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Section 1. Institutional Context and Strategic Framework

Introduction

1 The University of St Andrews was founded over 600 years ago and is the oldest university in Scotland. It is known across the globe as a world leader in education, with consistently high rankings in both national and international league tables (for example, we are currently placed first equal in the 2014 National Student Survey (NSS), third in the 2015 Guardian University Guide, third in the Times and Sunday Times Good University Guide (which names us Scottish University of the Year for the second year in succession) and 111th in the Times Higher Education Supplement (THES) world rankings (33rd for Arts and Humanities).

2 In the academic year 2013-2014, on which all data included in this document will be based, we had a total of 7,954 students: 6,278 Undergraduate (UG), 818 Taught Postgraduate (PGT) and 858 Research Postgraduate (PGR). These students are spread over eighteen academic Schools under four Faculties (Arts, Science, Divinity and Medicine) with around 605 academic staff. The University is supported by a further staff complement of 1,899 across all categories. Our beautiful location in a small coastal town with an essentially mediaeval core presents both the advantages of a close-knit community in an historic setting and also certain challenges such as remoteness, legacy estate and restrictions on growth.

3 Academically, we are privileged to admit one of the best-qualified student cohorts in the country to a community of outstanding intellectual achievement. Accordingly, our curricula and standards are demanding. Through our teaching and support for learning, we aim to instil in our students the values and skills that underpin our research, including high subject competence, a thirst for understanding, analytical rigour, clear communication, independence and integrity.

4 At the core of our educational structures is the traditional Scottish four-year degree, through which the majority of our students (who enter at first year level) receive an introduction to university study involving a wide choice of subjects, encouraging intellectual breadth and experimentation. From second year (to which we permit direct entry in certain subjects), increasing specialisation and an accelerated pace of learning provide a basis for the strong performance that we require for entry to Honours and Integrated Masters programmes. All degree pathways aim to support independent learning and to engage with our research agenda from an early stage.

5 Our students benefit in addition from our resolutely outward-looking, international perspective. We have staff and students from 120 countries, UG study destinations in more than 70 overseas institutions and a challenging approach to Study Abroad: unlike many other universities, we require students to take a full credit load, and we count study abroad grades towards degree classifications.

6 At St Andrews, academic excellence has primacy over all other endeavours. However, we believe that students should leave us with a first-class all-round education. We provide optional co-curricular learning, through which students develop skills associated with leadership and professionalism to complement their intellectual development. Together with the Athletic Union (AU) and Students’ Association (SA), we foster a particularly intense environment of opportunity.
and enterprise for students: among many other activities, St Andrews boasts Sports Centre membership of more than 5,000 students; upwards of 150 student societies affiliated to the Students' Association; an excellent Music Centre supported by choral and music scholarships; a lively multi-faith scene centred on the Chaplaincy; and a spectacular range of student input into charities and volunteering. Simultaneously, in the last three years the University has stepped up our emphasis on students' obligation to observe high standards of personal conduct as members of our community and of society at large.

Both the academic and extra-curricular aspects of a St Andrews education draw on collaboration with our students and are supported by excellent student-facing services such as the Library, IT Services (ITS), the Centre for Academic, Professional and Organisational Development (CAPOD), the Careers Centre, the Music Centre, Saints Sport, Residential and Business Services (RBS), Registry, Admissions, Student Services (SS), the Advice and Support Centre (ASC), English Language Teaching (ELT) and the separate SA. Our main learning and teaching contact in the SA is the Sabbatical Director of Representation (DoRep), who is extremely well integrated into University structures. S/he leads our distinctive cadre of School Presidents, who are the senior student representatives in different subject areas.

Within this general context, and as we shall explore in more detail below (see 1.2 Strategic approach to enhancing learning and teaching), the three key themes in this Reflective Analysis (RA) that we wish particularly to highlight as integral to our current thinking, and which we would like the ELIR team to consider, are:

- **Secure transitions in student progression**
  St Andrews students join our very challenging programmes from an exceptionally wide variety of backgrounds. We need to ensure that they move smoothly into and through the different stages of their studies, understanding our values and meeting our standards. In addition, students require reassurance that, disciplinary particularities notwithstanding, their progress is handled according to principles of parity across the University. Examples of work undertaken recently in this context, some of which will be discussed in greater detail below, include the following: at UG level, we have introduced better mentoring and support for Widening Participation (WP) entrant students, enhanced information for entrants from the USA, revised the policy for transition from sub-honours to Honours and improved preparation for Study Abroad. A fresh focus on PGT, especially from 2013-2014 onwards, has resulted in a new induction event for entrants and a new approach to transition to the Dissertation component of the degree. Our new Training in Good Academic Practice (TGAP) supports incoming students at every level to make a smooth transition to St Andrews norms and standards of academic integrity. All of these initiatives have benefited greatly from close collaborations across staff and students, underpinned by the philosophy of shared responsibility for excellent Learning and Teaching (L&T).

- **Shared responsibility for educational excellence**
  We are currently intensifying our focus on collaboration across the University in order to promote shared understanding and provide a clear, unified message to students. We wish to emphasise clearly that we expect high standards of work and conduct, and to underline the primary importance of academic study, albeit within an excellent all-round education supported by the many extra-curricular opportunities on offer. To further this focus we have initiated a suite of activities to increase trust across academic Schools, students and professional services as a basis, for example, for the transfer of certain responsibilities from Faculties or Schools to professional colleagues, with benefits for clarity, efficiency, coherence of approach and reduced bureaucracy. Recent activities under this heading have included the 2010 establishment of the ASC, which has become a central resource for all staff and students.
and has shown remarkable success in enhancing staff competencies across the range of professional services represented there. We have in addition set up a Service Directors’ Group–Student Experience (SDG-SE) for all professional Units with student-facing responsibilities, and we are systematically renewing opportunities for students, academics and professional colleagues to share information and cooperate in projects, working groups and discussion fora.

- **Streamlining processes and reducing bureaucracy around learning and teaching**
  As a small institution, dedicated to maintaining excellence not only in teaching but also in research and the overall student experience, we need to find the right focus for investment of our resources. Our priority is to allocate time to the quality of our academic and educational activities themselves and to create space for them by limiting the burden of administrative tasks wherever we can. To this end, we have since 2011 introduced a range of measures to streamline bureaucracy while maintaining a strong framework for quality assurance and enhancement. Examples to be discussed within the RA include a reduction in the number of formal University committees, replaced where appropriate by short-life working groups; the delegation of actions and responsibilities to the point of competence wherever possible; and the shortening/lightening of processes such as the approval of changes to the curriculum and of student business (Leaves of Absence etc.), as well as University-Led Reviews of Learning and Teaching (URLT), Annual Academic Monitoring (AAM) and External Examiner Reports.

Preparations for ELIR have provided an opportunity to reflect on our efforts in these three areas amongst others, with a special focus on our collaborative BA (International Honours) Degree programme delivered jointly with the College of William and Mary, Virginia, USA, which we present along with this document as our case study.

In keeping with the second theme above, this document has been prepared with input from a wide cross-section of students and staff from our academic and professional communities, with coordination and oversight from the Proctor’s Office and Director of CAPOD & Quality Monitoring (DCQM), whose roles will be discussed below.

### 1.1 Key features of the institution’s context and vision

Our vision in the context of learning, teaching and the St Andrews experience is to support our students to acquire:

- High levels of subject-based competence
- A lasting enjoyment of their subject and of learning
- Intellectual ambition coupled with research-led skills, such as the ability to elaborate interesting questions and analyse them with rigour; to process complex information; to integrate ideas in new ways; and to communicate clearly and precisely
- Appropriate confidence in their own intelligence and ability to contribute
- Qualities valued in excellent employees and colleagues such as leadership, creativity, collegiality and self-reflection
- Qualities valued in citizens such as integrity and respect
- A lasting affection for the University based on happy memories and an appreciation of its high standards

The sections below will explore the strategic and practical steps by which we seek to fulfil this vision, which we believe is generally shared by staff and students alike.
One important piece of contextual information to bear in mind is that the University introduced a new calendar for the academic year in AY 2012-2013. The principal effect of this reform was to conclude all Semester 1 teaching and assessment before Christmas, whereas students had previously taken semester 1 examinations in January. The previous pattern had the disadvantages of unpopular examination revision over the Christmas vacation and a significant carbon footprint due to multiple student journeys in January within the UK and overseas. The new pattern has solved these problems but resulted in a condensed and intensive Semester 1, somewhat balanced by a more leisurely Semester 2. The reform is not universally popular and will need a few more years to bed down; meanwhile, we are monitoring its effects through dialogue with staff and students. So far, after two years, we have noticed no significant adverse effects on module results. Some academic Schools tentatively report perceived effects on student wellbeing in terms of increased stress levels in Semester 1, but SS, who are keeping the matter under review, are yet to discover conclusive evidence of a link between the new calendar and presentations related to stress. In response to staff concerns about marking over the Christmas break, adjustments were made both to the reporting deadlines for results and to the policy on Assessment, Marking and Standard Setting, to clarify the University’s requirements for second marking, moderation and referrals to External Examiners.

**1.1.1 Key features of our approach to learning and teaching**

Since our last ELIR in 2010-2011, the University has been engaged in an intensive examination of its overall strategic direction. Debates are not yet concluded: however, through discussions with Court, Academic Council, Senior Management and academic Schools, at the time of writing we have studied and rejected the idea of radically increasing the size of the institution and are framing a small number of carefully-targeted, innovative academic projects that will support our overarching ambition to rank in the top 50 universities in the world within the next decade, as measured by leading international league tables. Put simply, the common thread in these projects is our determination to recruit the most brilliant students and academic staff, to continue to increase the proportion of PGR students within the University and to provide an environment in which all can flourish. Academic projects currently under consideration (amongst other initiatives) are:

- A “Seventh Century” programme of strategic academic appointments, both senior and junior
- Strengthened interdisciplinary activities in the Arts, including three new Institutes (War & Strategy, Legal & Constitutional Studies, and Global Art & Global Affairs), and underpinned by a new phase of planning for the Library
- An interdisciplinary Institute for new materials and energy research with an applied focus in the Sciences
- Enhancement of the Scottish Oceans Institute uniting Biology, Chemistry, Mathematics & Statistics, and Earth Sciences in collaboration with the European Marine Biological Research Centre
- A new Centre for Discrete Mathematics drawing in research from other disciplines, notably Computer Science

These projects are in the early stages of being crystallised.

Such projects, as they come to fruition, will be forced to operate against a backdrop of restricted space and resources. They are therefore being discussed in the context of a bold Estates strategy that has in recent years (and amongst other initiatives) seen the purchase of a former paper mill at Guardbridge, where plans for a biomass plant and associated energy sector research are now well developed; the acquisition of planning permission to create a wind farm near the Fife coast at Kenly; redevelopment of an old church into a new Research Library in the town centre;
and agreement of a 25-year lease to manage and occupy the town’s superb Byre Theatre as a Centre for the Creative Arts for both academic and community purposes. Concurrently, we have been re-examining our teaching timetable to improve efficient use of existing space and have seen progress in both occupancy and matching of activity to venue. Spatial and resourcing considerations thus also form a major part of our ongoing strategic debates.

In terms specifically of L&T and the student experience, a series of strategic and practical steps have been taken since the 2011 ELIR report, as outlined below.

### 1.2 Strategic approach to enhancing learning and teaching

The overall aim of the L&T Strategy¹ 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.’

This statement describes our general outlook (reflected in the SFC Outcome Agreement), which places importance on academic excellence first and foremost, but sees intellectual endeavour in equilibrium with the development of personal and social values. These overarching principles are elaborated in a number of supporting strategic statements, most notably the Quality Enhancement (QE) Strategy², which underpins excellence in L&T, and the Student Experience Strategy³, which primarily addresses extra-curricular matters. Yet all of these statements should be seen as tending towards the same strategic aim of providing a highly demanding and well-rounded education.

Given this general perspective, five initiatives undertaken since ELIR 2011 are of particular note.

#### 1.2.1 Reform of the Proctor’s Office

The University took the step in summer 2011 of vesting overall responsibility for learning, teaching and other student business together in a single Vice-Principal by amalgamating the role of Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching) with that of Proctor (responsible for student welfare and discipline and the student experience). While detailed line management of the University’s various extra-curricular Units remains distributed across the Principal’s Office (PO) for reasons of workload, the Proctor is now line manager to Student Services (SS) and the Chaplaincy, provides the PO liaison point for the Students’ Association (SA) and Athletic Union (AU), and maintains an overall interest in the broader student experience by chairing a group uniting relevant Service Directors⁴ as well as convening the Learning & Teaching Committee (LTC), Academic Monitoring Group (AMG) and Academic Assurance Group (AAG). Thus from 2011 onwards, the Proctor’s Office comprising the Proctor, Dean of Arts & Divinity⁵, Dean of Science and a small administrative team has sought to bring academic matters into more fruitful interaction with the co-curricular aspects of a St Andrews education. To this end, the Proctor’s Office interacts closely with the Centre for Academic, Professional & Organisational Development (CAPOD) and the Provost’s Office.

It is worth noting here that given the special nature of medical education, and the place of Medicine within the University’s academic management structures (whereby the Dean of Medicine is also the Head of School of Medicine and is thus line-managed by the Master),
the Faculty of Medicine is not wholly integrated into these new arrangements. Following the appointment of a new Dean of Medicine in summer 2014, a review of School-University relations is underway, which is expected to lead to clarification and formalisation of interactions across the School of Medicine, the Proctor’s Office and other University offices as regards L&T and student matters.

In general terms, however, our integrative approach can no doubt be developed further, with greater sharing of responsibility across academic and professional teams for delivery of our strategic goals in L&T, postgraduate education, quality enhancement and the student experience. Steps already established and under consideration will be discussed in more detail throughout this document.

Underpinning the establishment of the new Proctor’s Office was a strategic review of the entire Senate committee structure flowing from the overarching authority of Academic Council, our executive body representing Senate and comprising all Heads of School (HoS) together with members of academic management, elected students and Faculty representatives. The aim of the review was to streamline structures, eliminate unnecessary work and delegate responsibility for decision-making to the point of most appropriate expertise. As a result, several committees were disbanded and their work turned over to the authority of relevant officers, in most cases the Proctor or Deans supported as necessary by Advisory Groups rather than full sub-committees of Academic Council. This followed an earlier review of the Court Committee structure.

1.2.2 Senate Efficiency Review (SER) programme

At the same time as the above review of committee structures and official duties, 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. Known as the Senate Efficiency Review (SER) programme, this initiative has delivered mixed results to date, with a range of lessons learned for programme and project management and resourcing of change. Put simply, while the University had a clear idea of the intended outcomes of the programme, we were over-ambitious in timescale and in the range of projects we were pursuing simultaneously for development. Ultimately we lacked the necessary project management, business analysis and programming resources – in terms of quality, expertise and number of persons required – to complete the entire programme in the desired timeframe. We fell short of adequate ‘backfill’ for permanent staff heavily involved in the programme, and attempts to compensate for our own resourcing gaps by buying in expertise were expensive and not wholly successful. By November 2013, we had partially delivered some of the projects (e.g. Paperless Admissions, Enhanced Student Record Card, online PG Applications) but there were several major programme strands still outstanding with little confidence of meeting the projected completion deadlines. Set against this disappointing scenario, however, we had significantly improved our knowledge of the processes and areas of development still required. For example, we had come to appreciate the need for better coordination between workstreams and, crucially, we realised that we had not been adequately exploiting the capabilities of our existing core student administration system, SITS, provided and supported by Tribal plc.

Led by the Quaestor and Factor, we therefore decided upon a radical change of direction, significantly reducing the scale of the project and focusing on developing a new relationship with Tribal. This arrangement is designed to get more out of our existing systems, while also considering how best to design bespoke solutions where (and only where) necessary. During the first three quarters of 2014, we engaged closely with Tribal to examine their system capabilities and to identify the gaps in our own systems and processes. As a result of these collaborations,
a range of urgent repairs and small improvements to systems and processes was possible in
summer 2014 (e.g. KIS data collection and submission). This exercise also led to a new programme
plan, with a clearer structure for both governance and operations, approved in September 2014.

As a result, we are now proceeding with Wave 1 of workstreams agreed by the SER Programme
Board as follows:


Work will proceed in close partnership with Tribal who will bring programming, training and
project management expertise as required, with the University providing project managers
properly seconded from Units around the University and supported by ‘backfill’ to free up their
time. Agile methodology will be used, allowing for developments to be released as the projects
progress. The SER will also be supported by the newly created Change Unit that has been
established to bring about a permanent and fundamental shift in institutional culture to one of
continuous improvement.

Subsequent elements, to be clustered in Waves as appropriate, with an expected overall end-date
of September 2016, will deliver automated and streamlined systems for:

- Interactive Workspaces
- Academic Advising
- Change of Students’ Circumstances
- Paperless Admissions (marketing)
- Paperless Admissions (admissions)
- Fund Management Phase 2

Institutional commitment to the programme is strong, under the guiding principles of simplicity,
transparency and e-enablement, all intended to provide smooth, more effective processes
while saving time and effort. The Programme Board believe that the new approach will provide
developmental opportunities for all staff involved, growing capacity to address other sizeable
change projects in the future.

1.2.3 St Leonard’s College

Alongside the strategic steps outlined above, discussions took place leading to the re-launch, in
August 2013, of St Leonard’s College®. 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), St Leonard’s adopted a stronger research focus and took over responsibility for all
PGR student business with the strategic goal of further enhancing recruitment (both quality and
numbers) as well as the PGR student experience.

In response to student requests for a single postgraduate community, PGT students have been
granted membership of the College since January 2014 for extra-curricular purposes; all other PGT
matters, including the PGT student experience, were transferred to the Proctor’s Office under the
close scrutiny of the Deans. From 2013, a new post of Pro Dean (Taught Postgraduate), working
across all the Faculties, has enabled us immediately to enhance our support for existing PGTs
as well as to begin reviewing PGT provision across the board. A single Postgraduate Strategy
covering both PGR and PGT, was developed collaboratively (and is awaiting formal approval
by Academic Council in December 2014). In addition, in our dialogue with students and staff alike, we are emphasising the theme of transitions to encourage a less demarcated approach to these different student cohorts. A team of individuals thus now shares responsibility for the postgraduate student experience overall.

The departure of two Pro Deans (who moved to St Leonard’s as Pro Provosts), and the appointment of the Pro Dean (Taught Postgraduate), provided the opportunity for simultaneous reform of the other Pro Dean positions (Academic Advising, Curriculum and UG). The new job descriptions aim to provide a more developmental role for the Pro Deans as well as focusing their expertise more consistently on academic matters. This shift of focus has been enabled by the appointment of new Registry Officers (1.5 FTE, working once again across all Faculties) to relieve the Pro Deans of technical student business such as Leaves of Absence. In support of University strategy, the Registry Officers tailor their service explicitly to distinct UG, PGT and PGR needs.

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

Following on from discussions in the run-up to ELIR 2011, the University also merged and reformed the three small Units previously delivering our staff development strategy and some areas of student support: staff development (for professional skills), SALTIRE (for academic skills as well as quality enhancement and monitoring) and GRADSkills (generic skills for PGR and post-docs). CAPOD, established in May 2011, now manages a significantly streamlined, coherent and refreshed professional and academic development programme for staff, PGRs and post-docs, an increased and vastly improved offering in student support and development and (in close interaction with the Proctor’s Office) our L&T Quality Enhancement and Monitoring operations. CAPOD is a central operation in support of strategic goals across the institution, including the Enterprise agenda and our three RA themes of transition, shared responsibility and streamlining. Its work will be discussed in more detail below.

1.2.5 Enterprise education

The emergence of enterprise opportunities afforded by Guardbridge, Kenly and the Byre Theatre broadly coincided with a recognition within the University of the strategic need to drive forward not only business and research partnerships but also enterprise education, enterprise competitions (local and national) and enterprise opportunities for both students and staff. In 2013, therefore, the University created the new post of Vice-Principal (Enterprise and Engagement) to lead in this area, uniting strategic direction and capture of funding with the key academic endeavours of the institution.

An Enterprise Working Group – which includes student representation from the three main enterprise/entrepreneurship societies – was set up in 2013, tasked with developing our existing provision on enterprise education, including the opportunity for students to benefit from expert technical, legal and business advice on setting up small businesses. Supported by funding from Santander, the University has for three years also run a successful in-house enterprise competition, ‘Ideas Explosion’, which culminates in a Dragon’s Den-style ‘Provost’s Pit.’ This panel is convened by the Provost of St Leonard’s and includes representatives from the Scottish Institute for Enterprise and successful entrepreneurs. Individuals and teams are supported throughout this process by our Enterprise Officer and members of the Knowledge Transfer Office, with a view to students entering national enterprise competitions.

The University has also established a Hatchery, located on the North Haugh, which draws upon the expertise of our Enterprise Officer and other staff, while plans are also underway to establish
a Business Accelerator at Guardbridge. Supported by the Vice-Principal (E&E), students have led on developing the profile of enterprise activities across the University, including the setting up of conferences/workshops on enterprise and entrepreneurship, and an ‘Enterprise Week’ which runs throughout the fourth week of Semester 1. The University is also developing ways in which students can engage more fully with our business alumni through the Hatchery and via SaintConnect, an electronic forum that allows students to contact alumni willing to give advice (run by our Careers Centre).

