UNIVERSITY OF ST ANDREWS
POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Please find attached the agenda and papers for the Postgraduate Research Committee meeting which will be held on Wednesday 14 October 2015 at 2pm in Parliament Hall. Tea and coffee will be available from 1.30pm

Emmy Feamster
Postgraduate Administrative Officer, Proctor’s Office

AGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Paper Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Apologies for Absence &amp; Welcome to new Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Minutes of 13 May 2015 &amp; Matters Arising</td>
<td>For formal approval • minutes of previous meeting</td>
<td>Paper A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Remit and membership</td>
<td>For review and approval • Remit of PGRC and Academic Business Committee</td>
<td>Paper B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Postgraduate Research Priorities</td>
<td>To receive an update from the Proctor • Postgraduate Research Priorities for 2015-16</td>
<td>Paper C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Enhancement-Led Institutional Review</td>
<td>To receive the final Technical report and discuss the key commendations and recommendations relating to PGR business</td>
<td>Paper D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Working Group Reports</td>
<td>To consider preliminary reports from: • PG Change of Registration Working Group • Location of Studies Working Group</td>
<td>Paper F Paper G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Academic Monitoring and Review</td>
<td>To note the current structures for monitoring the success of research degrees and discuss whether any additional evidence is required as part of the annual monitoring process</td>
<td>Paper H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Papers for Information</td>
<td>To note the following papers which have been submitted to September Academic Council for formal approval: • Fitness to Study Policy (new) • Good Academic Practice Policy (updates) For information: • SFC Report on Internal Review • Update from the Vice-Principal (Proctor) • PGRC Guide for Members 2015-16 • Working Groups 2015-16</td>
<td>Paper I Paper J Paper K Paper L Paper M Paper N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Discussion Topic</td>
<td>To discuss possible useful topics for continued supervisor development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Next meeting: Wed 25 Nov 15, 2pm-4pm</td>
<td>Agenda Items • Policy on Parental Leave for PGR Students • Report on ‘The Burn’ • Consumer Protection Legislation • Senate Regulations: Doctor of Performance Degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University of St Andrews

POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Wednesday 13 May 2015 at 2pm
in the Senate Room

Present
Professor L Milne (Proctor) (Convener); Professor K De Troyer; Dr C Allison, Dr J Palmer; Mr O Hajda; Dr R Bavaj, Dr E Buckley Professor M Buehl, Dr M Costa-Gomes, Professor J Davila, Dr I Duncan, Professor N Hanley, Dr D Hanlon, Dr J Jentzsch, Professor T Neukirch, Dr P Reynolds, Dr K Rudy, Dr G Slomp, Dr G Turnbull.

In attendance
Mr D Farrell (for item one), Ms E Feamster, Dr H McKiggan-Fee, Dr L Meischke, Mrs N Milton, Dr A Sandeman.

Apologies
Professor A Dearle, Professor D Woollins; Professor B Gaut, Professor T Meagher, Dr A Reed, Dr M Singer, Ms T Struetzel, Mr J Tantillo.

1. Presentation: Senate Efficiency Review Projects

The Proctor welcomed Daniel Farrell (Assistant Registrar) who gave a presentation on the various Senate Efficiency Review projects associated with the administration of the student lifecycle. An overview was given of each project, what SER has accomplished so far, key contacts and deadlines for delivery. It was noted that the projects were being delivered in a series of waves with the wave one projects (assigned in summer 2014) expected to finish by the end of June 2015 (and ‘go live’ by 1 July 2015). These included: UKVI Compliance Auditing; Enhanced Record Card; Student Funding Administration; Enterprise Service Desk; Replacement of the Current in-house Docman system; and Curriculum Approvals and Collaborative Academic Partnership Database. Details of the showcase sessions (planned for mid-late June) would be circulated to members as would the presentation slides.

Information was also given about the preparation for the wave two projects which would include: new Advising System; Paperless Admissions; Automated workflows for Student Requests; and a replacement for i-Saint.

There was some discussion at the meeting about the technical relationship between the current Paperless Admissions system and MMS. (Update: since the meeting, confirmation has been received that Paperless Admissions although now running on a different web server, shares the same database and permissions system with MMS. The whole system is based on MMS from the way permissions are granted to the presentation layer that the users interact with).

2. Minutes of 18 February 2015 and 10 October 2014

The minutes of the previous meetings were accepted as correct records subject to some minor typographical errors in the list of attendees for the February meeting.
The Proctor took the opportunity to welcome all members and advised colleagues on how the Committee would be operating from next session. This information would be circulated to all members.

3. Enhancement-Led Institutional Review

PGRC received the preliminary outcome report from the recent ELIR visit which was held in February/March 2015 and noted that the University had now received the draft Technical Report. The Proctor reported that the visit had been very successful and the University was happy with the list of commendations and recommendation some of which related to PGR business and would require discussion at PGRC over the coming year. One key
There was a brief discussion about the PGR Tutoring Workshop which had been held on 6 May 2015. At this event, Directors of Teaching, Module Coordinators and PGR tutors had discussed the support provided to PGR students prior to taking on tutoring and demonstrating responsibilities. A recent student survey had highlighted widespread inconsistency across Schools with regard to the time that tutors spend preparing and marking, and receiving training and support. The Workshop focussed on gaining a better understanding of arrangements within Schools and gave an opportunity to share some examples of best practice. It was agreed that the examples of good practice should be circulated to PGRC members and that perhaps one of the speakers could attend the next PGRC meeting.

An overview was given of the compulsory training provided by CAPOD which tutors are required to complete prior to undertaking tutoring and demonstrating work (for details of CAPOD’s training see [http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/staff/policy/students-postgraduate/postgraduateresearcherswhoteach/](http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/staff/policy/students-postgraduate/postgraduateresearcherswhoteach/)) It was noted that as CAPOD provided generic training for all tutors, content was necessarily broad and consisted of high level principles. It was the responsibility of Schools to supplement this with local training and support. It was agreed to circulate a summary of the types of ‘administrative issues’ that from the start of session 2015/16 must be addressed as part of School-level induction for new PGR tutors. This should supplement the ‘academic issues’ which the School-level induction should cover, for example the use of lesson plans and how much time tutors were expected to spend on preparation and marking. The opportunity was taken to remind Schools that all tutors must have a contract in place before they take up post. It was also agreed that in addition to the formal School-level induction, there should be an ongoing opportunity for tutors to discuss teaching pedagogy within their School.

4. QAA Enhancement Theme
PGRC received information about the new QAA Enhancement Theme ‘Student Transitions’ (see [http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/staff/teaching/funding/availablefunding/enhancement/currenttheme/](http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/staff/teaching/funding/availablefunding/enhancement/currenttheme/)) and the funding opportunities available for student or staff led projects. These projects could focus on student transitions from undergraduate to taught postgraduate study, and also from taught to research postgraduate study. Directors of Postgraduate Studies were encouraged to spread details of these opportunities to both colleagues and students within their Schools.

5. Working Groups
PGRC received a paper proposing the establishment of three new PGRC Working Groups. The three top priority areas for review included: Progress Review; Length of Study/Thesis Completion; and Fieldwork. It was noted that an additional Working Group would be established to consider the introduction of a HEAR (Higher Education Achievement Record) for Postgraduate Research students. Following discussion some minor updates were made to the remit and membership for the three Groups.

6. Papers for Information
Location of Studies: the Proctor reminded colleagues that new processes were now in place. Directors of Postgraduate Studies must ensure that colleagues were familiar with and adhered to the new arrangements.

Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES): the Proctor took the opportunity to update colleagues on the latest PRES response rates and reported that work would be undertaken over the next few months to look at ways of improving future response rates. Clarification on the closing date for PRES would be sent to all members.

7. Date of next meeting
It was noted that the next meeting would be held on Wednesday 14 October 2015 at 2pm in Parliament Hall (tea/coffee available from 1.30pm).
UNIVERSITY OF ST ANDREWS

POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

REMIT AND MEMBERSHIP

All University Committees are invited to review their membership and remit at the start of each session. The Postgraduate Research Committee is therefore asked to consider whether any amendments are required to the current membership and remit of PGRC and Academic Business Committee.

Emily Feamster
Postgraduate Administrative Officer
Proctor’s Office

25 September 2015
UNIVERSITY OF ST ANDREWS

POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Remit

1. To advise Academic Council on matters relating to research postgraduate (PGR) policy and practice, in support of the University’s strategy.
2. To foster and share good supervision practice and promote developments in research supervision and training.
3. To engage with national and international developments in researcher training, monitoring activity across the sector (eg via conferences, Quality Enhancement themes, Higher Education Academy, Universities Scotland, Scottish Funding Council etc).
4. To receive summary reports on the approval of new and withdrawal of research and higher degrees.
5. To recommend to Academic Council changes to PGR Senate Regulations.
6. To recommend to Academic Council policies relating to the training and support of PGR students, and also relating to the wider PGR student experience (student satisfaction, academic support and employability).
7. To support the professional development of staff to enhance their skills in researcher training and supervision.
8. To receive summary reports related to the monitoring of academic standards and to debate and respond to them as appropriate.
9. To make recommendations concerning the physical (eg study space; accommodation) and organisational (eg St Leonard’s College; CAPOD) infrastructure required in order to support the delivery of the University strategy.
10. To consider such matters as are referred for discussion by the Vice-Principal (Proctor) and Deans, Academic Business Committee, and the Academic Monitoring Group.
11. To offer feedback and submit proposals to the Academic Business Committee.

Composition and Membership

Ex Officio
Vice-Principal (Proctor) – Convenor
Vice-Principal (Research) and Provost
Dean of Arts & Divinity
Dean of Medicine
Dean of Science
Pro Dean (Postgraduate Research)
Directors of Postgraduate Studies
SRC Director of Representation
Student Postgraduate Convenor

In Attendance
Academic Registrar
Director of CAPOD & Quality Monitoring
Director of Careers Centre
Representative from IT Services
Representative from Library
Representative from Student Services
Executive Officer to the Proctor
Administrative Officer (Postgraduate)

Reports to
Academic Council

Frequency of Meetings
5 meetings per annum (venue Parliament Hall)
### Membership: 2015-16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Principal (Proctor)</td>
<td>• Professor Lorna Milne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Principal (Research) and Provost</td>
<td>• Professor Derek Woollins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans of the University</td>
<td>• Dean of Arts/Divinity, Professor Paul Hibbert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dean of Medicine, Professor David Crossman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dean of Science, Professor Alan Dearle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro Deans of the University</td>
<td>• Pro Dean (Postgraduate Research), Dr James Palmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors of Postgraduate Studies for Schools</td>
<td>• Art History, Dr Lisa Goddard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Biology, Professor Thomas Meagher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Chemistry, Professor Nicholas Westwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Classics, Dr Emma Buckley (S1), Dr Myles Lavan (S2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Computer Science, Dr Ishbel Duncan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Divinity, Professor James Davila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Economics &amp; Finance, Professor Miguel Costa-Gomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• English, Dr Matthew Augustine (S1), Dr Tom Jones (S2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Geography &amp; Geosciences, Dr Nick Hanley or Dr Michael Singer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• History, Dr Riccardo Bavaj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• International Relations, Dr Gabriella Slomp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Management, Dr Philip Roscoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mathematics &amp; Statistics, Mr James Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Medicine, Dr Paul Reynolds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Modern Languages, Dr David Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Philosophical, Social Anthropological &amp; Film Studies, rep tbc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Physics &amp; Astronomy, Dr Jonathan Keeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Psychology &amp; Neuroscience, Dr Ines Jentzsch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Representatives</td>
<td>• SRC Director of Representation, Mr Joe Tantillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Postgraduate Convenor, Ms Tania Struetzel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Units</td>
<td>• CAPOD &amp; Quality Monitoring, Mrs Carol Morris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Careers Centre, Mr Paul Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• IT Services, Mr Kevin Donachie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Library, Mr Ewan McCubbin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Registry, Mrs Ester Ruskuc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student Services, Dr Lara Meischke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Proctor’s Office, Mrs Nicola Milton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>• Administrative Officer (Postgraduate), Ms Emily Feamster</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACADEMIC LEARNING & TEACHING BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Remit

1. To propose annual schedules of business for the Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) and Postgraduate Research Committee (PGRC), taking into account the timescales required for approval by Academic Council and successful implementation of policy changes.

2. To facilitate and support the business of LTC and PGRC by drafting papers and gathering views as necessary from Schools, relevant Units and students, prior to submission to LTC and PGRC.

3. To coordinate the implementation of new policies approved at LTC and PGRC taking into account timescales and resource issues and where necessary consulting back with LTC and PGRC.

4. To commission short-life task groups to make specific reports or recommendations to the Academic Business Committee and agree institutional representatives on external bodies such as the QAA Enhancement Theme Steering Group.

5. To receive and consider proposals submitted from LTC and PGRC members including student representatives.

6. To consider any other LTC and PGRC business as put forward by the Vice-Principal (Proctor).

Composition and Membership

Ex Officio
Vice-Principal (Proctor), Convenor Professor Lorna Milne
Dean of Arts & Divinity Professor Paul Hibbert
Dean of Science Professor Alan Dearle
Academic Registrar Mrs Ester Ruskuc
Two UG/PGT Academic Representatives Dr Stephen Tyre, (other member tbc)
Pro Dean (Postgraduate Research) Dr James Palmer
Executive Officer to the Proctor Mrs Nicola Milton

29 September 2015
These topics will be used to prioritise Postgraduate Research activities for the coming year. Formal discussions on some of these issues will take place at the Postgraduate Research Committee, Learning and Teaching Committee and Academic Monitoring Group. Others will be taken forward by Working Groups with input from both Schools and Units. These formal arrangements will be supplemented by informal consultations throughout the year, dialogue at the Academic Forum events and support from the Teaching Development and Enhancement Theme Funds.

**Thematic Priorities**

- Streamlining processes and reducing bureaucracy
- Secure transitions for students
- Shared responsibility for excellence student experience, across academic Schools and professional Units

**Priority Business**

- Tidy up postgraduate research policies and processes as needed
- ELIR recommendations
- Enhancement Theme (Transitions)
- Working Group Topics
  - Progress Reviews
  - Duration of PGR Studies
  - Fieldwork Status
  - Higher Education Achievement Record for PGR students
  - Postgraduate Changes of Registration

Professor Lorna Milne
Vice-Principal (Proctor)

25 September 2015
As a condition of grant, every four years the University is required to participate in an Enhancement-Led Institutional Review. Following the completion of the ELIR review and the review team visits in the spring of 2015, the final Technical Report was finalised and received by the University. This document is now in the public domain, having been published on the QAA website.

One year after publication of the ELIR report, the University is required to provide QAA Scotland with a year-on response to ELIR. This year-on response will focus on the action we have taken following the review and will include consideration of the effectiveness of that action. We will also be encouraged to comment on key areas of activity relating to good practice that we have prioritised since the ELIR.

The year-on response will provide a focus for our annual ELIR discussion with QAA Scotland which will be held in semester 2, 2015-16.

The Postgraduate Research Committee is asked to note the key recommendations and commendations outlined in both the Technical and Outcome Reports and also note that members of the Proctor’s Office will be meeting in early November to prioritise the work to be undertaken over the coming year.

Emily Feamster
Postgraduate Administrative Officer
Proctor’s Office
18 September 2015
Enhancement-led Institutional Review of the University of St Andrews

Technical Report
March 2015
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About the Enhancement-led Institutional Review method

A dedicated page of the QAA website explains the method for Enhancement-led Institutional Review of higher education institutions in Scotland and has links to the ELIR handbook and other informative documents.\(^1\) You can also find more information about QAA and its mission.\(^2\)

Further details about the enhancement-led approach can be found in an accompanying ELIR information document,\(^3\) including an overview of the review method, definitions of the judgement categories, and explanations of follow-up action. It also contains information on the Scottish Funding Council's response to ELIR judgements.

About this review

This is the Technical Report of the Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR) conducted by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) at the University of St Andrews. The review took place as follows: Part 1 visit on 3-5 February 2015 and Part 2 visit on 9-13 March 2015. The review was conducted by a team of six reviewers:

- Professor Jeremy Bradshaw (Academic Reviewer)
- Professor Howard Colley (Academic Reviewer)
- Professor Hilary Grainger (Academic Reviewer)
- Associate Professor Asa Kettis (International Reviewer)
- Mark Charters (Student Reviewer)
- Gavin Lee (Coordinating Reviewer).

In advance of the review visits, the University submitted a self-evaluative document (the Reflective Analysis) and an advance information set, comprising a range of materials about the institution's arrangements for managing quality and academic standards. In addition, the University submitted a case study: BA (International Honours): An Innovative Approach to International Education.

About this report

In this report, the ELIR team:

- delivers an overarching judgement on the current and likely future effectiveness of the institution's arrangements for managing academic standards and enhancing the quality of the student learning experience.

The overarching judgement can be found on page 3, followed by the detailed findings of the review given in numbered paragraphs.

ELIR Technical Reports are intended primarily for the institution which hosted the review, and to provide an information base for the production of thematic reports which identify findings across several institutions.

---

\(^1\) Further information about the ELIR method: [www.qaa.ac.uk/reviews-and-reports/how-we-review-higher-education/enhancement-led-institutional-review](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/reviews-and-reports/how-we-review-higher-education/enhancement-led-institutional-review)

\(^2\) Further information about QAA: [www.qaa.ac.uk/aboutus](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/aboutus).

Technical Reports set out the ELIR team's view under each of the report headings. Shorter Outcome Reports are provided which set out the main findings of the ELIR for a wider audience. The Outcome Report for this review is on the QAA website.\(^4\)

\(^4\) Outcome Report: [www.qaa.ac.uk/reviews-and-reports/provider?UKPRN=10007803](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/reviews-and-reports/provider?UKPRN=10007803)
Overarching judgement about the University of St Andrews

The University of St Andrews has effective arrangements for managing academic standards and the student learning experience. These arrangements are likely to continue to be effective in the future.

This is a positive judgement, which means the University has robust arrangements for securing academic standards and for enhancing the quality of the student experience.

1 Institutional context and strategic framework

1.1 Key features of the institution's context and mission

1 The University was founded over 600 years ago and is the oldest university in Scotland. In 2013-14, it had a total of 7,954 students including 818 taught postgraduates and 858 postgraduate research students. Students are spread over 18 academic schools which are located within four faculties (Arts, Science, Divinity, and Medicine) with around 605 academic staff. The University describes itself as having a beautiful location in a small coastal town with an essentially medieval core which presents both the advantages of a close-knit community in a historic setting and also certain challenges such as remoteness, legacy estate and restrictions on growth.

2 Since the previous ELIR in 2011, the University has been engaged in what it described as an ‘intensive examination of its overall strategic direction’ and at the time of the current ELIR visit was in the early stages of preparing a new 10-year Strategic Plan. There are no plans for radical expansion, instead the strategy is to concentrate on a number of focused innovative academic projects that will support the University’s ambition to feature among the world’s top ranking universities. The University indicated that the common thread in these projects is to recruit the ‘most brilliant’ students and academic staff, to continue increasing the proportion of postgraduate research students and to provide an academic environment in which ‘all can flourish’.

3 Estates and resourcing considerations have formed a significant part of the University’s ongoing strategic discussions. The ELIR team was informed of a number of developments, each of which represents an imaginative approach to addressing the challenges of accommodation and space: the development of the research library at Martyrs Kirk in the town centre, the biomass plant outside the town of St Andrews at Guardbridge, and the planned building work across the town itself. Issues around teaching space and student accommodation were raised across a number of the team’s meetings with staff and students (paragraphs 51 and 52).

4 The University identified five initiatives as being designed to strengthen its ability to fulfil its strategic ambitions relating to the enhancement of learning and teaching and the wider student experience: reform of the Proctor’s Office, the creation of the Centre for Academic, Professional & Organisational Development (CAPOD), the Senate Efficiency Review, the re-launch of St Leonard’s College, and a more recent focus on Enterprise.

5 Following restructuring in 2011, responsibility for learning and teaching together with a range of other student business is now the responsibility of a single role, the Vice-Principal (Proctor). The Proctor oversees Student Services and the Chaplaincy, provides the key liaison point for the Students’ Association and the Athletic Union, and maintains an overall interest in the broader student experience by chairing a group comprising relevant Service Directors. The Proctor also convenes the Learning & Teaching Committee (LTC), the Academic Monitoring Group (AMG) and the Academic Assurance
Group (AAG). The Proctor’s Office, comprising the Proctor, the Dean of Arts & Divinity, the Dean of Science and a small administrative team, has worked to integrate academic matters with the co-curricular aspects of the St Andrews education. In doing so, the Proctor’s Office interacts closely with CAPOD. CAPOD was formed since the 2011 ELIR from the merger of three smaller units and is now regarded by the University as supporting the institution’s strategic goals.

6 The Senate Efficiency Review (SER) involved a programme of administrative and IT projects aimed at streamlining and automating processes relating to the student lifecycle from admission to graduation and including curriculum development. Although the University recognised the initial work plan for the SER programme as having been overambitious, there were strong indications that, following a significant review of the programme plan, the project was on a much more positive trajectory. Wave 1 of the new workstreams was intended for implementation by June 2015 and, in discussions with the ELIR team, staff were optimistic about the potential of these new systems. Three initiatives were in progress during the current academic year: Curriculum Approvals; Enterprise Service Desk (student record management system); and Fund Management Phase 1. Subsequent Waves were scheduled to follow with projected completion planned for September 2016.

7 The University re-launched St Leonard’s College in August 2013 under the leadership of the Provost (reporting to the Vice-Principal for Research) and with the assistance of two Pro Provosts (Arts & Divinity and Science & Medicine). The College has adopted a stronger research focus and has responsibility for all postgraduate research business with the strategic goal of enhancing recruitment and the research student experience. In response to student requests for a single postgraduate community, taught postgraduate students were granted membership of the College from January 2014 for extracurricular purposes. All other taught postgraduate matters, including the student experience, are the responsibility of the Proctor’s Office. A new post, Pro Dean (Taught Postgraduate) was introduced in 2013 to work across the faculties reviewing taught postgraduate provision and enhancing the support for existing students.

