year and maintain persistent access to previous years' Resource Lists;
- Monitor use of Resource List items in HUB Reserve /Reserve collections;
- Gather feedback from Course Organisers via an annual survey;
- Regularly review the service in consultation with Course Organisers and EUSA.

13.2 What Course Organisers will do:

- Provide students with a Resource List based on good practice (as outlined above);
- Explain clearly to students in the first lecture and course guide/handbook about Resource List availability and routes to access 'Essential' readings (library availability, sharing with course friends) etc.
- Prioritise each item on the course Resource List using, 'Required purchase', 'Essential', 'Recommended' or 'Further reading';
- Consider if essential texts can be made available digitally;
- Provide the Library with details of any chapters/pages to be scanned;
- Use the online form to submit a request for a Resource List: https://edin.ac/resource-list-request-form
- Ensure the Resource List tool is activated in the corresponding Learn course. NB Responsibility for activating the link in Learn may vary across schools;
- Regularly review the Resource List and notify the Library of any changes to the list or course;
- Submit lists, either for review or creation, by the published deadlines if Resource Lists are required in time for the start of semester.

Library & University Collections, 10th January 2019