1.2.6 Learning & Teaching and Quality Enhancement Strategies

The five initiatives discussed above – reform of the Proctor’s Office, the SER, the re-launch of St Leonard’s College, the creation of CAPOD and our newly concerted focus on Enterprise – are designed to strengthen our ability to fulfil our strategic ambitions relating to quality enhancement in L&T and the wider experience for all students.

The QE Strategy sets out areas and responsibilities for the continual improvement of L&T quality wherever necessary and possible including, but not restricted to, the national Enhancement Themes (ET). Key strategic themes (the Proctor’s Priorities) identified through student and staff feedback, NSS results and other surveys have been agreed by LTC for the academic years 2014-2016 as follows:

- Improvement of feedback to students
- Enhanced, early provision of information about module choices available in the next academic year
- Fostering students’ confidence and ambition
- Enhanced employability as a result of studying in a research-intensive University
- Shared nature of responsibility for excellence in L&T
- Secure transitions in student progression
- Streamlining processes and reducing bureaucracy around L&T

Work is underway to advance all of these themes, for example in short-term working groups, between key contacts in Schools and Units and in projects supported by Enhancement Theme monies and our internal Teaching Development Fund.

The L&T and QE strategies are periodically revisited and updated at the appropriate University committees, and Schools are prompted to revisit them when preparing both for the Academic Monitoring process and for their yearly strategic planning meetings.

1.2.7 Linkages between monitoring and planning

Since 2011, efforts have also been made to strengthen links between academic monitoring and strategic planning for L&T by streamlining University processes. From 2014, we experimented by replacing the previous hour-long L&T strategic planning meetings supported by four- or five-page documents with a shorter report and a half-hour meeting with each School in late May/early June. This timing was chosen to coincide with the period during which Schools begin to prepare their AAM reports, and saves time by enabling Schools to use their reflections on the year just completed for monitoring purposes as well as for planning ahead. The Master, Proctor and Dean of the relevant Faculty meet each HoS and DoT to discuss their plans for future L&T activities, in particular:

- New pedagogy
- Curriculum developments in existing programmes
- New programmes, especially at postgraduate level
• Alterations to study abroad and collaborative arrangements
• Planned changes to Admissions profiles
• Outline resource implications of any plans
• Actions for the summer/early autumn in order to progress plans

This meeting paves the way for two specific strands of activity in the following academic year: curriculum planning, run by the Deans through the Curriculum Approvals Group (CAG), and the L&T aspect of the Schools’ Financial Strategic Planning meeting with the Master and Finance Director in late Autumn. Any L&T plans with implications for resources can now be worked up during the summer in collaboration with the Deans, Admissions, Finance and others, so that final agreement on resources can be reached at the financial meetings. With approval for any new programmes completed in November, Schools will be able to prepare Course Catalogue and prospectus entries in good time for the first available recruiting rounds.

It is anticipated that this new format will bring more coherence and understanding to the L&T strategic planning process. The corresponding reform of AAM is discussed below, under ‘Effectiveness’ (Section 1.3) and subsequent sections of this document as appropriate.

In support of the L&T, QE and Student Experience Strategies, other key statements appear in the graduate and Employability Strategy. All have been discussed and updated via the appropriate committee processes since ELIR 2011 and underpin current projects designed to advance their priority aims, e.g. three SDG-SE projects on: the ‘respect’ agenda relating to student conduct; the University’s identity as ‘internationally Scottish’; and support for improvement of students’ time management skills. They also support a Careers Centre project to improve training for a named ‘careers link’ colleague in every School.

1.3 Effectiveness of the approach to implementing strategies

The University ensures the effectiveness of its approach to implementing strategies related to L&T by a range of means, led from the PO, with key groups and individuals taking responsibility for particular aspects of the work.

1.3.1 Key postholders

Directors of Teaching (DoTs) lead the provision of all formal teaching in their School and are at the heart of L&T strategy implementation. DoTs are responsible for ensuring that School activities follow University policies and are aligned to University goals. One DoT per School is a member of LTC, together with representatives of the student body and service Units.

Directors of Postgraduate Taught Programmes (DPGTs) lead the provision of Taught Masters programmes (e.g. MSc, MLitt) and recently have come under the umbrella of the DoT. In some Schools which have large Masters cohorts, each Masters programme has a Convener with a Director in overall control and in others the Convener and Director roles are covered by one individual.

Directors of Postgraduate Research (DPGRs) lead the provision of PGR Degrees in the School (e.g. MPhil, PhD) and attend the Postgraduate Research Committee (PGRC). Other PGRC members include student and service Unit representatives. In smaller Schools, the roles of DPGT and DPGR may be covered by one individual.
DoTs, DPGTs and DoPGs all help to shape, and take shared ownership of, UG/PGT and PGR strategy and policy, through membership of LTC and PGRC respectively. This system ensures that there is always a name associated with each role, to provide continuity and ensure consistency.

In the last two years, the Proctor and Provost Office’s, SS and CAPOD staff have offered greater support to DoTs, DPGTs and DPGRs. This is done, for example, by signalling LTC or PGRC action points and offering training following decisions as required: recent instances include training on the new Good Academic Practice (GAP) policy and briefings on the introduction of Key Information Sets (KIS). A start-of-year briefing is held for all DoTs and thought is currently being given to the additional support that might be provided to this group, whose duties are especially important.

1.3.2 Academic Monitoring Group

Progress on L&T and QE activity is supported by academic monitoring, oversight of which resides with our AMG. In 2011, the AMG’s remit and membership was reconfigured and reduced and it is now chaired by the Proctor, bringing together the Deans of Arts & Divinity and Science, DCQM, Proctor’s Executive Officer and DoRep. A highly valued external member (currently Dr Tina Harrison, Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance, Edinburgh University) attends periodically. AMG scrutinises regular reports summarising QA and QE achievements and delegates any action points or follow-ups as necessary. Among the matters subjected to regular review are:

- AAM reports by academic subject (see 1.3.3 below)
- URLTs
- External reports: ELIR, External Examiners, Professional, Statutory & Regulatory Body (PSRB) accreditations
- Survey results: National Student Survey, iGrad, PRES, PTES
- Regular internal reports, e.g.: Collaborations & Study Abroad, appeals, academic misconduct, Module Evaluation Questionnaires (MEQs)

Since 2011, AMG has also come into line with other committees in reporting to Court via the AAG, consisting of the Proctor and a lay member of Court with the DCQM and Executive Officer in attendance. The AAG reports annually to the Audit & Risk Committee of Court, providing assurance as to the University’s management and monitoring of both quality and potential risks in L&T (those risks being mapped to each of the relevant institutional KPIs).

1.3.3 Annual Academic Monitoring

In 2012 the University reduced the burden of our previously rather heavy AAM process by requesting shorter reports and holding fewer interviews with Schools. We also now require the involvement of the School President in our annual dialogues. Schools are taking the exercise seriously and, while data packs are provided for every subject area, we have found we are focusing ever more successfully on the enhancement of L&T rather than statistics and QA. We are now encouraging Schools to adopt a model, piloted in the School of Psychology & Neuroscience, of setting aside time for the whole School to debate the year’s L&T at the close of summer module exams boards, thus involving as many staff as possible, and providing the DoT and HoS with material both for the AAM report and for L&T strategic planning.
1.3.4 Structured discussion and dissemination

In addition, we ensure effective implementation of University strategies related to L&T by means of:

- New links between AAM and LTC via a ‘Dissemination Event’ sharing the most promising practice identified during AAM, and a regular, short ‘Good Teaching/Good Practice’ slot on the agenda of every LTC meeting
- Dialogue with School Presidents\textsuperscript{14} and the DoRep, e.g. through the regular Presidents’ Forum attended by the Proctor and Deans
- Debate at LTC and regular, informal DoT, DoPG, HoS lunches
- An LTC Open Forum\textsuperscript{15} (for discussion of a wide ranges of L&T issues, open to all staff)
- New (2013) Teaching Practice Forum meetings facilitated by CAPOD for those interested in exploring a particular L&T issue
- New L&T webpages\textsuperscript{16} (2014) with information and ideas for all members of the L&T community
- An LTC ‘Away Afternoon’ for all members, first held in 2014, to focus on better understanding the role of DoT and to discuss how LTC might develop. In 2015 our theme will be the shared responsibility for educational excellence

These structures are supplemented by numerous formal and informal contacts between Proctor’s Office staff, colleagues and students around the University, made easily possible by our small size.

1.3.5 Learning and teaching culture

By relieving colleagues of unnecessary burdens, sharing AAM highlights, streamlining and strengthening links between L&T processes and including students more often, the University has already arrived at a more collaborative, enhancement-based culture in L&T. This is evidenced by the high quality of participation in, and feedback from, the various L&T activities outlined in this Section. We shall however continue to consider other means of evaluating our effectiveness, and are for example contemplating production of an ‘L&T Factsheet’ to be appended to each School’s annual L&T data pack as an aid to both monitoring and planning. This single-sheet snapshot will indicate how a School is positioned in relation to key strategic aims, e.g. performance in MEQs, proportion of PGRs, numbers of Study Abroad students, etc. A template is currently being developed by the Proctor’s Office and Registry’s Planning Manager: we hope to trial this in one or two Schools as part of the 2014-2015 URLT and L&T planning cycle.
Section 2. Enhancing the Student Learning Experience

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

2.1.1 The student population

Between the last ELIR and the 2013-2014 academic year, the student population remained stable with less than 2% growth overall, although the growth in PGR was proportionally greater.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTE/Academic Year</th>
<th>PGR</th>
<th>PGT</th>
<th>UG</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>6278</td>
<td>7954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>6126</td>
<td>7702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>6314</td>
<td>7893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>6113</td>
<td>7865</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

St Andrews prides itself on being internationally Scottish with a student distribution of circa 30% Scottish, 30% from the rest of the UK (RUK), 10% EU and 30% Overseas. Our strategy is to secure the uniquely diverse aspect of the University and ensure that our students thrive in a multicultural community based on respect, collegiality and tolerance.

Following the introduction of tuition fees for the rest of the UK and the distribution of additional UG Home funded places by the Scottish Government, the University will have increased its Home UG population by 480 students (largely in the Sciences) by 2016. In 2014-2015 this will result in a growth of about 300 Home UG students in the overall student population as against 2012-2013. The introduction of fees and the resulting competitiveness in the RUK market present a challenge to the maintenance of the size of the RUK UG cohort. We saw a dip in the numbers in 2012-2013 and had to rethink our approach to engaging with prospective students. The resulting improved dialogue with RUK schools and candidates has proved successful, and in 2014-2015 we will have recovered and slightly exceeded our pre-tuition fees numbers of RUK UG students.

The introduction of Tier 4 visa requirements, the abolition of post study work visas, the increased availability of integrated Masters programmes and UG tuition fees have adversely impacted on our PGT numbers. As a result we are launching a review of our PGT portfolio and fee structures.

As a research-intensive University, we value and rely on the contribution of our PGR students, and it is our strategy to continue to grow the PGR student population. The availability of funding for PGR students is key to the ability to attract them: securing funding thus remains the greatest challenge to growth. In 2013-2014 for the University’s 600th anniversary, special scholarships were made available, and we achieved a significant increase (8%) in our PGR intake.
2.1.2 Current figures

In 2013-2014 the University's student population of 7,954 was split 80-20% between UG and PG students.

Table 1: Degree seeking student population 2013-2014 by level by fee status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Level</th>
<th>Home FTE</th>
<th>Home %</th>
<th>RUK FTE</th>
<th>RUK %</th>
<th>Overseas FTE</th>
<th>Overseas %</th>
<th>Total FTE</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PGR</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGT</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>2406</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>6278</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>3125</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>2201</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>2628</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>7954</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

International appeal

The University has a diverse international student body, with over 120 countries currently represented. Since ELIR 2011, the international (non EU) student population has grown by 10% and now represents one-third of the student population. This growth is mainly evident at UG level (76% of our international students are studying at UG level). Approximately 50% of students studying at PGT level are from overseas.

Other demography

The gender balance across the student population is currently 57% female, 43% male and tending towards an increasing gap in favour of female students in line with national trends relating to the same statistics as well as with gender distribution of qualifying secondary school leavers. Where there is a gender imbalance in first year undergraduate and postgraduate students, staff representing the School in open days are reflective of the minority gender. Open days are subject based and we ensure that there is good representation from each gender of applicants/offer holders as well as existing students.

Approximately 10.2% (815) of students have a declared disability, a 14.9% increase compared to 2010-2011. In 2013-2014 almost 8% of our UK domiciled students were from an ethnic minority background, a 2% increase compared to 2010.

2.1.3 Admissions target setting and monitoring

Admissions targets are set in late October each year, taking into account the immediate priorities of the student population distributed across the funding matrix and student mix, School plans and the longer-term vision of the University.

Student numbers and performance against institutional targets are reviewed annually as part of the autumn planning meetings with Schools, focused on resource allocation (these meetings are informed by the L&T strategic planning dialogues, held in early summer). In addition to numbers, we also monitor the quality of our entrants. In the UG population, we use tariff point scores and SATs; in the PGT cohort, successful completion is taken as a quality indicator, while relevant entry qualifications are scrutinised for PGR.
The Academic Registrar (with support from the planning team within Registry) has the responsibility of securing relevant management information for every academic School and each student cohort over a five-year period to support target setting as well as monitoring and review. Delivery on institutional aims and objectives in this area is also monitored through Institutional Indicators by the PO, the Planning and Resources Committee of Court and the University Court itself. Academic Monitoring activities ensure review of management information relating to the overall student population at a more granular level, and not only in relation to entry and related quality, but also as regards progression, completion and attainment. The overall quality of our student intakes has been improving over the past five years.

2.1.4 Entry routes

The University is committed to the four-year Scottish degree structure that allows UG students to explore a variety of subjects in their sub-honours years without affecting their final degree outcome. The majority of our students, therefore, follow traditional entry routes, with students in Arts and Divinity most likely to make use of such opportunities.

Since the last ELIR, there has been a move to provide Integrated Masters (Enhanced Honours) in most of the science subjects. Successful completion of these pathways (such as MBiol, MBiochem) will also lead to accreditation by the relevant professional bodies. These programmes are five years long by design, but allow second year entry or accelerated progress for suitably qualified candidates and offer an exit point at BSc level after three or four years depending on the starting point. In most cases, students can also enrol for a BSc and move to Integrated Masters by meeting the relevant standards.

2.1.4.1 Non traditional routes into higher education

Widening access

The University of St Andrews both shares and contributes to the Scottish Government’s goal of ensuring that the young people of Scotland have access to world-class higher education. We aim to improve young people’s first chances and raise their aspirations so that those from under-represented groups make the most of the opportunities that exist. We meet our goals in this context through our many programmes of outreach, along with our contextual admissions process. We are also aware that there are some in our community that have been unable to take up their first chances and wish to return to education later in life. For that reason we have put in place specific entry routes for these applicants such as a General Degree entry route which is open only to those coming through further education. Through our approach to wider access in 2013-2014 we saw 39% of all Scottish entrants with some form of access criteria. The work we do is intended to increase entrant numbers to higher education in general, not only to St Andrews: many of the school pupils we have worked with over the past three years have gained places in very positive destinations elsewhere. Below are some of the ways in which we are working to ensure that our principles of widening access are put into practice.

The following tables provide an illustration of the number of applications and entrants that are access coded:
### Number of applications, offers and entrants for 2013-2014 entry showing whether they were access coded or not (Scottish domiciled Home fee status)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Number of Applications</th>
<th>Number of Offers</th>
<th>Number of Entrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Code</td>
<td>1472</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Access Code</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3398</strong></td>
<td><strong>1328</strong></td>
<td><strong>522</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Number of applications, offers and entrants for 2013-2014 entry showing whether they were access coded or not (RUK fee status)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Number of Applications</th>
<th>Number of Offers</th>
<th>Number of Entrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Code</td>
<td>1028</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Access Code</td>
<td>3748</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4776</strong></td>
<td><strong>2196</strong></td>
<td><strong>547</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Flexible provision

The University is committed to a flexible modular degree structure, encouraging breadth of learning, with a wealth of joint degrees and interdisciplinary opportunities, especially in **Arts**.

The Faculty of Science provides entry into second year in most subjects for those students with the required standard of qualification at Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF) level 7. The subjects most likely to admit second year entrants are Physics, Chemistry and Mathematics. This pattern has not changed over recent years.

The University allocates a number of places for entrants to the full-time General Degree. These are reserved for students coming through alternative routes such as the Scottish Wider Access Programme. Entrants can transfer later to a named Honours programme if they fulfil the relevant requirements.

Over 100 students have enrolled with the University on part-time study for their degree (day or evening provision). In addition, there are almost 250 students currently registered on distance learning programmes (in International Relations, Psychology & Neuroscience, Divinity and Biology). The uptake on such routes has not changed since 2009-2010.

### Articulation

The University has a number of articulation agreements with local colleges such as the Perth College *Pathway to Medicine* which enables adult returners access to a medical career that they may have thought lost to them. From 2013-2014, new agreements with Fife College and Dundee and Angus College allow HNC-qualified students direct entry into second year of a BSc.
Pre-degree programmes

Through ELT pre-degree programmes are offered of varying lengths for UG and PG applicants from a range of international backgrounds across all Faculties. Successful completion allows students to enter degree programmes at the relevant level.

Gateway programmes

The University has two ‘Gateway’ programmes, for Physics and Computer Science. These courses are intended for students who have fallen short of the minimum requirements for entry due to educational disadvantage. Students receive intensive extra tutoring and personal support in their entrant year to enable a secure transition into the main cohort.

Outreach

In the AY 2013-2014, over 2,000 pupil places were made available on outreach projects organised by the Access Team. This represents an increase of around 500 places in the last three years. The outreach programmes range from primary school through to the end of secondary school. This year, with the goal of promoting equity of access across Scotland, we have commenced a three year project, Access for Rural Communities, offering HE engagement to schools and pupils in the most extreme rural areas of Scotland. We are also supporting academic research investigating the particular nature of barriers to HE in rural areas; this will assess the effect of rurality on access to HE in Scotland and to St Andrews in particular, gathering evidence and proposing guiding principles to ensure equal opportunities. The outcome of this research will be made available in June 2015.

Our individual academic Schools are integral to all the outreach work at the University and contribute to all the main programmes. For example, since 2012 the Earth Sciences GeoBus (sponsored by NERC and five private companies) has visited over 31,000 pupils in more than 150 schools throughout Scotland, delivering hands-on activities to supplement science lessons; Chemistry’s school programme takes experiments and demonstrations designed for S1 and S2 pupils around Tayside, Angus, Fife and Perthshire; and Philosophy holds a very successful St Andrews Philosophy Study Day each year for pupils taking Higher Philosophy.

Contextual admissions

Recognising that outreach alone will not suffice to meet our goal of admitting more students with the potential to do well at St Andrews, we have also conducted major research into contextual admissions. Our resulting system enables our Admissions Officers to put into context the achievements of all applicants. Using this contextual system, 39% of our Scottish domiciled entrants and 22% of students coming from RUK were flagged with an access marker in 2013-2014. This requires monitoring, since it is not yet possible to point to a trend across all aspects of access criteria due to major changes in the last three years, both to the admissions process and to our use of contextual admissions.

Ongoing support

The University takes a proactive and strategic approach to supporting entrant students who have attended outreach programmes or who come through our contextualised admissions process. As from AY 2013-2014, students who come through FE routes and access courses are provided with a dedicated mentor for their first year and an access-aware Academic Adviser of Studies. This support to secure what can be a difficult transition has proved effective with all students.
Exemplifying our commitment to underrepresented groups, we received the Buttle Quality Mark in 2013 for our work with looked-after children.

**Scholarships and bursaries**

Our extensive financial aid and other support packages are strategically targeted to those with the greatest financial need, with looked-after or in-care backgrounds and the more mature students coming through routes such as the Scottish Wider Access Programme. Since the academic year 2009-2010, we have increased the number of scholarships/bursaries given to entrants: for example, in 2009-2010 the University awarded scholarships to 79 entrants, whereas in 2013-2014 this had risen to 321.

### 2.1.5 Progression and completion

In 2012-2013 the University's reported retention rate for full-time UG entrants was very high, with 97.2% remaining at the institution and 98.4% remaining in HE. We aim to maintain this high level of retention for all students. Through Academic Monitoring, information relating to progression and retention is reviewed annually, including trends in numbers of students taking leaves of absence by Faculty, level, gender and cohort, together with statistics for Honours entry and withdrawals. As many subjects offered at the University are not available in secondary school curricula, we acknowledge that students need time to experiment and familiarise themselves with new subjects. The Advising processes and flexibility of the four-year degree pathway structures support this, with 12-15% of our students making changes to their degree intention, i.e. subject combination and/or level.

Progression and completion is also important in PGT cohorts. In 2013-2014 the University removed the 13.5 threshold for progression to the Masters dissertation to allow students sufficient time to make the transition to Masters level study. The effects of the change will be subject to Academic Monitoring to ensure that we achieved our aims.

At PGR level, progression and completion are emphasised and monitored from the start of the student journey. In 2013-2014 the Provost worked particularly intensively with DPGRs as well as HoSs, to clarify completion requirements and restate institutional objectives to have all PGR students complete their PhDs successfully within the fee-paying period (usually 36 months, or longer for some externally-funded programmes). It is recognised that to achieve this, greater emphasis has to be placed on progress reviews and dealing with issues impeding successful progression as they arise. As the student enters their final 12 months, they formulate a detailed plan with their supervisor(s) to ensure that the thesis will be ready for submission, ideally by the end of that period or shortly thereafter. It is the responsibility of Schools, through regular progress reviews, to ensure that the transition between years is monitored carefully and an honest appraisal is recorded regarding progress towards completion. This is monitored by the Provost’s Office and supplemented with an annual report to AMG.