8 In 2013, the University created the new post of Vice-Principal (Enterprise and Engagement) to lead on the strategic areas of business and research partnerships, enterprise education, and enterprise opportunities for students and staff. An Enterprise Working Group was established in 2013, including student representation, to develop the existing provision in enterprise education. Supported by funding from a commercial bank, the University runs an in-house enterprise competition. With support from the Vice-Principal (Enterprise and Engagement) students have led on developing the profile of enterprise activities across the University, including setting up conferences and events such as an Enterprise Week.

9 In preparing for the ELIR, the University identified three areas it wished the ELIR team to engage with: secure transitions in student progression (paragraphs 91-94); shared responsibility for educational excellence (paragraphs 14-16 and 105-110); streamlining of processes and reducing bureaucracy around learning and teaching (paragraphs 5 and 6). These three areas are considered as indicated and throughout this report.

1.2 Strategic approach to enhancing learning and teaching

10 The overall aim of the Learning & Teaching Strategy is ‘to foster a world-class learning community in which top-level research influences educational design and practice, and where excellent students are supported to fulfil their potential as independent, analytical and thoughtful contributors to society’. There are two key supporting strategies: the Quality
Enhancement Strategy, which underpins excellence in learning and teaching, and the Student Experience Strategy which addresses extra-curricular matters.

11 Key strategic themes, known as Proctor’s Priorities, have been identified for the period 2014-16. They were developed following consideration of staff and student feedback and approved by the LTC. There are seven identified priorities around topics including improving feedback to students, employability, student progression and streamlining processes. They are being progressed through a range of approaches including short-term working groups.

12 The establishment of the Proctor’s Office was predicated on a strategic review of the entire Senate Committee structure. The intention of the review was to streamline structures, eliminate unnecessary work and delegate responsibility for decision-making to those with the most appropriate expertise. Staff endorsed the move away from committees, with responsibility being given to individuals to take decisions with advice as appropriate. The University identified directors of teaching as key to the implementation of the Learning and Teaching Strategy within their schools. In discussions with the ELIR team, staff indicated that the compact size of the schools facilitated discussion and engagement. They told the team the restructuring had resulted in a flatter management structure, reinforcing the role of the Proctor and the Proctor’s Office in sharing practice and consulting with schools. During the review visits, the ELIR team met staff and students who confirmed that the reconfigured Proctor’s Office acted as an agency for change and enhancement. Staff who met the ELIR team indicated that the introduction of short-life working groups had been successful, encouraging ‘brief, worthwhile’ discussions that lead to realistic recommendations for implementation by the University.

13 The School of Medicine has not been wholly integrated with the rest of the University. Its alignment with General Medical Council expectations, while working to secure academic standards, has tended to work against its alignment with the other academic schools. Unlike the other deans who report to the Proctor, the Dean of Medicine (who is also the Head of School of Medicine) is line-managed by the Master. With the appointment of a new Dean of Medicine in summer 2014, the University has begun to see a shift towards closer integration between Medicine and the other schools. The ELIR team learned that, in future, the pro-deans of Medicine would attend Curriculum Approvals Group meetings with the other deans. The school also engages fully with the Annual Academic Monitoring process. The ELIR team considered that both the school and the rest of the University have much to gain from a closer working relationship and exchange of expertise, for example the team learned that the Teaching Fellow role was better integrated in the School of Medicine than in many other parts of the University (paragraphs 79 and 81).

1.3 Effectiveness of the approach to implementing strategies

14 Overall, the University has an effective approach to implementing strategies relating to learning and teaching. The closer links between academic and professional services achieved through the Proctor’s Office have further strengthened strategic effectiveness. The Proctor’s Office works closely with the directors of teaching and CAPOD to provide an enhanced strategic overview. Student representatives are involved in supporting the implementation of strategies, for example the work relating to enterprise education and school presidents are involved in key processes, such as the Annual Academic Monitoring dialogues (paragraph 105). It was evident from discussions with staff and students that the Proctor’s Office is regarded as an agency for change and enhancement across the University.

15 The translation of institutional strategies into school plans and activities depends on good communication between staff. Directors of teaching fulfil a pivotal role in securing
school engagement with institutional strategies. The University regards the changes to its committee structures as having brought about clearer accountability and greater staff engagement. While key postholders were very familiar with the University’s strategic intentions, the flow of information appeared to be less effective among the wider constituency of academic staff who, in discussions with the ELIR team, were not always explicitly aware of institutional initiatives. The team would, therefore, encourage the University to promote greater explicit engagement with, and reflection on, the Proctor’s Priorities by teaching staff (paragraph 110).

In relation to the School of Medicine, the ELIR team would encourage the University to continue with the positive work aimed at integrating the School with wider institutional practices and processes for the mutual benefit of the whole institution.

2 Enhancing the student learning experience

2.1 Composition and key trends in the student population, including typical routes into and through the institution

In 2013-14, the University had a total student population of 7,954 FTE students spread across 6,278 undergraduate (79 per cent), 818 taught postgraduate (10 per cent) and 858 research postgraduate (11 per cent). The student population has remained stable since the 2011 ELIR, with less than 2 per cent overall growth in that time. Scottish domiciled students make up 30 per cent of the student population, 28 per cent come from the rest of the United Kingdom (rUK), 10 per cent from the rest of the EU, and 32 per cent are from overseas (outside the EU).

The number of overseas students from outside the EU has increased by around 10 per cent since the 2011 ELIR. The increase is mainly visible in the undergraduate student population with 76 per cent of all international students studying at undergraduate level. International students make up half of the total postgraduate student population. The University has a diverse international student population with over 120 countries represented. Significant numbers of international students come from the USA, China and Canada who comprise around 15 per cent, 4 per cent and 2 per cent of the total student population respectively.

The University has identified a strategic goal for growth in taught postgraduate student numbers over the next 10 years and has an ongoing focus on increasing postgraduate research student numbers. It is anticipated that this will lead to a change in the proportion of undergraduate and postgraduate student numbers and may create a change to the University’s staff:student ratio.

The gender balance of students sits at 57 per cent female and 43 per cent male. Where a gender gap is identified within programmes, academic staff hosting open days will be drawn from the minority gender. Around 10 per cent of students have a declared disability, an increase of 15 per cent since the 2011 ELIR. Around 7 per cent of UK domiciled students come from black minority ethnic backgrounds, a 2 per cent increase since the previous ELIR.

The vast majority of students studying at the University are registered as full-time (around 99 per cent) with 100 FTE students enrolled on part-time study and 105 FTE students on distance-learning programmes. These figure have not changed since the 2011 ELIR.
The University identifies students from widening participation backgrounds using a range of access codes such as entrants from SIMD20 and SIMD40, low progression schools, participation within widening access programmes such as LEAPS, SWAP and Sutton Trust summer schools, applicants from the Access to Rural Communities project, applicants from carer backgrounds and applicants who have been out of education for more than three years without having attended university. All widening participation applicants are assigned an access code used to identify them during the admissions process. Using these metrics, the University identifies its widening participation population from Scottish domiciled students at 39 per cent and around 20 per cent of the rUK population.

Student retention remains high across the University at over 97 per cent. Students on an access code have a retention rate that is one per cent lower than the University average, which the institution has identified and indicated it is aiming to address.

Entry and Admission

Typically, students enter the University from secondary education and qualify for entry through Highers and A-Levels. Entry requirements set by the University are high and selection of students is highly competitive. The University expressed its commitment to the four-year Scottish degree structure that allows students to explore a variety of subjects in their sub-honours years. Since the 2011 ELIR, the University now provides Integrated Masters in most of the science subjects, successful completion of which also leads to accreditation by the relevant professional bodies. These Masters programmes are five years long by design but allow second year entry or accelerated progress for suitably qualified candidates and offer exit points at SCQF level 9 and 10.

Articulation is not a common entry route, although the University does have a small number of agreements with local colleges such as the Perth College Pathway to Medicine and agreements with Fife College and Dundee and Angus College allowing HNC-qualified applicants direct entry into the second year of a BSc. The University runs a number of ‘gateway’ programmes for students who do not meet the minimum entry requirements due to educational disadvantage. These programmes offer additional tuition to students and, upon successful completion, students can enter a Physics and/or Computing Science degree.

Since the 2011 ELIR, the University has increased the number of scholarships and bursaries given to entrants from 79 in 2009-10 to 321 in 2013-14. Financial aid and other support is targeted to those students with the greatest financial need. During the ELIR visit, students who had entered from articulation and widening participation backgrounds indicated that the support they had received during their transition into the University was effective and that the variety of programmes for support met their needs (paragraph 34).

Supporting equality and diversity in the student population

The University has an effective approach to supporting equality and diversity. The Single Equality Outcome Scheme encompasses a strategic direction and an action plan. A variety of arrangements aimed at addressing equality and diversity are also embedded in the University’s practices.

The University has developed an Inclusive Curriculum Toolkit which programme and course designers are required to engage with in order to ensure programmes and courses meet legislative requirements. The Toolkit itself also promotes inclusive teaching practices. Most academic schools have a disability or equality and diversity officer and the University has demonstrated an active interest through the recent LTC Open Forum exploring Diversity in Academia. This led to a project exploring the diversity of authors within reading lists in the Faculty of Arts as part of the national Enhancement Theme, Developing
and Supporting the Curriculum. CAPOD offers students opportunities to attend workshops in cross-cultural working and from 2015-16, students will be required to undertake an online equality and diversity module.

29  The Faculty of Science has engaged with the Athena Swan toolkit and each school within the faculty has an Athena Swan committee. The University has been awarded a Bronze Institutional Athena Swan award and holds an Institutional LGBT Charter Mark. A number of schools within the Faculty of Science have also received awards in recognition of their work in promoting equality and diversity. The University has established an Equality and Diversity Awards group operating across the institution which aims to support the sharing of good practice and reduce duplication of effort. Plans have been identified to continue enhancing the approach to equality and diversity within the Faculty of Arts, and the ELIR team would encourage the University to pursue these.

30  Students who met the ELIR team valued the diversity of the student body, confirming that teaching staff capitalised on the benefits of diverse classes in bringing issues of inclusivity and diversity to the fore. Some students, particularly the postgraduates, acknowledged that this approach was more successful in some schools than in others.

Students with a disability

31  Around 10 per cent of the student population has a declared disability, an increase of 15 per cent since the 2011 ELIR. Student Services offers practical living support as well as providing a needs assessment in relation to teaching and assessment. Academic members of staff are notified, through the Module Management System, of students on their programme who require reasonable adjustments and each student has a named disability advisor in order to ensure effective communication.

International students

32  The University takes an integrated approach to supporting international students, seeking to ensure that they feel part of the wider St Andrews community and providing support for them in an inclusive manner. English Language Teaching provides a variety of programmes for students who are not native English speakers. There is also provision for students to learn about the cultural and philosophical basis for academic policies and what this means in practice within a Scottish higher education institution. The University provided very good examples of how this cultural induction was undertaken within schools and the curriculum, such as mock exams, formative assessment and supplemented grade descriptors.

33  The Students’ Association hosts an International Students’ Reception and offers events hosted by student societies featuring a wide diversity of groups, from the African and Caribbean Society to the Townsend Society which supports commuter students. Most students who met the ELIR team considered that there is a wide range of effective support structures for international students. The University is aware that some students studying on the BA (International Honours) collaborative programme found integrating with the St Andrews community challenging and actions have been taken to help address this (paragraph 139).

Widening participation students

34  The University supports widening participation with many initiatives in place across the institution. Senior staff told the ELIR team that the philosophy towards access provision focuses on admitting students who can succeed within the academic context of St Andrews Activity to support this philosophy include outreach work with colleges and low progression
schools and supporting student experience opportunities within the University. A number of academic schools offer specific outreach programmes within low progression schools providing support with UCAS applications, personal statements and aspiration-raising as well as offering opportunities for St Andrews students to work with S1 and S2 school pupils. These initiatives have reached over 31,000 school pupils in more than 150 schools throughout Scotland. The University also offers an evening degree programme. A number of places are allocated for students entering through the Scottish Wider Access Programme offering a flexible route to a general degree. Students can transfer to a designated Honours programme if they meet the academic requirements. Students who enter the University from a further education articulation or an access route are provided with dedicated mentoring for their first year through a peer mentoring system and an access-aware Advisor of Studies. The University’s work with people leaving care or living in caring contexts has been recognised through the Buttle Quality Mark.

2.3 Engaging and supporting students in their learning

Student representation

35 There is an effective approach to student representation with a strong and constructive relationship fostered between the Students’ Association and the University. Staff have welcomed the School President system, which had recently been introduced at the time of the 2011 ELIR. This system allows students to have a more strategic engagement in learning and teaching within the schools, for example the recent project relating to feedback on assessment (paragraph 44). Since the 2011 ELIR, a new tier of student representation has been created at the faculty level. Faculty presidents operate as a senior support and mentor for school presidents. Faculty presidents sit on the University Academic Council along with the Student President and allow an effective flow of student opinion from schools to institutional level. This system of representation is mirrored at a postgraduate level. Senior managers acknowledged there may be a gap for student engagement when school learning and teaching committee meetings take place during the summer, and indicated that they would address this.

36 School and faculty presidents and class representatives are all offered training which is delivered by CAPOD and the Students’ Association. At the time of the ELIR visit, around 95 per cent of student representatives had been trained. Some students commented that the training they received had not adequately prepared them for their role, and there would be value in the University reflecting on the ways in which it could enhance this to ensure student representatives are supported in the schools.

37 Although not all students who met the ELIR team were clear about who their school president was, or the precise nature of the role, there was general agreement that the system has produced effective changes that have enhanced the student experience. As the student president arrangements embed, there would be benefit in the University and Students’ Association considering additional ways of promoting these roles to the wider student body.

38 School and faculty presidents are recognised through their Higher Education Achievement Record and their role fulfils aspects of the St Andrews Award. The University also offers nominations for the Proctor’s Award, which is given to a student who has made a substantial contribution to the enhancement of learning and teaching within the institution. From discussions during the ELIR visit, it seemed that recent changes to the arrangements for making nominations to the Proctor’s Award were not clear to students. A number of students who met the ELIR team were uncertain whether they could nominate themselves or whether staff were meant to do this. The University could consider whether further clarification would be useful.
39 Taught postgraduate representation is facilitated through a system of programme representatives supported by the Postgraduate Convenor, an elected member of the Students’ Representative Council. Postgraduate student representatives who met the ELIR team were satisfied with the effectiveness of the representation arrangements and could identify changes that had been made following their involvement.

Student evaluation questionnaires

40 Module evaluation questionnaires (MEQs) are completed by students at the end of each module and students commented that these contained generic questions about learning and teaching. From 2014-15, the University has moved to an online system for administering MEQs which has had a negative impact on response rates. The Students’ Association is working on a campaign involving the student president network to boost return rates. Some students expressed the view that the generic nature of the MEQ made it difficult to identify particular changes that would enhance their experience.

41 Postgraduate research students found it difficult to identify any changes that had been made following feedback they had provided, and were not very aware of student surveys or other quality arrangements. However, they did identify the value of speaking directly to staff.

Feedback on assessment

42 Students had mixed views on the promptness and value of feedback and improvement of feedback to students is one of the Proctors’ Priorities (paragraph 11). The University’s Student Handbook 2014-15 contains a link to a document, the University’s Policy on Feedback to Students on Work Submitted for Assessment. This policy does not prescribe timelines for turnaround of marking. However, it does state that ‘feedback should, whenever possible, be delivered in time for students to benefit from it in their next assignment’. Although there seems to be widespread adoption of an unofficial two-week deadline, feedback return times vary across the schools. There are school-level policies for feedback response timetables but it was not clear from the ELIR team’s discussions with students whether schools were routinely meeting these deadlines. The team’s reading of student handbooks showed wide variations in the guidance offered about feedback, some stated a turnaround time for marking coursework, while most did not. Students reported that feedback return times were also cited on the University's Module Management System.

43 From analysis of the periodic review reports, the Academic Monitoring Group (AMG) has identified a tension between the speed of return of students' work and the quality of feedback, and a perception of variation in marks between tutors. The Annual Academic Monitoring overview report, received by AMG, acknowledges the need to communicate to students any possible delays in returning their work well in advance of the event. To help with monitoring at University level, the module evaluation questionnaires include a question on whether work is returned within stated deadlines.

44 During the current ELIR, a student-led project considering feedback on assessment was underway. The Director of Representation had led a group who interviewed class representatives from all schools to produce a snapshot of feedback practice across the University. The study found that detailed and prompt feedback was being provided in many parts of the University and that most schools were performing well. By the time of the Part 2 visit, students had presented a report on the project to the Presidents’ Forum and the next stage was to prepare a more formal paper for the University LTC. The ELIR team noted that the project findings were largely positive with the report likely to focus primarily on disseminating good practice. In discussion with the team, teaching and support staff were
aware and supportive of the project, expressing confidence that its outcomes would be implemented. There was a clear commitment from the Proctor’s Office to support students to develop the paper for the LTC to ensure a successful outcome and implement any recommendations.

**Student support and development**

45 The University operates a system of academic alerts which are generated based on students’ engagement in their studies. Where a student’s engagement reduces or is identified as an issue, the University initiates an early intervention through student support colleagues or through academic staff and advisors in order to identify any difficulties the student is experiencing and support them.

46 In 2010, the University established the Advice and Support Centre (ASC) as a one-stop shop for students. Students and staff view the creation of ASC as positive, indicating that it has led to a significant change in culture and to the provision of holistic support for students covering academic and pastoral matters. In addition to ASC, students identified a number of other points of contact for support, confirming that they felt sufficiently supported in their studies and wider student experience. Each school has a system of academic advisors who provide guidance on academic matters. Each faculty also has a Pro-Dean Advising who takes senior responsibility for supporting students in academic and pastoral matters. In discussions with the ELIR team, students were positive about their experience of engaging with the advisory system.

47 The Students’ Association and CAPOD run a number of professional skills workshops and activities for students which students generally regard highly. The Proctor’s Office runs a compulsory online module for all students, Training in Good Academic Practice, which is intended to support students to develop their academic literacy. The introduction of the module was viewed positively by the ELIR team and it was evident from discussion with staff and students that it has promoted a keen awareness of academic skills and misconduct. However, postgraduates and undergraduates in the later stages of their programme expressed strong views that the module was pitched at too low a level. There would be value in the University considering the student feedback and, potentially, reviewing the module.

48 In addition, CAPOD offers student support in mathematics and statistics led by trained postgraduate research students, and is also offering disciplinary-specific academic skills workshops in the Faculty of Arts. There are plans to develop similar workshops in the Faculty of Science in 2015-16. Students who had attended the workshops viewed them very positively and it was evident that this was a highly successful activity which had mutual benefit for students and tutors.

**Postgraduate students**

49 The University website describes St Leonard’s College as the home for all postgraduate students. The College is a virtual entity which runs a series of events for postgraduate students including dinners and an initiative allowing students to bid for small amounts of funding to run a lecture series related to their research interests. The ‘virtual’ nature of the College seemed to militate against the promotion of strong student engagement. Students told the ELIR team they tended to identify with other places, such as their school, research centre or hall of residence rather than the College. There was also a view that the College was primarily aimed at research students. Nevertheless, students appreciated the effort to create a postgraduate community, indicating it was likely to evolve over time. Senior managers acknowledged the challenges of engaging students in a virtual concept, and considered that clearer marketing might help this. They also emphasised that
the drive to engage had to come from the students themselves, with the University supporting them.

CAPOD runs a range of courses for research and taught postgraduate students through the Gradskills and M-Skills programmes. Students who had participated in these programmes commented that they found them beneficial. Some students commented that, although CAPOD does provide a wide range of courses, even more partnership working with schools to provide discipline-specific workshops would be welcomed.

Learning environment

Since the 2011 ELIR, the University has refurbished the main Library and this has been welcomed by staff and students. The availability of study space within the Library remains an issue, however students who met the ELIR team were very positive about the University’s approach to redeveloping spaces which has provided more flexible social and study space. The University redeveloped the Students’ Association building to provide social spaces which are intended to meet a diverse range of needs, as well as introducing social study space to the premises.

In meetings with the ELIR team, staff and students raised the issue of on-campus accommodation and students, in particular, commented on the difficulties they experienced in accessing accommodation within the town. Students who were not based on the campus indicated that they found it problematic to engage fully in the range of activities that were on offer to other students, notably the extracurricular opportunities. They expressed the view that they were not able to enjoy the whole St Andrews experience. Given that the student population is likely to become increasingly diverse and there are always likely to be students who cannot live in the town, the University is asked to reflect on the ways in which it can support all students to engage with the opportunities provided.

Use of technology

The use of technology to support learning, including the virtual learning environment (VLE), was described to the ELIR team by staff and students as variable. The University has identified this as an area for development and had recently appointed a new Head of Learning Technology & IT Skills Development. She is expected to provide support for the strategic development of learning technologies and IT skills training across the University. She will work within CAPOD, which is likely to promote a strong link between technology and pedagogy.

Until now, the University’s approach to using technology in learning has been ‘bottom-up’ rather than strategic and the focus has been on technology supporting structures rather than enhancing learning. Although the University is not expecting to grow its distance learning provision significantly, some staff indicated that there might be greater use of blended learning in the future. Several staff, including the directors of teaching, emphasised that the primary value of the St Andrews’ student experience is in face-to-face teaching, suggesting that this limited the use of technology. At the same time, they provided a number of good examples of blended learning being used, for example flipped classroom. Undergraduate students did not express any wish for more technology-enhanced learning. They referred to the practice of recording lectures at the School of Medicine as something that might even make teaching less effective. Postgraduates commented that greater use could be made of the VLE to provide improved access to electronic resources, primarily books. It seemed to the ELIR team that there would be considerable value in the University engaging in an active debate on the ways in which technology could be used to support the St Andrews approach to learning and teaching.
2.4 approaches to promoting the development of graduate attributes, including employability

55 The University and Students’ Association offer a vast number of opportunities outside the curriculum for students to engage in curricular and extracurricular activities with over 230 student societies and sports teams. Students can participate in the St Andrews Award, which is being reviewed by the Students’ Association to increase its flexibility and accessibility for a wider proportion of the student population. Students appreciate the breadth of opportunities available to both undergraduate and postgraduate students, although the postgraduates highlighted that it was difficult for them to engage in the wider elements of University life due to their academic workload. The ELIR team also heard that mature students found it challenging to engage in the co-curricular activities due to their other commitments, often having accommodation some distance from the University facilities, and some students referred to a lack of childcare at the institution.

56 CAPOD provides training for the students who have coordinating roles in the student societies and students were very positive about the support and encouragement they received. In partnership with the Students’ Association, CAPOD has developed the Professional Skills Curriculum which comprises over 20 different professional skills topics delivered through a series of online workshops, lectures and practical skills sessions. Students who complete the Professional Skills Curriculum will have the achievement recognised on their degree transcript. Work has also been undertaken to review how curriculum and assessment can provide scope for the acquisition of skills that are directly relevant to the workplace. The University recognises this as an area for further activity in order to support students to identify these skills.

Careers and employability

57 The Careers Centre offers support to students in an extensive range of ways aimed at supporting student employability, such as CV development, job search, and support for placement and internships. It is evident that the Careers Centre is well used by students and feedback is generally positive. In discussions with the ELIR team, some students reflected that there was not enough support for students who were seeking employment in other countries or for postgraduate students. Support targeted at international students has been enhanced recently with the appointment of an International Opportunities Manager and, given student feedback about this aspect of the service, there would be benefit in the University monitoring its success in this area.

58 A range of internship opportunities are available to students within the University through work placements or research projects, as well as opportunities in industry. Around 57 per cent of undergraduate students undertake some form of internship before graduating and view these experiences as very valuable. Academic staff reflected on the challenges of finding enough suitable internships and highlighted the need to manage students’ expectations in relation to their availability, as well as discussing with students the role placements fulfil as part of the overall learning experience.

59 The University has explored how curriculum and assessment can provide scope for acquiring skills that are relevant to the workplace, and it is recognised that further work could be carried out in this area. During the review visits, the ELIR team heard a range of views including that support for employability was very effective. A small number of postgraduate research students said the University focused more on developing them as researchers and preparing them for future roles in research and academia rather than for employment outside higher education.
Similarly, a small number of taught postgraduates reflected that there was a strong research orientation to their programmes, indicating that there were opportunities to embed more innovative approaches to employability in the curriculum, linking theory to examples of real world applications. Students studying on science programmes expressed a desire for greater engagement with industry. There would be benefit in the University reflecting on these opinions as it develops its work in this area.

2.5 Effectiveness of the approach to enhancing the student learning experience

The University has a highly effective approach to enhancing the student experience. There is very clear evidence that student engagement and representation play a central role in the learning and teaching environment. The school and faculty president structures allow students to be represented across the institution as well as through the Students' Association. Student representatives are very positive about their experiences and are proactive in identifying areas in which to engage, such as the current work on assessment and feedback.

Staff and students have a strong shared sense of the St Andrews graduate identity, which is underpinned by the extensive range of co-curricular opportunities made available by the University and the Students' Association. In the context of this very positive set of activities and in the likelihood of the student population continuing to become more diverse, the University is encouraged to reflect on the ways all students can be supported to engage with the holistic St Andrews experience.

Support for students has been enhanced through the creation of the one-stop Advice and Support Centre which, among other things, ensures there are links between the professional support staff and the academic staff, for example through the Academic Alert system. The University has engaged positively with the widening participation agenda, offering a range of initiatives aimed at raising aspirations and promoting access to higher education. There is a strategic and well-embedded approach to supporting equality and diversity including use of the Inclusive Curriculum Toolkit, and adopting teaching practices which support inclusion of the whole student cohort. The Faculty of Science has been particularly prominent in this area and the University plans to enhance activity in the Faculty of Arts, which it is encouraged to progress.

The University has identified the use of technology in learning and teaching as an area for future development, and is encouraged to reflect on the ways in which greater use of technology could enhance the institution’s approach.

3 Enhancement in learning and teaching

3.1 Approaches to identifying and sharing good practice

The University has an effective approach to identifying and sharing good practice. Systematic sharing of good practice across the institution is a key feature of the revised annual monitoring and review processes (paragraphs 105-110). Good practice and development points are identified through the Annual Academic Monitoring (AAM) process and are reported systematically to the Annual Monitoring Group. CAPOD identifies around 10 areas of good practice on which directors of teaching are invited to vote. The most popular five examples of good practice are then disseminated by CAPOD in an email sent to schools, forming the basis of a University-wide Annual Academic Monitoring Dissemination Event. There are plans to widen the sources of good practice for the Dissemination Event to include, for example, external examiner reports and projects funded through the Teaching
Enhancement-led Institutional Review of the University of St Andrews

Development Fund. The Dissemination Event is attended by directors of teaching and a limited number of colleagues. Senior staff told the ELIR team that greater demand to attend the Dissemination Event is coming from the schools. There is an intention to vary the name, subject and style of dissemination events to encourage broader attendance from across the University.

66 The directors of teaching view themselves as drivers of innovation in schools through various formal and informal sharing mechanisms, for example through the school teaching committees or teaching lunches. Many schools have regular events open to all staff where enhancement of learning and teaching is discussed. The directors of teaching provide a pivotal link between the schools and the centre of the institution, for example through their membership of the University Learning & Teaching Committee (LTC). LTC has a good teaching/good practice slot at the end of every meeting, and there is a LTC Open Forum on different topics open to all staff and students. Previous topics include ‘Diversity in Learning and the Academy’ (April 2014), ‘The developing use of technology in teaching at St Andrews’ (April 2013) and ‘Making feedback work for you’ (December 2012).

67 A recent initiative is the Teachers’ Talk webpages, which draw together all the University’s learning and teaching resources, including a resource for sharing good practice. Staff confirmed to the ELIR team that this provided a useful noticeboard which enabled staff to contact colleagues with a view to learning more about their practice. The Teaching Development Fund is designed to fund collaborative projects relating to learning and teaching across a group of schools. These projects are often collaborative across disciplines, and involve both academic and support staff, as well as students, with the outcomes being shared between projects. The University is developing mechanisms to ensure these projects can be more closely aligned with institutional strategic priorities.

The Centre for Academic, Professional & Organisational Development (CAPOD)

68 CAPOD plays a central and highly effective role in the identification and dissemination of good practice. The combination of support for development and academic monitoring and review in one unit provides for a holistic and well-integrated perspective on quality enhancement. CAPOD is closely involved with the revised AAM process (paragraph 65) and also prepares an annual summary of University Review of Learning & Teaching (URLT) reports (paragraph 113).

69 The directors of teaching reported very positive interaction between the schools and CAPOD, including the pool of academic staff and postgraduate research students who deliver CAPOD programmes and workshops. The ELIR team heard from staff who said the experience of being a member of the CAPOD training pool supported them to engage with others from across the University, for example as co-presenters which benefited them individually as well as those being trained. Drawing on the expertise of academics contributes to the perceived relevance of academic development activities and ensures that they are firmly anchored in academic practice. It was less evident to the ELIR team that academic development activities are research-led or that pedagogic and other relevant research inform their content and delivery. CAPOD staff do not carry out pedagogical research themselves, but rely on the co-opted academic staff from across the University to provide the research perspective. A proportion of these staff are engaged in pedagogical research and are part of a small network of colleagues across the University. The University is encouraged to consider extending CAPOD’s work to include further development of this community of practice in pedagogical research to ensure that the academic development activities are informed by the latest research in learning and development.

70 The activities provided by CAPOD are perceived by staff as appropriate and responsive to the schools’ needs. The range of support provided to postgraduate research
students, academics and administrators is highly appreciated, although it is acknowledged that there is less development support aimed at more experienced academic staff who, consequently, use CAPOD less.

71 The ELIR team learned that CAPOD has an evaluation strategy to determine the transfer of learning from development events and to consider the longer-term impact on performance. The strategy comprises five evaluation levels: baseline, reaction, learning, behaviour, and impact. Its implementation was at a very early stage at the time of the ELIR visits but looked like a potentially positive approach.

3.2 Impact of the national Enhancement Themes and related activity

72 The ELIR team learned that the University is revising its approach to the Enhancement Themes for the new Student Transitions Theme in 2014-15. Previously, funding had been provided to a range of small projects and, while these projects had been successful, the University recognised challenges with embedding and disseminating the outcomes. However, the University reflected that a benefit of this approach had been the successful encouragement of bids for funding from services and students, and hoped to maintain this level of interest. The Proctor is now responsible for institutional Enhancement Themes funding with CAPOD having key contact responsibility. The University expressed its intention to maintain its scheme of grants for small grass-roots projects, while working to align these more closely with institutional priorities, such as supporting taught postgraduate student transitions. The ELIR team considered that this has the potential to provide a more effective way of securing longer term impact.

3.3 Engaging and supporting staff

Academic development and support

73 New staff members receive an induction interview with their head of school at which requirements for staff development are identified with encouragement provided for follow-up. There is a one-day induction programme for new staff, but no requirement to undertake a formal teaching qualification. All new staff are provided with mentors, although the level of support and engagement is dependent on the needs of the individual. The ELIR team heard that staff can seek additional mentors from other universities, for example through the cross-institutional mentoring scheme with the University of Dundee.

74 Formal training from CAPOD, in the form of two workshops, is mandatory for postgraduate research students who teach. In exceptional circumstances they may be able to apply for exemption, but this is considered on a case-by-case basis. In addition, schools are intended to provide further training and support through the period of teaching. Student tutors are also expected to carry out a marking practical exercise and be involved in peer observation of teaching, both observing and being observed, for at least one teaching session. There are two optional HEA-accredited modules for postgraduate students who teach. Students who met the ELIR team were aware of this opportunity, but none had completed the modules. The students expressed the view that there was an over-reliance on CAPOD to cover all training and they indicated that they would like to receive more subject-specific training which might be developed by schools in partnership with CAPOD. It was evident that the current school-based support for teaching was variable with some students receiving limited context-specific guidance. The University is strongly encouraged to ensure that all postgraduate students who teach receive support from their schools for undertaking this role, in addition to the training already provided centrally by CAPOD.
75 Staff without prior experience of supervising research students at St Andrews, and all supervisors on a regular basis, are required to attend supervisor training. University policy states that it is the head of school’s responsibility to ensure that new supervisors are appropriately trained.

76 There are no other minimum expectations for staff development, and senior managers indicated that this is partly related to resourcing. The ELIR team heard that the University has no intentions of offering a postgraduate certificate in academic practice (or equivalent) but funding has been provided for individual members of staff to access the programmes offered by other universities. The University will also provide support for staff seeking individual accreditation through the HEA.

77 Academic staff confirmed that the approach to staff development is voluntary but that directors of teaching or heads of school would strongly encourage individuals to undertake development where required. Staff told the team they were generally content with the support available, indicating that the University was good at providing support or filling gaps in provision through external speakers or targeting internal resources.

78 The ELIR team learned that CAPOD aims to expand the staff development opportunities for academic leadership for heads of school and directors of teaching. The team would endorse this initiative and encourage the University to recognise the importance of including learning and teaching aspects of strategic leadership as well as those relating to research.

Incentivisation

79 Teaching is recognised in the University’s promotion criteria. The criteria are relevant and comprehensive, but the weighting procedure places considerably greater emphasis on research excellence over teaching excellence, other than for promotion to Principal Teaching Fellow. Teaching fellows fulfil a number of roles across the University and senior staff acknowledged that this was an issue. Currently there are two distinct approaches to the teaching fellow posts. One involving a permanent contract and a broad role that is likely to involve the individual becoming well embedded with the work of their school. The other involves a temporary contract, often replacing staff who are on research leave, potentially resulting in the individual being poorly integrated into the academic community. The University has identified the provision of better conditions for teaching fellows on fixed-term appointments as a priority, to ensure they have the same opportunities for mentoring, project funding, research funding and conference attendance as other teaching staff. In addition, there is a limited formal career structure for teaching fellows, who cannot advance beyond Principal Teaching Fellow. The University is encouraged to consider the role, status and promotion structure for teaching-only staff.

80 There are two Teaching Award Schemes that aim to recognise and reward excellence in teaching, an institutional University Teaching Excellence Award and a Students’ Association Teaching Award. Representatives of each scheme sit on the other’s awarding panel. Undergraduate students who met the ELIR team appeared to have limited awareness of these awards. The team also considered that the students’ own criteria for nominating teaching staff seemed to be quite high. However, members of staff with a development and enhancement role emphasised the positive experience of the award ceremony, drawing together teachers and students from across the University.
3.4 Effectiveness of the approach to promoting good practice in learning and teaching

Overall, the University has an effective approach. The suite of development opportunities provided by CAPOD is responsive to the University’s needs and promotes positive engagement by staff and students. CAPOD also provides very effective support for the systematic arrangements in place to identify and share good practice. The University is encouraged to consider extending the role of CAPOD to include further development of the community of practice in pedagogical research and to increase support for mid-career and longer serving researchers. CAPOD provides effective central support to postgraduate students who teach and the University is asked to ensure the schools are supplementing this with adequate contextualised training and support. The University is aware of the variation in the role of teaching fellows and the limitations of the teaching-only career structure, and is asked to review this.

4 Academic standards

4.1 Approach to setting, maintaining and reviewing academic standards

The University's approach to academic standards is robust and generally meets sector expectations. It has a conventional approach with overall responsibility for academic standards resting with the Senate. Day-to-day responsibility for setting, monitoring and reviewing standards rests with schools, and the Proctor’s Office has oversight of this. Each school has a teaching committee, which has school responsibility for curriculum development and links directly to the University Learning & Teaching Committee (LTC) through the directors of teaching.

Proposals for new modules and programmes generally originate in the schools with school teaching committees, directors of teaching or directors of postgraduate studies. Proposals for approval of new modules or programmes are submitted for the consideration of the deans, advised by the Curriculum Approvals Group (CAG). The role of the CAG is to ensure that standards are maintained in academic programmes offered at the University, using the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (Quality Code) as an external reference point. This includes providing an institutional overview of all modules and programmes and the alignment of assessment to learning outcomes. Final authority for new programmes lies with the Academic Council, who may also withdraw an existing programme, if necessary.

4.2 Management of assessment

Information about assessment, including timetables, policy and regulations for examinations, is available on the University website. The University's Assessment Policies and Procedures govern the amount of specific assessment per student, for example limiting the amount of group assessment. These policies and procedures make it clear that the assessment requirements of each module and any subsequent major changes to them must be notified to the relevant dean, who will scrutinise them for consistency with school and faculty practice. The document also states that all new module assessments must be reviewed by an external examiner.

Assessment strategies are described in the programme specifications, including all material submitted for assessment of each programme. Marking strategies vary between the schools, but the University requirement is that the strategies applied should be appropriate to the form of assessment and the subject discipline. There is also an expectation that the marking strategy should be consistent with best practice in that discipline. There are University requirements for second marking and moderation. Module handbooks are
required to contain details of their associated assessments, making this information, therefore, available to students at the start of the module.

86 Schools are required to publish grade descriptors for each appropriate level and type of assessment, with the expectation that these will conform to the SCQF guidelines for each level. The University’s Assessment Policy and Procedures also state that descriptors should be sufficiently relevant to the assessment for which they are used to provide meaningful feedback to students about their performance and enable them to understand the judgements on their assessments.

Common Reporting Scale

87 The 2011 ELIR report asked the University to ensure consistency and clarity in the arrangements for mapping students’ marks to grades by reflecting on the marking practices adopted in some schools.

88 The Common Reporting Scale (CRS) is included in the Student Handbook 2014-15, but the marks are only described in terms of the corresponding Honours classification. There is no explanation of what characteristics denote a piece of work worthy of any individual grade. There is an expectation that grade mappings should be included in course handbooks. Programme handbooks are available on the school websites. Most handbooks contained the grade descriptors although some did not.

89 Staff reported consistent use of the CRS and transparency of ‘mapping’ for staff and students. They said CRS is used consistently for reporting, but marking is carried out according to each school’s preferred method. Some schools grade directly onto the CRS, while many others use percentage marking and then convert onto the CRS, or a mix of both approaches. Students reported considerable variation and dissatisfaction with the transparency of marking and a lack of understanding of the CRS. Students who studied across schools found the different expectations or priorities in marking complicated and confusing. They reported variation between schools in how useful the marking guidelines were and students from outside the UK found the guidelines difficult to interpret.

The University is encouraged to strengthen the support it gives to students, particularly those studying across schools and from other academic cultures, to enable them to understand assessment requirements. This is particularly important given the University’s practice of not requiring external examiners to attend programme exam boards thereby, in some cases, removing the opportunity for an integrated external overview of any student’s performance. The University is encouraged, therefore, to develop a systematic process for monitoring cohort performance across modules and programmes especially, though not exclusively, for students studying across schools or institutions.

90 Taught postgraduate students expressed concerns about grade compression which they believed to be caused by the threshold for progression to Master’s level, and a general reluctance to award marks at the top end of the CRS, meaning that the available marking range tended to be within a narrow band. Example data provided to the ELIR team supported this view. There would be benefit in the University encouraging academic staff to use an appropriately wide range of marks when grading students’ work.

Progression

91 Honours entry criteria have been modified since the 2011 ELIR. There are still different requirements for entry into Honours study according to the school. All schools operate a system of automatic entry to Honours, in which any student who has attained sufficiently high grades in sub-Honours modules is eligible for progression. Some schools, typically in the sciences, use a University-administered examination to determine
progression to Honours where the student has failed at the first attempt. The School of Medicine operates its own conditional Honours entry system for students who have initially failed.

92 It was clear to the ELIR team that the rationale for different systems in Arts and Science did have a logical basis, associated with the number of Honours pathways in the Arts and the greater likelihood of students gaining direct entry to second year in the Sciences which reduces the range of Honours options available to those students. Students who met the team were aware that different systems existed and, generally, were clear about how the process worked in their schools.

Study abroad

93 Students studying abroad discuss their curriculum with staff before they leave to produce a Learning Agreement that details the modules they will study while away from St Andrews. Information about Learning Agreements is available to outgoing students on the University website. When the students return, there is a grade conversion process to translate their grades into St Andrews’ marks. The grade conversion following study abroad is applied consistently. Staff told the ELIR team that grade conversions for each partnership are published routinely on the website. All students are briefed about credit and grade conversion in preparation for study abroad. Further information about the policy, grade conversion tables for different countries and guidance about credit loads abroad are all available online. The University is confident that the mechanism is robust, although staff acknowledged there would be benefit in further standardisation of grade and credit conversion across the schools. Students who had participated in study abroad reported a clear understanding of the credit conversion process.

94 Following a number of years of collaboration with some of its international partners, the University is in a position to monitor grade conversions by institution, and has started to track student performance at specific institutions to determine how that performance compares with Honours performance at St Andrews. The grade conversion tables for the BA (International Honours) programme (paragraph 128) have already been modified as a result of analysis of student performance and senior staff informed the ELIR team that other Grade Conversion Tables had similarly been revised. The University is encouraged to continue with this analysis across the entire portfolio of its collaborative partners.

Research students

95 The University’s practice in relation to monitoring research students’ progress is in line with sector expectations. There is an annual review of each student’s progress with very clear guidance at institutional and school-level on how this should be carried out in the Policy for Supervisors and Students in Research Postgraduate Programme. The research student and their supervisor each submit a confidential report, following which a meeting is held between the candidate and a panel comprising at least two members of the school who are appointed by the school director of postgraduate studies. The panel should not include the research student’s principal supervisor, nor anyone who might inhibit the student speaking frankly about his/her supervisor. Oversight of the progress review process is the responsibility of the school postgraduate committee, the convener of which is appointed by the head of school.

4.3 Use of external reference points in managing academic standards

96 The University’s use of external reference points is, generally, in line with sector expectations.
External examiners

97 The University has a policy for external examining that describes procedures for the appointment and responsibilities of external examiners for taught courses. It states that no University qualification (other than honorary degrees) should be awarded without participation in the examining process by at least one external examiner. The responsibilities of the external examiner include curriculum approval, review of assessments, and modulation and benchmarking of assessment marks. They are shown an overview of the cohort grade spread at module level.

98 The University regards the final degree classification as a straightforward arithmetic calculation based on aggregation of module performance, which is carried out by the Registry. Academic staff expressed the view that, provided the module external examiner process is effective, then the degree process is secure. The policy for external examining makes it clear that external examiners have no role to play in determining final degree classifications. However, the policy does provide for the attendance of an external examiner at a final degree classification board, but it was clear to the ELIR team that this was not a common occurrence. The University is encouraged to reflect on this practice (paragraph 104).

99 The University has taken the decision that it will not routinely publish its external examiner reports. Examiner reports are currently considered by school teaching committees, which include student representation. However, this places a large burden for dissemination on a single student in each school. There are benefits of making the reports more widely available in that this makes the whole assessment process more transparent for students. The University is asked to reconsider its decision.

Programme approval and review

100 New programme proposals are required to adhere to the Quality Code, including any appropriate Subject Benchmark Statement, and to align with the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF) and, where appropriate, European Qualifications Framework (EQF), and any relevant PSRB requirements. Schools are also required to seek advice from external sources. For new modules, this will normally be an external examiner; for new programmes, University policy indicates that an external subject specialist should be consulted. The ELIR team’s reading of a sample of documentation confirmed that there is detailed reference to external sources in the approval process.

101 Periodic review of modules and programmes, known as University Review of Learning & Teaching, includes consideration of external reference points such as the SCQF and the Quality Code. Sample documentation confirmed there is also explicit consideration of assessment.

4.4 Effectiveness of the arrangements for securing academic standards

102 The University generally has robust processes that have been reviewed and refreshed since the 2011 ELIR. The approach to setting, maintaining and reviewing academic standards is effective. However, there is still variation between schools, for example in relation to assessment marking practice.

103 The 2011 ELIR asked the University to ensure consistency and clarity in the mapping of marks to grades on the Common Reporting Scale (CRS). Progress has been made, but students would benefit from the University undertaking further work to help clarify the assessment requirements and to make the use of the CRS more transparent.
The current limited involvement of external examiners in the degree awarding process increases the possibility of inter-school or inter-institutional differences in marking criteria affecting students' final awards. The University should reduce this possibility by providing clearer guidance on the differences in marking criteria and establishing routine and systematic analysis of programme cohort performance, to provide an overview of student performance across modules and subjects. In addition, given the potential value of external examiner reports to identify enhancements that enrich the learning experience, coupled with the benefits of greater transparency for students, the University is asked reconsider its decision not to publish the reports.