### 2.1.6 Transitions

Just as the University works to support secure transitions into and within St Andrews as discussed above, we regard this theme as key also for students studying abroad. The Case Study on the joint BA (International Honours) programme with the College of William and Mary explores this in more detail, as does Section 6 on Collaborations. However, we list below some external opportunities to encourage successful student transitions, the results of which are reported to Academic Monitoring and the Proctor’s Office:
• Placements or opportunities for internships abroad. The Careers Centre has many resources to enable students to identify and gain internship experience abroad. St Andrews students have been exceptionally successful in the Saltire Foundation\(^4\) with a higher proportion of enrolled students gaining places than at any other University. The Careers Centre also provides documentation and insurance certification, where needed, for students who have secured opportunities abroad
• Study Abroad programmes with partners in Europe, North America, Latin America, Africa, Asia, the Middle East and Australia
• A wide range of core and optional fieldwork modules overseas, across all Faculties
• Travel scholarships and bursaries, open to all on a competitive basis
• Competitive summer internships with partner institutions, most recently in India
• Co-tutelle and joint PhD programmes in several subjects, often involving HEIs abroad

2.1.7 Graduate prospects and employability

St Andrews students are well received and successful in finding employment and opportunities for further study. They are the most active in their use of their University Careers Centre of any of the top 30 UK universities according to the reputable third party survey High Fliers. They also come eighth out of High Fliers top 30 universities (largely Russell Group and others who have strong employability records) for the proportion who have had internship experience and seventh for the accumulated time of their internship experience. A high proportion of St Andrews students regularly go on to further study, typically about 35%. The unemployment rate is relatively low compared with the national cohort and peers (at 6%, versus Scotland 7% and 9.1% UK in 2012), and the proportion of those 'graduate' situations (as defined by DLHE) is also relatively high at 76%. Such data are submitted to Academic Council in an annual Careers Centre report, which also gives a flavour of the comprehensive, dynamic service the Centre provides.

Recognising our high overseas population, strategic efforts have since 2012 been devoted to the establishment of improved careers advice for international students, with the appointment in 2013 of an International Opportunities Manager overseeing – among other responsibilities – events in the USA attended to date by more than 600 students, parents, alumni and employers. Following reports that our students risked being disadvantaged when seeking jobs or graduate places outside Europe, they will from 2014-2015 have access to a supplementary information sheet, interpreting the St Andrews Degree classifications in terms of the USA Grade Point Average\(^25\).

In addition to tailored and generic support for CV building and job searching offered through the Careers Centre, the University offers active support to all students in finding placements, summer jobs and internships. This includes the development of programmes to connect students to networks of alumni in each major sector, as well as working with partner employers and alumni to facilitate mentoring and graduate opportunities. The Careers Centre also facilitates overseas internships, where employers often require authorisation, authentication or other support from the University.

In recent years the Careers Centre has deliberately stepped up collaborations with student groups and the SA, with a resulting rise in awareness of the support available for enhanced employability. Other highly successful collaborations include those involving CAPOD, aided most notably (but not exclusively) by the joint Careers-CAPOD appointment of an officer to provide both developmental skills training and careers advice, mainly to science PGs and post-docs. This collaborative approach is reflected in some of the developmental opportunities for all students listed below, each of which reflects our belief in the provision of an excellent, rounded education, responsibility for which is shared across the University:
• The St Andrews Award\textsuperscript{26} for students in their second year and beyond, giving formal recognition to work-related activities as well as a full programme of workshops. The award features on a student’s transcript
• A paid summer internship programme in which the University, as a major employer, provides graduate-level work experience for as many as possible of its students
• A paid summer UG Research Internship Programme to provide intensive research apprenticeships and support emerging vocations
• A range of academic modules at SCQF levels 7 to 11, several of which are open to all students, on Business, Entrepreneurship and Venture Planning
• The Professional Skills Curriculum (PSC), a collaboration between the SA and CAPOD, training students in over 25 topics and recognised on the Higher Education Achievement Report (HEAR)
• A student enterprise programme run by our Enterprise & Employability Officer, collaborating with the Scottish Institute for Enterprise and experts within and outwith St Andrews. This includes business start-up support as well as more formal enterprise and entrepreneurship education
• An intensive 3-day ‘Careers Launch’ conference\textsuperscript{27}, piloted in January 2014, by CAPOD in partnership with the Careers Centre and the SA. Building on the success of this venture, the conference will run again in January 2015
• PGR students have access to the GRADskills programme and the PGT students have their own M-Skills programme both coordinated by CAPOD
• Extra-curricular tuition in a wide range of languages is available (e.g. modern European; Greek and Latin; Persian; Hebrew)

Certain cohorts of students also benefit from particular opportunities related to their study discipline. Credit-bearing placements are for example widely taken up in Chemistry and Modern Languages, and there are plans to extend this as part of the expansion of the Enhanced Honours provision in STEM (e.g. Biochemistry, Earth Sciences). Many Schools have associated student societies that organise industry or other professional speakers and visits. In addition, the University regards the experience of student representation or office-bearing as valuable education and preparation for employment. To help students capitalise on such opportunities, we have since 2012 provided bespoke training for club, society and Student Representative Officers (see 2.3.4.1).

Despite high levels of student engagement in the many successful activities run by Careers there are a few areas where additional work is being undertaken. For example, St Andrews responses to the International Student Barometer survey in 2012-2013 and 2013-2014, as well as the PRES in 2013, indicate that our students see something of a gap between careers events and their academic Schools or programmes. 2014-2015 will therefore see renewed endeavours to connect the two, in part by providing better support for a ‘careers link’ academic in each discipline. Recent results from the PTES highlighted that we remain below the sector average in questions relating to employability; discussions have therefore started between the Careers Centre and Pro Dean (Taught Postgraduate) to find ways of enhancing the support available.

Since the Employability Enhancement Theme, all Schools have amended their curricula and assessments to provide scope for the acquisition of skills directly relevant to the workplace: widespread examples include presentations, teamwork, timed work, research and report writing. However, the topic remains on our L&T agenda, particularly in the context of helping students to recognise and articulate their own attributes.
2.2 Supporting equality and diversity in the student population

2.2.1 Equality and diversity policies and awards

Our commitment to the equality and diversity agenda is firmly embedded in our central processes and procedures. The University’s Single Equality Outcomes Scheme provides strategic direction and an action plan for the next three years. It consolidates required strategic actions across all equality strands and protected characteristics into one single plan and therefore provides a more effective and streamlined approach to supporting equality and diversity. The University’s Equality and Diversity Officer (EDO) plays a key facilitative role in supporting, training and guiding staff and students in this process and endeavours to ensure that the staff and student population is treated fairly across all ‘protected characteristics.’

The University has participated in external equality and diversity projects such as the Equality Challenge Unit’s (ECU) Equality and Diversity for Academics to identify good HE sector practice. Every science School has an Athena SWAN Committee, using the Athena SWAN toolkit. The EDO receives minutes from these meetings and monitors the development and implementation of action plans. Several awards have been received, recognising fair treatment and non-discrimination: an Athena SWAN ‘Bronze Institutional Award’; Athena SWAN ‘Silver Department Award’ for Chemistry and ‘Bronze Department Awards’ for Mathematics & Statistics and Psychology & Neuroscience; and a JUNO award for the School of Physics & Astronomy.

We also hold an institutional LGBT Charter Mark. The University has plans to extend the same approach to the arts & humanities disciplines by signing up to the ECU’s proposed Gender Equality Charter Mark award and has recently developed partnership links with the Scottish Resource Centre for Women in STEM and ‘Inter-connect’ to establish a schedule of onsite career development workshops for women working and studying in STEM subjects in the University.

What was originally established as the Institutional A-SWAN Award Group, is now the Equality & Diversity Awards Group, for the purposes of sharing good practice and non-duplication of effort as Schools and Units work towards various awards. This group is chaired by the Provost, and has representation from all Schools, as well as students and professional staff.

The Equality & Diversity Awards Group is advised by a smaller E&D Steering Group, also chaired by the Provost and which also has Union and student representation. It drives forward the University approach to E&D and reports to the PO. The Steering Group is evaluating progress in improving the representation, progression and success of staff and students from ethnic minorities within St Andrews, with a view to applying for the Race Equality Charter Mark in April 2015. St Andrews is one of four Scottish institutions participating in the pilot of this scheme. Overall the University aims to foster a grass-roots approach, rather than a top-down, management-driven agenda.

2.2.2 Accessibility and inclusivity

In 2013 the University launched an Inclusive Curriculum Toolkit which provides an internal compliance guide signposting staff to good practice in the different stages of curriculum design, delivery and assessment. While Schools are expected to take account of the Toolkit, it would be true to say that more active interest in the E&D agenda (consistent with our general approach) has been generated by a 2014 LTC Open Forum, Diversity in Academia, followed by a discussion at LTC which expressed the resolve to hold further similar activities.

The Open Forum was linked to a project supported through DSC Enhancement Theme funding, ‘Mapping the Geographies of Teaching and Learning’, which explores diversity in teaching at sub-honours in the Faculties of Arts and Divinity. The overall aim of this project was to map
the geographies of where authors of sub-honours readings are based (institutional affiliation, country of origin) and to explore whether Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) issues, global South perspectives and gender-related issues are addressed in modules. The project recognises that questions related to diversity in the curriculum are vast, complex and difficult to negotiate while balancing the needs of the academic community, staff research interests, market factors and the University's broader commitment to widening access. It has observed that important progress is being made by some Schools in addressing diversity-related issues. Findings from the project will be available later this academic year.

L&T policies are monitored to ensure that practices are inclusive and accessible to all students. A new Working Group on Inclusive Learning has been set up at the particular request of the DoRep and involves colleagues from academic and professional backgrounds as well as student representation. The Group will scope out possible guidelines or policy reforms to advance equal and enhanced access to learning, reporting to LTC in 2014-2015.

The above work is informed by analysis of the appropriate University data. The University was recently successful in bidding to participate in the ECU project, ‘Attracting diversity: equality in student recruitment in Scottish HEIs’ starting in September 2014. The project explores improving student recruitment across the different equality groups in Scotland. Its findings will help us to benchmark our data more accurately against other HEIs using the same scheme.

Educating and supporting our students in fully understanding E&D issues is also a priority for the University. Students currently sign up to our principles of tolerance, integrity and respect as part of the Honour Code and from 2015-2016 all entrants will be required to complete a new online diversity training module as a condition of matriculation.

2.2.3 Pre-arrival and induction support

Extensive induction information addresses a wide range of student concerns about diversity and equality issues, and feedback from students is that they find our approach to be extremely helpful and reassuring. Our ELT Unit is key to supporting non-native speaking students, who apply from a wide range of countries and backgrounds. The Unit provides a variety of pre-sessional language and foundation programmes of different lengths. As well as teaching language skills, ELT courses raise student awareness of differences between academic disciplines and how these may differ from previous learning experiences. Students also learn about the cultural and philosophical basis for academic policies and what this means in practice. A challenge remains as regards how to prepare the expectations of overseas students (and their families) who do not require language tuition. With this in mind, SS has become more involved in discussions with prospective students from the USA, and a brochure has been prepared to aid the cultural transition to St Andrews for North American students.

Incoming students with disabilities and long term medical conditions receive a personalised invitation to contact the disability team to ensure support arrangements are in place for the start of session. Students applying through widening access programmes receive a wide range of support through the Admissions Access and Outreach Team which helps applicants to make a more informed choice about the advantages of degree programmes in relation to career options.

The SA 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.
2.2.3.1 PGT induction

In 2013-2014, responsibility for PGT students was moved to the Proctor’s Office. Recognising that more could be done for PGT induction, a bespoke event was set up for new PGT students to complement local School events. The event was adjusted in 2014 to address specific concerns of this group at the start of their studies. In addition, incoming PGTs in Computer Science, History and Management have been piloting a pre-arrival mentoring scheme with existing PGT students. We plan to roll this scheme out to more Schools in 2015.

External guidance also provides an opportunity to review our provision of information to prospective students. Following the recent HEFCE circular Guidance to institutions on providing information for prospective postgraduate taught students, a task group led by the Pro Dean is considering ways to increase direct contact between candidates and staff and to develop better resources (including social media) to inform prospective students.

Issues of equality and diversity will form part of our continued review of PGT provision. While many PGTs are catered for by ELT, and numerous other support mechanisms are provided by SS, the Chaplaincy and others, we recognise that this cohort, with around 50% overseas students undertaking only one (very busy) year of study, requires particular care.

2.2.4 Support for students post-matriculation

A wide array of services is available to support students once they have joined the University, all working to the ethos of a rounded education founded on academic priority.

Students who indicate that they use English as an Additional Language (EAL) or have low confidence are directed to a language diagnostic tool or In-sessional English Language Service (IELS) and can then access one-to-one tutorials and language development provision in ELT.

Student Services provides a wholly integrated range of student support dealing with personal, social and financial issues. Support is available via the ASC helpdesk, or one-to-one appointments in SS and/or with Wardens in student residences. Students with disabilities are offered practical living support as well as an assessment of needs relating to teaching and assessment arrangements. SS liaises with Schools to provide appropriate academic support for students having difficulty engaging with their studies due to circumstances beyond their control. The Unit also trains and works collaboratively with student groups to promote mental health awareness, disability awareness and wellbeing.

The Chaplaincy provides additional support and advocacy for students of all faiths (and none), and there is also a dedicated International Students Honorary Chaplain.

The Careers Centre provides support by actively promoting events and vacancies with a diversity focus, such the Inside and Out LGBT careers event in the City of London. Specific careers advice is also available for students with disabilities. Careers Centre support for international opportunities is mentioned above (2.1.7).

CAPOD also has a role in helping students settle quickly into University life. Students can obtain support to develop academic, professional and IT skills (see 1.2.4, 2.1.7, 2.3.4.1). As part of a number of dedicated development programmes, UGs and PGTs also have the opportunity to attend a workshop in cross-cultural working early on in their studies.
The Pro Dean (Taught Postgraduate) plays a leading role in enhancing the PGT student experience and has initiated changes to the regulations with regard to the progression requirements, invited key speakers on Masters teaching to the University, arranged educational sessions for PGT teachers and worked with CAPOD both on a new suite of PGT induction events and on the development of M-Skills. The widely welcomed inclusion of PGT students in St Leonard’s College provides another support network.

The Provost leads enhancement of the PGR student experience and has facilitated a growing sense of community among PGR students, providing opportunities for ideas to be shared and collaborations to develop. The College hosts regular events that support students in their intellectual and research activity and foster a culture of entrepreneurship, encouraging PGRs to think about avenues for their own creativity. The elected President of the Postgraduate Society and other PG representatives actively assist St Leonard’s in this regard.

### 2.3 Engaging and supporting students in their learning

Engaging and supporting students in their learning is central to our identity and to our success at St Andrews, and we view it as a responsibility shared by all. While we depend on our academic staff to guide our students’ intellectual development, it is recognised that our service Units share fully in the responsibility to provide a first-rate education and to enable students to engage with it to the best of their ability. Without our excellent Units, we would struggle to deliver the quality of teaching we provide, and many of our students would simply be unable to complete their studies.

The key fora for development of policy and procedures in this area are the University’s LTC, uniting all academic Schools and every service Unit with direct responsibility to support L&T, and also the SDG-SE. Our intention is to bring members of these groups into increasingly close interaction, enabling academic and professional colleagues to learn better understanding and trust for one another’s work, so that we present a more seamless operation to our own and our students’ benefit. Thus, for example, all committee members attend and contribute to LTC events, including the Open Forum, dissemination events and a four-hour LTC ‘development afternoon’ (first held in 2014), where we focus primarily on teaching matters. At the same time, LTC working groups on, for instance, Deferred Assessment, Extenuating Circumstances and Early Module Information, include students and colleagues from both Schools and Units, while three SDG-SE projects (the ‘respect’ agenda, being ‘internationally Scottish’ and students’ time management skills) have drawn in students and staff from across the University.

#### 2.3.1 Student representation

St Andrews has a strong student representative structure. This includes a network of School Presidents who improve communications and cooperation between students and staff. School Presidents are a fundamental link between the Students’ Association and elected class representatives. They chair meetings of their subject’s Student-Staff Consultative Committee and generally set the agenda in consultation with the DoT. They also propose new activities, such as staff-student socials, seminars or learning support – for example, the Classics UG assistant teaching scheme.

School Presidents meet on a fortnightly basis with the DoRep and also at the School Presidents’ Forum which is attended by the Proctor and Deans. Minutes of each meeting are published online through the SA website; action points and updates from the DoRep are sent out to all School Presidents immediately following the Forum.
Building on the success of the School Presidents system, the University recently agreed to the creation of two Faculty Presidents who are elected from the UG student body in their respective Faculties (Arts/Divinity and Science/Medicine). The Faculty Presidents have replaced the former Student Representatives on Academic Council.

New representative arrangements for PG students were introduced in 2013-2014. These mirror the structures currently in place for UG student representation.

Students are engaged in many aspects of University governance and day-to-day operations and are well represented on the University's central committees.

The SA and the University have a long-standing and trusting relationship. Students make formal representations to the University and the wider community on issues affecting them through the Students’ Representative Council (SRC) and through its academic representation network. Students have the autonomy to lead projects relating to the learning experience at a variety of levels, and we value the ambitious nature of the partnership-based activity initiated by our students each year. The University and SA also join together in taking up the opportunity for an annual dialogue with Student Participation in Quality Scotland (sparqs).

Of special note since the last ELIR, the SA and University have worked together on the £12m redevelopment of the SA building, with a particular focus on better supporting student-led performing arts, societies and representational activities, together with a concern to open up the space in a more inclusive manner by providing an alcohol-free café and improved disabled access. The University and SA have worked in close partnership through the Project Board and have found additional ways to support one another: the SA has taken the opportunity to conduct a review of its governance with a view to meeting its obligations in respect of the newly refurbished building, while the University has provided free spaces wherever possible to accommodate student activities while parts of the building are closed. Two members of University management (the Proctor and the Director of Finance) currently sit on the SA Board of Trustees, allowing the University to gain further awareness of the depth and breadth of SA activities.

The strong relationship between the SA and University can also be illustrated by the Association’s voluntary participation in the URLT programme in 2013. The Review of the SA highlighted the positive partnership between the SA and University, and the very clear and significant contribution the Association makes to the student experience, offering an impressive range of services and opportunities to the student body.

To recognise the significant commitment by students in enhancing L&T in the University, the SA and University recently established the Proctor's Award, to be awarded annually to a student who shows outstanding commitment and initiative in supporting L&T.

2.3.2 Communication from students to the University

The University captures formal feedback from students through MEQs (to be introduced online from 2014-2015), Unit surveys and also externally facilitated surveys such as the NSS, i-Grad, PTES, PRES and DLHE. Results and analysis from the surveys are circulated to Schools and Units; the institutional results are considered by the AMG and Service Directors’ Group, while any conflated themes are then referred to the LTC, SDG-SE or other relevant bodies. In addition, feedback is secured through the student representative structures such as Schools’ Student-Staff Consultative Committees and Class Representatives.
It is appreciated that more work could be done to ensure that students are aware of the steps that the University has taken to respond to the feedback received from students through MEQs and Student Surveys. Over the coming year, Schools will be asked to review and enhance the way in which they provide this feedback to students, with the School Presidents playing a key role in this process.

Following an occasion in 2013-2014 when communication between LTC and the School Presidents’ Forum fell out of synch over the development of policy on Honours entry, resulting in a difference of views that might otherwise have been avoided, the Proctor and DoRep have undertaken in 2014-2015 to use their regular catch-up meetings to discuss the progress of LTC or similar business.

### 2.3.3 Communication to students

Aside from the formal student representation structures for ‘local’ School communications, students also receive information through a dedicated Current Students homepage, the dedicated student portal iSaint, a weekly central email – the ‘Wednesday memo’ – a range of social media feeds from the University centrally, its Schools and Units, and via St Andrews student media (this includes a fortnightly free newspaper, a student radio station and a variety of online St Andrews news sites.) Communications about central matters of institutional importance, such as the introduction of the new academic year, are coordinated through the PO and the Proctor.

### 2.3.4 Student development opportunities

The University’s support and resource for student and staff development has been focused and intensified since the creation of CAPOD in 2011. This has been in response to a greater need for professional skills for students, an institutional strategy to expand PG numbers and a commitment to equip staff with the skills to perform in a demanding environment.

Each member of CAPOD’s developer team has responsibility for a particular cohort of staff or students. This structure has worked very well in creating areas of specialism and forging rewarding networks, such that CAPOD has built up a strong contribution to creating and maintaining excellence in L&T that goes well beyond traditional CPD for staff. Areas for development are identified through our quality monitoring processes and also through ongoing dialogue with Schools and Units. In 2014 CAPOD created the role of Head of Student Development, bringing together academic and co-curricular support for students at all levels. Development for students is offered in four areas for UG:

- Academic skills
- Mathematics and Statistics support
- Professional skills
- IT skills

The new Head of Student Development will also consolidate additional areas of expansion.

### 2.3.4.1 Undergraduate students

Mathematics and statistics support to UG students has increased partly due to the decision to replace a single departing staff member with a pool of PGR tutors (now over 20 in total), which has improved the service available to students. Combining staffing efficiencies for CAPOD with development opportunities for PGRs, a similar model will be used to supply a programme of
academic skills support for UGs, designed and coordinated by CAPOD and comprising workshops led by specially-trained PGRs in each academic discipline. This is being trialled in Arts Schools in 2014-2015. These initiatives exemplify our commitment to sharing responsibility for L&T across the institution, and to providing an excellent all-round education for students at every level.