5 Self-evaluation and management of information

5.1 Key features of the institution's approach

The University's evaluative practices are centred upon Annual Academic Monitoring (AAM) and periodic University-led Reviews of Learning and Teaching (URLT). Since the 2011 ELIR, the University has enhanced its AAM process through, for example, having a more focused pro forma for reporting, including the student school president in AAM dialogues and having an annual dissemination event where schools can share positive practice.

In addition to formal AAM reporting, a third of the schools had a dialogue each year with the Proctor, deans, the Director of CAPOD & Quality Monitoring, and the Student Association Director of Representation. Interviews rotate around the schools over a three-year cycle, but a school where quality and standards are deemed at risk would be called for interview regardless of their place in the cycle. Additionally, a school can request a meeting if it wishes to discuss an issue arising from the AAM process.

Examples of AAM reports seen by the ELIR team showed that schools highlight key features which include recording new and innovative practice and problems that have arisen during the year. Reports also provide updates on actions arising from the previous year's AAM. The reports are usually produced in June to coincide with, and inform, the learning and teaching strategic planning meetings between senior management within the school and senior University managers. These planning meetings cover topics such as staff workloads, new programme proposals, new appointments, teaching fellows, institutional IT systems and teaching accommodation requirements.

All the AAM reports are considered by the Academic Monitoring Group (AMG) at a meeting in August, and minutes of the 2014 meeting seen by the ELIR team show that there is a thorough and effective interrogation of school reports. Actions for dissemination of good practice and further investigation of issues are also identified. In addition, the AMG carried out a three-year review of the revised AAM process in 2014, and concluded that the process was working effectively and leading to greater sharing of positive practice (paragraph 65).

The ELIR team regarded the identification and dissemination of good practice arising from the AAM process by the AMG, along with facilitation by CAPOD, as an area of positive practice. The team also noted that the University was seeking to ensure that all school presidents were involved with the full AAM process and all heads of school attended the AAM dialogues. In addition, for 2015-16, the Proctor's Office has requested that the schools organise a reflective event, open to all academic staff, on the outcomes of the AAM process. This development is strongly supported by the ELIR team.

The directors of teaching were strongly supportive of the revised AAM process. They consider it to be streamlined but no less rigorous, emphasising that it is a more
evaluative and worthwhile experience for schools. They appreciated the shorter format of the report and central provision of student data. Senior staff believe they have had some success in engaging colleagues with the process. In discussion with the ELIR team, academic staff expressed the view that they received enough information from the directors of teaching, but many staff had little awareness of the AAM process, including those with responsibility for managing programmes. Senior managers indicated that they were comfortable about the lack of widespread awareness of AAM among teaching staff, preferring for them to be fully engaged in high quality learning and teaching, leaving the directors of teaching and committees to monitor quality. While the team has some sympathy with this approach, it places considerable responsibility on a small number of people who are not directly involved in the delivery of modules, with the risk of issues going unnoticed, as well as reducing the number of staff involved in the reflective process. The University is, therefore, strongly encouraged to secure the engagement of a wider group of academic staff in the reflective elements of the AAM activity.

111 The URLT process runs on a five to six-year cycle and includes professional service departments as well as academic schools. Up to 10 URLTs may be conducted during a year. Review panels include a postgraduate research student representative, the Student Association Director of Representation and discipline experts from outside the University. The ELIR team recognised that the Director of Representation can bring continuity to the URLT exercise, but also sees an opportunity for the University to engage a wider group of students from the pool of school and faculty presidents.

112 Since the 2011 ELIR, the University has moved to align URLTs with PSRB reviews, formalised the process for evidence provided by students, and, from 2014-15, will pilot the inclusion of an international reviewer who will provide a written submission to the panel. The review is intended to be enhancement-led and discipline areas are requested to identify enhancement themes prior to the review event. The significant number of commendations, recommendations (both to the school and the University) and the constructive critical analysis seen in the URLT reports indicate a rigorous approach to periodic review.

113 CAPOD produces a summary report on the findings of URLTs for the year which is received by the AMG. This report exemplifies the University’s attention to self-evaluation, for example, in providing a focus for the key issues requiring University attention such as library space, the distinctiveness of MLitt programmes in comparison with fourth year Honours, and year 1 of PhD study.

114 Student involvement in evaluative processes is guided by the Director of Student Representation (DoRep). This is an important post and among the duties of the DoRep is representing student views on senior committees, training of student representatives and leading a cadre of faculty and school (student) presidents. In a meeting with the ELIR team, student presidents and class representatives confirmed that they made a positive contribution to evaluative practices. The school and faculty presidents also discussed University initiatives relating to evaluative practice, for example module evaluation, through the Presidents’ Forum, a twice-semester meeting with the Proctor and deans.

115 Currently, the AAM and URLT reviews are informed by NSS results, external examiner reports, MEQs and internal reviews. With regard to the broader provision of data and information to support reviews and other self-evaluative procedures, the University has a range of sources including a central student records system and a teaching support system. Through these the University can generate information on staffing, research grants and budget monitoring. The teaching support system (MMS) provides information on data including student cohorts, marks and module numbers. At the time of the current ELIR, the University was about to pilot a learning and teaching fact sheet, produced on behalf of CAPOD and the Proctor’s Office with the aim of improving the provision of information and
data for the AAM and URLT processes. A provisional template seen by the ELIR team indicated that a comprehensive set of metrics would be presented. It was proposed that a traffic light system would indicate performance in certain areas, for example student surveys.

116 Another example of the University’s self-evaluative approach is the Senate Efficiency Review (SER). The project was developed following a LEAN management analysis of institutional practice and procedures including those centred on learning and teaching. The SER is aimed at reducing bureaucracy and streamlining processes, such as those around student admission, progression and curriculum development. After a difficult start, which required a reappraisal of work strands, the project is now well on the way to delivering improved information systems that will, for instance, capture curriculum developments and a more effective life-cycle approach to the management of student records (paragraph 6).

117 Outcomes of evaluative practices are considered by the University in a number of ways. The AMG has responsibility for overview of evaluative practice and this small group includes the Proctor, deans, Director of CAPOD & Quality Monitoring, DoRep and an external member. At a summer meeting it considers the outcomes from all AAM reports (paragraph 107) and minutes of this meeting indicate that areas of action are identified which may involve the schools or the University LTC. The AMG also identifies themes for the annual AAM Dissemination Event and, in turn, the outcomes of the event are considered by the LTC. For the URLTs, the annual CAPOD report is also considered by the AMG which identifies appropriate actions. The AMG reports to the University Court through the Academic Assurance Group (AAG) and the latter provides an annual report to the Audit & Risk Committee of Court. The most recent AAG report seen by the ELIR team identified areas of positive practice and areas of potential risk that needed close oversight. The team noted that the report gave an accurate reflection of the key outcomes from the AAM process.

5.2 Commentary on the advance information set

118 The Advance Information Set (AIS) produced for the current ELIR provided a comprehensive overview of the University’s evaluative processes and the ways in which these are considered by University committees. The AIS demonstrated that the University has systematic and robust procedures for addressing the quality of student learning and academic standards. The AIS helped the ELIR team to identify themes around the effectiveness of CAPOD in enhancing learning and teaching, the effectiveness of annual and periodic monitoring and the dissemination of positive practice, and the impact of the revised Senate Efficiency Review on streamlining information provision and support for University processes such as admissions, student progression and academic monitoring. The team noted potential positive practice in the conduct of academic monitoring, the enhancement activities led by CAPOD, and the use of school and faculty presidents in evaluative processes. Student feedback in the AIS indicated some continuing issues regarding the library and availability of study space, which the University is continuing to address. The mapping of University practice against the Quality Code presented in the AIS also highlighted potential areas for further development (paragraph 119).

5.3 Use of external reference points in self-evaluation

119 The RA prepared for the current ELIR outlined a range of external reference points used by the University in its self-evaluative procedures, such as the SCQF and the Quality Code including Subject Benchmark Statements. The University is meeting sector expectations in its evaluative practices by taking into account the requirements of these reference points. For example, programme specifications show that the programmes are assigned an SCQF level, there is reference to subject benchmarks and, where appropriate,
recognition by the relevant PSRB. Alignment with external reference points is conducted during module or programme approval and external examiners confirm the programme continues to align with the subject benchmarks.

120 Since the 2011 ELIR, the University has mapped its provision and practice against the Quality Code using key staff and groups to map expectations and indicators against University practice and policy. It has adopted a traffic light system to identify the extent of alignment. University practice aligns with the great majority of indicators and, for a few indicators, the mapping document gives details of development work aimed at achieving closer alignment. The notable exceptions from full alignment with the indicators are in Chapter B7: External Examining. While the University is meeting the broad expectation of the Chapter, it has decided not to publish external examiner reports and is asked to reconsider this (paragraphs (97, 98 and 104).

5.4 Management of public information

121 The University meets the indicators set out in Part C of the Quality Code. Prospectuses are attractive, well-produced documents providing a good balance between academic information and more general information on the student experience at St Andrews. Module handbooks are generally adequate in providing students with essential programme information (paragraph 85).

122 The University provides much of its public information through its website with the Corporate Communications Unit having responsibility for oversight of the information. The Unit works closely with other professional support areas. Web content is provided and updated by support and academic units, however, the ELIR team learned that, recently, there has been increased central control of top-level webpages under the leadership of the digital communications team. The University acknowledges that there is scope for enhancing the provision and accuracy of public information and the Digital Advisory Board (DAB) is tasked with improving presentation and quality control of web material. A digital framework provides guidelines for staff on the use of digital information. In a meeting with staff it was stated that redesign of the web would focus on user requirements and that, for key areas of public information, the University would move towards a ‘golden copy’ culture with clearly defined ownership and responsibilities. Much of the redesign work will involve schools, and the digital communications team will work closely with school IT and computing officers. The ELIR team recognises the value and importance to the University of reviewing the way it provides information through the web.

123 The University also provides course information through some 500 Key Information Sets and, although sceptical of the value of the KIS, it has led to improvements in the accuracy of information in the course catalogues. The ELIR team noted the easy availability of important module and programme information, such as admission requirements and credit requirements for progression.

5.5 Effectiveness of the approach to self-evaluation and management of information

124 The University has demonstrated an effective approach to self-evaluation in a number of ways. The Reflective Analysis gave an accurate and balanced view of the University’s approach to self-evaluation, in particular, highlighting areas for development with regard to: the initial progress of the Senate Efficiency Review (SER), the continued expansion of student study space, the Common Reporting Scale, and the provision and accessibility of public information. The University’s commitment to a culture of self-evaluation
is also demonstrated by its review and revised phasing of the SER, and the improvements to the AAM process since the 2011 ELIR which have been monitored and reviewed.

6 Collaborative activity

6.1 Key features of the institution’s strategic approach

125 The University adopts a strategic approach to internationalisation and this was illustrated by the Case Study, BA (International Honours): An Innovative Approach to International Education, submitted for the current ELIR. The University’s Strategic Plan expresses the intention to increase overseas undergraduate student numbers. The University considered that its collegial approach to collaborative partnerships was illustrated by the development of the BA (International Honours) programme with a longstanding partner with which a number of student exchanges were already in place. The University recognises student mobility and international collaboration as fundamental cornerstones of its strategic vision to expand the boundaries of international scholarship.

126 The University has chosen to establish a small number of high quality, low-risk collaborations, which involve study at two or more institutions leading to a joint award. Current collaborations comprise one undergraduate programme, and 10 taught postgraduate programmes with: four UK partners, two international partners, and three European consortia. The University sees collaboration as a way of strengthening postgraduate research culture, for example through a co-tutelle approach allowing students to gain benefit from local and international researchers. There are collaborations through co-tutelle arrangements with around 20 institutions in the UK, Europe and overseas, for example through participation in the Science without Borders scheme providing links with institutions in Brazil. In the UK there are arrangements with the University of Stirling at postgraduate level in Philosophy and there is an established relationship with the Royal Conservatoire of Scotland.

127 Subsequent to the 2011 ELIR, the University reviewed the effectiveness of its collaborative agreement to validate and award research degrees for the Royal Conservatoire of Scotland (RCS), giving particular consideration to the effectiveness of the reporting links between the two institutions. The University continues to enhance its links with RCS. Primary responsibility for the relationship now lies with the Provost (who leads on research matters), supported by a smaller, more focused group than before. There are annual meetings, chaired by the Provost, which include the Director of CAPOD & Quality Monitoring, to discuss sharing of resources, staff collaborations and how RCS students can engage in St Andrews’ activities, such as the GRADskills programme and St Leonard’s College. In 2013-14, the St Andrews Music Centre initiated a music research seminar and invited the RSC Director of Postgraduates along with a group of RCS postgraduate students to attend and contribute.

128 The BA (International Honours) programme represents a longstanding and close collaboration with the College of William and Mary, Virginia, USA. This is deemed to be a truly integrated joint undergraduate programme in which students spend two years at each institution studying Economics, English, History or International Relations. At the time of the current ELIR, the programme was in its fourth year of operation, with the first cohort due to graduate in summer 2015. Students who met the ELIR team attested to the wide-ranging academic and social benefits of this programme. The University acknowledges that, given the complexity and challenge of such a programme, a long-term commitment was vital and so the programme was conceived as having an initial 10-year duration. The benefits of already having established relations with the College through teaching and research collaborations was viewed as essential to the process.
Erasmus partnerships and research relationships have led to participation in the Masters Mundus programmes, as well as a new initiative to offer a joint Masters in German and Comparative Literature with the University of Bonn. This is a two-year degree programme involving two semesters of study in both institutions and is in line with models elsewhere in Europe. The Collaborations & Study Abroad (CSA) team have oversight of 42 school undergraduate programmes and 13 St Andrews Abroad Programmes. Every school, except Medicine, has either its own programmes or participates in St Andrews Abroad.

6.2 Securing academic standards of collaborative provision

Since the 2011 ELIR, the University has developed a new framework for the monitoring and review of collaborative programmes which is a five-step process focused on: approval, implementation, first review, annual monitoring and review, and agreement renewal review. Approval processes for new collaborative programmes now align with Chapter: B10 of the Quality Code and should include: a comprehensive review of existing links with the institution; an assessment of the suitability of the partner(s), in particular the ability of the partner to provide a high quality academic experience to complement the St Andrews education; details of the arrangements for partnership operation; and an assessment of the sustainability of the projected collaboration. Approval documentation also requires details of the partner’s procedures for module approval and review, along with strategies for enhancement at the partner institution.

New collaborative programmes are discussed by the Curriculum Approvals Group and require comments from external examiners. Proposed programmes are considered and approved by the Proctor’s Office with final ‘sign off’ provided by the Vice-Principal (Enterprise and Engagement). Registry holds a centrally-approved list of collaborations and is responsible for updating this. The Collaborations and Study Abroad team, based in Registry, are responsible for facilitating the approval and ‘setup’ processes with the partner, as well as coordinating the various processes and colleagues to ensure the smooth operation of the collaboration.

Each partnership programme has an academic lead based within the relevant school, and it is the school’s responsibility to ensure good relations with the partner institution, aligning their collaborative arrangement with wider curriculum provision. The Collaborations and Study Abroad Office is ultimately responsible for the operational management of collaborative programmes, however, responsibility for academic standards rests with schools and this is reviewed through the University’s annual monitoring processes. In meetings with academic staff it was clear that colleagues who held direct responsibility for specific programmes were well informed about student progress and development of the programme. However, it was less clear to the ELIR team where overall academic oversight for collaborative provision rested within the University.

Each school is required to report on their collaborative activity as part of the Annual Academic Monitoring (AAM) process. Examples of AAM reports provided to the ELIR team evidenced that some schools did report on collaborative provision, however, this was ‘light touch’ in nature and some schools did not comment on their collaborative provision at all. The University has recognised this variation in practice and has committed to updating the AAM template, from 2014-15, to request reflections on collaborative programmes where relevant and to make it explicit that this should include consultation with students. The ELIR team would endorse this development, and would encourage the University to ensure that all schools with collaborative provision engage with the process.

An annual report on collaborative activity is considered by the Academic Monitoring Group. The report is produced by the Collaborations and Study Abroad Office and covers all
reviews of collaborative provisions, making recommendations on continuing, amending or terminating a partnership as appropriate. The sample reports provided to the ELIR team evidenced strong statistical information about institutional provision but provided limited evaluation of the student experience.

135 Each collaborative programme is required to host a Joint Committee including staff from the partner institution. In addition to the Joint Committee, the William and Mary Partnership hosts an internal Academic Board, which considers all academic matters and maintains institutional oversight of that partnership. The ELIR team’s reading of this documentation confirmed that there is an insightful and evaluative consideration of the student experience on that programme.

136 The University emphasised that its new five-step framework for monitoring and reviewing collaborative programmes is intended to be a proportional process that can be adapted to suit the complexity and scale of the collaborative provision under consideration. However, it has not yet been made explicit how much flexibility there is for schools in adapting the framework to suit new partnerships.

137 Approval and monitoring of study abroad programmes is managed through the Collaborations and Study Abroad team. Schools are responsible for assessing curriculum alignment and suitability and can choose to work with any new student abroad partner the University has established a link with. The University believes this process has enhanced study abroad provision within the Faculty of Science by matching partner institutions within specific disciplines. Monitoring of study abroad is overseen through the AAM process and a site visit is required every three to five years. The Collaborations and Study Abroad Office have also established a Student-Staff Consultative Committee as a formal means of gathering feedback on study abroad programmes and services. A student internship placement has also been established to lead on projects and contribute to a peer support service for inbound and outbound students.

6.3 Enhancing the student learning experience on collaborative programmes

138 The University stated that students on collaborative programmes are fully integrated into the community, taking part in academic and extra-curricular activities in the same way as other students. The University also stated that this experience is to be replicated in partner institutions. The University has processes in place to track various student cohorts on collaborative programme, however it does not currently carry out systematic monitoring of cohort progress and achievement compared with students on the same modules/programme who are not on a collaborative route (paragraph 94).

139 While appreciating the benefits of studying in two (or more) institutions, both from a personal and academic point of view, students on the BA (International Honours) programme indicated that they had encountered some challenges in integrating into the St Andrews community, suggesting that the St Andrews approach was academically and socially more ‘hands off’. In particular, these students believed that William & Mary had a more structured approach to transition. The students had established a Student Partnership Group to ease transition between the two institutions and reported that this initiative had been very well received by staff at St Andrews. Students confirmed that the University is very receptive to student feedback and had made changes to support their learning experience.

140 Students undertaking study abroad programmes acknowledged the benefits of these, confirming that they had been well prepared for the experience. Students with
experience of studying abroad were clear about who to approach with problems, including health and welfare as well as academic issues. The Collaborative and Study Abroad team was seen as an important conduit for student support while students were abroad.

6.4 Effectiveness of the approach to managing collaborative activity

The University has made progress since the 2011 ELIR to enhance the effectiveness of its frameworks for managing and monitoring collaborative programmes. A new five-stage process has been introduced which has the potential to be effective. The University intends that the five-step framework should be used flexibly, in proportion to the nature of the collaborative provision in question. Given the early stage in its introduction at the time of the ELIR visit, the ELIR team was unclear how this proportionate approach would operate in practice and, in particular, it was not explicit how much flexibility would be permitted.

It is clear that collaborative programmes are managed carefully at school level, particularly the William and Mary collaboration. The Joint Council and Academic Board provide strong management at the strategic and operation level with detailed evidence of any arising issues being resolved in an effective manner. However, the University is strongly encouraged to ensure that there is clear academic oversight of all collaborative activity at the institutional level. Currently, there is a possibility of this becoming distributed between schools. Schools are required to review collaborative programmes through the Annual Academic Monitoring and University Review of Learning and Teaching processes but, as the University has recognised, reports from these processes do not always include explicit reflection on academic standards or the student experience on collaborative programmes. The University intends to include a prompt for this in a revised template from the current academic year, and the ELIR team would strongly support that development.

The experience the University has gained from its partnership with William and Mary will be valuable to inform the establishment of future collaborative programmes as well as the institution’s approach to internationalisation more generally. The University is encouraged to ensure that learning from the William and Mary experience is reflected on as part of future developments.

The University has a successful approach to promoting and supporting student mobility through its study abroad arrangements, including the wide range of partner institutions with which it has agreements in place. As noted earlier in this report, the University also has systematic arrangements for recognising learning undertaken elsewhere (paragraph 93).
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About the Enhancement-led Institutional Review method

A dedicated page of the QAA website explains the method for Enhancement-led Institutional Review of higher education institutions in Scotland and has links to the ELIR handbook and other informative documents. You can also find more information about QAA and its mission.

Further details about the enhancement-led approach can be found in an accompanying ELIR information document, including an overview of the review method, definitions of the judgement categories, and explanations of follow-up action. It also contains information on the Scottish Funding Council's response to ELIR judgements.

About this review

This is the Outcome Report of the Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR) conducted by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) at the University of St Andrews. The review took place as follows: Part 1 visit on 3-5 February 2015 and Part 2 visit on 9-13 March 2015. The review was conducted by a team of six reviewers:

- Professor Jeremy Bradshaw (Academic Reviewer)
- Professor Howard Colley (Academic Reviewer)
- Professor Hilary Grainger (Academic Reviewer)
- Associate Professor Asa Kettis (International Reviewer)
- Mark Charters (Student Reviewer)
- Gavin Lee (Coordinating Reviewer).

This report sets out the overarching judgement formed by the ELIR team on:

- the current and likely future effectiveness of the institution's arrangements for managing academic standards and enhancing the quality of the student learning experience.

It is possible for the overarching judgement to be expressed in three levels which indicate that the institution's arrangements are: effective; have limited effectiveness; or are not effective. More detail on these categories is provided in the ELIR information document.

The overarching judgement for this report can be found on page 3, followed by the areas of positive practice and the areas for development.

A more detailed Technical Report is also available for this review. The Technical Report sets out the ELIR team's findings under each of the headings in the ELIR 3 method.

---

1 Further information about the ELIR method: www.qaa.ac.uk/reviews-and-reports/how-we-review-higher-education/enhancement-led-institutional-review
2 Further information about QAA: www.qaa.ac.uk/aboutus
4 Technical report: www.qaa.ac.uk/reviews-and-reports/provider?UKPRN=10007803
About the University of St Andrews

The University was founded over 600 years ago and is the oldest university in Scotland. In 2013-14, it had a total of 7,954 students including 818 taught postgraduates and 858 postgraduate research students. Students are spread over 18 academic schools which are located within four faculties (Arts, Science, Divinity, and Medicine) with around 605 academic staff. The University describes itself as having a beautiful location in a small coastal town with an essentially medieval core which presents both the advantages of a close-knit community in a historic setting and also certain challenges such as remoteness, legacy estate and restrictions on growth.
Overarching judgement about the University of St Andrews

The University of St Andrews has effective arrangements for managing academic standards and the student learning experience. These arrangements are likely to continue to be effective in the future.

This is a positive judgement, which means the University has robust arrangements for securing academic standards and for enhancing the quality of the student experience.

Areas of positive practice

1. The ELIR has identified a number of areas of positive practice and these are summarised below.

2. **Staff and student development** - the suite of development opportunities provided by the Centre for Academic, Professional & Organisational Development (CAPOD) is responsive to the University’s needs and promotes positive engagement by staff and students. CAPOD’s work also supports the University to achieve a clear overview of its strengths and development needs.

3. **Identification and dissemination of good practice** - linked to the institution-led review processes, and supported by CAPOD, there are systematic arrangements for identifying and sharing good practice. These include an annual dissemination event attended by the directors of teaching from every school drawing on the outcomes from the Annual Academic Monitoring process.

4. **Enhanced role of the Proctor’s Office** - the revised organisational structure has brought together learning and teaching with oversight of other student-related activity. The Proctor’s Office works closely with the directors of teaching and CAPOD to provide an enhanced strategic overview, including identifying a set of priority areas.

5. **Positive approach to widening participation** - the University has a wide range of initiatives and activities aimed at raising aspirations and promoting widening access to higher education. There are effective arrangements in place to support students who enter the University from a widening participation background, in line with the University’s intention to be academically, but not socially, elite.

6. **Proactive student engagement and representation** - there are highly effective student representative arrangements in place including the successful posts of school and faculty president. The student representatives are proactive in identifying areas in which to engage and are supported by the University to do so, for example student-led groups are currently considering feedback on assessment and module evaluation questionnaires with the outcomes of each being considered for action by University committees.

7. **Graduate identity and co-curriculum** - staff and students share a strong sense of a St Andrews graduate identity. This is underpinned by a varied and imaginative set of co-curricular opportunities which are provided to students including internships, sports activities and engagement with the community.

8. **Integrated student advice and support** - integrated student support is provided through the ‘one stop’ Advice and Support Centre which incorporates a range of formerly separate service areas. It also provides links between the professional services and academic staff to create a more holistic service for students covering academic and pastoral dimensions, for example through the Academic Alert system.
9 **Promotion of equality and diversity** - the University has a range of activities in place to support equality and diversity in the curriculum and in the wider student experience. Schools in the Science Faculty, in particular, have engaged with a range of sector awards and the University is encouraged to progress with its plans to involve the whole institution in this activity. There is an institution-wide Inclusive Curriculum Toolkit which provides advice for staff on good practice in curriculum design, delivery and assessment with staff engagement in equality and diversity being promoted through events and a project exploring diversity in undergraduate teaching. The University has plans in place to require all students to complete an online diversity training module as a condition of matriculation from 2015-16.

10 **Student mobility** - the University has a successful approach to promoting and supporting student mobility including agreements in place with a wide range of partner institutions and systematic arrangements for recognising learning undertaken elsewhere.

### Areas for development

11 The University is asked to consider the areas summarised below.

12 **Academic oversight of collaborative activity** - ensure there is clear academic oversight of collaborative activity, including securing the systematic engagement of academic staff in the arrangements for monitoring student performance as well as reflecting on the wider student learning experience.

13 **Role and status of teaching-only staff** - consider the role, status and promotion structure for teaching-only staff.

14 **Contextualised support for postgraduates who teach** - ensure all postgraduate students who teach receive support from their schools for undertaking this role. This would complement the well-regarded training already provided centrally by CAPOD.

15 **Academic engagement in annual monitoring** - secure the engagement of a wider group of academic staff in the reflective elements of annual academic monitoring to enhance the student experience.

16 **Use of technology to support learning and teaching** - reflect on the ways in which greater use of technology could enhance the St Andrews approach to learning and teaching.

17 **Integrate School of Medicine** - continue the positive work aimed at integrating the School of Medicine with wider institutional practices and processes for the mutual benefit of all schools.

18 **Engaging with the student experience** - continue to reflect on the extent to which all students can engage with the St Andrews student experience, in the context of a more diverse student body including those who live some distance from the University.

19 **Future development of CAPOD** - consider extending the existing positive work of CAPOD to include further development of the community of practice in pedagogical research and increase support for mid-career and longer serving researchers.

20 **Student performance and assessment** - develop a systematic process for monitoring cohort performance across modules and programmes, especially, although not exclusively, for students studying across schools or institutions. The University should also
undertake additional work to help students understand the assessment requirements, including clarifying the use of the Common Reporting Scale.

21 **Publication of external examiner reports** - publish external examiner reports in order to give students the opportunity to engage in discussion and consideration of this element of the assessment process.

**What happens next?**

22 QAA Scotland will continue to engage with the institution through the annual discussion visits which, amongst other matters, consider the ways in which the institution is responding to the ELIR outcomes.

23 One year after publication of the ELIR Outcome and Technical Reports, institutions are asked to provide a follow-up report to indicate how they are responding to the outcomes of ELIR. Institutions also engage in a follow-up event with colleagues from other institutions to explore the ways in which the ELIR outcomes are being implemented. The final version of the institution’s follow-up report is published on the QAA website.

**Further information**

24 A more detailed **Technical Report** is also available for this review. The Technical Report sets out the ELIR team’s findings under each of the headings in the ELIR 3 method.

25 This review and its findings relate to the institution as a whole and do not provide information about individual programmes of study or subjects. For further information about those, contact the institution or visit its [website](#).

26 University sector institutions in Scotland also engage in systematic Enhancement Theme activity. Further information about that work, which has a sector-wide and institutional focus, can be found on the [Enhancement Themes website](#).

27 Further information about QAA Scotland and the enhancement-led approach, including the ELIR method, can be found on the [QAA website](#).

28 For further information about the Scottish Funding Council see [www.sfc.ac.uk](#)
The PRES is a biennial survey of postgraduate research students to collect feedback about supervision, learning and general experiences in order to inform improvement. A total of 1070 students were invited to participate, and 386 students did so - a response rate of 36%.

The survey covered 9 areas: Supervision, Resources, Research Culture, Progress and Assessment, Responsibilities, Research Skills, Professional Development, Overall Experience. For the first time the University was allowed to supply its own questions, which looked at the Students’ Association, Employability & Careers, Student Support Services and Student Experience.

This pack includes an overview of the results, a sector comparison supplied by the Higher Education Academy followed by an internal analysis. Each school will receive a datapack along with their own redacted free-text comments in due course.

1 Institutional Overview

Supervision

Students at St Andrews have an overall positive experience of supervision, with 88% of respondents agreeing with the statement in this section. In particular, 95% of students agreed that their supervisor has the skills and knowledge to support their research. Only 76% of students agreed that their supervisor helped them identify their training and development needs, although this is up on 2013’s figure of 70%.

The vast majority of free-text comments praised individual supervisors and expressed gratitude for the support they have received. Of those comments that identified issues, the following areas were raised a number of times.

- Confusion about the role of a second supervisor.
- Desire for more supervisor meetings.
- Difficulties addressing a poor relationship with a supervisor.

Resources

78% of students are happy with the resources available at St Andrews. In particular, the satisfaction levels regarding suitable working spaces and access to specialist resources are up to 85% and 78% respectively from the 2013 values of 76% and 67%. It should be noted however that over 20% of students were not satisfied with the provision of computing, library and specialist resources.

The main themes that occurred in the free-text were as follows:

- PGT use of the Martyrs Kirk.
- Lack of specific journals or books.
- Lack of dedicated work space.
- Insufficient computing facilities.
Research Culture

Only 70% of students were satisfied with the research culture within St Andrews. The area in which students felt most let down was opportunities to become involved in the wider research community outside of their department, with almost 40% of students unsatisfied. Around three-quarters of students did agree that their department provides a good seminar programme. Many students expressed a wish for more interdepartmental interaction organised or facilitated by the Schools. Tying in with the previous section, some students commented that the lack of office space in the department led to them feeling disconnected from the department.

Progress and Assessment

Overall, 78% of students were satisfied that they had received appropriate information regarding progression and assessment. Deadlines and formal monitoring were the best understood, with 86% of students agreeing that they understood the requirements. The following themes appeared a number of times in the comments:

- Lack of information for Arts students.
- Desire for a (better) School level induction.
- Difficulties with thesis structuring.

Responsibilities

Students were generally happy with their understanding of their own and their supervisors’ responsibilities, and knowing who they can approach with concerns, with over 80% of students saying they were satisfied in these areas. Less satisfaction however was shown with respect to the institution valuing and responding feedback - only 60% of students felt that the institution did this well. The comments reflected a feeling that students felt they could not approach staff in their School, and if they did nothing would be done to address their concerns. There were however a few comments praising staff in individual Schools.

Research Skills

Overall, students were satisfied in how their research skills have developed during the course of their programme at St Andrews, with an average of 83% happy. The only area that dropped below 80% satisfaction was development of students’ confidence to be creative or innovative, with 75% of students happy that these skills had developed. Unfortunately this aspect was not brought up in the free-text comments. Many comments reflected that this was a difficult section to answer as some students felt their skills were already good before they came to St Andrews. A number of comments praised the courses provided by CAPOD, although some found the provision lacking. Students also questioned whether TGAP was suitable for research students.

Professional Development

79% of students were satisfied with their professional development at St Andrews. The area that students were least satisfied in was developing contacts and professional networks, with 30% not satisfied. Again comments were split between praise for the courses provided and disappointment with them.

Overall Experience

Satisfaction with the overall experience of the degree programme remains high at 84% (compared to 83% in 2013).
Institutional Questions

Many students chose to tick “Not applicable” for these questions, and a significant number were “on the fence”, selecting “Neither agree nor disagree”. Only around 10% of students were outright dissatisfied with the services provided by the Students’ Association; 32% of students expressed neither a positive nor negative opinion here. 74% of students agreed that they had improved their career prospects. Only 57% believed the Academic community gave them good career advice, although only 14% outright disagreed with this statement. Only 46% of students found the Careers Centre gave them good advice, but it should be noted that only 12% disagreed that good advice was available. Around 67% of students felt appropriate support was available from the ASC, with only 6% showing discontent. Students were less content about the levels of dedicated social space: only 48% were happy, with around 24% dissatisfied.

Notes

Students are said to be “happy” or “satisfied” if they selected “Mostly Agree” or “Definitely Agree”. School level splits are according to data held on the official student record. Department level splits where they exist are by identification on the student’s part.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Summary for University of St Andrews compared to the Sector benchmark
Appendix 2: St Andrews compared to Russell Group Benchmark
Appendix 3: School Level Overview by Category
Appendix 4: Institutional Questions
1. Summary for University of St Andrews compared to the Sector benchmark.

Comparing St Andrews to the Sector benchmark, the most positive statements were:

1. I have a suitable working space (n = 375)
   - % agree: 85%
   - Difference: 8.5%
   - Significance: p<0.001
   - Effect size: 0.07

2. I have frequent opportunities to discuss my research with other research students (n = 379)
   - % agree: 73%
   - Difference: 8.0%
   - Significance: p<0.01
   - Effect size: 0.05

3. My department provides a good seminar programme (n = 379)
   - % agree: 77%
   - Difference: 3.1%
   - Significance: p<0.01
   - Effect size: 0.01

Comparing St Andrews to the Sector benchmark, the most negative statements were:

1. There is adequate provision of library facilities (including physical and online resources) (n = 382)
   - % agree: 75%
   - Difference: -9.0%
   - Significance: p<0.001
   - Effect size: 0.1

2. My confidence to be creative or innovative has developed during my programme (n = 382)
   - % agree: 75%
   - Difference: -4.3%
   - Significance: p<0.001
   - Effect size: 0.02

3. I received an appropriate induction to my research degree programme (n = 382)
   - % agree: 72%
   - Difference: -3.9%
   - Significance: p<0.001
   - Effect size: 0.01

The quartile graph shows the range of institutional scores in PRES for each measure, divided into quartiles. For example, the lower quartile covers the range from the lowest scoring institution across a quarter of the lower scoring institutions. The diamond indicates where this institution is on the scale. The overall satisfaction graph shows the institution and benchmark scores for the overall question. The positive and negative statements are the three statements (where an agree/disagree scale is used) with the largest positive and negative differences.
### Difference between St Andrews and Sector benchmarking group, by subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modern Languages and Linguistics</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language and Literature</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology, Psychiatry and Neuroscience</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science and Informatics</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical Sciences</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of St Andrews</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theology and Religious Studies</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology and Development Studies</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics and International Studies</td>
<td>-6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography, Environmental Studies and Archaeology</td>
<td>-8.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relative to the Sector benchmarking group, Research culture was most positive, with a score 4.0% higher than this benchmark. The area at St Andrews most negative relative to the Sector benchmarking group was Research skills, with a score 2.3% lower than this benchmark.

**Within Research culture, comparing St Andrews to the Sector benchmark, the most positive statements were:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>% agree</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Effect size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: I have frequent opportunities to discuss my research with other research students (n = 379)</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>p&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: The research ambience in my department or faculty stimulates my work (n = 380)</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>p&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Within Research skills, comparing St Andrews to the Sector benchmark, the most negative statements were:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>% agree</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Effect size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: My confidence to be creative or innovative has developed during my programme (n = 382)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>-4.3%</td>
<td>p&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: My understanding of 'research integrity' (e.g. rigour, ethics, transparency, attributing the contribution of others) has developed during my programme (n = 377)</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>-2.2%</td>
<td>p&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2. St Andrews compared to Russell Group Benchmark

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th><strong>PRES 2015 (%)</strong></th>
<th><strong>PRES 2013 (%)</strong></th>
<th><strong>% change</strong></th>
<th><strong>RG 2015 (%)</strong></th>
<th><strong>% difference</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent do you agree with the following statements about supervision?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1. My supervisor/s have the skills and subject knowledge to support my research</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. I have regular contact with my supervisor/s, appropriate for my needs</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3. My supervisor/s provide feedback that helps me direct my research activities</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4. My supervisor/s help me to identify my training and development needs as a researcher</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about resources?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.a. I have a suitable working space</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.a. There is adequate provision of computing resources and facilities</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.a. There is adequate provision of library facilities (including physical and online resources)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.a. I have access to the specialist resources necessary for my research</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(your centre, school, institute or other unit where you are primarily based or attached for your research).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.a. My department provides a good seminar programme</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.a. I have frequent opportunities to discuss my research with other research students</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.a. The research ambience in my department or faculty stimulates my work</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4.a. I have opportunities to become involved in the wider research community, beyond my department</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress and Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about induction, progression arrangements and assessment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1.a. I received an appropriate induction to my research degree programme</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2.a. I understand the requirements and deadlines for formal monitoring of my progress</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3.a. I understand the required standard for my thesis</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4.a. The final assessment procedures for my degree are clear to me</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about responsibilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1.a. My institution values and responds to feedback from research degree students</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2.a. I understand my responsibilities as a research degree student</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3.a. I am aware of my supervisors' responsibilities towards me as a research degree student</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.4.a. Other than my supervisor/s, I know who to approach if I am concerned about any aspect of my degree programme</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about research skills development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1.a. My skills in applying appropriate research methodologies, tools and techniques have developed during my programme</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.2.a. My skills in critically analysing and evaluating findings and results have developed during my programme</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.3.a. My confidence to be creative or innovative has developed during my programme</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.4.a. My understanding of 'research integrity' (e.g. rigour, ethics, transparency, attributing the contribution of others) has developed during my programme</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about professional development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.1.a. My ability to manage projects has developed during my programme</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.2.a. My ability to communicate information effectively to diverse audiences has developed during my programme</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.3.a. I have developed contacts or professional networks during my programme</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.4.a. I have increasingly managed my own professional development during my programme</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Please indicate whether you have taught (or demonstrated) at your institution during your research degree programme.</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.a. If yes, to what extent do you agree that you have been given appropriate support and guidance for your teaching?</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.b. Did you receive formal training for your teaching?</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about your experience?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.1.a. Overall, I am satisfied with the experience of my research degree programme</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.2.a. I am confident that I will complete my research degree programme within my institution's expected timescale</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About your programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. When you started your programme, did you consider yourself to be fluent in English?</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4. Institutional Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>% agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. Thinking of all the services, including representation, student activities and societies, and social events, provided by the Students’ Association at this Institution, to what extent do you agree with the following statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.1. I am satisfied with the services provided by the Students’ Association</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Employability &amp; Careers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.1. As a result of my course, I believe that I have improved my career prospects</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.2. Good advice from the Academic community is available for making career choices</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.3. Good advice is available from the Careers Centre for making career choices</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Student Support Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.1. Appropriate support, targeted to PGR students, is available from the Advice and Support Centre (the ASC) at the point of need.</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Student Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.1. The University provides me with a satisfactory level of dedicated Postgraduate social space</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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As part of a review of all policies governing PGT students, an initial scoping exercise highlighted that currently there is currently no policy or guidance available to staff and students that clearly defines the different postgraduate qualifications available, and the process of transition into and between these qualifications. The Learning and Teaching Committee agreed that a Working Group be established to consider these issues.

The document that follows is an update on the work of the Change of Registration Working Group. It sets out some principles which if agreed would need to then be incorporated into the Postgraduate Senate Regulations and policies. The plan would be to gain agreement on the principles set out in this document prior to drafting a full proposal with the changes in regulations and policies outlined and the addition of a fee structure.

The Postgraduate Research Committee is asked to approve the principles set out in this document prior to formal approval of the necessary policy and regulatory changes which will be presented later in the academic year.

Clare Peddie
Pro Dean (Taught Postgraduate)

23 September 2015
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Aims of the Working Group
Currently, no policy or guidance is available to staff and students to clearly define the different PG programmes available and the process of transition between these programmes. A recent LTC Open Forum debated the subject of transition between postgraduate degrees for students, and the points from that discussion have formed the basis of the work to be carried out by the group.

The key aims of the Working Group were to:

1. Create policy and guidance for students and staff that define the qualifications and governs the process of transition into and between postgraduate degrees along with recommendations for changes to the Postgraduate Senate Regulations as required.
2. Make recommendations for the management of the transition with respect to student status, training and access to services.

The following document describes the proposals prepared by the Working Group for LTC associated with aim 1. We set out by writing:

2. Award definitions.
3. Expected time periods for each awards including distance learners.
4. For each programme: exit awards.
5. For each programme: transition requirements (transitions up and down).
6. The fee implications of each transition (to follow).
7. PG regulations and Policy: changes needed (to follow).
1. Guiding Principles
   • Recruitment and retention of the very best students
   • Recruitment and retention of students capable of the award for which they are registered
   • Improved clarity of registering and reporting status
   • Reflect current practice as far as possible
   • Create transparency of process
   • No double counting of time
   • No double counting of credit
   • Equity of access
   • Ease of transition
   • Compliance with SCQF guidelines
   • Considering transition within institution not admissions from outside

2. Award Definitions
The Working Group used the SCQF framework (http://www.scqf.org.uk/framework-diagram/Framework.htm) and the practice of other comparable institutions to draft the following award definitions:

**PGCert** - At least 60 credits of which a minimum of 40 should be at SCQF Level 11 (5000 level) or above.

**PG Diploma** - At least 120 credits of which a minimum of 90 should be at SCQF Level 11 (5000 level) or above.

**MSc** - At least 180 credits of which a minimum of 150 are at SCQF Level 11 (5000-level). Includes taught (normally 120) credits and a final project or dissertation of maximum length 15,000 words normally worth 60 credits.

**MLitt** - At least 180 credits of which a minimum of 150 are at SCQF Level 11. Includes 120 taught credits and a dissertation of maximum length 15,000 words normally worth 60 credits.

**MRes** - At least 180 credits of which a minimum of 150 are at SCQF Level 11 (5000-level). Normally includes some taught credits and a final project or dissertation of maximum length 15,000 words normally worth 60 credits.

**MSc (by research)** – One year of full-time research and a dissertation of maximum length 20,000 words at SCQF level 11.

**MFA** - Two years of full-time study or equivalent including 120 taught credits which a minimum of 90 are at SCQF Level 11 and a thesis, or an alternative assessment appropriate to subject discipline and approved by the Dean, of maximum length 40,000 words. The definition for the thesis for the MFA degree is buried within the regulations for a MPhil Section IX. 4. There should be a separate section for the MFA degree and the section within the MPhil deleted. The description of the final assessment for the MFA should be generic enough not to have to go back to the regulations should further types of MFA degrees be introduced. Change in the current regulations required.

**MPhil** – Two years of full-time study or equivalent including 120 taught credits which a minimum of 90 are at SCQF Level 11 and a thesis of maximum length 40,000 words or an alternative assessment appropriate to subject discipline and approved by the Dean.
**MPhil** *(by research)* - Two full-time years or equivalent of research at SCQF level 11 and a thesis of maximum length 60,000 words or an alternative assessment appropriate to subject discipline and approved by the Dean. *Change in the current regulations required – not currently in the regulations – thesis is longer as no taught module component. Needed as an exit qualification but also as a registered degree.*

**PhD** - as defined by the other working party. SCQF Level 12

*These definitions describe the current awards offered by the University and do not currently represent an attempt to modify our awards. **This award is not currently defined in our regulations.

### 3. Periods of Study

The following table shows the suggested time periods allocated to each degree programme in future policy and regulations. The time periods allocated to PhD programmes is the work of another working group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
<th>Year 8</th>
<th>Year 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PGCert FT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCert PT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCert Distance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGDip FT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGDip PT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGDip Distance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG Masters FT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG Masters PT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG Masters Distance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPhil and MFAs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPhil and MFA PT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPhil and MFA distance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Allowed time           |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Maximum deferral period (only for research component) |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Maximum period including Leave of Absence            |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
4. Exit Awards

Next the Working Group considered the relevant exit awards for each defined award. In order to receive an exit award the candidate must fulfil the criteria for the exit award. The student must also either be discontinuing study or the award of the exit award does not affect the student’s eligibility to graduate from the programme in which the student is currently registered.