The same approach is used for the increasing range of bespoke training sessions in professional skills development for student groups including sports leaders, Class Representatives, School Presidents, Hall Committees, Student Ambassadors, and Club and Society Committees. These sessions come partly under the umbrella of the Professional Skills Curriculum (PSC), a strategic initiative launched in 2011 to address students’ relative lack of professional skills and behaviours, as well as a surprising deficit of confidence in their skills, suggested by NSS scores. Available to all students, the PSC delivers over 25 professional skills topics through lectures, online workshops and practicals, engaging 440 students in 2013-2014. The PSC has elicited very positive feedback from students who feel it develops confidence and workplace skills that feed into their academic studies. Further expanding the reach of the PSC (by involving student PSC interns and ambassadors) is one of the priorities for 2014-2015.

2.3.4.2 PGT students

Another initiative is the M-Skills programme designed especially for PGT students in response to the findings of periodic student focus groups and comprising four strands:

- Making the Most of St Andrews
- Getting Through your Course
- What Comes Next?
- Getting Set for the Workplace

Creating a programme to satisfy this diverse group has proven to be challenging, and more work is needed to engage a greater number of PGTs. In 2014-2015, additional focus will be given to the most popular workshops, including Resilience, Writing Skills and Transition. The ‘Mastersness’ methodology developed by SHEEC will be considered as one approach to use in helping develop our support for PGTs.

2.3.4.3 PGR students

CAPOD supports development of our PGR cohort via a well-established programme (GRADskills) and a dedicated PGR developer. There has been improved support for PGs who teach, through mandatory induction sessions and the opportunity to take two HEA-accredited ‘Introduction to University Teaching’ modules. Success in either one of these modules awards the candidate Associate Fellowship of the HEA. The modules achieve very positive feedback from participating students whose goal, in the main, is to pursue a career in academia.

2.3.4.4 Student transitions

In 2014-2015, more effort will be made to support the transition from UG/PGT students to PGR, as well as the transition of PGRs into postdoctoral research positions or outside of academia. This work has already begun and will progress as part of the University’s response to the Enhancement Theme ‘Student Transitions.’ An expansion of the successful University mentoring scheme for early career researchers (recently shortlisted for a THE Award) is one approach that is being considered to enable this.
2.3.4.5 IT training

A recently established area of joint development for staff and students has been the provision of IT skills training, made possible through the appointment of a dedicated IT trainer. Staff and PGs now have the option to work towards the globally recognised Microsoft Office Suite qualification. Our current IT training for UG is at an early stage: however, the University is shortly to appoint a new Head of Learning Technology and IT Skills Development, whose first duty (among others) will be to assess how to take this forward.

2.3.4.6 Feedback to students on assessment

Although the University has well-developed mechanisms for students to receive feedback on their summative and formative assessment, there is room for improvement (as highlighted in our Collaboration Statement[^43]). In 2014, the University supported a project to trial an approach previously used at Edinburgh Napier University to help students reflect on how they can derive the greatest benefit from the feedback they receive. The method promotes the adoption of Dweck’s ‘growth mindset’ and encourages students to welcome constructive criticism as an opportunity to improve. Two Schools piloted the scheme in 2014, and a report from the pilot is currently under consideration.

At the same time, 2014-2015 will see the start of a more intensively student-led project to raise awareness of issues about feedback. Under the guidance of the DoRep, a student working group will analyse and present information detailing coursework feedback issues from the student perspective with a view to improving the quality and timeliness of feedback, as well as students’ use of it.

2.3.5 Student behaviour and wellbeing

An official Opening Ceremony for all incoming UG students was introduced in Orientation Week 2011. This introduces students to ‘belonging’ in an academic world and helps focus their thoughts both on their studies and on our broader community values. Thought is being given to whether a similar event could be introduced for PGs. Senior members of the University welcome the students and speak inspirationally on the search for knowledge, encouraging students to open their minds to the possibilities of learning, debate and intellectual experimentation. At the same time, and also through the Honour Code, the University makes clear to students at the start of every year that they are expected to meet high standards of conduct in terms of respect for others.

As nearly all new UGs live in halls of residence, Wardens and Hall Committees play a key role in Orientation Week, welcoming new entrants and encouraging positive engagement. In 2012-2013, SS and CAPOD established a completely new training programme for all Wardens that now includes Mental Health First Aid.

SS now conduct monitoring of both student-generated self-certificates of absence (since 2011) and School-generated ‘academic alerts’ indicating a lapse in student engagement (from 2013). Schools monitor the number and severity of academic alerts and raise any concerns with the student, Registry Officer or SS. In turn, Registry colleagues will, from 2014-2015, assist the Decanal teams to monitor under-performance by students who will receive an early intervention of warning and advice before they fall into Termination of Studies, rather than after they have failed modules, as previously occurred. We value such proactive intervention for students experiencing difficult circumstances.
The University works on the principle of developing students’ agency and independence in all aspects of their lives. SS in particular has therefore introduced initiatives to empower students with difficulties to manage and improve their own mental health and well-being and relieve normal levels of stress during their studies. These include:

- Transformation of the former ‘SupNet’ peer support programme into Student Minds which offers ‘buddying’ for students who are experiencing difficulties, but also organises regular activities raising awareness and promoting good mental health
- Wardens holding or facilitating ‘mental wealth’ activities in residences
- Workshops on Compassion-Focused Therapy, Anxiety Management and Mindfulness
- Providing access to online ‘self-help’ support programmes and e-books that can be used by students in their own time
- Support for our very successful student-run Nightline branch that won the Nightline Association’s ‘Nightline of the Year’ in 2011 and ‘Best Volunteer Support’ in 2014
- Creation of a SA Wellbeing Committee that liaises closely with SS and brings together independent student-led groups dedicated to supporting student wellbeing

Counselling and support advice is available to all students and we have also continued to widen and improve service in the ‘one stop shop’, the ASC. Transcripts and student status letters can be printed instantly at the desk, online appointments can be made to see SS Advisers, Academic Advisers, Registry Officers and Pro Deans, and student queries can be addressed on matters ranging from finances to accommodation. The ASC has been rated first or second each year since its inception in the International Student Barometer. It will be included in a URLT review of SS due to be undertaken in Semester 1, 2014-2015.

### 2.3.6 Study abroad

The University welcomes the increased focus on outbound mobility at the national level and is committed to encouraging outbound student mobility and to enhancing the experience of all participating students. While it is difficult to compare mobility figures across a diverse HEI sector in Scotland, we are pleased to have grown our traditional semester and year-long study abroad numbers to around 200 undergraduates per year over the last few years, and to have increased the participation of science students.

Key priorities for the University as expressed in the Study Abroad Strategy are to increase the number and range of opportunities available to qualified students, to promote WP, to develop an ‘on return’ service and to engage with the transition to Erasmus+

A robust process, managed by the Collaborations and Study Abroad (CSA) team of Registry, frames the establishment of all new exchange programmes and is designed to cut out the unnecessary work caused by unsatisfactory programmes by capturing information and assigning responsibilities in a series of clear steps. Individual Schools must assess curriculum match and suitability and opt in to any new programme established by the University. The ‘opt in’ process by Schools has greatly enhanced our study abroad provision and has helped in particular with increasing mobility from the Science Faculty by allowing us to match partners in the right disciplines. New University-level programmes are established regularly, most recently with the National University of Singapore, the University of Melbourne and a Biology summer exchange with IISER in Mohali, India. New links seek to broaden opportunities for students, as well as enhancing teaching and research connections.

The application and selection process for most Study Abroad programmes is coordinated by the CSA team, and selection for St Andrews Abroad is led by the Pro Deans. Honours entry is
the minimum requirement for all study abroad programmes, but other factors are used in the selection process, and most programmes have stronger academic entry requirements. As demand for study abroad has grown, the current selection process has come under pressure, and will be reviewed in 2014-2015, with the aim of making the selection criteria for the most competitive programmes clearer to students.

In 2013-2014 the University was awarded Scottish Government Outward Mobility funding to support a Study Abroad WP project which seeks to enhance links between the work of the University’s Access team and Study Abroad. The project aims to develop mechanisms to engage with students from non-traditional backgrounds from first engagement with the University (whether this is through one of the Aspire projects aimed at 10-13 year olds, the First Chances project aimed at 14-17 year olds, the STAR project for 18+, or indeed matriculation at the University) to peer support whilst abroad. There is much scope to develop useful initiatives in this area, towards which the project is a promising step.

The University consults students on the development of our programme portfolio and enhancement of associated services. Each School has a Study Abroad Coordinator who works closely with the CSA team, provides academic guidance to students and has oversight of all students’ learning abroad.

Attendance at a pre-departure meeting is compulsory for all students who are preparing to study abroad, and briefing sessions are also available to help prepare transition to a new academic culture. If inbound and outbound students have questions, they can consult the CSA team without having to make an appointment.

All students are briefed about credit and grade conversion before they participate in study abroad. The conversion policy, standard Conversion Tables and guidance about credit loads abroad are all available online. A new Learning Agreement process was recently introduced, which has significantly improved the timely return of approved Agreements. On return, students are given two weeks to submit any supporting evidence for the conversion process to their Schools. Conversions are undertaken by Schools, using the standard Conversion Tables, and are submitted to the Deans for approval. The Deans ensure that conversions are fair and consistent across the faculties. In order to refine our conversion process further, we are developing more institution-specific credit and grade Conversion Tables, using partner information and analysis of conversion data over the last few years.

Students returning from abroad can apply for an internship to lead CSA projects and contribute to a peer support service for inbound and outbound students. In 2013-2014 an Enhancement Theme project funded a student intern to develop an ‘on-return’ service to enhance student re-integration to St Andrews and to encourage participation in promotional and pre-departure activities. A CSA Student-Staff Consultative Committee has also been set up as a formal means of gathering feedback on study abroad programmes and services.

### 2.3.7 Work placements

A small number of Schools, such as Biology, Chemistry and Modern Languages, offer students work placements both at home and abroad. These programmes are approved on an individual basis with dedicated staff within the School having responsibility for liaising with the partner companies. These colleagues ensure that there is adequate provision for work-related learning and that all aspects of support for the participating students have been considered, with appropriate contact and understandings in place. While students are away on placement we ensure that avenues for contact and support are available, normally via email interactions with
the Study Abroad Coordinators or placement advisers. Students participating in work placements abroad are also supported by the CSA team throughout their time, and many receive Erasmus grant funding for working in Europe as part of their St Andrews degree programme. With growth in new programmes such as the new MBiochem, we plan to review the way we administer work placements to ensure consistency.

### 2.3.8 Internships

St Andrews students are acutely aware of the benefits of gaining internship experience alongside their academic studies. A challenge for the University is sourcing and providing appropriate internship experiences with graduate employers, given the highly international student body and paucity of such employers in the immediate vicinity.

The Careers Centre surveyed UG students’ internship experiences in 2013: 95% of respondents recommended the experience to others. As mentioned above (2.1.7), the High Fliers survey showed that 57% of St Andrews UGs had achieved an internship by the time of their graduation in 2012, placing the University eighth in the UK and 62% in 2013, placing us fifth.

Examples of internship opportunities provided by the University include the University Research Internship Programme (URIP) and Careers Centre internship programme as well as a wide range of internships offered by Schools and Units. The Careers Centre also coordinates the Santander funded scheme which provides internships in SMEs. Information on internship opportunities is available through the Careers Centre webpages, LinkedIn alumni mentoring group and SaintConnect networking platform. At the time of writing we are planning a substantial increase in the number of research internships for UGs.

The University is actively seeking other new avenues: for example, networking events in Washington and New York have already resulted in internships for students, and some alumni have provided shadowing opportunities that may lead to further internship offers.

### 2.3.9 University Estate

The University’s Estate comprises many different types of buildings from state of the art contemporary structures to elegant listed buildings. The eclectic mix of building styles and interiors lends to the unique learning experience that St Andrews offers. This in itself presents us with a challenge in adapting our space to respond to the changing needs of today’s learners. A rolling programme of refurbishments has begun, to increase the provision of technology-enriched, flexible and agile spaces suitable for teaching, solitary learning and collaborative group study. The budget for this work, agreed in 2013-2014, is managed by the Teaching Infrastructure Strategy Group (TISG) chaired by the Proctor.

The continual pressure on teaching accommodation has been exacerbated by the constraints of a timetable that struggles to accommodate literally thousands of possible subject combinations across the student body. The University has recently taken a more flexible approach to management of the teaching timetable, resulting in better usage of space. Utilisation for 2013-2014, based on four physical surveys of teaching rooms over both semesters, was 26.16%, showing a significant rise on the 20.75% of 2012-2013. This reflects the benefits of a more flexible approach to traditional ‘class hours’, allowing the best quality teaching space to be used for a greater number of activities. Further flexibility is planned to help ensure a timetable with highly ‘local’ teaching, i.e. requiring minimal travel time between venues for students and staff. We are also reviewing Joint Degrees with a view to removing obsolete programmes and freeing up opportunities for more popular or appropriate subject combinations.
The completed refurbishment of the main Library (underway and noted at the time of ELIR 2011) has been a resounding success in providing a modern, fresh and inspiring learning environment. It has allowed for greater diversification of styles of study space (total provision increased by a third), improved self-service and security technologies both of which initially helped to facilitate a 28% increase in semester opening hours since 2011 (47% during vacation). This was further increased in 2014-2015 to 8am-2am, seven days a week.

However, footfall has risen by more than 50% since 2011 with an average of 6,500 visitors to the building per day during semester. The Library now sees overcrowding far earlier in the semester than pre-redevelopment and experiences daily pressures related to lack of adequate toilet facilities, power points and building temperature controls. Student feedback shows there is continued demand for investment in the Main Library’s facilities. In order to foster independent learning, we are addressing the relative shortage of informal study hubs and PG workspace by pursuing a programme of improved social and informal study areas. It is hoped that these will encourage collegial interaction among UGs, PGs and staff. Around 100 new study spaces are to be added in 2014-2015.

Other recent notable developments to the Estate include:

- Martyrs Kirk Research Library: a beautiful research reading room created in a former church in the heart of town. The building offers 40 study spaces available to PGRs and staff and a Special Collections Reading Room with a dedicated teaching space
- St Leonard’s College PG Centre with dedicated office spaces for 55 Arts PGRs
- Biomedical Sciences Research Complex: a state of the art research building, housing scientists from the Schools of Medicine, Biology, Chemistry and Physics & Astronomy. The building achieved a BREAM “outstanding” rating, making it the first UK laboratory, and the only building in Scotland, to receive the top green rating
- Wireless internet access across the University, including all halls of residence
- SA refurbishment programme, due for completion in 2015
- Sports Centre upgrades with provision of tennis courts, a hockey pitch and 3G synthetic rugby pitch, with further investment planned for the main building
- A 25-year lease agreement to manage the Byre Theatre as a venue for University music, specialised teaching (especially drama and film) and a community and extra-curricular programme of performances, to include student use
- A rolling programme of residence modernisation, with a current focus on PGR accommodation at Fife Park

The University needs to keep abreast of changes in learning styles and, in a joint venture between the University and SA, students were surveyed in 2014 about their study habits and their use of technology. The results of this study will help inform the business of TISG and the Space & Asset Management Group. Consideration will be given on the value of running the survey again in 2015-2016 to identify the impact of any actions taken forward as a result of the recommendations.

2.3.10 Technology enhanced learning and teaching

St Andrews currently uses two VLEs, Moodle and GALEN (the in-house Medicine VLE), alongside the University’s Module Management System (MMS), which is used for administrative purposes. While the VLEs are widely used, we are not satisfied that the current provision guarantees the excellent support for learning we would expect. Upon recruitment of a new Head of Learning Technology & IT Skills Development, therefore, a VLE Working Group will be established to consult with students and staff on requirements, including current and desired functionality, the need for a single or multiple VLEs, the interface of the VLE with other systems such as MMS and ownership
and support for the VLE. The new appointee will provide support for the strategic development of learning technologies and IT skills training across the University.

### 2.4 Approaches to promoting the development of graduate attributes including employability

In keeping with our vision of academic excellence at the centre of a rounded education, we seek to develop a wide range of graduate attributes in our students. Preceding sections (see in particular 2.1.7) describe activities underway to promote co-curricular and professional/leadership skills to support employability. Many of these have been framed by our Student Experience and Employability strategies, developed in consultation with students in the relevant Service Directors’ areas of responsibility. Initiatives in each of the Units concerned have been launched to meet the University’s aspiration to help students develop as valued citizens, colleagues and employees. In addition, the three cross-Unit projects (respect, ‘internationally Scottish,’ time management – see 1.2.6), as well as the PSC and Careers Launch conference, grew directly out of discussions of the SE strategy.

Sections 3 and 4 below will detail how we currently enhance and manage academic standards to ensure that students are encouraged to develop their intellectual ambition and to acquire the research-led skills we want them to value and to take into the workplace.

In future work related to academic programmes, scheduled to take place under the SER programme (see 1.2.2), it is intended that the Course Catalogue should display the academic and non-academic skills (graduate attributes) that are available as part of module outcomes, in such a way as to inform student/adviser discussions about future module choices and potential employability. Following a student’s completion of their modules, the relevant graduate attributes will automatically be preserved on the final HEAR where, collectively, they will illustrate the wide range of skills to which the student has had exposure across their programme. Pending this development, many Schools already display graduate attributes in their module handbooks.

### 2.5 Effectiveness of the approach to enhancing the student learning experience

Engaging and supporting students in their learning is central to our identity and we invest heavily in this aspect of our operations. We also have a long and rewarding history of involving students in decision-making and governance, a partnership that plays a key role in our success in enhancing the student learning experience. As part of our ongoing reflection and review (not least in writing this RA), we continue to identify areas that require further consideration and to address them, most often in collaboration with students themselves.

In order to keep down the number of meetings and quantities of paperwork, we make our quality enhancement structures work as hard for us as possible. Thus, the mechanisms used to check effectiveness in terms of the student learning experience overlap to some extent with those for Academic Monitoring (referred to throughout this document), supplemented by formal bodies such as the School Presidents’ Forum and SDG-SE and informal consultations at every level of University life. Projects and working groups reporting to LTC or SDG-SE use student feedback to ensure that the learning experience is improved wherever possible, and survey scores are – as discussed elsewhere in the RA – explored with relevant staff and students wherever they fall short of our desired standards.
This attentiveness to the student experience is reflected in our satisfaction ratings (currently first equal in the UK in NSS), suggesting that the St Andrews learning experience is excellent and highly appreciated. However, we are far from complacent and, as mentioned above, we are keen to reinforce the ethos of shared responsibility for excellence across the institution.
Section 3. Enhancement in Learning and Teaching

3.1 Approaches to identifying and sharing good practice

The strategic direction for enhancement is guided by the QE Strategy, reviewed and revised during academic year 2013-2014 and approved by Academic Council in June 2014. In it the University's objectives for QE are stated as:

- The improvement of teaching and learning quality wherever necessary and possible
- Continual emphasis on bettering our techniques to develop students as independent learners, to stretch their ambitions and competences and to stimulate their enthusiasm for learning
- The development and enactment of key strategic focal points in L&T, as determined from time to time
- An enhanced appreciation among students and staff of the high quality of L&T in the University and a shared ambition to contribute to their further refinement

As with the L&T and SE strategies, responsibility for delivering this strategy is shared by academics, professional support staff and students. In this chapter, we discuss our approach to identifying and sharing promising practice, activity related to the national Enhancement Themes (ET), and our work to engage and support staff and students in these areas.

3.1.1 Academic monitoring and review

Academic monitoring and review processes are central to our recognition of good and promising practice.

A key innovation of our academic monitoring processes in this context has been the creation of CAPOD under the management of DCQM, which houses responsibility for quality enhancement and professional development in the same unit as academic monitoring processes. The co-location of these activities demonstrates that we see academic monitoring not as an end in itself, but as the basis for improvements that can be supported through CAPOD’s range of development opportunities.

At the outset of CAPOD, a role of Academic Monitoring and Development Adviser was created to have responsibility for identifying good practice across all monitoring and review processes. Summaries of good practice are reported to AMG and are also used to inform potential professional development needs.

3.1.2 October Annual Academic Monitoring Dissemination Event

The Annual Academic Monitoring Dissemination event was introduced in 2012-2013 in response to feedback that AAM was a bilateral process between AMG and one School at a time, thus missing the opportunity for Schools to learn from each other. Attended by DoTs and other interested colleagues, the Dissemination Event is now a key moment in the academic calendar for sharing information. DoTs are invited to choose topics identified in the AAM reports and selected for their broad interest. At the event, the relevant DoTs give short talks on the selected topics, and lead discussion in groups. Those same groups then meet once more in the following
month, to broaden the dialogue. At November LTC, each group member highlights lessons learned from the exercise that can be adapted for their own disciplines. They report any follow-up in the next year’s AAM round.

3.1.3 LTC Open Forum; Teaching Practice Forum

The LTC Open Forum, open to all staff and students (where appropriate) takes place twice per year. Recent topics include Feedback on Assessment and Technology-Enhanced Learning with a variety of delivery formats. The Teaching Practice Forum established in 2013-2014 offers a more intimate, informal facilitated discussion of more practical issues, such as the use of various technologies in the classroom.

3.1.4 LTC ‘Good Teaching/Good Practice’ slot

This short slot has been introduced as a standing item on the agenda at the end of every LTC meeting, providing an opportunity to share information on School and/or Unit-based initiatives e.g. an extra-curricular film-making competition run by Film Studies and a project to translate visitor information for the University Museum into the languages studied by our students in Modern Languages.

3.1.5 Teachers’ Talk webpages

Over the last year, the Proctor’s Office has developed webpages that aim to pull together all learning and teaching resources – policies and procedures, ELIR documents, good practice information, events and so on. Supported by comments from DoTs at the January 2014 LTC Awayday, these pages include a resource to enable sharing and showcasing of innovation and good practice.

3.1.6 Small project funding

Further good practice is also highlighted in applications for ET funding (see below, Section 3.2.2) and to our Teaching Development Fund. These projects are often collaborative across disciplines, across academic and non-academic colleagues, and in staff-student partnerships. Successful applicants may be asked to deliver a poster or presentation at a specially designed event, allowing successful projects to be showcased and helping to foster ideas in others. Although we have been impressed by the number and quality of projects in both categories, and by how a small amount of seed funding can lead to complex, creative pieces of work, we are now designing mechanisms to ensure that such funding aligns more effectively to strategic priorities, as well as evaluating its impact.

3.1.7 Academic School events

Many Schools hold regular events at which L&T enhancement is discussed among staff: the longstanding practice of ‘teaching lunches’ in Psychology has recently been trialled in History; Medicine reserves at least one School seminar per semester for a teaching-related topic; Management regularly invite HE and CPD experts to speak; most Schools hold an awayday each year at which curriculum and pedagogy are debated, usually in the presence of student representatives.

For several of the above activities, CAPOD has developed a comprehensive and robust evaluation strategy to extend the process of evaluating the impact of development activities. Feedback forms at the end of individual events are consistently used but of limited value, and CAPOD has started
the process of collecting evaluation data from before attendance (baseline data) to months after attendance, in order to establish the transfer of learning from development events and the longer term impact on performance.

3.2 Impact of the national enhancement themes and related activity

The University’s engagement with the national enhancement themes has been led by an institutional team, most recently (2013-2014) chaired by the Pro Dean Curriculum (Arts/Divinity). The team included representation from Schools, Units and students. During 2012-2014, on the Theme of Developing and Supporting the Curriculum, the institutional team combined a ‘top down’ approach, sponsoring University-wide events that (a) disseminate outcomes of individual projects and/or (b) raise awareness of the main topic areas of the theme, with encouragement for ‘bottom up’ initiatives, primarily by encouraging University staff and students, through funding, to develop projects relating to the theme. Calls for funding were announced on the University’s L&T webpages where news and outcomes of successful projects in the form of case studies were disseminated. At its monthly meetings, the team considered funding applications, planned events, and disseminated news from national events and Steering Committee meetings attended by team members.

In 2014-2015, the new ET, Student Transitions, will be launched under slightly different internal structures. While the demonstrably successful scheme of grants for small grass-roots projects will be maintained, administrative time will be cut back by reducing the size of the team and number of meetings, while alignment to institutional priorities will figure more prominently in our planning. A particular focus is expected to be PGT students, where we have identified a need to effect smoother academic, and sometimes cultural or personal, transitions: the Theme will be launched at an LTC Open Forum event in December 2014.

3.2.1 Enhancement Theme events

Over the three years of the Developing and Supporting the Curriculum (DSC) theme, the University organised events relating to the theme’s topic areas, including:

- A University-wide seminar on the Curriculum for Excellence, which included presentations on the nature, development and potential impact of the Curriculum for Excellence and presentations from the heads of three Fife schools. Following the presentations, workshop activities allowed staff from diverse subject areas to explore the impacts for their own practice and the links they have with schools
- A major afternoon-long event on enhancing feedback to students, with an external speaker, followed up with a pilot project – part-funded by ET money – to adapt the approach to feedback for ongoing implementation in Schools
- A L&T ‘Away Afternoon,’ with an invited facilitator, for members of the University’s LTC, prompting reflection about members’ work both individually and as a group with responsibility for the best possible teaching and learning across the University
- An Open Forum, open to all members of the University, on the topic of Diversity in the Academy

A closing event for the DSC Theme in October 2014 celebrated and further disseminated the collective activity of the last three years.
3.2.2 Project funding

To incentivise projects related to the Theme, our main approach was to invite applications for funding of projects on a rolling, monthly basis. In keeping with the University’s strong focus on engaging students with enhancement, projects were proposed by students (both UG and PG) as well as staff, or a combination of the two. We were also keen to encourage dialogue and joint work across Departmental and School boundaries. In 2011-2014, a total of £20k was allocated to 32 projects, one-third of which involved students as applicants. While two-thirds of projects came from academic Schools, the others were proposed by Units (for instance, three student internships were created in Careers, CAPOD, and Registry). A quarter of projects overall were collaborations between Departments and/or Units. The level of student involvement was encouraging and we shall continue to foster this.

While encouraging small enhancement projects, we are aware that although initiatives can make a short-term difference, the initial momentum can fade if innovations are not embedded in L&T systems and processes. Therefore, we seek a balance between enabling innovation and requiring evidence of sustainability, for example through curriculum change or the wider adoption of new practices. One such instance of long-term impact from successful DSC projects arose from a scheme in History to provide UG students with a programme of academic skills support taught by PGR tutors. The feedback from History was so enthusiastic that this model is being rolled out across the entire Arts Faculty in 2014-2015, managed and supported by CAPOD.

3.3 Engaging and supporting staff

The University is committed to the recruitment and retention of excellent staff, in both academic and professional roles. CAPOD supports this by offering a wide range of learning and development opportunities to help deliver institutional strategy by ‘... develop[ing] the skills and flexibility required to allow the University’s changing workforce requirements to be met’ (University Strategy 2008-2018). Investment in our staff enables us to provide the best possible learning experience for our students.

3.3.1 Staff induction

All staff who are new to the University are provided with a tailored induction plan, specific to their role. After being inducted locally in their Schools or Units by their line manager, all new staff attend an Induction Day at which senior staff from the PO and Units introduce the strategic aims and values of the University. The Induction Day has been revised over recent years in response to feedback from staff and senior management, to ensure the event is coherent and effective. The day offers an opportunity to meet fellow newcomers as well as colleagues from across the University. The first sessions are common to all staff, both academic and support; academic staff then receive a supplementary introduction to the University’s L&T and research strategies, policies and practice. For all staff cohorts, induction is complemented by a short course, New Staff Essentials, which runs monthly and introduces key information on such matters as Health & Safety, diversity awareness and the Q6 review and development scheme.

All academic staff are encouraged to participate in the Academic Staff Development Programme (ASDP), a series of workshops and events aimed at professional development, familiarising staff with key policies and practice and encouraging reflection focused on learning, teaching, assessment and research. New staff are expected to attend training in any aspect of L&T with which they are not familiar before undertaking new duties for the first time at St Andrews:
for example, lecturers new to PhD supervision should attend training before, or at the start of, supervising their first doctoral candidate. ASDP workshops provide an opportunity to network with and learn from academic colleagues from across the institution. The programme is coordinated by CAPOD and delivered largely by selected St Andrews colleagues with known expertise and enthusiasm (currently a pool of 60 of which 15 will be delivering in 2014-2015). For academic year 2013-2014, these workshops were structured in the areas of Research, Teaching and Service. In addition, ELT can provide support when necessary to staff for whom English is not their native language. Some staff opt to join our HEA-accredited Introduction to University Teaching modules (2.3.4.3), but this is not mandatory.

3.3.2 Support for academic staff

Support for academic and research staff is also available through the following routes:

- Mentoring schemes – both internally and through the cross-institutional mentoring scheme with the University of Dundee
- A coaching service managed by CAPOD which is available to all staff
- Courses, events and activities specifically for postdocs and early career researchers via CAPOD’s CoReskills programme. This includes a development programme launched in 2013-2014, ‘Passport to Research Futures,’ which is designed to focus thinking about career planning, professional development and employability
- A Teaching Development Fund which aims to fund substantive, collaborative projects that will have an impact on the organisational culture of L&T within a School, Faculty or across the University. Applications for up to £5,000 can be submitted for any one project, and are encouraged to support the Proctor’s strategic priorities.
- Recognition of academic staff who make a significant contribution to excellence in teaching, via our Teaching Excellence Awards, launched in 2012-2013. Nominations are received from HoS, and Award winners are celebrated at a special annual award ceremony run in collaboration with the SA who also present prizes for their own student-led Teaching Awards
- LTC Open Forum and Teaching Practice Forum, held at least once every semester. Both showcase and promote discussion on aspects of L&T
- Funding and facilitation by CAPOD of Awaydays for Schools, Departments and Units, via CAPOD
- Funded participation in external events viewed as Continuing Professional Development (e.g. the ET conference amongst other fora)

The University also provides support for all staff beyond that purely for L&T through Human Resources, CAPOD, Occupational Health, and the Chaplaincy to ensure that appropriate attention is paid to staff wellbeing and to provide opportunities to enhance career development.

3.3.3 Teaching Fellows and temporary teaching staff

Since 2011-2012, Teaching Fellows (TFs) have been invited to join an informal forum for Research Fellows run by the Vice-Principal (Research), to discuss academic and career issues. In 2013-2014, in response to requests from TFs, the Vice-Principal (Research) commissioned a report into the employment of TFs in the University. This report has recently been completed, and suggests that we have work to do in distinguishing between the different categories of TFs (broadly in terms of short-term versus standard contracts), and in clarifying contractual matters such as workloads and job descriptions, as well as career paths for those on standard contracts. This report coincided with an acknowledgement that the situation of temporary teaching staff required review and possible standardisation. As a result, the Proctor, Provost, Master, Vice-Principal (Research) and
other senior colleagues will be considering this matter with a view to making recommendations within the 2014-2015 academic year.

3.4 Effectiveness of the approach to promoting good practice in learning and teaching

At St Andrews, we carefully protect free space in which ‘grass roots’ L&T initiatives can flourish, recognising that small ‘local’ projects can lead to lasting and important developments, not only for sections of the University but for the institution as a whole. At the same time, we do not encourage innovation for its own sake, and believe it is crucial to allow space for more traditional L&T activities, acknowledging that excellent lectures, tutorials and labs have a strong place in a St Andrews education. We also believe to a great extent in trusting academic Schools to know what specific approach is best for their students in any given discipline.

That said, since ELIR 2011, we have consciously adopted a more active regime of encouraging good practice and reflective analysis in L&T, led by the Proctor’s Office. Longstanding structures such as LTC Open Forum and the Teaching Development Fund have been refreshed, with organisation handed over to a more inclusive mix of Pro Deans, DoTs and professional colleagues, while feedback from DoTs and others has been heeded, leading to the Autumn dissemination event, L&T web pages and LTC Away Afternoon, amongst other initiatives. Attempts to re-balance LTC’s traditional focus on policy and procedure with an interest in pedagogy send an important signal of our intended direction, while the introduction of University Teaching Excellence Awards is a significant and welcome symbolic step, underlining the importance the University places on L&T.

The underlying principles of our approach, then, favour a blend of tradition and innovation, discipline-specific and institution-wide perspectives, with the simple proviso that each strand of L&T practice should be excellent in delivery and in outcomes, and well understood by students. The many fora for dialogue outlined in this RA, together with periodic consultation on our practices and the analysis of L&T data already described, allow us both to take stock of feedback and to capture creative ideas for L&T enhancement at all levels. The restructuring of CAPOD, its training programmes and QE function, has ensured that support is available whenever standards fall short of where we wish them to be.

These structures have allowed us to identify areas of relative weakness that need to be addressed and successful work has resulted, for example regarding the need to refresh IT provision in teaching rooms, to encourage integration into curricula of more employability-based activities, and to provide good web pages for the L&T community. Currently we are preoccupied by the need to appoint a Head of Learning Technology and IT Development in order to address our sub-optimal support for the VLE and the use of other technologies in the classroom. We are also aware of a need to clarify our approach to Teaching Fellows and temporary teaching staff. These two issues will be taken forward as promptly as possible, leading to further effective promotion of good practice.
Section 4. Academic Standards

4.1 Approach to setting, maintaining and reviewing academic standards

Schools take responsibility for setting, monitoring and reviewing academic standards at a local level, with institutional management and oversight via the Proctor’s Office. A robust and regularly reviewed set of policies and procedures provides assurance that consistently high standards are maintained across the University, taking account of external benchmarks such as the Academic Infrastructure, the UK Quality Code, Subject Benchmark Statements, the SCQF and PSRB requirements. Programme and module approval is considered by a new (2013-2014) Cross-Faculty Curriculum Advisory Group (CAG) chaired by the Deans, further streamlined in 2014-2015 to provide efficiency and consistency. The DCQM manages both periodic URLTs and the AAM exercise, reporting to monthly meetings of the AMG, detail of which can be found in Section 5. Student engagement, often but not exclusively led by the DoRep, is also integral to the setting and reviewing of academic standards.

4.1.1 University structures

4.1.1.1 Senate and Court

Senate, as embodied in its modern format, Academic Council, has overarching responsibility for academic standards and for the quality of the University’s awards themselves; the Audit & Risk Committee (ARC) of Court requires an annual report from the AAG on the management and monitoring of academic quality and standards. These two strands may overlap, for instance when issues discussed by the AMG are shared with the LTC: for example, LTC conducted a dialogue about the reform of the AAM process and also discusses external survey results.

4.1.1.2 Curriculum approvals

The Proctor and Deans are responsible for the formulation of University policy in relation to curriculum development and provide guidance to Schools in these areas.

Schools review their existing Programme Specifications annually before signing off the content of the Course Catalogue for the coming year. Responsibility for the initiation of new curriculum developments lies with School Teaching Committees (see below) and proposals, signed off by the DoT or HoS, are considered by the Deans, advised by CAG. Guidance on the approvals process is available in the Curriculum Approvals Flowchart. The Deans have authority to approve new modules and any significant changes to existing modules and/or programmes; however, only Academic Council can authorise the approval of a new programme or withdrawal of an existing programme.

In 2013-2014, we introduced into each main Faculty (Arts/Divinity and Science) a re-designed post of Pro Dean Curriculum, a position that had previously been confined largely to academic advising and institutional liaison related to our BA (International Honours) programme (see Case Study). Under the new arrangements, Pro Deans Curriculum are expected not only to act on behalf of the Deans as the first scrutineers of curriculum proposals, but also to take initiatives in developing aspects of the curriculum, especially interdisciplinary ones, in dialogue with Schools. This approach will produce new synergies, improved cross-Faculty learning and enhanced curricular coherence across the University.
All proposals for new modules or new programmes must be in line with the University’s overall strategy for L&T and with academic plans as presented by the School(s) making the proposal. Proposals, submitted on a form designed to capture key information, must comply with University regulations relating to module structures, credits, academic levels and assessment and to the educational strategies for supporting students’ learning outcomes and personal development (Graduate attributes). Assessment methods and scheduled learning hours must be clearly aligned to the learning outcomes and should fall within a bracket of quantitative norms (regarding essay/exam length, contact hours, etc.) that are not prescribed by the University but are monitored by the Deans and CAG. Forms must also confirm that proposals accord with the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF) and/or European Qualifications Framework (EQF), with QAA subject benchmarks where these exist and, where relevant, with appropriate PSRBs. They include comments from External Examiners and must be supported by the latter as being consistent in every regard with the overall curriculum and syllabus.

Besides adhering to internal and external academic standards, new programmes are not approved unless supported by a clear business case, developed by the School(s) involved in collaboration with Admissions, Registry and Finance. Business cases are ultimately signed off by the Master, with advice from other relevant senior officers (e.g. Proctor, Provost, Deans). Programmes involving collaborations with other institutions are subject to particular checks (see Section 6 below).

In order to facilitate rapid approval of module proposals and amendments, since 2011-2012 it is no longer required that submissions should be formally approved by LTC; rather, the Deans and CAG respond to Schools as rapidly as possible, with an emphasis on agility, dialogue and support. LTC and Academic Council subsequently receive formal notification of developments. This has significantly shortened the time it takes, for example, for a new member of staff to be able to offer a specialist module to students.

4.1.1.3 Curriculum approvals: communications and further work

Outline information about programmes and modules is captured during the proposals and approvals process, which also harvests data for the University’s Key Information Sets (KIS). This material is used to create the Course Catalogue that is the ‘golden copy’ source of academic information for Advisers, other staff and students. Improvements to this process are being made under the SER programme (1.2.2), with the intention that our programme information will be more reliably standardised and the collection of data is more easily integrated with other processes (e.g. KIS).

Future phases of SER will enhance the automated workflow for capturing, maintaining and modifying this information, while also improving the searchability of the Catalogue and of Programme Specifications, which currently remains inadequate. The information collected will also feed dynamically into other SER projects, such as the projected new Advising system, which will in turn interact with the new ‘formative HEAR’ (2.4, above).

4.1.2 Study abroad

Risk assessment is an integral part of the establishment and monitoring process for all study abroad programmes. It is undertaken through the initial proposal, the institutional agreement and the annual programme review. In addition, the University expects a site visit at least once every three to five years. All destinations are also monitored through the Foreign & Commonwealth Office alerts, which are received whenever travel advice changes.
4.1.3 School Teaching Committees

Each School-based teaching committee is a decision-making sub-committee of the School Staff Council, acting as the main ‘local’ body for curriculum development and linked to the University’s LTC by the DoT. Membership varies across Schools but typically comprises the DoT (Convener), Advisers of Studies, Examinations Officer, Recruitment/Admissions Officers and School President. Student representation is required on School Teaching Committees, and the introduction of School Presidents has given added consistency to student representation at this level. Meetings are usually held twice per semester, with extra meetings as required by special circumstances. Teaching Committees are expected to ratify proposals for changes to their curriculum, and to discuss L&T matters such as NSS results, ET, changes to University strategy and policy and the School’s AAM report.

4.1.4 PGR standard setting and review

PGR students undergo a formal progress review at least once in each year of registration. The reviews are overseen by the School’s PG Committee, the convener of which is the DoPG, appointed by the HoS. When a research student is supervised in two different Schools, the processes of the lead School are followed.

The research student and the principal supervisor are first invited to submit confidential reports on progress. As with all confidential material held by the University, these are available to the student under the University’s Data Protection Act Subject Access procedures. The student may also be required to submit other materials for assessment.

A meeting is then held between the candidate and at least two academic members of staff designated by the DoPG to discuss the reports. The panel should not include the research student’s principal supervisor, nor should it include anyone who might inhibit the student’s speaking frankly about his/her supervisor. The panel may also meet separately with the supervisor. The purpose of the meetings is to ascertain:

- Whether the research student has progressed satisfactorily in his/her programme of study by meeting appropriate standards agreed with the supervisor
- Whether the research student is on track to complete his/her degree within the appropriate time
- Whether any decision is required concerning the re-registration of a student for a higher or a lower degree than the one for which they are registered, or concerning leave of absence, extension or termination of their studies
- Whether the research student is satisfied with his/her supervision and the general provision of facilities and support within the School and the University

The results of the annual progress review are formally recorded by the review panel and made visible to the Pro Provosts. Any specific decisions, action points or recommendations that arise from the progress review are reported in writing to the student and brought to the attention of the Head of School and the relevant Pro Provost.

4.1.5 External Examiners

Our External Examiners work in a system that is essentially the sector norm. They are required to become familiar with programme structure, L&T methods and assessment techniques in their assigned programmes and modules. They provide advice and recommend change where appropriate, in order to ensure the quality and standards of awards, the standards of student
Enhancements to learning, teaching and assessment practices at School and/or institutional level may be made as a result of feedback from External Examiners: for example, comments received from the MSc External Examiner in Computer Science contributed to a discussion that eventually led to the removal of the 13.5 PGT progression threshold across the University.

A large number of our own staff are, or have been, External Examiners in other Scottish and UK HEIs, PhD examiners internationally, or ELIR reviewers, gaining valuable insights into standards at other institutions and occasionally adapting for St Andrews the examples of positive practice they have encountered elsewhere. For example, in the School of Physics & Astronomy, the DoT participated in an external review of the collaborative MSc degree programme where it was suggested that open exams used in other parts of the collaboration would be worth considering at St Andrews. The School subsequently introduced open notes exams in one of its modules, a practice commended at the last URLT.

Enhancements to our interactions with External Examiners since ELIR 2011 include:

- Revisions to the Policy on External Examining in May 2012 to align with Chapter B7 of the UK Quality Code
- A redesign of the External Examiner Report Pro Forma to streamline the process and encourage External Examiners explicitly to consider QE
- Changes to the report rubric so that the External’s comments feed more directly into the AAM process
- Inclusion of Student Presidents in our AAM interviews, which gives student representatives an opportunity to participate directly in any discussion of an External’s report

It may be worth noting that we do not direct Schools systematically to publish External Examiners’ details in student handbooks: we consider this unnecessary, as this information quickly goes out of date, there has never been any demand for it, and students would in any case be unable to act upon it (as acknowledged by the Quality Code). However, current information would be provided to any student who requested it.

4.1.6 Academic Monitoring

As mentioned previously (1.3.2), the AMG chaired by the Proctor is the key committee with responsibility for managing and monitoring academic standards as set and implemented in the processes detailed immediately above. In a conscious effort to create constructive and shared approaches to quality, the Group takes a supportive, consultative approach to Academic Monitoring (AM) as far as possible, inviting other colleagues to attend its meetings on an ad hoc basis when appropriate expertise is recognised as being valuable, or to support an annual report. Particularly useful links have been created with the Clerk to the Senate, the Academic Registrar and her team, Admissions and other professional colleagues whose work supports and indeed shares deeply in the responsibility to safeguard first-rate academic standards.