Programme: Postgraduate Diploma
Exit Award: Postgraduate Certificate
Criteria: 60 taught credits, a minimum of 40 should be at SCQF Level 11 (5000-level) or above.
Note: Where the candidate does not meet the minimum of 40 credits at SCQF Level 11 (5000-level) requirements but has 60 credits an Undergraduate Certificate can be awarded.

Programme: MLitt or MSc
Exit Award: Postgraduate Certificate
Criteria: 60 taught credits - minimum of 40 should be at SCQF Level 11 (5000-level) or above
Exit Award: Postgraduate Diploma
Criteria: 120 taught credits - minimum of 90 should be at SCQF Level 11 (5000-level) or above
Note: Where the candidate does not meet the SCQF level requirements but meets the credit requirements an undergraduate certificate or diploma can be awarded.

Programme: MPhil (by research)
No exit award.

Programme: MPhil (including taught credits)
Exit Award: Postgraduate Certificate
Criteria: 60 taught credits - minimum of 40 should be at SCQF Level 11 (5000-level) or above
Exit Award: Postgraduate Diploma
Criteria: 120 taught credits - minimum of 90 should be at SCQF Level 11 (5000-level) or above
Note: No exit points of MLitt and MSc. MPhil is at the same SCQF level as MLitt and MSc.

Programme: Master of Fine Arts (MFA)
Exit Award: Postgraduate Certificate
Criteria: 60 taught credits - minimum of 40 should be at SCQF Level 11 (5000-level) or above
Exit Award: Postgraduate Diploma
Criteria: 120 taught credits - minimum of 90 should be at SCQF Level 11 (5000-level) or above
Note: No exit points of MLitt and MSc. The Working Group considered that the MFA is at the same SCQF level as MLitt and MSc and an MLitt is not a suitable exit qualification from a MFA given the very different nature of the final assessment (dissertation for an MLitt – appropriate assessment to discipline for a MFA). Change in the current regulations required.

Programme: PhD
Exit Award: Postgraduate Certificate
Criteria: 60 taught credits - minimum of 40 should be at SCQF Level 11 (5000-level) or above
Exit Award: Postgraduate Diploma
Criteria: 120 taught credits - minimum of 90 should be at SCQF Level 11 (5000-level) or above
Exit Award: MPhil (without rewrite/corrections) – examination form change required
Exit Award: MPhil (with rewrite/corrections)

DPerf
MFA – under new regs currently in draft
4. Transitions

Transition is defined as a transfer to a higher or longer degree within the University of St Andrews. The Working Group defines the timing at which the transfer could take place and the suggested requirements for that transfer to be permitted.

All offers of transfer should be made unconditional as soon as possible in the process to ease the transition for the student.

**Transition from Taught Masters to MPhil (taught)**

**Timing**

There are two timing options for this transition:

1. After completion of taught 120 credits and at any point up to and including completion and reporting of the dissertation but not graduation. The student has chosen not to graduate, so work for the dissertation can form part of the MPhil (taught) thesis. In this case the total time allowed for the 120 taught credits and the MPhil thesis is two years.

2. After graduation with the Taught Masters. Credit achieved in the Taught Masters programme and work for the dissertation cannot form part of the MPhil (taught). The time allowed for the MPhil is two years from the start of the MPhil. These students would normally start at the beginning of the following academic year.

**Requirements**

a. This transition can only be made after a formal request from the student to the Head of School.

b. Student requests can only be made after successful completion of the initial 60 taught credits. At this stage the School can make offers of transfer to an MPhil to the student, conditional upon completion of 120 credits with a minimum of 13.5 GPA (see clause d below). *(This is required otherwise students could avoid failing to get an MLitt or MSc by registering for an MPhil).*

c. The School can make unconditional offers of transfer to candidates who have achieved a minimum of 13.5 GPA in 120 taught credits at any point prior to graduation with the Taught Masters award.

d. These requirements are a minimum and the School may wish to set additional requirements which must be published and be applied equally across all candidates. It is recommended that Schools make the decision as early as possible to smooth the student’s transition, and could make the decision to transfer the student based on the early submission of a draft dissertation.

e. The student either does not register for the Taught Masters dissertation or must withdraw from the Taught Masters dissertation if the student wishes to transfer to an MPhil (taught) and does not wish to graduate with the MSc or MLitt.

**Transition into Research degrees**

**Transition to PhD or MPhil (by research) from an MLitt, MSc or an MPhil (taught)**

The candidate can apply upon completion of 60 taught credits and can be awarded a conditional offer on achieving a minimum of 13.5 GPA in 120 taught credits in addition to meeting School requirements or selection procedures. Normally application and acceptance to enter into a PhD or MPhil (by research) should be made before completion of the research period for the Masters
degree and ideally should allow successful candidates to engage in research degree orientation activities.

Entry to research degrees must always be through the School’s documented recruitment process and the application should be considered alongside those from outside the institution. The School must be satisfied that the candidate is capable of completing the MPhil (by research) or PhD in the time allowed.

If entry to the research degree is offered there is no University requirement to complete the Masters dissertation unless the student wishes to graduate with the Masters degree or the School requests completion of the Master’s degree as a condition of entry. Completion of the Masters degree necessarily requires delayed entry to the PhD until after the reporting of the dissertation grade.

If the student chooses not to complete the Masters degree, any period doing research post completion of the taught modules is incorporated into the PhD time period. Time engaged in taught modules is not incorporated into the PhD time period. A candidate who transfers to a PhD without graduating with the Masters may graduate with PGDip.

A scholarship equivalent to one third of the Taught Masters fee should be granted to PGDip (Distinction) candidates against fees of the first year of the PhD. This has the effect that the student is able to use the fee of the dissertation period to help fund the first year of a PhD.

Improve university support for students in transition and alumni entry by allowing application for accommodation at conditional status.

**Transition from MPhil (research) to a PhD**
Upon recommendation by the supervisor and review team at 9 month review with approval of the Head of School. Time spent engaged in the MPhil is incorporated into the PhD time period. Note: need to establish a standing agreement for candidates moving from MPhil (research) to PhD where there is no fee or time detriment to candidate.

**Transition from PhD to MPhil (research)**
Upon recommendation by the supervisor and approval of the Head of School at 9 month review. Note: need to establish a standing agreement for candidates moving from PhD to MPhil (research) where there is no fee or time detriment to candidate.

**Transition into the MFA from a research degree**
Should not be possible to make a transition from a research degree into the MFA without the prerequisite taught modules. It is believed that the existing regulation was written to permit students on PhD programmes to drop down to MPhil. **Change in the current regulations (regulation III 3. A.) required.**

**Transition into the MFA from other taught Masters programmes**
The candidate must have passed the prerequisite taught modules or their equivalence to the satisfaction of the School concerned (normally GPA>13.5).

Clare Peddie
Working Group Convenor

23 September 2015
Early in AY 2014-15, the Provost’s Office introduced a new Policy on Location of Studies for postgraduate research students. In May 2015, this was followed up by a separate Policy on Location of Studies for postgraduate taught students. The PGT paper was approved by the Business Committee and submitted to Academic Council in June 2015 on the proviso that work be undertaken over the summer to create one policy document which would cover PGR, PGT and UG students.

The Pro Dean (Taught Postgraduate), Pro Dean (Research Postgraduate) and Assistant Registrar agreed to take this forward and the attached paper is now presented to the Postgraduate Research Committee for approval.

Emily Feamster
Postgraduate Administrative Officer
Proctor’s Office
23 September 2015
Rationale
All students are expected to reside at a term address within a commutable distance from St Andrews during their study unless they have formal permission from the University of St Andrews for their study location to be outside St Andrews. This permission can be granted for academic purposes; for example to conduct essential research. This permission can also exceptionally be granted for non-academic purposes at Undergraduate or at Taught Postgraduate level with the support of the School and with agreed mechanisms in place for continued academic support. The relevant Pro Dean can be involved when the request is complex or when the Schools refers a case to the Registry Officer.

The University has a duty of care to all students and therefore must be able to contact all students at any point during their programme of study. In addition the University must hold the current address for all students as well as an historic trail of previous addresses. It is also expected that students can readily access academic advice throughout academic study and that agreed mechanisms are in place to support this.

For students requiring a visa to study in the UK, the Home Office has introduced regulations also requiring Tier 4 Sponsors to hold the latest address of study for students as well as an historic trail of previous addresses\(^1\). The University must be able to show that the address we hold for a student, who has leave to remain in the UK on a Tier 4 licence, is accurate and where students are not resident in St Andrews in term time, they have permission to be out with St Andrews. We must also demonstrate that students can engage appropriately with their studies at this location. Non-compliance with these Home Office regulations could entail a loss of the University’s Tier 4 sponsor licence and seriously affect our ability to recruit overseas students. In response to these requirements the University has introduced procedures to monitor where students are located during the course of their studies.

Policy
The address at which a student lives while pursuing academic study is known as the **term address**. The UK term address must contain a full valid postcode for reporting purposes. Students must ensure that their term address is up-to-date and accurately reflected on their student record.

Students who are **resident in St Andrews for the purposes of study** should reside at a term address within a commutable distance from St Andrews.

The University defines **commutable distance from St Andrews** as a distance from St Andrews permitting students to attend the University during core working hours on a daily basis if required to do so.

All students who require their **term address** to be outwith the commutable distance from St Andrews for any reason must seek formal approval to do so prior to the commencement of their programme of study, or prior to changing address. All students who require to be away from their term address; for example, to engage in fieldwork or research away from St Andrews, for a period. This policy does not

---

overide the regulatory requirement\(^2\) for student attendance with respect to absence from taught modules.

Overseas students must seek expert advice on the conditions of their Tier 4 visa prior to leaving the UK for any reason e.g. leave of absence, fieldwork. Students who are on fieldwork or undertaking a placement as part of their academic studies must be approved via the normal channels. See PGR guidelines at: [http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/staff/teaching/strategypolicy/policy/postgraduate/research/](http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/staff/teaching/strategypolicy/policy/postgraduate/research/) or for Undergraduates and Masters students at [https://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/utrec/guidelinespolicies/riskassessment/](https://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/utrec/guidelinespolicies/riskassessment/). All students who are on fieldwork for longer than 28 days must inform Registry of their intended location. A reliable local contact must be declared on the risk assessment form.

**Formal Approval Process for Undergraduate or Taught Postgraduate students**

Undergraduate or taught postgraduate students who wish their term address to be out with the commutable distance from St Andrews or plan to be away from their term address for a period of more than 10 consecutive days must first seek approval.

Permission can be granted by the Head of School (or delegate) for academic purposes such as research in another laboratory, placements, access to libraries, field work etc. For non-academic purposes, the request must be forwarded to the relevant Registry Officer who may refer complex cases to the Pro Dean (Taught Postgraduate) or the Pro Dean (Undergraduate).

The Registry Officer, acting on behalf of the Pro Deans, can grant approval only in exceptional circumstances for a student to be resident outside the commutable distance from St Andrews for non-academic purposes. Postgraduate taught students are expected to reside at their term address for the duration of their programme, including the dissertation period. If permission is granted, on academic or non-academic grounds, an agreed mechanism for continued academic support must be in place. Once approved, the consent must be recorded on the student record maintained in Registry the new address must be placed on the student record maintained in Registry.

**Formal Approval Process for Postgraduate Research students**

Postgraduate research students who wish their term address to be out with the commutable distance from St Andrews must seek approval to do so prior to the commencement of their programme of study or prior to changing address. This approval must be sought in writing, stating the grounds, from the School’s Director of Postgraduate Studies. If the case is complex, the Director of Postgraduate Studies can refer the decision to the Registry Officer who can consult the Pro Dean (Postgraduate Research). Once approved, the consent must be recorded on the student record maintained in Registry the new address must be placed on the student record maintained in Registry.

Students who are away from their term address for any reason, for more than 5 consecutive working days and up to 28 days, should inform their supervisor and School as a matter of routine. The period of absence from the term time address can be extended to 38 days if this includes time when the University is closed.

Students who will be away from their term address for longer than a period of 28 consecutive days (including weekends) must seek approval from the School’s Director of Postgraduate Studies (a period of 38 days will apply where this time includes time when the University is closed). Once approved, the consent must be recorded on the student record maintained in Registry the new address must be placed on the student record maintained in Registry.

Appendix 1
Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate Students - Requests to be located outwith the commutable distance from St Andrews – process diagram

Student requests to be located outwith the commutable distance from St Andrews providing academic or non-academic rationale and proposing the mechanism for continued academic support.

Academic grounds

Student request should be sent to Head of School (or delegate) who assesses the request

Decision communicated to student

YES

Head of School notifies the Registry Officer who communicates decision to student, with instruction that student must update address via eVision and notify Registry Student Support Officer when complete.

NO

Non-academic grounds

Student request should be sent to Registry Officer who assesses the request and if appropriate confirms the mechanism for continued academic support with the School. In complex cases the Registry Officer can consult the relevant ProDean.

YES

Registry Officer communicates decision to student and School, with instruction that student must update address via eVision and notify Registry Student Support Officer when complete.
Appendix 2

Postgraduate Research Students - Requests to be located outwith the commutable distance from St Andrews – process diagram

Student requests to be located outwith the commutable distance from St Andrews

School (DoPG) assesses the impact of the request on studies.

Request includes:
- Start and end dates
- New address
- Reason for request

NO

School communicates decision to student.

YES

Registry Officer reviews School approval and has opportunity to consult with ProDean (PGR)

NO

Registry Officer communicates decision to student and School.

YES

Registry Officer communicates decision to student and School, with instruction that student must update address via eVision and notify Registry Student Support Officer when complete.
The Postgraduate Research Committee is asked to note the remit and membership of the Academic Monitoring Group (AMG). The AMG has institutional responsibility for the quality of the academic provision and student experience offered by the University – this covers undergraduate, taught postgraduate and research degrees.

As part of its annual monitoring activities the AMG receives evidence to evaluate the success of research degrees. The AMG is reviewing the evidence it considers and asks the Postgraduate Research Committee to comment on whether any additional evidence is required over and above the examples detailed below (extracted from the UK Quality Code, Chapter B11 Research Degrees).

- submission and completion times and rates, with account taken of any variations (for example relating to individual research students' circumstances, part-time programmes and the requirements of research councils, sponsors or other relevant bodies)
- pass, referral and fail rates
- withdrawal rates
- the number of appeals and complaints, the reasons for them, and how many are upheld
- analysis of comments from examiners
- recruitment profiles
- feedback from research students (as individuals and collectively), employers, sponsors and other
- external funders
- information on subsequent employment destinations and career paths of research students who have achieved the qualification.

Nicola Milton
Executive Officer to the Proctor

29 September 2015
ACADEMIC MONITORING GROUP

REMIT AND MEMBERSHIP

Remit
To be responsible to the Academic Assurance Group for the quality of the academic provision or student experience offered by the University taking cognisance of the University’s Strategy and SFC Outcome Agreement.

Internal Quality Framework

1. Receive and consider Annual Academic Monitoring reports and identifying issues or actions to be taken forward.
2. Receive and consider University-Led Reviews of Learning and Teaching (URLTs), reports, identifying issues or recommendations requiring further action.
3. Monitor issues and trends relating to the quality of modules and programmes through receipt of annual thematic reports from:
   a. External Examiners’ Reports (UG/PGT)
   b. Module Evaluation Reports (Proctor’s Questions)
   c. External Student Surveys: NSS, PTES, PRES, iGrad and DLHE
   d. Curriculum Approvals Group
4. Monitor issues and trends relating to student recruitment, progression and achievement through receipt of annual reports (and internal institutional data) on:
   a. Academic Misconduct
   b. Student Academic Appeals
   c. Student Academic Complaints
   d. Fitness to Practice Medicine
   e. Student Progression & Completion (UG/PGT/PGR)
5. Monitor study abroad and collaborative degree activity through receipt of annual reports on:
   a. Study Abroad, Placements & Exchanges
   b. Collaborations and [any Collaborative Agreement Renewals]
   c. Royal Conservatoire of Scotland
6. Identify good practice across all monitoring and review activity and disseminate as appropriate.

External Quality Framework

1. Lead the University’s engagement with periodical QAA Enhancement-Led Institutional Review and monitor the effective implementation of Review recommendations.
2. Ensure that the University complies with the UK Quality Code by undertaking a periodic mapping of its processes to the Code.
3. Ensure that the University complies with the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework and other external reference points such as Subject Benchmark Statements.

Reporting Lines
Submission of an Annual Report to the Learning & Teaching Committee and Postgraduate Research Committee.
Composition and Membership
Ex Officio
Vice-Principal Proctor (Convenor), Professor Lorna Milne
Dean of Arts/Divinity, Professor Paul Hibbert
Dean of Science, Professor Alan Dearle
Director of CAPOD & Quality Monitoring, Mrs Carol Morris
SRC Director of Representation, Mr Joe Tantillo
Executive Officer to the Proctor (Clerk), Mrs Nicola Milton

Nicola Milton
Executive Officer to the Proctor

28 September 2015
Last session, the Deans and Student Services developed a new policy on how to respond to and manage concerns regarding a student’s health or behaviour that is seriously impacting on themselves and/or others, and indicating that they may not be currently fit to study.

This policy has been submitted the September meeting of Academic Council in order that it can come into effect from the start of session. The paper is presented to the Postgraduate Research Committee for information.

Nicola Milton
Executive Officer to the Proctor

29 September 2015
UNIVERSITY OF ST ANDREWS

POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

POLICY ON FITNESS TO STUDY

Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to respond to and manage concerns regarding a student’s health or behaviour that is seriously impacting on themselves and/or others, and indicating that they may not be currently fit to study. The University aims to support such students through to successful completion of their studies where possible.

This policy encompasses concerns relating to currently registered students, prospective students, and summer students, and will be used when a concern is raised.

Raising a Concern

The University may become aware of a concern regarding a student’s fitness to study by a number of channels including self referral and referral by third parties.

Concerns should be raised with the Advice and Support Centre (ASC) in the first instance. ASC staff will refer the concerns to the appropriate member of Student Services staff (usually a Support Adviser) who will respond to the individual/s raising the concern; and contact the student.

Early Intervention prior to consideration of Fitness to Study

Student Services will assess the concern/s raised, check the student’s academic status and determine whether the situation can be resolved under academic regulations, or non-academic misconduct regulations. If there is a relevant academic or non-academic process, this will be implemented, alongside offering support and reasonable adjustment to the student to navigate this process, and monitor their health.

Where there are no relevant regulations, Student Services will inform the student of the concern/s raised, offering guidance and any available appropriate support. As a result of this guidance, the student may choose to take a Leave of Absence. Some students choose to continue their studies if the relevant support and monitoring (University or external) can be put in place, and the student agrees to engage with this. Student Services will discuss with the student what types of support and monitoring would be appropriate to their situation, which may include:

- Regular meetings with Student Services
- Engaging with relevant external health professionals
- Reviewing suitability of current accommodation situation
- Set points for review of the situation to ensure agreement is being complied with

If concerns re-emerge at any point, including where the student ceases to engage with support and monitoring, the situation will be re-assessed. This may result in decisions previously made being overturned (ie decision to allow to remain within a residence reviewed and student rehoused).

Fitness to Study Case Conference

If the student does not wish to take a Leave of Absence, and does not engage with the Early Intervention process or subsequent monitoring, Student Services will notify the student that their case will be considered at a Fitness to Study Case Conference. Student Services will compile the relevant available information for the purpose of generating a report and recommendation to inform this case conference. This would include:
• Any interaction with Student Services, including any existing disability record and medical documentation previously provided by the student
• Reports from any concerned individual witnesses (which may include academic staff, other students, parents)

In some cases, Student Services may request that the student meets with a University commissioned general practitioner or psychiatrist. These professionals would have a greater understanding of the University context than an external health professional might, and be able to make a more informed analysis of the student’s ability to engage with their studies.

The student will be given the opportunity to submit their perspective, either in person, or by a written statement. If support is required for attending or submitting a statement, the student may approach Student Services or the Education Advocate within the Students’ Association. Students should be aware that in the event that they do not attend or engage, the Proctor reserves the right to proceed in their absence.

At the Case Conference, the Proctor along with the Dean of the student’s Faculty (or for Faculty of Medicine students, the Dean of Science) will review the report from Student Services, and any information presented by the student.

Outcomes of a Fitness to Study Case Conference are:

1. The student can continue their studies with appropriate support;
2. The student chooses to take a Leave of Absence;
3. The student cannot currently continue their studies, and a compulsory Leave of Absence is required.

The outcome will be communicated to the student in person by the Director of Student Services, followed by written confirmation from the Proctor.

**The University’s Complaint Handling Procedure**

Any student who is dissatisfied with the University’s procedures following the conclusion of the Fitness to Study process should consult the University’s Complaints Policy at [http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/administration/complaints](http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/administration/complaints). Complaints should be directed in the first instance to the Dean of an alternative Faculty.
Process for assessing Fitness to Study

Concern indicated about a student’s health or behaviour that is impacting seriously on themselves and/or others

Early Intervention
Student Services assesses concerns, checks the student’s academic status and contacts student

Is there an appropriate academic or non-academic policy to address the concerns?

Yes

Relevant process referred to Offer support, make reasonable adjustments and monitor/review health

No

Does the student engage with Student Services? Can guidance and monitoring resolve the concern?

Yes

OR

Student agrees to take Leave of Absence

No

Student progresses with agreed monitoring

Concerns re-emerge

Student Services compiles relevant materials to formulate a report and recommendation for the Fitness to Study Case Conference, which may include:

- Student Services records (e.g. existing disability records and medical documentation provided by the student)
- Consultation with appropriate concerned individual witnesses – e.g. representation by parents, academic staff etc.
- External professional input may be commissioned where appropriate (e.g. a University-commissioned GP, Psychiatric Assessment, or Social Enquiry Report)

Student Services invites student to submit a statement and/or attend Fitness to Study Case Conference to offer their perspective

Fitness to Study Case Conference
Proctor and Dean of the Faculty (Dean of Science for Faculty of Medicine students) review Student Services report, alongside any information presented by student.