AMG’s modus operandi is to take a high-level overview of academic standards based on the reports it commissions and receives, which include information relating to progression, trends in Honours entry and degree results as detailed in Section 2.1. For example, a School experiencing an unusual number of appeals and complaints, or a sharp variation in degree attainments, would be approached by the Dean on behalf of AMG, who would guide the School through the actions
necessary to address points of concern. The School would then be required to report back to AMG after a suitable interval and progress would be monitored.

AMG’s method of working has been greatly facilitated by the establishment in 2011 of new structures under which the Deans of Arts & Divinity and Science report to the Proctor (rather than the Master, as previously), giving them greater authority to act on matters of academic standards in L&T. It is further strengthened by the Executive Officer to the Proctor who is supported by her two administrative colleagues and acts as a lynchpin of the Office, scheduling business and drawing connections across the diverse activities of the team. The joint monitoring and development responsibilities of another key individual, the DCQM, is noted above (3.1.1).

The AMG reports to the AAG which meets at least once each semester and reports annually to the Audit & Risk Committee of Court, whose duty is to ‘assure the quality of the University’s services and practices and to ensure that the University is not exposed to unmanaged risks or inappropriate or irregular procedures.’ Each year the AAG considers items on the risk register related to L&T, to assure itself that all risks are minimised and to fulfil a clear and direct responsibility to Court for standards in L&T and the student experience. The annual report also provides an opportunity for a face-to-face dialogue between a Court Committee and the AAG if requested.

4.2 Management of assessment

4.2.1 Assessment methods

Assessment methods for all modules must be approved by the Deans, who encourage variety and innovation as well as appropriateness with regard to credit weighting and learning outcomes. Experimental or particularly successful assessments are discussed as part of the annual L&T Dissemination Event in October. Schools are expected to ensure a varied mix of assessments across a programme of study within a given discipline; certain aspects are however constrained by the University’s Assessment Policy and Procedures, e.g. regarding the amount of group work permitted for any student. Certain types of assessment (e.g. oral presentations, written examinations, take-home examinations, group work) are subject to special rules as regards timetabling, marking, moderating and record-keeping.

4.2.2 Marking

All marking, as far as practicable, is conducted anonymously. In most Schools, students submit written work online via MMS which automatically date-stamps and anonymises the submission, facilitates use of Turnitin where necessary and enables electronic delivery of feedback if desired. MMS records individual marks and calculates overall module grades for scrutiny by end-of-semester Module Boards and subsequent reporting to Registry. The system also flags up whether a student has successfully completed the compulsory Training in Good Academic Practice (TGAP), an online course designed by St Andrews staff and introduced for all students from AY 2013-2014. TGAP marks a significant change in our approach to academic misconduct, actively promoting good academic practice before penalising bad practice. Students entitled to alternative arrangements for reasons of disability are also flagged in the system. Academic staff and the Examinations Office liaise with SS to implement any prescribed adjustments to a student’s assessment regime.
Schools are required to define marking criteria in advance and to publish information regarding any translation of marks from one scale to another: for example, where an exercise requires marks to be expressed in percentages, students should be informed of the mechanism used to map the percentage onto a mark on the University’s 20-point Common Reporting Scale\(^67\) (CRS).

Schools use mark descriptors both as marking guidelines and as part of their feedback to students. Written or oral feedback on all student work including examinations is compulsory, and Schools are expected to publish timeframes for its return. In 2013-2014, two Schools piloted a scheme to train students in the effective use of feedback and the outcomes of this experiment are currently under consideration by the Proctor.

### 4.2.3 Penalties

Penalties for Academic Misconduct\(^68\) are applied only after a careful process, standardised across the University. In 2014-2015 we are introducing greater equity across the University for penalties in relation to late work and word limits.

### 4.2.4 Moderation and second marking

The University’s Assessment Policy and Procedures contain centrally defined minimal expectations regarding moderation and second marking, though Schools occasionally exceed these. Inexperienced markers and colleagues new to St Andrews must be given appropriate training and support, while teams of tutors marking a single exercise are expected to use benchmarking schemes such as marking seminars and moderation by a coordinator.

### 4.2.5 External examining

While each discipline prioritises its own needs, the fundamental role of External Examiners is defined by University policy\(^69\). Externals do not mark students’ work, nor alter individual marks, but act as critical reviewers for their discipline. They have access to MMS and to course materials and are expected to form an overview of a programme by scrutinising coursework and examinations across a variety of modules in the course of their term of office. They are thus invited to comment on standards and the syllabus at both module and programme level. Their observations, addressed by Schools and Deans, feed into AAM.

External Examiners attend Module Boards in their Schools, where the quality of student work is discussed and decisions are ratified regarding exceptional circumstances (the University has for many years operated a helpful system of S-coding\(^70\) as a solution of last resort for grades affected by special circumstances). The profile of results for each module is in addition seen by the Dean, who may query it under certain circumstances, such as the appearance of an anomalous distribution of grades. The Externals’ presence is not required at Degree Classification, which is a strictly arithmetical process, carried out by Registry according to a published algorithm and double-checked within Schools. Any (extremely rare) anomalous cases are brought by Schools to the Deans before results are released.

### 4.2.6 Progression

During the end of year Examinations Boards process, Schools take decisions about progression based on assessment results. Students who have/have not reached the required standards for entry into Honours receive notification of their status soon after the release of results. The notification wording was standardised in 2012, adding suitable advice for those who had failed to meet the prerequisites. Following a recommendation from ELIR 2011, a clearer and more
uniform set of principles regarding the criteria for Honours entry across the University was announced in two stages, 2012 and 2014. As student representatives have indicated a wish to see yet further modifications to the policy, continued review will be led by the DoRep in the AY 2014-2015. For PGT candidates, the requirement to achieve an average grade of 13.5 in taught credits in order to progress to the dissertation was abolished in 2013-2014 with the aim of offering the dissertation experience to all enrolled on PGT programmes who have passed all their taught modules, allowing dissertation planning and preparation to begin earlier in the year and be embedded into the curriculum (because almost all students will progress to the dissertation). This step helps to smooth the sometimes difficult transition from UG study, the workplace or study overseas to PGT study. A difficult transition can cause early poor performance to adversely affect a student’s average grade for taught credits. Importantly, however, overall standards were not lowered by the reform: PGT students are still required to achieve an average of 13.5 across the taught and research elements of the degree, and 13.5 in the dissertation itself, in order to qualify for the Masters degree. We consider these reforms to the progression process to be a considerable educational and experiential enhancement at both UG and PGT levels.

Concerning the assessment of doctoral candidates, and on the recommendation of ELIR 2011, the Provost conducted a review of University practice and clarified our policy regarding the conduct of progress reviews and vivas (see Appendix, response to ELIR 2011).

4.2.7 Academic appeals

A comprehensive two-stage process exists for students who wish to appeal against a mark, module grade or progression decision. The University’s policy on academic appeals was updated in 2012-2013, largely to reflect sectoral guidance from the Scottish Public Services Ombudsman on how Scottish universities should differentiate between academic appeals and other institutional complaints. Pro-formas were also created for each stage of appeal, with the aim of guiding students to express their appeals more clearly, and to highlight the admissible grounds under which an academic decision may be reviewed (limited to extenuating circumstances not previously notified for good reason and defective policy or procedure). A report on appeals, their number by School and cohort, and any relevant trends is submitted annually to the AMG.

4.3 Use of external reference points in managing academic standards

The University’s approach to assuring and enhancing L&T quality is informed by nationally agreed external reference points. These include the UK Quality Code, SCQF, Subject Benchmark Statements, External Examiners and PSRBs.

Such reference points are integrated into University procedures for managing academic standards. For example, the curriculum approvals process systematically requires new programmes and modules to be related to national subject benchmarking statements and to the appropriate SCQF level. External Examiner comments are also required when a new programme or module is proposed, or when a significant change is made to an existing one. In the course of their duties, External Examiners once again comment upon draft examination papers, standards of student achievement and on marking and feedback. They are able to see the distribution of grades for any given module or degree programme, and are invited to comment.

Benchmarking statements and PSRB criteria feature also in URLTs and accreditation exercises, during which other external experts scrutinise and advise on both curriculum/syllabus design and the standards achieved in pieces of student work, as well as across a student cohort.
In addition to these mechanisms, staff keep abreast of wider norms and standards for the sector and for their disciplines by engaging fully at every level with other external networks such as the HEA, Universities Scotland, SHEEC, QAA Enhancement Themes Steering Committee, the Teaching Quality Forum and the Quality Strategy Network. Both academic and non-academic staff are supported to attend conferences and other events of relevance to their area of responsibility and expertise; many also serve on national committees or advisory groups. The DCQM and Executive Officer to the Proctor are trained ELIR Reviewers and have experience of undertaking ELIRs in other institutions.

4.4 Effectiveness of the arrangements for securing academic standards

The University enjoys a very high level of confidence in its academic standards and in the mechanisms we employ to secure them. External Examiner and URLT review teams report regularly in extremely positive terms on our academic standards, our students’ achievements, the imaginative but rigorous curricula in our Schools and the suitability of our assessment regimes at each level. Our academic Risk Register, monitored by Court, rates all potential L&T risks as low.

4.4.1 League tables and surveys

Insofar as student opinion can be seen as indicative of quality, our students deem our standards to be appropriate: we consistently appear at the top of league tables and surveys for student satisfaction with the expertise of their lecturers and the content of their course. MEQs broadly report high levels of student satisfaction: a redesign in 2013-2014 also permits some monitoring of students’ own engagement with each module they take.

4.4.2 Staff

Our staff, appointed and promoted according to careful criteria, are well qualified to design curricula in line with the latest research and to compare our students’ achievements with those of other highly reputable institutions where many of them are themselves employed as External Examiners.

4.4.3 Academic success

We are encouraged in our view of our high academic standards by the fact that approximately 15% of our students every year obtain a credit-weighted mean of 16.5 or more across all modules (equivalent on our Common Reporting Scale to a First Class grade), thus meriting inscription on the Deans’ List for academic excellence. In addition, our degree results show 86% of students achieved a First or 2.1 in 2013-2014, an increase of 2% from 2012-2013. (See table below.) Our high academic standards are supported by our External Examiners who play a crucial part in our quality assurance and enhancement structures.
Benchmarking degree classification outcomes for 2012-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>% First &amp; 2.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The University of Oxford</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Durham</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of St Andrews</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSE</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College London</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of York</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Bristol</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial College London</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Cambridge</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Edinburgh</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.4 AAM reform

The AAM process will be discussed more fully in Section 5. However, we should note here that, as mentioned above, the major development with regard to securing academic standards since ELIR 2011 is the reform of our general academic monitoring arrangements, designed a) to link AAM more logically and practically to School planning, University policy-making and L&T practice and b) to free up time to devote to our high standards in other areas, such as academic research, by reducing bureaucracy. Internally, feedback from Schools has suggested that the reforms are well received and working satisfactorily; our External AMG member, External URLT participants and Court concur. Externally, there has been interest in our AM reforms from the Scottish sector, and our DCQM was invited to give a presentation on our practices at the 2014 Institutional Approaches to Self-Evaluation event hosted by QAA Scotland.

Evidence for the effectiveness of these arrangements can be found, amongst other matters, in the very small number of special reviews commissioned in the last three years (one, scheduled for follow-up during the URLT programme), a reduced number of appeals requiring to be heard at Senate hearings (12 in 2011-2012; 4 in 2012-2013; 2 in 2013-2014) and the uniformly satisfactory outcomes of AAM and URLTs since ELIR 2011, all of which have identified examples of outstanding achievement on the part of both staff and students.
5.1.1 Overview

In St Andrews our approach to self-evaluation reflects our values: a strong, engaged and supportive staff and student community that takes a critical approach to institution-wide and School-based practices, while also sharing new and good ideas. The University approaches self-evaluation rigorously and recognises the need to assess the effectiveness of our approaches. Having for many years taken an approach focused mainly on information and data, we have recently moved towards a process of continuing dialogical self-reflection as part of all review processes, including operational and strategic planning.

5.1.2 Annual and periodic monitoring and review processes

Annual and periodic reflection and evaluation is carried out through well-established academic monitoring and review processes and initiatives under the leadership of the Proctor via AMG, but owned and shared across the Institution. The DCQM is responsible for ensuring monitoring and review processes are scheduled appropriately, ensuring all areas of L&T and support are included (both academic Schools and student-facing Units).

5.1.3 Annual Academic Monitoring

The AAM process is a well-established component of the University calendar and is a crucial element of our procedures for the quality assurance and enhancement of learning and teaching. It provides a structured opportunity to reflect on learning, teaching and assessment, to explore current practice and to share positive and innovative experiences.

A review of AAM was undertaken during 2011-2012 with the aim of maintaining a rigorous process while alleviating the heavy administrative burden it had come to impose upon academic colleagues, especially DoTs. Key improvements following the review included:

- A more logical and efficient timing and schedule
- A greatly simplified pro forma for Schools’ AM reports
- Reduction from half to one-third of the number of Schools called to interview each year with Proctor, Deans, DCQM and DoRep
- Inclusion of School Presidents at AAM dialogues
- An annual dissemination event each October where areas of positive practice are shared. The event initiates and sponsors continued group work to spread enhancements of L&T, with outcomes reported to LTC in November

While the revised AAM process continues to encourage rigorous self-reflection based on qualitative and quantitative evidence, the new reporting format takes a lighter touch. The pro forma for reports ensures a consistent approach across all Schools and encourages a concise bullet-point format with four key questions that focus on what has gone well, what is new or
different, where there is scope for improvement, and what actions have been taken following the previous year’s AAM process. Instruction is given that the reports should be based on evidence such as outcomes of internal review, external examiners’ reports, NSS and other survey results, together with outcomes of MEQs.

AAM now builds more explicitly on processes at School level (e.g. discussions at exam/module boards, and end of year teaching discussions), while School strategic planning of L&T is now timed to link up with quality assurance processes. Data provided by Registry’s Data Team for the exercise includes that provided for strategic planning (for the first time in 2013-2014), with the addition of other key data required for quality assurance, e.g. distribution of modules grades and degree classification statistics compared to previous years and other Schools. This provides economies of effort as well as a logical link between the two processes. If successfully piloted, the L&T Factsheet mentioned above (1.3.5) will be adopted across all Schools as a summary of Schools’ situation in regard to strategic priorities.

Following submission of the AAM reports for 2013-2014 (the third year of the new format), the AMG evaluated the new process and agreed that it is effective and provides a great deal of insight into operations at School level. Additionally, in almost all reports for 2013-2014, Schools indicated that they had considered and adopted practices to which they were introduced by the AAM process and dissemination event, thus providing clear evidence of enhancement through sharing of good practice.

The AAM process is summarised in the AAM flowchart. A sample of annual monitoring reports is included in the Advance Information Set (AIS).

5.1.4 University-led reviews of learning and teaching

The AAM process is supplemented by an in-depth review of each subject area, with external participation, every five to six years. The URLT schedule includes student-facing service Units such as the Library, SS, Careers and CAPOD; the schedule also includes review of new and collaborative programmes or any areas of concern as directed by AMG or the Proctor’s Office. Each review team includes two external subject/discipline experts, the Dean of Faculty, a senior academic staff member from a cognate discipline, a UG/PGT representative (normally the DoRep) and a PGR representative (chosen from those participating in or having completed one of CAPOD’s HEA-accredited modules aimed at PGRs who teach).

The subject areas under review reflect on their practices and identify areas for enhancement ahead of the review itself. This reflection is embodied in a RA, normally drafted by the HoS and DoT or Head of Unit in consultation with staff and students. Areas under review consistently cite the focused engagement in reflection as a major benefit of these processes.

Not only does this panel explore the topics raised in the RA, but it also considers the extent to which there has been true reflection by the School/Unit under review and how broad its engagement has been with staff and students throughout the process. How the panel’s assessment will be reflected in the L&T Factsheet is under discussion by AMG. AMG are reluctant to introduce a numerical measure for this assessment and are more likely to set thresholds by which Schools/Units will be assessed on a traffic light system.

Between seven and ten URLTs may be held in any academic year, and the process operates in accordance with published guidelines for Schools and Units. The core programme for the review day, adapted appropriately for each School/Unit, includes meetings with staff (both
academic and support) and students (sub-honours, Honours, PGT and PGR). A cross-section of students within these levels is explicitly sought to ensure that feedback is representative of the whole student body. An explanatory note provides students with context.

Enhancements of the URLT process since ELIR 2011 reflect our general drive to promote quality while reducing bureaucracy. They include:

- An overhaul of scheduling to create a positive complementarity between URLTs and reviews by PSRBs, minimising duplication of effort for those Schools on which the latter can weigh heavily
- A systematic request for review teams to provide Schools with a note of key themes for discussion in advance of the review day
- Establishment of evidence of the student view prior to the review (normally led by the School President)
- The inclusion of an international reviewer to enhance our review process will be trialled during the review of Mathematics & Statistics in Semester 2, 2014-2015

Individual reports go to AMG for approval or action. An annual analysis identifying key overall themes across the academic year is also prepared for AMG, who will determine any further action if appropriate. CAPOD is asked to pursue any implications arising for staff and student development requirements. Innovative and/or positive practice is disseminated as appropriate, for example via LTC meetings or LTC Open Forum.

Evaluative Reports for AY 2013-2014 reviews are available in the AIS.

An annual overview report on URLTs prepared by CAPOD and considered by AMG monitors the extent to which subjects are truly reflective, and this informs the guidance provided at briefings ahead of reviews in the following year. This report also goes to LTC.

**5.1.5 Study abroad**

All Study Abroad programmes are reviewed annually, a process that involves student feedback, academic and administrative review. The results of the review, together with recommendations, are submitted to the AMG and actions taken forward by CSA with AMG support (including the renewal or termination of agreements). Student experience projects are identified as a result of student feedback e.g. new online partner profiles were created in response to a request for more programme information early in the process.

In addition to annual review, strong measures are in place to handle more urgent issues on Study Abroad programmes, in particular where student safety is concerned. All participants are covered under the University’s travel insurance policy, which helps us to provide emergency support if needed. Over the last few years, our experience of operating programmes in the Middle East in particular has helped us refine practices and safety procedures, ensuring that all communications are clear and comprehensive.

**5.1.6 Student engagement in reflection**

Student engagement is a crucial aspect of the University’s approach to effective evaluation and reflection. We have become increasingly responsive to institutional student feedback surveys such as those discussed earlier in the RA. Results and actions are owned and followed up at Vice-Principal level.
Student sabbatical officers and other elected student representatives give voice to student interests on a wide range of University committees. Student inclusion provides for a contextualisation of University decision-making processes regarding the student experience and offers fresh, focused and intelligent approaches to problem solving and prioritisation. As energetic and highly engaged partners, our students are invaluable in reflecting on and contributing to the development of University policies and procedures.

The University and SA jointly deliver training to an extensive network of class representatives. Staff inclusion introduces a viewpoint informed by the institution's history and priorities and lends staff expertise to the development of student-led projects. In the areas of L&T and QE, student engagement is energetic and extremely positive, with an agreement for the current and coming years for staff and students to work together on two topics: individual feedback to students and the early dissemination of course information. All student-facing Units, from SS to Residential Business Services and Estates, work closely with student representatives from their particular constituencies.

5.1.7 Management information in self-evaluation

All self-evaluative and reflective practices are underpinned by the use of management information.

The University has long had a series of self-service reports available to colleagues in Schools as well as in Units (e.g. the staff survey, research grants, budget monitoring, applications reports, recruitment, staff data analysis). These reports are available using the University's Business Intelligence tool. However, well-structured higher level reports covering all aspects of teaching and the curriculum are still periodically and manually produced by other means. They are regularly distributed to Schools and Senior Management and aid the improvement of data quality, shared understanding, planning and decision-making.

5.1.8 SER/management reporting

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 technical evaluation has been completed and concluded that no significant investment in systems architecture is required. However there will need to be changes to the current data structures in our Data Warehouse and a reporting infrastructure will need to be developed, supported by relevant expert resource. Critically these developments will need to support and link up with the requirements and objectives of the SER programme (1.2.2).

5.1.9 MMS

The University has a teaching administration tool (MMS), integrated with the central student records system, which provides reports on student cohorts, marks, results, module numbers and work submission. This facilitates decision-making and ongoing quality review at School level. Many unnecessary data entry steps have been eliminated thus assuring data quality and enabling colleagues in the Schools as well as in Registry to focus on the quality of processes. We have found that having an electronic administrative area (such as MMS) available for Schools and separate from the system housing approved and official outcomes and results enables dialogue between teachers and students recognising that occasionally decisions can be subject to change as a result of such processes. Once results and decisions become official/approved, they are uploaded into the central system and cannot be changed without due process, relevant decision log and communication to all stakeholders.
5.1.10 Planning function

In 2012-2013 the Academic Registrar assumed the role of Head of Planning. The Planning Team within Registry draws together relevant management information across the key data sets with relevant contextualisation of trends and issues. It also highlights potential areas of focus determined through analysis of such reports, and internal as well as external data sets.

5.2 Commentary on the Advance Information Set

The AIS provides an overview of quality management processes and analysis. The individual sections are commented and reflected upon throughout the RA.