Student informed of outcome
In person by Director of Student Services (or delegate)
Written confirmation by Proctor

Student may make a complaint to a Dean not previously involved and thereafter progressed to VPGov
UNIVERSITY OF ST ANDREWS
POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE
POLICY ON GOOD ACADEMIC PRACTICE (UPDATES)

The following updates have been proposed following a review of the Good Academic Practice policy in August 2015 undertaken by the Pro Deans (Undergraduate), Dean of Arts & Divinity and Dean of Science.

These updates have been submitted the September meeting of Academic Council in order that the revised policy can come into effect from the start of session. The paper is presented to the Postgraduate Research Committee for information.

Lynn Balfour
Administrative Officer (Proctor’s Office)
17 September 2015
Page 2 - amendment

High Principle 14 (new)

Data relating to academic misconduct cases is treated confidentially. Information on outcomes is communicated only on a need-to-know basis.

Rationale: additional high principle clarifies how information and data relating to academic misconduct is handled.

Page 3 - amendment

- Taking electronic devices, software or materials into an examination venue (other than those specifically permitted), irrespective of whether or not any use of the item(s) was made.

Rationale: amend to exam venue following recent cases of academic misconduct where the misconduct itself took place outside of the examination hall, but still in the venue.

Page 6 - amendment

The student(s) concerned must be invited in writing and by email to attend the hearing with at least five working days' notice. Students have the right to defer the date of a board until after the examination period if the board is scheduled to occur in the week prior to, or during, the examination period. If a University closure, vacation or examination period begins within the five day period of notification, the convener of the Board will endeavour to convene the Board before the closure, vacation or examination period, unless the student requests that the Board be deferred. They must at that time be informed that the meeting concerns suspected academic misconduct, the type of misconduct suspected, and the piece(s) of work in which it is suspected. The student must also receive a copy of the Turnitin report, and/or any other supporting documentation where relevant.

Rationale: Add ‘supporting documentation’ as this wording assumes the Turnitin report is the only document the student should receive, when in fact, there are often documents such as ‘marked up’ pieces of work, and data sheets that the student should receive in advance of the hearing.

Page 8 – amendment

The University will endeavour to deal with any cases of alleged group academic misconduct involving more than two students (i.e. a ‘group’) in the same way as it would deal with any other incident of academic misconduct.

Rationale: Group misconduct is defined as ‘more than 2’ students, but policy does not advise on how to deal with misconduct involving 2 students, therefore removing number of students avoids confusion.
If the suspected misconduct involves a student’s exam script, the anonymised script(s) will be sent to the School by the School Representative to be internally marked as normal, with no information about the possible academic misconduct - marking should proceed at this point without bias or prejudice. Once a mark has been given, the marker will then be asked to review the mark based on the report submitted by the Chief Invigilator. The marker will report to the AMO on the extent to which any unauthorised material was relevant to the examination and whether it appears to have been used by the student(s).

Rationale: There has been confusion about waiting until scripts were marked to pursue a case, when incident did not involve script e.g. possession of mobile phone.

Lynn Balfour  
Administrative Officer (Proctor’s Office)  
17 September 2015
Annual Institutional Statement of Internal Subject Review  
for Academic Year 2014-15

Response to the Scottish Funding Council for the University of St Andrews

1. Introduction

During the spring of 2015 the University participated in ELIR. The University prepared for this review in consultation with academic and professional staff, and students, and was delighted to receive a judgement from the review team that: ‘The University of St Andrews has effective arrangements for managing academic standards and the student learning experience. These arrangements are likely to continue to be effective in the future.’ A number of pleasing commendations were made along with helpful recommendations in areas where the University recognises that there is further work to be done. These outcomes will be used to help shape the agenda of the Learning & Teaching Committee over the next year. The University was pleased to note a step change in this most recent cycle of the ELIR process, with quality assurance matters being addressed early in the visits, allowing for a focus on enhancement for the remainder of the review dialogue.

The University provided detail on the BA International Honours programme as its case study for ELIR. This is a fully-integrated joint degree programme where students spend two years in St Andrews and two years at the College of William & Mary in Virginia, USA, providing students with a rich academic, cultural and social experience. We congratulated our first cohort of graduates from the programme in June this year.

The Academic Monitoring Group (AMG) continues to operate efficiently with its reporting line to Court clear and effective. The external member of the AMG has recently come to the end of her term, and the opportunity was taken to reconsider this role. AMG agreed not to appoint an external member to attend regular meetings, but rather to consult appropriate colleagues across the sector in the event that an agenda topic warrants an external perspective.

2. Enhancements to University-led Reviews of Learning & Teaching (URLT)

As part of an interim review of URLTs during 2014/15 to fine-tune previous process amendments, AMG agreed that the URLT working dinner and review meetings should be formally chaired by the Dean of Faculty. It was also agreed that a short descriptor of each team member’s role should be provided as part of a revised guideline.

For the first time this year an International view was included as part of a URLT. The School of Mathematics & Statistics invited an eminent colleague from the USA to visit the School ahead of the formal review. The visitor met with staff and students, observed teaching, attended a Student-Staff Consultative Committee and delivered a talk attended by staff and students. A short report was provided by him in advance of the scheduled URLT review day, and circulated to the review team as part of the advance documentation. In light of the success of this additional aspect to URLTs, the AMG agreed that an international view would be included in future URLTs where the discipline under review considered it would be beneficial.
Review teams are carefully appointed at this University and always include the Dean of Arts & Divinity or Dean of Science or may include both where the discipline sits across two faculties. For academic year 2015/16 the University has appointed a new Dean of Arts & Divinity. To ease the transition into the role of chair of URLTs, the new Dean of Arts & Divinity will attend the first review of the year (School of Psychology & Neuroscience) that will be chaired by the Dean of Science in order to gain a better understanding of the process. This has also prompted the creation of a URLT Guideline for Deans to aid greater understanding of their role. Particular attention will also be paid to the gender balance of review teams this next year as it was brought to AMG’s attention by the student Director of Representation that, on occasion in 2014-15, the teams were not as well balanced as they might have been. This is often due to candidates’ availability, but this issue will be carefully monitored in 2015-16.


Schools and student-facing units reviewed this year are listed below along with a general comment on the outcomes of these processes. The University continues to include student-facing service units in its schedule for internal review as it has done for many years. The guideline for URLTs developed last year aimed at providing information and advice specifically for student-facing units in preparation for review and was used for the first time for the review of Student Services. Acting on feedback following this review, the guideline has been adjusted for clarity and will now also provide a descriptor of each review team member’s role.

3.1 Economics & Finance
Following a review of Taught Postgraduate Programmes in the School of Economics & Finance described in last year’s report to the SFC, a full URLT of this School was held early in 2014-15. The review team commended the School for action taken in response to the review of taught postgraduate programmes which was beginning to bear fruit, but reported concerns regarding learning and teaching which were evidenced by a poor showing in the NSS in 2014. The School is being supported in addressing these concerns, particularly through the management of the School, creation of a more flexible curriculum, and introduction of more innovative forms of assessment that will help students better to develop a range of skills in communicating their ideas. A new Head of School, appointed in January 2015, is tasked with forging ahead with a response to the review report recommendations. Regular meetings with the Proctor and Deans have confirmed positive progress. Limited Confidence reported

3.2 Film Studies
The Department of Film Studies has existed at the University for 10 years. Until recently the subject was only available as a Joint Honours option, but in academic year 2014-15 existing students had the option to switch to Single Honours Film Studies, and in September 2015 the department will welcome its first cohort of incoming Single Honours students. The Department was commended for its high level of curricular innovation, the integration of staff research into teaching and its strong, supportive and intellectually stimulating community. Within a group of relatively minor recommendations made, the Department was asked to address concerns regarding the management of teaching/administration responsibilities and over-reliance on junior staff members and postgraduate tutors. For these reasons a caveat was applied to the ‘confidence’ judgement. These recommendations will be discussed during the Department’s annual academic monitoring dialogue with the AMG in September. Confidence (with caveat) reported
3.3 Mathematics & Statistics
The School of Mathematics & Statistics was the pilot School for the (successful) introduction of a view of an international colleague to the URLT (as described in 2 above). The review of this School was extremely positive with external members of the review team describing the curriculum as ‘of the highest quality and as good as any in UK universities’ and ‘the final level of material in the MMath allowing for direct access to PhD programmes anywhere in the world’. The excellence of the student intake was commended along with the range of entry levels and strong progression rates. Recommendations included providing learning & teaching activities that are less traditional and to consider providing a greater diversity in continuous assessment to provide greater breadth of opportunity.  

Confidence reported

3.4 Modern Languages
The School of Modern Languages is home to six departments (Arabic and Persian, French, German, Italian, Russian, and Spanish), seven taught languages, a variety of taught postgraduate (PGT) courses as well as a team-taught Comparative Literature programme. The School offers excellent research-led teaching, with staff and students alike demonstrating strong engagement in, and enthusiasm for, learning, teaching and research. Commendations included the introduction of an overarching language Syllabus Review Group that aims to strengthen cohesion and progression of the School’s curriculum and a focus on small-class teaching with a broad variety of interactive teaching styles. Recommendations included reviewing how the School responds to feedback by introducing a transparent process so that students feel they are heard. The School was also encouraged to explore and address differences in staff and undergraduate perception in relation to the content and scope of a language degree in terms of language and literature.  

Confidence reported

3.5 Student Services
The review considered the range of services provided by Student Services, including welfare, discipline, residential, specialist advising (disability, academic, finance, international, immigration) and counselling. Overall the review team found that Student Services is a well-led unit that provides excellence in the quality of its services to students and staff. The adoption of a sector-leading, innovative and holistic approach to these services enables staff outwith the unit to have confidence that the advice provided supports students well, whatever their circumstances, in making the most of the educational opportunities provided at the University of St Andrews. The review team viewed Student Services as having a clear mission, vision and understanding of the current and long-term challenges, with clear outcome measures and reporting, demonstrating the value of the work of Student Services for the wider University. Minor recommendations included continuing with the work currently being undertaken regarding the University’s mental health policy, and reviewing how the unit collects, analyses and reports on student and staff feedback on their services.  

Confidence reported

3.6 Next Steps
Each School/Unit reviewed is required to create an action plan (on a template provided) in response to recommendations made within an agreed timescale. The Director of CAPOD & Quality Monitoring follows up on the action plan and reports back to AMG on satisfactory progress. In the rare circumstances where satisfactory progress is not demonstrated, further action is taken by the Dean of Faculty. As usual, a document drawing together themes and issues emerging from the above reviews has been prepared during the summer months for consideration at the first AMG of 2015-16. It is the intention to include any noteworthy activity in the Annual Monitoring Dissemination Event.
4. Schedule for University Reviews of Learning & Teaching for academic year 2015-16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic School</th>
<th>Service Unit/Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music (Sub-Honours modules only as there is no degree programme)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Monitoring and Review of Collaborative Programmes

Although we have previously monitored collaborative programmes as part of URLTs, during 2014-15 we implemented a 5-step framework designed specifically for review of collaborate programmes. The five points of academic review are: Approval; Implementation; First Review; Annual Monitoring and Review; and Agreement Renewal Review. During 2014-15 two programmes were at the First Review stage: MLitt in German and Comparative Literature, and MSc in Dependable Software. Both reviews were led by the Pro Dean (Taught Postgraduate) and considered a range of aspects of the programme including recruitment, admissions, student performance, assessment and feedback, project supervision and the transition between institutions.

5.1 MLitt in German and Comparative Literature (School of Modern Languages)
This international 2-year degree is offered in cooperation with the University of Bonn, with students spending year 1 in Germany and year 2 in Scotland. The programme gives students an introduction to traditions and methodologies of Comparative Literature studies in the UK and Germany and has a strong emphasis on research skills. The management of the programme was found to be excellent with high levels of student satisfaction, particularly in supervision. Recommendations were mainly at an operational level, but the School is encouraged to ensure there is external examiner oversight at a programme level in addition to module level.

5.2 MSc in Dependable Software Systems (School of Computer Science)
This Double Erasmus Mundus MSc programme has an objective of providing students with the knowledge, skill and in-depth technical understanding of the key concepts required to design and build dependable software systems. Participating institutions are the National University of Ireland Maynooth, Université de Lorraine and the University of St Andrews. Overall the management of the programme was found to be excellent with good communication between participating institutions and healthy recruitment. However, as funding for the programme will cease in 2017, consideration is now being given to its continuation and other potential alternatives.

6. Annual Academic Monitoring

The annual academic monitoring process continues to be effective with a reporting deadline of end June. The format of the dissemination event held in October has increased in popularity. In previous years we have invited Directors of Teaching and one other interested colleague from each School to attend. However, due to demand, we will be opening up the event to a larger audience in October 2015 and will include positive practice identified from URLTs as well as AAM reports.
7. Development needs/good practice identified from review processes

7.1 Annual Academic Monitoring
The University continues to scrutinise reports from annual academic monitoring and URLTs to identify areas of good practice and development needs. These outcomes are used to help inform the agenda for the Learning & Teaching Committee, the Academic Monitoring Group and provide options for the annual dissemination event held in October each year. For example, areas of good practice shared with others at the dissemination event in October 2014 included: *integrating careers and employability into the curriculum* (Geography and Geosciences); *dissertation conference day* (Geography & Geosciences); *building a skills matrix in degree programmes* (Biology); *diagnostics for entrant students* (Music); *pre-entry online resources* (Social Anthropology).

7.2 Key themes emerging from 4 URLTs held in 2014-15:

**Positive practice:**
- All 4 disciplines have been undergoing some form of review and redesign of curriculum
- Integration of staff research into teaching
- Availability and approachability of staff
- Three out of four reviews commended excellent student-staff relationships
- Two reviews commended engagement with employability skills
- Two reviews commended strong engagement with enhancement themes

**Areas for development identified from reviews in 2014-15, but potentially being applicable to all disciplines:**
- Provision of more discipline-specific training for tutors
- Reflection on whether all stated learning outcomes are being delivered
- Introduction of less conservative forms of assessment to help students develop a wide range of skills
- Helping students to identify and articulate skills gained

8. Diversity in the Curriculum/Equality of Opportunity

An update of the suite of high impacting equality initiatives being undertaken at the University follows:

**Athena SWAN Charter**
In addition to the University’s institutional award, in Sep 2014, Chemistry was awarded Silver; Mathematics & Statistics awarded Bronze; and Psychology & Neuroscience awarded Bronze. All STEM Schools are working on Athena SWAN with all to be submitted by Nov 2015, with Schools in the Arts & Humanities to apply from April 2016 ([http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/hr/edi/sex_gender/athenaswansupport/](http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/hr/edi/sex_gender/athenaswansupport/)).

**Inclusive Curriculum Toolkit**
Utilised by our Directors of Teaching, the online guidance was further updated in May 2015 to be in line with latest guidance from the ECU and HEA ‘Embedding Equality into the Curriculum’ events ([http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/hr/edi/inclusivecurriculum/](http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/hr/edi/inclusivecurriculum/)).
LGBT Scotland Charter Mark
Work is being undertaken to renew the charter through work with the student LGBT Society and by working with professional service units to ensure that services and policies are LGBT compliant (http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/hr/edi/sexualorientation/charter/).

Race Equality Charter Mark (pilot)
Chaired by the Vice-Principal (Enterprise and Engagement) the group involves academics, professional staff, Student Director of Representation, and Student Representative Council for Race Equality, which ran from Jun 2014 to Apr 2015 (http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/hr/edi/race/charter/).

Aligned to the ‘Scottish Specific Duties (2012)’ and the ‘SFC Outcome Agreement’, strategic and operational equality actions are monitored monthly by the Vice-Principal (Governance & Planning); Chief Legal Officer; Director of HR; HR E&D Officer (Head of E&D); and Trades Unions. It is presented to the Lay Court Members and the Principal at the Remuneration and HR Committee with senior academic support by our two Vice-Principal Equality Champions, VP (Research) and VP (Enterprise and Engagement) (http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/hr/edi/equalityschemeandpolicies/reports/).

Stonewall Diversity Champion Award
The University recently gained the award (June 2015) and will be making a ‘Workplace Equality Index’ submission in September 2015 (http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/hr/edi/sexualorientation/stonewall/).

Training & Awareness
‘Unconscious Bias’ understanding is built into training provision with content from the ECU and the School of Psychology & Neuroscience professors. A staff online module ‘Diversity in the Workplace – HE’ has been updated (May 2015). An online Recruitment Training module is due to be live by August 2015, plus an online Student Diversity Training module for all new 2015/16 incoming students.

Student Diversity Data
We should also note that we consider data relating to student diversity in the process of academic monitoring. This data comes to Academic Monitoring Group as part of the data set for annual academic monitoring.

9. PSRB Accreditation 2014-15

The School of Management has recently gained accreditation from the CIPD for its MLitt in Human Resource Management.

No other reviews by PSRBs were held during academic year 2014-15.

10. Monitoring and Analysis of Data

The University has set up a working group to address the need for better structured, self-service management reports that integrate key institutional data sets (such as student lifecycle, finance, research, estate, human resources, knowledge exchange and reputation). A programme of administrative and IT projects was initiated with the aim of streamlining and automating a suite of processes relating to the student lifecycle from admission to graduation as well as curriculum development. Following a slow start,
work is now progressing well and wave 1 of the works was completed in June 2015 under the auspices of the Senate Efficiency Review (SER) programme. The remaining work has an expected end date of September 2016. The SER programme of work will enhance our capacity for self-evaluation by supporting, informing and streamlining University processes and information management.

10.1 Measures of Teaching Quality
As reported last year, the University was creating a Teaching Quality Factsheet to give a snapshot of key information that could be used for various purposes. Each School was provided with a Teaching Quality Factsheet for the first time this academic year. Initial feedback has been positive in the main, with suggestions provided by Schools on what else could usefully be included. It has been agreed by AMG that the factsheet should be produced early in September each year.

10.2 NSS
The University participated in the NSS for the ninth time in 2014 and again performed well, with an overall first in Scotland and joint first in the UK, moving up one place from the previous year. Five St Andrews subjects – Computer Science, Geography, Biology, Anthropology and Divinity – achieved satisfaction levels of 100%. St Andrews students gave the University high marks for course teaching, the organisation and management of their programmes, academic support and learning resources.

As is normal practice for the University, our Statistical Analysis & Benchmarking Team prepares NSS reports for each individual discipline, with a comparison to previous years and to other disciplines in the institution. This analysis plays a crucial part in dialogue at strategic planning meetings and is included as part of the advance documentation for URLTs. Schools will investigate any aspects of the analysis where scores are outwith what would normally be expected for this institution or their discipline, and be pro-active in seeking an improvement in the following year.

10.3 iGrad
The University has participated in iGrad for 6 years and used the resulting data to help identify particular areas for action in respect to improving the student experience. After reflecting on the analyses for the last 2-3 years and noting little meaningful change, the University decided not to participate in 2014-15. The current aim is to participate again in 2016-17.

11. Student Participation
Students continue to be represented on all major committees (typically via the Students’ Association President and Director of Representation), and continue to be involved in any major initiatives, academic or otherwise. The School Presidents system continues to function well. They now have a key role in gathering student opinion prior to URLTs and submitting a short paper that is included in the advance documentation for these reviews. The Director of Representation continues to represent taught students on the panel for each URLT and this helps to provide him/her with an insight into the management of Academic Schools.

11.1 Collaboration Statement
For 2015-16, the Vice-Principal (Proctor) and Students’ Association Director of Representation have agreed the three main topics that will form an over-arching focus for staff-student collaborations under a general heading of Quality Enhancement. These topics are: feedback; early provision of study information for
students; and dissertation supervision. The Collaboration Statement agreed in May 2015 can be found on the following link http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/st teaching/strategypolicy/collaboration/.

11.2 Teaching Awards
For the third year running the University and Students’ Association held a joint ceremony for the delivery of the Student-Led Teaching Awards and the University’s Teaching Excellence Awards. These awards are increasingly well-supported by students and staff. The Proctor’s Award is also presented at this ceremony. This award is a collaboration between the Students’ Association and the Proctor’s Office that rewards commitment in enhancing learning and teaching by a student, particularly a class representative or School President. Information on winners is provided on both the University and Students’ Association webpages: http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/staff/teaching/funding/excellence/

CAROL A. MORRIS
Director of CAPOD & Quality Monitoring
(Centre for Academic, Professional & Organisational Development)
August 2015
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Grade Point Average: Report on Pilot Scheme
Earlier this year, the HEA published its Report of the Grade Point Average Pilot Project, a project chaired by Sir Bob Burgess and sponsored by the HEA. It is a self-contained, self-explanatory report and can be found at: https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/resource/grade-point-average-report-gpa-pilot-project-2013-14 The Report recommends that a GPA system should be adopted across the UK Higher Education Sector, and that it should run initially in tandem with the current system for Degree Classification (First, Upper Second, etc). Discussion is invited across the sector to inform further thinking and possibly policy-making. At the September meeting of Academic Council there will be debate about the report, its recommendations, their significance for the sector and possible impact on St Andrews.

QAA Characteristics Statements

Laidlaw Launch Event
The first of two leadership weekends, part of the Laidlaw Undergraduate Internship Programme in Research and Leadership, took place on 25 and 26 April 2015. The first day was themed as a leadership introduction, and included sessions on leadership values and behaviours, giving and receiving feedback, academic leadership and leadership styles. It featured valuable contributions from Dr Morven Shearer (Medicine) and Prof Derek Duncan (Modern Languages.) The second day focused on leadership skills and featured sessions on horizon scanning, creativity, problem solving and practical leadership exercises. The interns rated the weekend positively, and the second weekend takes place on 3 & 4 October 2015. The poster presentation and launch event for next summer’s Interns will take place on Tuesday 27 October 2015 and will be attended by Lord Laidlaw. This is an open event and Directors of Teaching are welcome to attend.

Teaching Development Fund
The next deadline for applications is 19 October 2015. Applications are invited for projects that focus on the following Proctor’s Priorities:

- Shared nature of responsibility for excellence in Learning and Teaching
- Streamlining processes and reducing bureaucracy around Learning and Teaching

Further information about the application process can be found at: http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/staff/teaching/funding/availablefunding/development/howtoapply/
Funded Projects

In 2014-15, the Teaching Development Fund panel awarded funding to seven projects. Details about these projects can be found below.