5.3 Use of external reference points in self-evaluation

5.3.1 UK Quality Code for Higher Education

As highlighted throughout this Section, the UK Quality Code is integral to maintaining academic standards. The University has systematically used recent revisions to the UK Quality Code to reflect upon our provision and policies. Key staff have attended consultation sessions on the Code and contributed to detailed discussions surrounding the mapping of our activities to the Code’s expectations and indicators of good practice. This has been a useful exercise in engaging staff with the Code more widely in the institution, with relevant groups carrying out the initial mapping (and using a traffic light system to indicate where work is ongoing and where further work is required). The mapping is then assessed by AMG to ensure that the University is in a satisfactory position in relation to the Code’s requirements.

Chapter B2 on Recruitment, Selection and Admission to Higher Education is being reviewed and implemented in 2014 through a team of managers from Admissions and Registry and including the Admissions Officers in academic Schools. Progress is being monitored by the Admissions and Registry Management Group and the results will be reported to the Proctor and the Vice-Principal (Enterprise and Engagement).

5.3.2 SCQF framework

St Andrews is aligned with the principles of the SCQF framework and periodically reviews its provision to ensure that it is appropriately structured and cross-referenced. In 2013-2014 we commissioned a review of Taught Masters programme requirements to ensure that our provision is compliant and conforms to best practice across the sector. This work is ongoing.

5.3.3 Benchmark statements

Relevant statements have been issued to Schools and notifications of updates for consultation and revised statements are communicated as and when they appear. Reference must then be made to these benchmarks when submitting new modules or programmes for approval, and in Programme Specifications. One of the main roles of the External Examiners is to ensure that the standards set for the University’s awards are appropriate in relation to relevant benchmark statements. Additionally, external assessors participating in URLTs consider whether our provision is aligned with national benchmarks and are asked to indicate any shortfalls.
5.4  Management of public information

5.4.1 Overview

The University seeks to provide complete, current, reliable, accessible and useful information about all of its activities. Centrally-generated internal and external communications are directed and supported by the University’s Corporate Communications Unit, working in close collaboration with other services as well as relevant management stakeholders such as the Principal, Vice-Principal, Research Policy Office, Admissions, Development, Careers, Registry, the SA and Academic Registrar. Public information from the University is provided largely through the University website, but other methods of communication include social media, direct public engagement and the mainstream local, national and international media. Internally, Corporate Communications produces In the Loop, a newsletter regularly circulated by email and intended to keep staff abreast of current information. Schools and Units produce their own newsletters, annual reports and planning reports as they see fit, or as required by the University’s planning and reporting calendar.

The content of the website is owned and updated in a devolved fashion. However, the style and the top-level pages have recently become centrally-owned and a major review, redesign and restructuring of externally accessible webpages is underway. A special Digital Communications team which combines the University’s web and digital media expertise is leading this work under the direction of senior management and key stakeholders in teaching, research and student recruitment. A Digital Advisory Board (DAB), accountable to the ICT Strategy & Planning Group, has been established to share good practice in web design and content creation. New pages and content are being ‘designed by data’ in direct response to detailed web analytics and to strengthen an emerging culture of more thoughtful, user-centred design.

As far as possible, the University is moving towards a culture of ‘golden copy’ information management for policies and advice, particularly those relating to student matters. The new L&T webpages group together information of use to both students and staff, which Schools and Units are encouraged not to duplicate or re-interpret in separate pages or publications. It is however recognised that this process requires vigilance and commitment across the institution, and that it is not yet complete.

As a result of the KIS project (5.4.2), the University created a course search facility and improved the information available to prospective as well as current students and academic colleagues. The main benefits of this facility are to integrate relevant information otherwise distributed across the webpages with different owners and sources, and to allow the institution to contextualise at a high level its values, provision, approach to L&T and the student experience. The course search facility is being enhanced as part of the general web improvement project described above. It seeks in particular to assure the ‘golden copy’ approach to providing information for applicants and managing expectations.

We are now engaged in the development of a functional and rich online environment to present information for prospective PGT students, as required in guidance from the national funding bodies in summer 2014. This project is led jointly by the Pro Dean (Taught Postgraduate) and colleagues in Registry. It is being conducted as part of the SER programme.
5.4.2 Key Information Sets

Prior to their implementation, and in consultation with other Scottish universities, St Andrews was prominently involved in discussions of the appropriateness for the Scottish HE sector of Key Information Sets designed by HEFCE. In particular, there was much discussion of the way in which fee information should be worded, given the different regimes in operation north and south of the border. St Andrews also repeatedly expressed concern that the breadth of subject choice available in the Scottish four-year degree made it difficult to identify ‘typical’ study and assessment patterns for any given course as required by the KIS. Thus, the data we are able to provide are reductive and elide the positive and distinctive qualities of the Scottish sector as a whole.

The University put a vast amount of work into producing over 500 Key Information Sets for the Unistats website, with the Proctor’s Office taking lead responsibility, strongly supported by Registry expertise. A small Steering Group managed the interpretation of guidelines and directed consistency of approach across the board as well as managing communications with stakeholders and contributors. The data collection exercise involved all Schools, included academic quality assurance processes overseen by the Deans and was ultimately delivered by Registry, whose Planning Team also systemically quality controlled the data.

Three years after implementation, we remain broadly sceptical about the overall value of the Key Information Sets. Nevertheless, the University took advantage of the requirement to produce KIS to improve the quality and presentation of module and course information provided in our Course Catalogue. In addition, the data, once collated, enabled some degree of reflection on the consistency of approach to L&T across Faculties and disciplines. One area for review has been the consistency of design, weighting, contact hours and marking arrangements for Honours projects and dissertations, leading to an investigation by the Decanal teams, due to report during 2014-2015.

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

The QEF has helped St Andrews to develop a culture where self-evaluation has become second nature to the L&T community, with AMG playing a central role in focusing and formalizing this process. In addition, Schools and Professional Service Units provide self-reflective reports for their planning meetings with senior management, while annual reports are submitted to Academic Council and Court Committees as appropriate. A token of the success of these central structures is the extent of informal and spontaneous self-reflective activities in Schools, such as curriculum reviews, ‘brown bag’ lunches and Teaching Awayday debates (often including student representatives as well as colleagues from Units). This energy keeps St Andrews L&T up to date and dynamic, as our external examiners and commentators confirm.

A further demonstration of our commitment to self-evaluation is SER (1.2.2), where we examined and subsequently altered not only our project management methodology but our entire approach, with a view to making this programme an exemplary and transformative one, technologically, procedurally and – crucially – culturally. On the basis of lessons learned, we established the new Change Unit and intend that it should catalyse and embed improved ways of working together across the institution in the course of supporting future initiatives. In addition, SER will itself further enhance our capacity for self-evaluation by supporting, informing and streamlining University processes and information management.
While we are confident that our public information is more than adequate, we are aware that there is scope for enhancement. The Digital Advisory Board, in the process of devising improved presentation of information, is simultaneously engaged in quality control of material posted on the University’s central webpages and will be engaged in this work for the foreseeable future.
Section 6. Collaborative Activity

6.1 Key features of the institution’s strategic approach

6.1.1 Overview

The University is committed to the development and enhancement of strategic alliances that enrich the academic life of the institution and further cultivate our ‘internationally Scottish’ dimension by strengthening our links around the world. As a research-intensive institution, we see mobility and international collaboration as crucial to the University’s strategic vocation to expand the boundaries of international scholarship. We are committed to embedding mobility in the curriculum, so as to develop an outward-looking culture among our students and to enable them to take full advantage of opportunities later in their careers. We view international collaboration as a particularly powerful way of developing graduates who are not only highly skilled, but confident, flexible, tolerant and globally-minded. In order to take forward these goals, the University is currently recruiting a new Vice-Principal (Internationalisation).

Our strategic partnerships are driven by strong synergies in teaching and research expertise. Collaborative research projects infuse teaching at all levels, while student and staff mobility programmes create further opportunities for enhancing curriculum linkages and innovations. All partners are carefully selected, with comprehensive, long-term teaching and research collaborations in mind. Our strategic partnerships are those that operate successfully on multiple levels, reflecting academic priorities in research and curriculum development and providing the foundation for strong, multi-faceted and long-term collaborations.

By focusing on a relatively small number of high-quality collaborative partnerships, the University is able to tailor operations and service for each unique arrangement, investing in strong partner relations and the enhancement of the student experience. Since ELIR 2011, we have introduced new quality and review frameworks to manage the number and standards of our collaborative provisions: our intention is to embed these processes and to ensure that information is shared amongst all the departments involved in managing collaborative activity. Further, it is envisaged that the frameworks will facilitate the enhancement of provision by identifying and developing best practice, and carrying this over to other programmes where appropriate.

6.1.2 Types of collaborative activity

The University continues to focus on establishing and enhancing a small number of high quality but low risk collaborations, defined as those that involve study under the auspices of two or more institutions, usually leading to a joint award. As indicated in more detail below, we have one such programme at UG level and ten programmes at PGT level, comprising four with UK partners, three with international partners, and a further three with European consortia. At PGR level, we have established collaborative PhD programmes with other UK institutions and operate a number of individual Co-tutelle programmes with institutions across the world. At present, we have around 20 active Co-tutelle arrangements.

6.1.2.1 BA (International Honours)

In the United States, our longstanding and close collaboration with the College of William & Mary has enabled us to develop a truly integrated joint UG degree programme, the BA (International
Honours), in which students spend two years at each institution studying Economics, English, History or International Relations. Both institutions are delighted with the progress of this initiative, which entered its fourth academic year in autumn 2014, with the first cohort graduating in summer 2015. As far as we are aware, this programme is the only one of its kind, and we offer it, therefore, as a detailed case study at the end of this document (for which reason it will barely feature in the rest of this section).

6.1.2.2 PGT Masters level collaboration

In Europe, our Erasmus partnerships and research ties have led to our participation in innovative Masters Mundus programmes, as well as a new initiative to offer a joint Masters in German and Comparative Literature with the University of Bonn. As with William & Mary, our partnership with Bonn has evolved over a number of years, through student exchanges and staff collaboration, which undoubtedly smoothed the path for the establishment of a joint award. In recognition of its innovation and commitment to strategic collaboration, the joint project with Bonn was awarded funding to support programme development by the Deutscher Akademischer Austausch Dienst. In line with models elsewhere in Europe, the Masters is a two-year degree programme involving two semesters of study at each institution.

6.1.2.3 Joint research degrees

At research level, joint degrees arise out of staff expertise and academic links, often leading to further collaborative projects. The University has developed a number of individual Co-tutelle programmes, involving institutions in the UK, Europe and further afield. Participation in the Science Without Borders scheme has created further opportunities to enhance institutional links in Brazil through the development of Co-tutelle programmes. Within the UK, we continue to collaborate closely with several institutions, for example in our arrangement with Stirling at PG level in Philosophy. Joint PhDs are an important strand of the University’s objective to strengthen its PG research community.

6.1.2.4 Royal Conservatoire of Scotland (RCS)

In addition to a small number of joint degree collaborations, the University continues to enhance links with the RCS, with whom we have an agreement to validate and award research degrees. Opportunities to strengthen collaborative ties are discussed at annual meetings, including sharing resources and events to facilitate staff collaboration, and RCS students’ regular use of GRADskills. In 2013-2014, the Music Centre initiated a music research seminar and have been in contact with the RCS Director of Postgraduates to invite their students to attend and contribute.

6.2 Securing academic standards of collaborative provision

6.2.1 New agreements

All new institutional agreements are signed off by the Vice-Principal (Enterprise and Engagement). The complexity of the arrangement determines the proposal and approval route. However, each proposed arrangement undergoes the appropriate risk assessment in order to ensure the necessary institutional safeguards are in place and that the arrangement conforms to the University’s standards for collaborative links. Once signed by all parties, agreements that involve applicants or students, or have a curriculum impact, are held by Registry, which is responsible for maintaining the institutional record.
Within Registry, the CSA team is responsible for facilitating the approval and set-up of new partnerships, partnership and agreement maintenance, and for co-ordinating with other Registry teams, Schools, Units and partner institutions to ensure the smooth operation and monitoring of collaborative arrangements overall.

6.2.2 Academic management of collaborative programmes

Schools are responsible for academic relations with partner institutions and for aligning their collaborative arrangements with their wider curriculum provision. Academic management and oversight of UG and PGT provision is provided by the Pro Deans Curriculum, Pro Dean (Taught Postgraduate) and Deans. The Pro Dean (Taught Postgraduate) plays an important role in ‘hands-on’ academic oversight of all collaborative provision at this level, and reports to the Deans on matters of principle requiring further discussion. The Provost and Pro Provosts provide similar oversight of collaborative arrangements for PGRs.

The AMG receives an annual report on collaborative activities, which brings together the various reviews undertaken during the academic year, together with any recommendations for the continuation, amendment or termination of activities. Academic monitoring of collaborative provision is facilitated by CAPOD and supported by Registry.

Each collaborative programme has an academic lead at each partner institution, and an agreed format for a Joint Committee, though the membership and remit of this currently varies across programmes according to the needs of each particular partnership. For example, the St Andrews/William & Mary Joint Council is convened annually and involves academic and administrative colleagues from both institutions, including the St Andrews Proctor and William & Mary Provost, the St Andrews Pro Dean Curriculum and the William & Mary Academic Director for the Joint Programme and both Academic Registrars.

In addition to the Joint Council, the BA (International Honours) Academic Board is an internal St Andrews committee, chaired by the Pro Dean Curriculum (Arts & Divinity), which brings together academics from each of the four Schools (see 6.1.2.1), so as to consider all academic issues and maintain institutional oversight of the collaboration.

6.2.3 Framework for collaborative arrangements

Each collaborative programme is a unique arrangement, requiring comprehensive academic and administrative engagement at the outset and throughout the partnership. Since our last ELIR, we have focused on developing mechanisms to support and enhance our collaborative provision and facilitate the continued development of our strategic partnerships. The Registry has developed the central support available to Schools, facilitating administrative oversight and coordination, and supporting academic review at each key stage of a collaborative programme. The development of the role of Pro Dean (Taught Postgraduate) as a cross-Faculty position has further enhanced academic coordination at Masters level, facilitating the sharing of good practice across programmes. The close working relationship between professional and academic staff has helped us to address more effectively some of the unique challenges of collaborative provision, such as frameworks for academic monitoring.

6.2.4 Monitoring and review of collaborative programmes

In 2012-2013, the University reviewed its procedures for monitoring academic standards on collaborative programmes, and a new five-stage review process was approved by the AMG
in order to consolidate existing mechanisms and provide an overarching framework for all collaborative provision. The five points of academic review are: Approval; Implementation; First Review; Annual Monitoring and Review; and Agreement Renewal Review.

6.2.4.1 Approval

As part of the approval process, we have introduced new, more specific documents for Collaborative Business Cases and Collaborative Programme Proposals, incorporating guidance from the new UK Quality Code Chapter B10 and building on our experience of establishing joint degrees. This stage includes a comprehensive review of existing links; 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 a St Andrews education; details of the arrangements for partnership operation; and an assessment of the sustainability of the projected collaboration. It also takes account of the partner’s procedures for module approval and review and strategies for enhancement at the partner institution. Collaborative Business Cases are considered and approved by the Proctor’s Office and the Vice-Principal (Enterprise and Engagement), with advice from Admissions, Finance and Registry. Since they are viewed as an integral part of our programmes, all collaborative programme proposals are considered by the CAG, alongside any other curriculum business. External Examiner feedback is sought from the outset and throughout the five-stage review process.

6.2.4.2 Implementation

Implementation involves a light touch and relatively informal review at the commencement of the programme, primarily involving the School, Registry and Pro Dean, leading to a summary report for consideration by AMG. The aim is to iron out any issues with the initial programme establishment.

6.2.4.3 First review

The first review is a more comprehensive process, providing an opportunity to monitor progress and ensure any problems are resolved at an early stage in the life-cycle of the programme. This review generally takes place in the academic year after the first cohort of students has been admitted, and is coordinated by CAPOD, with support from Registry.

6.2.4.4 Annual monitoring and review

In addition, each School is prompted to include information about collaborative programmes in the AAM process. Where appropriate, collaborative programmes also form part of URLTs.

6.2.4.5 Agreement renewal review

The agreement renewal review is a full review of all aspects of the partnership (including financial, strategic direction and academic value), which takes place around 12 months prior to the end of the agreement period, providing the University with an opportunity to review the operation, management and development of the partnership. Review reports and recommendations are submitted to the AMG.

The University is in the process of introducing and embedding the five-stage review and trialled the approach with new and established collaborations in 2013-2014.
In doing so, the aim has been to keep extra bureaucracy to a minimum by ensuring that, as far as possible, collaborative provision forms part of standard monitoring processes. At the same time, it is our aim that the additional review points necessary to collaborative provisions should become standardised, in such a way that our processes support the unique qualities and value of each programme while enhancing our relationship with the partner institution.

6.2.4.6 Proportionality

The five-stage review is intended to be proportionate to the type of collaboration. Thus, while the over-arching framework is helpful, it is being used flexibly according to each activity. For example, we are taking a carefully adapted approach to individual Co-tutelle programmes. Schools now complete a new proposal form before a Co-tutelle student commences study, giving details of the research plan and location of study, the links with the other institution, arrangements for progression, assessment and award. Co-tutelle proposals are submitted to the Provost for consideration and ultimate signature by the Vice-Principal (Enterprise and Engagement). Once underway, normal PhD progress reviews underpin annual review while any thematic issues are now reported annually to AMG.

6.2.4.7 Royal Conservatoire of Scotland

The validation agreement with the RCS is a unique partnership for St Andrews, and the relationship and the mechanisms for enhancing the collaboration have been developed over the years. As the awarding institution, St Andrews is responsible for academic standards, and the RCS has adopted the University’s regulations, policies and procedures governing the appointment of research supervisors and student progression and examination. The annual meeting, chaired by the Provost, facilitates resolution of any issues, enhancement of the student experience and improvement where possible of wider institutional collaboration.

6.3 Enhancing the student learning experience on collaborative programmes

While at St Andrews, students on collaborative programmes are fully integrated into the community and take part in academic and extra-curricular activities in the same way as any other students. They participate in classes alongside full-time St Andrews students on various degree pathways. This approach enriches the learning experience for all.

While at a partner institution, students should also receive a first class academic experience to complement their St Andrews education. As such, all new programme proposals must demonstrate that partners have the means to provide a high quality learning experience.

6.3.1 Student transitions

A key objective of collaborative programmes is to offer students opportunities to experience other academic cultures and to foster intellectual maturity, while enhancing co-curricular skills and long-term employability. However, the transition to a new culture can be challenging, especially at UG level. As such, work has been undertaken to support students through transitions by providing more detailed orientation before they move to partner institutions, together with more ‘hands-on’ support from afar. Such work will be explored in more detail in the Case Study.
6.3.2 Student feedback

Student feedback to St Andrews and partner institutions has helped us to enhance the academic experience. For example, following feedback from students on our Masters Mundus Crossways in Cultural Narratives programme, the consortium has reviewed carefully the credit split across institutions and is working on slight structural amendments to ensure an even workload in different semesters at different institutions.

6.3.3 Royal Conservatoire of Scotland

In order to enhance the experience of doctoral students at the RCS, the students are also members of St Leonard’s College and receive messages and invitations as part of the wider research community in St Andrews. Students are matriculated at St Andrews for the duration of their studies, and many participate in our GRADskills programme. RCS students also participate in the PGX-change, an event run by CAPOD that provides an opportunity for PhD students in any year of study to present their work to an interdisciplinary audience. RCS students normally deliver at least one presentation per semester.

6.4 Effectiveness of the approach to managing collaborative activity

Since our last ELIR, a key objective in relation to our collaborative activities has been to enhance the effectiveness of frameworks for managing and monitoring collaborative programmes. We have aimed to secure standards, strengthen partnerships and facilitate the development of new collaborations in line with our strategic priorities, while also streamlining processes and improving efficiency. We are very satisfied with the progress made in this area, particularly the introduction of a new five-stage review process, the development of the central service to coordinate and support provision and the closer links between academic and administrative work, which helps to ensure a holistic approach to managing partnerships.

However, a number of challenges remain. The first is to standardise, where appropriate, aspects of existing programmes, so as to ensure a consistent approach, an excellent experience for all participating students and a reduction of needless effort for all. For example, work is currently underway led by the Pro Dean (Taught Postgraduate) and Registry to review common aspects of existing programmes, such as procedures for credit and grade conversion. The issue of standardisation is particularly acute on programmes delivered by a consortium, where any changes must be agreed by several partners and compromise is often required. As a participant in two current Erasmus Mundus programmes, we are familiar with both the benefits and challenges of working as part of a consortium.

A second, related, challenge, particularly for international collaborations, is navigating very different higher education legal, quality and cultural frameworks. While there is a shared academic vision at a very early stage, the journey to commencing a new programme is a long-term commitment involving significant investment of time and resource. For example, although our partnership with the University of Bonn is long-standing and strong, the establishment of a new joint programme was nevertheless challenging, because it involved new issues, some of which we had not anticipated, such as degree certificates, expectations as regards awards, financial arrangements and securing external accreditation in Germany.
Finally, like many other institutions, we have found it challenging to collate and maintain comprehensive agreement and partner information to support the management of collaborative provision. We have examined ways to maintain details in a reportable and accessible format and to link to curriculum information where appropriate. As a result, as part of the wider SER project to streamline student and curriculum administration, we are developing a tool which will facilitate maintenance of all institutional agreements by recording relationship history, site visits, financial arrangements, agreement renewals and a wide range of other critical details. In addition to enhancing administration of collaborative activities, a core objective will be to create a web tool to increase their visibility.

In conclusion, St Andrews is committed to nurturing multi-faceted and strategic partnerships around the world. Although we are a small institution, our international reputation for teaching and research facilitates innovative and varied collaborative projects founded on strong academic synergies. Our collaborative links enrich in turn the University’s ‘internationally Scottish’ culture and so enhance the experience of all St Andrews students.
Appendix: Actions following the last ELIR

Our last ELIR report was in 2011. We reproduce below the Summary Recommendations of ELIR 2011, with short responses in italics. References are to the most relevant paragraphs in the current document and are not exhaustive.

- **Learning environment** – Continue implementing the identified improvements to the learning environment, particularly the Library, and promote the effective use of the virtual learning environment (VLE) across all schools.

  The £7m Library Main Building redevelopment was completed in 2012; a further £1.7m Research Library with a Special Collections facility was added at Martyrs Kirk in 2013. VLE promotion has continued across the institution, but at a slower than ideal pace. At the time of writing, the University is seeking to appoint a new Head of Learning Technology and IT Skills Development, to re-energise and expand on current provision.

- **Equality of opportunity** – Continue reviewing existing policies and action plans relating to equal opportunities to ensure they meet legislative requirements and are in line with good practice established in the sector. In this context it is recognised that the University has taken a proactive approach to identifying groups of students who have particular needs and finding ways of addressing them.

  With the appointment of an Equality and Diversity Officer, the University has accelerated its pace in this area. For example: the establishment of a Single Equality Outcomes Scheme; proactive involvement in various external E&D projects; launch of an Inclusive Curriculum Toolkit and the creation of opportunities for pedagogical discussion.

- **Annual Academic Monitoring** – Promote the effectiveness of the AAM process by clarifying the information to be provided by Schools in relation to enhancement. There would also be benefit in differentiating between groups of students in the data considered as part of the AAM process, for example to provide information on the progression of students from different backgrounds. The University should avoid over-reliance on one individual for the implementation of the AAM process.

  AAM has been completely overhauled and Schools are asked for less, more focused information in their reports, for which they are reminded to bear the University’s L&T and QE strategies in mind (see 1.3.3). Student data is carefully differentiated for these discussions and for AMG (1.3.2). The DCQM is supported in her quality responsibilities by the Executive Officer, Proctor’s Office and the Academic Monitoring & Development Advisor.

- **Role of the internal Examiner in research degrees** – Clarify the role of the Internal Examiner during annual progress meetings to ensure that their objectivity and independence in the examination process is not compromised by their involvement with the annual meetings. This is in the context of the University having secure arrangements for monitoring and reviewing the progress of PGR students.

  The Internal Examiner, who normally convenes the PhD examination committee, is required to be demonstrably independent, both academically and personally, of the student and supervisor. Involvement in the academic progress monitoring of the student therefore precludes assuming the role of Internal Examiner. Our Policy acknowledges that academic interaction between potential conveners and the candidate may be inevitable in small departments. If no suitably qualified, independent Internal Examiner is available, a second External will be appointed and an
independent Convener (if necessary from another department or School) will fulfil the University’s administrative functions.

- **Common Grading Scale** – Ensure consistency and clarity in the arrangements for mapping students’ marks to grades by reflecting on the marking practices adopted in some schools.

  A major exercise to examine and reflect upon marking practices was held in 2011-2012, resulting in a statement clarifying the relationship of marks (for individual pieces of work) to grades (for whole modules). Schools are required to make clear any mapping practices in their handbooks or webpages.

- **Collaborative partnership** – In the context of a positive partnership between the two institutions, review the effectiveness of the collaborative agreement with the Royal Scottish Academy of Music and Drama, giving particular consideration to the effectiveness of the reporting links between the two institutions.

  *Primary responsibility for the relationship with the Royal Scottish Conservatoire (RSC) has been passed to the Provost (who leads on PGR matters), supported by a smaller, more focused group than before. The Provost chairs an annual monitoring meeting between the two institutions, which includes the DCQM. The Academic Monitoring Group (AMG) receives a report from this meeting.*

- **Quality Enhancement (QE) Strategy** – Consider developing the QE Strategy so that it provides clearer direction to the schools on the University’s enhancement priorities.

  *The QE Strategy previously addressed each of the separate national Enhancement Themes. This was completely rewritten in 2011-2012 with input from the University’s Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) and SDG-SE, to provide a more general set of aspirations and to reflect the University’s own language and values. It was refreshed in 2013-2014 (1.2.5).*

- **Communication between the institution and Schools** – Ensure that the communication and reporting links the University has in place are used more consistently in practice to maximise their full enhancement potential. For example, matters of strategic priority that are discussed at institutional committees should be addressed systematically by the Schools.

  *Steps to reinforce better communication between the institutional and School levels include: annual visits to every School by the Principal and Deputy Principal; reminders of action points arising from LTC and PGRC; open briefing and training sessions on new policies as required; ‘Supervisor Update’ sessions; discussion fora with School Presidents; regular lunch meetings with Directors of Teaching (organised by the Proctor); Directors of Postgraduate Studies (organised by the Provost) and Heads of School (organised by the Master, with other colleagues in attendance); new L&T web pages.*
Case Study: BA (International Honours):
An Innovative Approach to International Education

1. Overview of the BA (International Honours)

The BA (International Honours) degree (BA (Int Hons)) is a ground-breaking programme now in its fourth year where students are fully and jointly integrated into two university systems, one in the United States and one in the UK. The challenges of this have been seen in the past as being too great to be surmountable, however through integration on a range of levels, by pioneering and enthusiastic students as well as dedicated staff on both sides, this joint programme is already proving to be a great success. The students on the BA (Int Hons) degree spend two years in St Andrews and two years in the College of William & Mary. They are required to spend one sub-honours and one Honours year in each institution. Currently four degree programmes are offered in Economics, English, History or International Relations. Students can begin their studies in either university, and follow a mobility pattern of alternate years at St Andrews and William & Mary or starting and finishing in the same institution. Graduates receive a Joint Degree certificate bearing the St Andrews degree classification and the William & Mary Latin Honors, and a detailed transcript from each institution. They will graduate in the ceremony of the institution they attend in their fourth year and will have the opportunity to partake in the ceremony of both institutions.

While St Andrews degree programmes are characterised by increasing depth of study in a chosen field, William & Mary offers a liberal arts education in which breadth of study is key to educational principles. The aim of the curriculum in each strand of the Joint Programme is thus to offer an element of specialisation characteristic of a St Andrews degree, combined with the breadth typical of a William & Mary degree, thereby enabling students to experience two distinct academic cultures within a single framework. BA (Int Hons) students acquire breadth and depth to a greater and more intentional extent than is provided at either institution individually.

In addition, the Programme has been designed to create multiple and extended points of transition, beyond those typical of the traditional study abroad model where students would spend a year or a semester abroad. The ability to experience different learning environments and grading systems encourages a greater tolerance and reflectiveness towards their academic experiences. The frequent transitions challenge students to develop agility and adaptability, a confident and flexible approach to their learning, and a broad and international perspective, all of which equip and prepare our graduates for employment in a global market.

Structures have been established which ensure effective management of the Programme at all levels. At institutional level, the collaboration is governed by the Joint Council, comprising members from both universities, which meets annually and manages the strategic direction of the Programme. In St Andrews the operational aspects of the Programme are managed through the Academic Board (which has academic oversight of the Programme in St Andrews) and the Operations Group (which deals with issues relating to fees, accommodation etc.). The Academic Board is chaired by the Pro Dean Curriculum (Arts & Divinity) and members include the relevant School academic representatives. While these structures work well, a challenge for us to consider is balancing the need for robust committee structures with our commitment to streamlining processes and reducing bureaucracy around learning and teaching.

Sub-honours students are advised by the Pro Dean Curriculum (Arts & Divinity) and at Honours level the BA (Int Hons) students are advised by their programme Honours Advisers in each School. While the students are expected to integrate fully into university life in St Andrews they are free to
discuss issues regarding their joint programme with their School reps, Pro Dean Curriculum (Arts & Divinity) and Registry’s Head of Academic Partnerships and International Experience.79

2. **Why was this selected as a Case Study?**

This Case Study has been chosen because it illustrates our strategic approach to internationalisation and the student experience and also provides an opportunity to explore two of the key themes identified in the Reflective Analysis: the shared responsibility for excellence in learning and teaching and secure transitions in student progression. The former is core to our approach to the institutional partnership with the College of William & Mary, while the latter is an overarching theme of the Programme, which intrinsically encourages students to engage not only with academic, but also with social, cultural and personal transitions. The Case Study also illustrates the collegial approach taken to the establishment of this joint programme, the value of learning and teaching in two environments, and the ongoing reflection and refinement which characterises our approach to quality enhancement.

3. **What were the key strategic drivers?**

As explained in the Reflective Analysis, the University sees mobility and international collaboration as crucial to the University’s strategic vision to expand the boundaries of international scholarship. We view international collaboration as a particularly powerful way of developing graduates who are highly skilled, confident, flexible, tolerant and globally-minded.

The BA (Int Hons) degree is the fruit of a long-standing and successful link between the two institutions: both are historically well-established, relatively small in size but competitive on a global academic scale and reputed for their excellent teaching. Recently St Andrews has been ranked third in the UK in the Times rankings and William & Mary is ranked second in the US by US News & World Report (2015) for undergraduate teaching. The two institutions already had well-developed exchanges in operation as William & Mary was one of St Andrews’ first study abroad collaborators; the BA (Int Hons) provided an opportunity to build on this existing relationship.

4. **Learning & teaching strategies**

The strategic vision was to develop a joint programme which would:

- Design and deliver an innovative undergraduate programme that would draw upon the high quality of teaching and learning delivered by both institutions
- Be at the forefront of developments in global collaborations in higher education by moving beyond traditional study abroad to provide a truly integrated and international learning experience
- Prepare students for the global marketplace of the twenty-first century
- Deepen and broaden existing collaboration with a long-standing partner of a similar size, outlook, mission and commitment to internationalisation
- Strengthen our global reach and develop new markets through the recruitment of highly qualified students using a joint international brand

5. **Teaching & learning successes**

While still only in its fourth year, the success of the established strategies are reflected in the teaching and learning outcomes. Students wholeheartedly endorse the programme and this is evidenced through the networks they are establishing while undertaking the BA (Int Hons) degree and the drive to maintain those networks in their future careers.
Our students have succeeded academically and many of them have become leaders in the universities as Society Presidents, as motivators for new ideas, for example, the William & Mary – St Andrews Student Partnership, (WaMStA) and as contributors to the broader academic life of the universities.

6. What has been our approach to operation of the BA (Int Hons)?

Success of the collaboration is, for the most part, due to the strength of institutional relationships and excellent communication at all levels, between students and academics in relevant Schools and with administrative and support staff. Staff have worked hard to create a shared understanding that enables the partnership to be flexible and responsive, allows us to deal effectively with unanticipated problems, and has enhanced staff commitment to the Programme on both sides. Staff from the four participating Schools regularly visit each other’s institutions, teach and meet the students and build up a good understanding of each other’s academic practices. A research Symposium that brings academic staff together will run for a second time in March 2015 in Williamsburg and will focus on Crossing Boundaries.

The BA (Int Hons) is characterised by a strategic and academic shared responsibility between academic and administrative staff from the initial design through to oversight, and operations.

From the outset, both institutions recognised that the establishment of the Programme would take time as well as a degree of compromise, and that it would also evolve from its initial conception as staff and students progressed through it. Both St Andrews and William & Mary were thus committed to a long-term project form the outset, which would require significant investment, ongoing review and flexibility on both sides. An institutional agreement specified an initial duration of ten years, with a commitment to a full review after five, so as to give the programme time to consolidate and to enable us to see the first cohort through from application to graduation, before any structural changes or major programme developments were introduced.

7. What have been the key areas of success?

In addition to the Programme's success in enhancing learning and teaching, the close connection with William & Mary has created more opportunities for staff exchanges and research collaboration, enriching academic pursuits on both sides. Visits by academic staff (including staff not directly associated with the Programme) research symposia, team teaching and collaborative research projects have been undertaken or are planned. This has afforded a better understanding of each partner’s learning and teaching methods, and provided an opportunity to share good practice. This has helped inspire confidence in the programme for participating students as consistent interaction between academics from the two institutions is evident.

Cooperating with colleagues from William & Mary (and remaining constantly aware of our students’ reactions) also provides us with valuable international feedback on our academic content and modes/organisation of learning; the Programme thus serves a valuable purpose for feedback and reflection more widely.

In addition to ensuring effective academic input at each institution, both institutions have invested time and resource in developing cross-institutional relationships to manage the Programme at all levels. The commitment to regular site visits and meetings, and joint events with applicants and students, has led to increased understanding, clear and open communication and
a high level of trust. Tuition fees, pitched close to the William & Mary out-of-State fee and above the St Andrews overseas fee, comfortably cover investment in staff time and travel to support the Programme.

Although we are starting our fourth intake in 2014-2015, application numbers are strong and have increased year on year, and selection is competitive. At St Andrews, we received 49 applications for 2011 entry and 142 for 2013 entry with a target entrant cohort of 20 at each institution. Our objective now is first to consolidate and then to diversify further the entrant cohorts. As part of this, we are developing more subject-specific promotional information, that encourages students to think beyond the holistic benefits of an international education to the more specific academic benefits of a fully joint degree in IR, English, Economics or History where students are provided with a wide range of choice of subjects and teaching methods, and which allows them to broaden their knowledge and skills in flexibility of learning.

Both institutions felt it was important that students be encouraged to integrate fully in each community, and experience the different cultures of each. However, we also help to foster a sense of joint programme identity. This has been a difficult balance to find sometimes, especially in relation to supporting transitions from one institution to the other. Students themselves have acknowledged this and have been keen to offer suggestions. As a result, a WaMStA Student Partnership group has been created by a group of students, so as to give the cohort a forum for discussion, peer support and institutional engagement. In addition, students have been engaged by both institutions to fulfil new Ambassador, Intern and Peer Adviser roles. Although the cohorts are small and close-knit, students tend also to be very active and engaged in the wider student communities, and this has been a positive feature of the Programme so far.

8. What have been the main challenges?

The nature of the institutional relationship and our collaborative working methods mean that we are able to engage with challenges as they arise, and to reflect on and enhance operations and service where required. There are new challenges every year and student ideas and requests have helped to test the robustness of the Joint Programme.

An early challenge was the need for each institution to sacrifice some of its own practices to accommodate the educational philosophy of the other. Thus, in order to adjust to William & Mary’s breadth requirements, BA (Int Hons) students take fewer Honours credits in their degree subject than most St Andrews students, while in order to satisfy St Andrews’ expectation of progression, they devote more credits to their ‘major’ than ‘straight’ William & Mary undergraduates. Even the degree name is a compromise: where the traditional St Andrews Honours degree would normally be MA (Hons), the title ‘Master of Arts’ was inappropriate in the William & Mary context. The new learning outcomes, regulations, curricular pathways and degree title were all subject to intensive negotiation before being led through their respective approvals processes by the relevant officers of each institution.

After the Programme got underway, one of the key challenges has been managing student expectations and confidence, especially for those few individuals who are very challenged by the transition from one institution to another or, occasionally, choose to transfer out of the Programme to one institution or the other. This has not been straightforward as the Programme is new and we do not yet have a cohort of successful graduate role models to call on. Facilitating and supporting students through academic, social and cultural transitions has required time and attention but as a result of our experience we have developed support mechanisms such as a buddy scheme and specific pre-departure and arrival orientations. It also helps us better to
understand the role of these transitions in the wider educational experience we provide, weighing how these transitions balance against the ‘gains’ in terms of international experience, flexibility and resilience.

We also recognise that students need help to articulate the unique benefits of the Programme and discussions about this are underway with our Careers Centre.

Fine-tuning curricular matches has been another challenge of the programme. For example, academic staff were asked to review the requirement for students undertaking the History route to become increasingly proficient in a foreign language, as feedback from students suggested that not only do some struggle academically with the language requirement, but some perceive it as a barrier to wider module choices. Having discussed the matter, History staff in both universities have concluded that the language requirement should remain in place. Therefore, languages staff and Academic Advisers have been alerted to the need for particular care when matching BA (Int Hons) students to language module choices.

Although both institutions agree on programme aims, learning outcomes and what academic success looks like, it has been more difficult to mirror the shared understanding in the established marking and grading systems of each institution. Our grading scales and expression of degree outcomes are different, and it has been challenging to map grade conversion in a way that is appropriate for the Joint Programme, so that the assessment of a student’s performance can be comparable across both institutions, even if the grading structures are very different. Aligning the St Andrews Common Reporting Scale with the William & Mary letter grading scale was challenging, and required a revision once we had evidence of students’ performance in each system. It is now settled, but will continue to be monitored.

9. **The future of the Programme**

In summer 2015, the first cohort of BA (Int Hons) students will graduate. There are plans to develop an alumni network to support the Programme and to track graduate destinations. Over the coming year, both institutions will also consider whether it is feasible to extend the Programme to other subject areas.

10. **Would we use the same approach if we developed a Joint Programme with another institution?**

As stated at the start of the Case Study, the success of the Programme arises out of a strongly collegial approach at every stage, from negotiation and establishment of the Programme to its continuing enhancement. This was possible because our longstanding connection to William & Mary gave us confidence in the College’s academic standards and practices. Our solid relationship also facilitated the very thorough negotiations necessary to create a degree programme requiring compromise on both sides, approval by the appropriate structures in each institution and compliance with national or State norms. We feel confident that this careful attention to detail has not only contributed to quality, but has saved time and expense in the longer term by fostering a sense of common purpose and preparing us to solve any problems together.

If St Andrews were to initiate another international programme with similar strategic aims, we would aim to invest in the cultivation of relationships and preparation of academic requirements well in advance of the first intake of students. Our experience of working with William & Mary has reinforced to us the importance of a long-term commitment to a new venture, the need for close alignment with a strong partner and the importance of close working relationships between academic and administrative colleagues.
The Programme continues to be challenging but worthwhile. Our fourth year students are energised and already preparing to apply what they have learned in the classrooms and through the Programme to their graduate lives. These students reflect the very best of the Joint Programme in their confidence, flexibility, tolerance and academic achievements and they are indicative of the value of such an innovative degree.
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## Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbr.</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAG</td>
<td>Academic Assurance Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAM</td>
<td>Annual Academic Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIS</td>
<td>Advance Information Set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Academic Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMDA</td>
<td>Academic Monitoring &amp; Development Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMG</td>
<td>Academic Monitoring Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC</td>
<td>Audit &amp; Risk Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASC</td>
<td>Advice &amp; Support Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASDA</td>
<td>Academic Staff Development Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASDP</td>
<td>Academic Staff Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>Athletic Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BME</td>
<td>Black &amp; Minority Ethnic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAG</td>
<td>Curriculum Approval Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPOD</td>
<td>Centre for Academic, Professional &amp; Organisational Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRS</td>
<td>Common Reporting Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>Collaborations &amp; Study Abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAB</td>
<td>Digital Advisory Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCQM</td>
<td>Director of CAPOD &amp; Quality Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLHE</td>
<td>Destination of Leavers from Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoPG</td>
<td>Director of Postgraduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoRep</td>
<td>Director of Representations, Students' Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoT</td>
<td>Director of Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPGR</td>
<td>Director of Postgraduate Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPGT</td>
<td>Director of Postgraduate Taught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSC</td>
<td>Developing &amp; Supporting the Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAL</td>
<td>English as an Additional Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;D</td>
<td>Equality and Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECU</td>
<td>Equality Challenge Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDO</td>
<td>Equality &amp; Diversity Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELIR</td>
<td>Enhancement-Led Institutional Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELT</td>
<td>English Language Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQF</td>
<td>European Qualifications Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>Enhancement Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td>Further Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE</td>
<td>Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEA</td>
<td>Higher Education Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEAR</td>
<td>Higher Education Achievement Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEFCE</td>
<td>Higher Education Funding Council for England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HoS</td>
<td>Head of School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IELS</td>
<td>In-sessional English Language Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>IT Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIS</td>
<td>Key Information Set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;T</td>
<td>Learning &amp; Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT</td>
<td>Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTC</td>
<td>Learning &amp; Teaching Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMS</td>
<td>Module Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NERC</td>
<td>Natural Environment Research Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSS</td>
<td>National Student Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO</td>
<td>Principal's Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PGR  Postgraduate Research Student
PGRC Postgraduate Research Committee
PGT  Postgraduate Taught Student
PRES Postgraduate Research Experience Survey
PSC  Professional Skills Curriculum
PSRB Professional, Statutory & Regulatory Body
PTES Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey
QA   Quality Assurance
QAA Quality Assurance Agency
QE   Quality Enhancement
RA   Reflective Analysis
RBS  Residential & Business Services
RCS  Royal Conservatoire of Scotland
RUK  Rest of UK
SA   Students' Association
SCQF Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework
SDG-SE Service Directors' Group – Student Experience
SE   Student Experience
SER  Senate Efficiency Review
SFC  Scottish Funding Council
SHEEC Scottish Higher Education Enhancement Committee
SME  Small and Medium Enterprise
sparqs student participation in quality Scotland
SRC  Students' Representative Council
SS   Student Services
STEM Science, Technology, Engineering & Maths
TGAP Training in Good Academic Practice
TISG Teaching Infrastructure Group
UG   Undergraduate
URIP University Research Internship Programme
URLT University-led Review of Learning & Teaching
WP   Widening Participation
VLE  Virtual Learning Environment