• **'Toolkit for the creation of Digital Exhibitions’**  
  (Art History, Computer Science, History, Classics)  
  This project will develop a toolkit for the creation of digital exhibitions, which enable digital 3D Objects and Scenes to be combined with text, audio and videos to provide an engaging educational experience for use in Undergraduate and Postgraduate learning, teaching and research.  
  **Project Lead:** Alan Miller ahr1@st-andrews.ac.uk

• **‘Read Me! A self-correcting online resource to consolidate skills in reading pre-modern handwriting for MLitt students in History’**  
  (English, Library, Computer Science)  
  This project will create a short series of online exercises in reading pre-modern handwriting using original materials held in Special Collections, to be used in support of teaching of MLitt students in History  
  **Project Lead:** Margaret Connolly mc29@st-andrews.ac.uk

• **‘Constructing Academic Identities’**  
  (ELT)  
  This project will help students to understand their academic identity as a student at the University of St Andrews through reflection on their development of transferable skills and increasing subject knowledge, gained while creating and participating in a British Science Week (BSW) event.  
  **Project Lead:** Kerith George-Briant kmg11@st-andrews.ac.uk

• **‘Building Student Confidence Using VERP (Video Enhanced Reflective Practice)’**  
  (Music, Social Anthropology, Management)  
  This project application is for a pilot training for staff in using Video Enhanced Reflective Practice, a teaching methodology that uses video feedback to help students to identify performance strengths and weaknesses and subsequently to identify how they can improve their performance in a particular task.  
  **Project Lead:** Jane Pettegree jkp1@st-andrews.ac.uk

• **‘Visualising Environmental Change’**  
  (Geography & Sustainable Development, Computer Science)  
  A student-led project to disseminate our understanding of how the environment has changed in the past, and is changing today, using innovative technologies.  
  **Project Lead:** Ian Lawson itl2@st-andrews.ac.uk

• **‘Recording the Past’**  
  (History)  
  A scheme to offer students in the School of History the opportunity to produce a television documentary in lieu of the conventional, final year dissertation.  
  **Project Lead:** Gerard DeGroot gjdg@st-andrews.ac.uk

• **‘Specifying a system for the capture of assessed student presentations in audio with video’**  
  The project will develop, trial and report on the specification of an audio visual capture system that can be used by all Schools to record assessed student presentations in a manner that meets the University’s policy on assessment and can be used to provide formative feedback to students.  
  **Project Lead:** Charles Lovatt cl210@st-andrews.ac.uk
Undergraduate Research Assistant Scheme
In 2014-15 over 90 projects were funded through the new Undergraduate Research Assistant Scheme. Feedback about the scheme has been very positive: reports will be posted to the web at https://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/students/academic/internships/researchassistantscheme/
A call is currently out for applications for projects in either S1, S2 or summer 2016.

Enhancement Theme: Student Transitions
A range of activities are planned for 2015-16 and 2016-17 to enhance the following transitions at institutional level:

- The transition from student to professional
- Transition through collaborative programmes
- The transition from taught postgraduate study to research postgraduate study

Staff and students are encouraged to come up with their own ideas for events, initiatives and projects that aim to support and enhance the following transitions:

- The transition from pupil to student
- The transition from abroad to St Andrews
- Transitions from the perspective of under-represented groups
- Unexpected transitions
- The transition from dependent to independent learner
- The transition from University accommodation to private accommodation

Funding of up to £500 is available. Application deadlines are 19 October 2015 and 7 March 2016. Further information is available via www.st-andrews.ac.uk/staff/teaching/funding/availablefunding/enhancement/funding/

New Programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/Dept</th>
<th>Degree Award</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>With effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>MA Hons</td>
<td>Archaeology and Anthropology</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>MPhil</td>
<td>Artificial Intelligence</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>MPhil</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>MPhil</td>
<td>Computing and Information Technology</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>MPhil</td>
<td>Human Computer Interaction</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>MPhil</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>MPhil</td>
<td>Information Technology with Management</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>MPhil</td>
<td>Networks and Distributed Systems</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>MPhil</td>
<td>Software Engineering</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Medicine</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>Gateway to Medicine</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Programme Withdrawals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/Dept</th>
<th>Degree Award</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>With effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Physics &amp; Astronomy</td>
<td>European MSc</td>
<td>Photonics (EMSP)</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Awaiting Academic Council approval

Nicola Milton, Executive Officer to the Proctor
24 September 2015
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Remit and Membership
The Postgraduate Research Committee (PGRC) has its own website at: https://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/staff/teaching/committees/pgresearchcommittee/ The website features agendas, minutes and reports and is updated following each meeting. Information on the activities of short-life Working Groups will be made available electronically to ensure that members are kept informed and can contribute to specific developments. Members are recorded as present – other staff, for example, Heads of Service Units, attend as advisors to the PGRC for their current area of responsibility and are therefore recorded in the minutes as ‘in attendance’. Student representatives serve as full members and are eligible to vote.

Events/Working Groups
The PGRC plays a key role in implementing the academic and supporting strategies but much of this activity is delegated. There are three main forms of devolved activity:

- **Fora:** ongoing groups with the function of identifying and disseminating best practice; considering issues highlighted by the Vice-Principal (Proctor). Current fora include the Academic Forum and lunches for Directors of Postgraduate Studies.

- **Short-Life Working Groups:** usually with a relatively small number of members tasked on behalf of the Vice-Principal (Proctor) to develop policies and/or implementation plans in areas of significant strategic importance, e.g. recommendations from the 2015 QAA Enhancement-Led Institutional Review (ELIR). The remit, timetables and reporting mechanisms are determined by the Vice-Principal (Proctor).

- **Projects:** activity related to a specific target with one of the strategic themes, usually taken forward by an individual or group on behalf of the University. The remit, timetables and reporting mechanisms are determined by the Vice-Principal (Proctor).

Academic Business Committee
The Academic Business Committee facilitates and supports the business of the PGRC by drafting papers, agreeing the agenda, proposing an annual schedule of business and coordinating the implementation of new policies approved at PGRC. The full remit and membership for this Committee can be found at: https://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/staff/teaching/committees/

Notice of Meetings
The PGRC meets five times per academic year and will be aligned with the meeting dates for Academic Council. A schedule of meetings for each academic year is issued in May/June of the previous session. Meetings are usually scheduled for 2 hours (2pm-4pm) but may run over if more detailed discussion of particular items is required. Tea and coffee is available from 1.30pm to give members the opportunity to network with colleagues in advance of each meeting.

The meeting dates for 2015-16 are as follows (all meetings will be held in Parliament Hall):

- Wed 14 Oct 15
- Wed 25 Nov 15
- Wed 10 Feb 16
- Wed 13 Apr 16
- Tues 3 May 16
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Typical Meeting Structure
The order of business at each PGRC meeting typically proceeds in the following order:-

- Welcome and Apologies
- Minutes of the Previous Meeting
- Matters Arising
- Items of Strategy & Policy
- Papers for Information [including Proctor’s Update]
- PGR Developments in Schools
- Next Meeting: Date and Key Items

There is usually no discussion on the ‘Papers for Information’ and there is no ‘Any Other Competent Business’. Items being proposed by someone other than a PGRC member will be brought to the top of the agenda so that the proposer does not need to remain for the duration of the entire meeting. On occasion, meetings may be preceded by a presentation on a particular topic which may be of interest to members.

The main focus of business for the PGRC in 2015-16 will be:

- Progress Review
- Fieldwork
- Length of Study
- Re-Registration
- PGR HEAR

Agenda and Papers
Agenda items considered by the PGRC are a combination of University-level issues and issued raised by Schools, Units and students. Major items are identified as far as possible in advance with the schedule of key activities being considered by the PGRC at the first meeting of the year. The agenda for each meeting highlights the main items for consideration at the subsequent meeting.

Although slots on the agenda will always be available for issues to be raised by Schools, Units and students, most of the agenda is usually given over to institutional matters relating to the academic and/or supporting strategies or items identified by the Academic Business Committee.

Notifying Agenda Items
The agenda is typically set three weeks in advance of each meeting: possible items should be notified to the Clerk prior to this date. Items notified to the Clerk ten days or less before the meeting will be included on the agenda only with the prior agreement of the Convenor; otherwise, they will be held over until the next meeting.

The Convenor and the Clerk will determine whether notified items are matters for the PGRC or for another group (typically the Academic Monitoring Group).

Members are requested to identify all matters to the Clerk in advance of the meeting, including any urgent, last minute issues, in preference to tabling papers or raising matters not previously notified to the Clerk.

Preparation of Papers
Papers are prepared by the Convenor and the Clerk in conjunction with other members of the PGRC or individuals outwith the PGRC as appropriate.

PGRC members, or other colleagues, who would like to present a paper to the PGRC for consideration should contact the Clerk in the first instance. The Clerk will liaise with the Convenor to determine whether or not the paper should be forwarded to PGRC for consideration. If the paper is accepted the Clerk will advise on details such as the meeting at which the paper will be considered and the format of the paper. Proposers of papers will be invited to introduce their paper at the meeting.
Circulation of agenda and papers
The agenda and papers are circulated two weeks in advance of each meeting. Additional circulations, typically including ‘to follow’ papers are kept to a minimum, but on some occasions are unavoidable. Strategic or significantly important papers will not be “to follow”.

Voting and Decision-Making
PGRC may discuss matters on which there is no clear agreement. On matters requiring a decision, the PGRC will operate on the basis of a broad consensus. If there is no broad consensus the Convenor will decide whether a vote should be taken or the issue is deferred to a subsequent meeting for further, more detailed discussion.

When an item requires a decision outwith a scheduled meeting, the Convenor will determine the decision to be taken and if possible will do so in consultation with members of the PGRC. Any decision taken will be notified to the next meeting.

Substitute Attendance
Members who are unable to attend a meeting of the PGRC should notify the Clerk in advance and should nominate a substitute to attend in their place. Members and their substitutes should discuss any items requiring a collective view in advance of the meeting so that the substitute can respond on behalf of the School or Unit. In the absence of the Convenor, the Provost or one of the Deans will undertake the role.

Quorum
The quorum of the PGRC is 50% of the membership (excluding those “in attendance”). Coopted members are not included in the quorum.

Reporting to Academic Council and Court
Academic Council
The minute from the PGRC is sent to Academic Council usually for information only although Academic Council can raise any matter for discussion at the meeting. Any substantial changes to policies and/or Senate Regulations require Academic Council approval.

Each Academic Council meeting features an item for discussion. Topics are based on matters of concern to the University as a whole are determined by the Senate Business Committee in advance. This can include discussion on postgraduate research issues. Views emerging from this will be fed back to the PGRC.

Court
Policy issues relating to postgraduate research students are not normally discussed at Court however it does consider the Annual Institutional Statement of Internal Subject Review required by the Scottish Funding Council and must approve the Statement prior to submission. Monitoring of learning and teaching and postgraduate research provision is overseen by the Academic Assurance Group which reports annually to the Audit & Risk Committee.

Reporting to Schools, Units and Students
Discussions and decisions relating to the PGRC meetings must be reported to Schools, Units and students. Such reporting is the responsibility of the representatives on the PGRC. All PGRC decisions and discussions should be communicated widely: paperwork and outcomes of debates are very rarely identified as confidential. Following each PGRC meeting, the Clerk will liaise with the Academic Business Committee regarding the information which may have to be communicated more widely across the University.

Each Director of Postgraduate Studies should ensure that his or her Head of School is informed of pertinent issues and decisions so that the Head of School can in turn contribute to Academic Council discussions of these matters. Heads of Units should ensure that colleagues are properly informed.
**Reporting to the PGRC**
Members are responsible for circulating PGRC papers within their Schools and Units as appropriate and for ensuring that the responses communicated at the meeting are representative of the shared view of those consulted not the personal opinion of the individual PGRC member.

**Participation in Working Groups, Projects and Fora**
Much of PGRC’s work is now taken forward by Working Groups. PGRC members are encouraged to invite their colleagues to participate in the activities therefore providing a wide spectrum of views and experiences. PGRC members will be regularly updated on the issues being considered by the Working Groups and advised of the timescales for being able to input into the discussions.

**Other Committees/Groups**
Within the University, there are other groups whose functions are related to research postgraduate issues and the student experience, eg the Academic Monitoring Group and the Service Directors’ Group (Student Experience). The PGRC engages with both of these groups, the links between the PGRC and these groups being facilitated by joint membership.

**Annual Timetable**
At the first meeting of the year, a PGRC review report is produced which summarises the key activities and achievements of the previous session. The report also identifies the key strategic issues to be considered by the PGRC in the forthcoming session, together with targets and timescales.

---

Nicola Milton  
Executive Officer to the Proctor

29 September 2015

---

**Key contacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lorna Milne</td>
<td>Vice-Principal (Proctor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convenor of the Postgraduate Research Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Email: &lt;proctor&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmy Feamster</td>
<td>Administrative Officer (Postgraduate), Proctor’s Office Clerk to the Postgraduate Research Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Email: &lt;deansoffice&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Postgraduate Research Committee is advised that the following Working Groups will be taking forward pieces of work during 2015-16.

Nicola Milton
Executive Officer to the Proctor
23 September 2015
### Academic Alerts

**Background Information**
A survey carried out by the Extenuating Circumstances Working Group showed that Academic Alerts are not being used consistently across Schools, and a key theme from DoTs was a request for additional guidance on when to issue different levels of Alerts. It was agreed that a Working Group consider these issues.

**Remit**
- Establish how Academic Alerts are used for the various purposes and through what mechanisms for both UG and PG students; to review systems to ensure that resultant communications are not unnecessarily duplicated, or potential communications gaps left.
- Review use of Alerts system by Schools to see whether it is being used appropriately, or whether/how Schools can be supported to use the system consistently.
- Consider the current wording of the Academic Alerts and what the significance is to the students of each level, and if changes should be made.
- Scope work that needs to be carried out to improve Academic Alert system.

**Membership**
- Gerald Prescott (Biology), Convener
- Becky Ballantyne (Registry)*
- Lisa Jones, (Philosophy)
- Aidan Naughton (Pro Dean Sci UG)
- James Palmer (Pro Provost)
- Maggie Winton (Student Services)
- Joe Tantillo (SRC DoRep)

**Reporting Timescales**
LTC: 7 Oct 15
PGRC: 14 Oct 15

*New Registry rep tbc
Additional members may be co-opted to contribute to implementation

---

### Credit-bearing Work Placements

**Background Information**
In St Andrews, degree programmes or modules involving Work Placements are well established in some Schools and a newer development in others. Currently, there is no University guidance on the operation of Work Placements, and practice varies considerably across Schools. Work Placements are a growth area, but one in which universities face increasing complexity, in the context of the QAA’s Chapter B10, UKVI, Erasmus+, and student funding regulations.

**Remit**
- Gather/share good practice from Schools with established Work Placement programmes.
- Compile University guidelines on the operation of Work Placements which will help ensure consistency where appropriate and assist School establishing new Work Placement programmes.
- Ensure practices are in line with the QAA guidance in Chapter B10.
- Review the financial arrangements associated with Work Placements including tuition fee funding.
- Ensure the University is compliant with UKVI regulations.

**Membership**
- tbc
  - Sam Lister (Registry), Convener
  - Study Abroad Officer
  - Sam Mansell (Pro Dean UG Arts)
  - Reps from Biology, Chemistry, Modern Languages

**Reporting Timescales**
Report to Academic Business Committee: end of S1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working Group</th>
<th>Background Information/Remit</th>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Reporting Timescales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Education for Sustainable Development** | **Background Information**
In Jun14 the QAA and HEA published guidance for HEIs: ‘Education for Sustainable Development’. It was agreed that a Working Group be established to consider how this guidance could be used within St Andrews.

**Remit**
- Raise awareness of the new QAA guidelines for delivery of education for sustainable development within Higher Education in the UK.
- Assess the extent and form of Learning for Sustainability taught across the University of St Andrews.
- Establish a monitoring process to measure progress in Learning for Sustainability.
- Develop a strategy to encourage embedding of Learning for Sustainability as part of scholarship and a whole institutional sustainability policy. | Iain Matthews (Pro Dean Adv), Convenor
Rehema White (Geog & SD)
Tony Crook (Social Anthropology)
Graham Kirby (Computer Science)
Shona Russell (Management)
Rebecca Sweetman (Classics)
Joe Tantillo (SRC DoRep) | tbc |

| **Fieldwork Status for Postgraduate Research Students** | **Background Information**
In Dec14 it was proposed that there should be a review of fieldwork status and the generation of fieldwork fees. It was argued that the cost of a PhD is the equivalent of 36 months of full-time fees, therefore reduced fees for fieldworks is irrelevant. If a student finishes early, there is no reduction and no refund. If a student requires part-time status due to fieldwork this should be dealt with through Change in Mode of Attendance. It was agreed that a Working Group review fieldwork status and associated issues.

**Remit**
- Review current provisions for fieldwork in Schools/Departments where it forms an important aspect of the PhD.
- Determine the most common arrangements for supervision, and average load of engagement (full-time, half-time, etc), while on fieldwork.
- Develop policy and guidance for how to figure fieldwork in to fee status and length of study. | Roy Dilley (Soc Anthro), Convenor
Emmy Feamster (Proctor’s Office)
Rick Fawn (International Relations)
Eric Bowman (Psychology)
Liliana Martins e Caneco (Registry) | tbc |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working Group</th>
<th>Background Information/Remit</th>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Reporting Timescales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Achievement Record (HEAR) for Postgraduate Research Students</td>
<td><strong>Background Information</strong>&lt;br&gt;There is currently discussion across the sector about the introduction of a HEAR for postgraduate research students and the development of a national template. It was agreed that a Working Group should consider how to take this forward in St Andrews. &lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Remit</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Consider the types of achievement/information (both academic and professional development) that should be recorded on the HEAR.&lt;br&gt;• Consider how to collect, verify and store the information.</td>
<td>Alison Sandeman (Registry), Convenor&lt;br&gt;Jane Money-Boyd (Registry)&lt;br&gt;Petr Kilian, (Science supervisor)&lt;br&gt;Roger Rees, (Arts supervisor)&lt;br&gt;Bonnie Hacking (Careers)&lt;br&gt;Heather McKiggan-Fee (CAPOD)&lt;br&gt;Tania Streustel, PG Convenor&lt;br&gt;Nicola Milton (Proctor’s Office)&lt;br&gt;Additional PGR students may be asked to contribute on an advisory basis</td>
<td>End Oct 15 for preliminary report to the Proctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Study/Thesis Completion for Postgraduate Research Students</td>
<td><strong>Background Information</strong>&lt;br&gt;At Academic Council in Dec14, an amendment was proposed to the Postgraduate Research policy which would make the absolute latest that a PhD thesis may be submitted and still be eligible for examination 12 calendar months after the end of the 36 months of full-time equivalent student. Academic Council was concerned the language used in the amended version of the policy was overly prescriptive and did not account for the fact that, across various disciplines, the length of time a student may take to complete a PhD (depending on their funding or fieldwork component) can vary from that currently stated (namely, 36 months of full-time study plus a maximum of 12 months’ extension). It was recommended that more flexible language be used to allow for exceptional extension cases to be considered. It was agreed that a Working Group consider the issues underpinning the proposed policy amendments. &lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Remit</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Consider implications of the policy, including financial, as well as its relevance for our relationship with the Research Councils.&lt;br&gt;• Reflect on how to accommodate exceptional extension cases.&lt;br&gt;• Recommend final wording of the policy.</td>
<td>Al Dearle (Dean of Science), Convenor&lt;br&gt;Emmy Fearnster (Proctor’s Office)&lt;br&gt;Alison Sandeman (Registry)&lt;br&gt;James Mitchell (Maths &amp; Stats)&lt;br&gt;Matthew Augustine (English)&lt;br&gt;Nick Hanley (Geog &amp; Geo)&lt;br&gt;Kathryn Davidson (Finance)&lt;br&gt;Helen Reddy (Research Policy Office)</td>
<td>tbc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Group</td>
<td>Background Information/Remit</td>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>Reporting Timescales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Postgraduate Change of Registration** | **Background Information**  
As part of a review of all policies governing PGT students, an initial scoping exercise highlighted that currently there is no policy or guidance available to staff and students that clearly defines the different postgraduate qualifications available, and the process of transition into and between these qualifications. It was agreed that a Working Group should consider how to take this forward.  
**Remit**  
- Create policy and guidance for students and staff that defines the qualifications and governs the process of transition into and between postgraduate degrees along with recommendations for changes to postgraduate regulations as required.  
- Make recommendations for the management of the transition with respect to student status, training, and access to services. | Clare Peddie (Pro Dean), Convenor  
Lynn Balfour (Proctor’s Office)  
James Palmer (Pro Provost)  
Carl Donovan (Maths & Stats)  
John Hudson (History)  
Sonja Heinrich (Biology)  
Liliana Martins e Caneco (Registry) | LTC: 7 Oct 15  
PGRC: 14 Oct 15 |
| **Progress Review for Postgraduate Research Students** | **Background Information**  
Some recent Senate Appeals have highlighted deficiencies in the current mechanisms for progress reviews. Regular interaction between supervisors and postgraduate research students is necessary to enable research students to progress satisfactorily. Likewise, the annual review is an important checkpoint to verify that adequate progress is being made and that the current supervisory provisions are sufficient. These issues were discussed at the DoPG lunch in Apr15 and it was suggested that a Working Group undertake a scoping exercise to evaluate current School and Faculty arrangements for formal progress review. This would be done with a view to improving current policy and procedures.  
**Remit**  
- Gather and compile information on progress reviews across Schools and Departments, including timing and frequency of reviews, attendance at review meetings, and mechanisms for keeping appropriate records of the outcomes of reviews.  
- Create policy and guidance for steps to be taken when a progress review is reported as satisfactory with concerns or unsatisfactory.  
- Ensure practices are in line with UK Quality Code guidance in Chapter B11, Indicator 13. | Riccardo Bavaj (History), Convenor  
Emmy Feamster (Proctor’s Office)  
Ishbel Duncan (Computer Science)  
Kate Rudy (Art History)  
Graham Turnbull or Jonathan Keeling (Physics & Astron)  
Alex Griffiths (Registry)  
Dawn Hollis, (PGR student rep, History)  
Tania Struezel, PG Convenor | tbc |