UNIVERSITY OF ST ANDREWS

POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Please find attached the agenda and papers for the Postgraduate Research Committee meeting which will be held on Wednesday 12 October 2016 at 2pm in Parliament Hall. Tea and coffee will be available from 1.30pm.

AGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Paper Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Apologies for Absence &amp; Welcome to new Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Health and Safety for Postgraduate Research Students</td>
<td>To receive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• information on health and safety guidelines for postgraduate research students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Minutes of 3 May 16 &amp; Matters Arising</td>
<td>For formal approval</td>
<td>Paper A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• minutes of previous meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Remit and membership</td>
<td>For review and approval</td>
<td>Paper B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Remit and membership of PGRC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Postgraduate Research Priorities</td>
<td>To consider</td>
<td>Paper C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Postgraduate Research Priorities for 2016/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Doctoral Students who Teach</td>
<td>To consider a preliminary report from the PGR Tutoring Working Group</td>
<td>Paper D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Doctoral Students who Teach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Papers for Information</td>
<td>For information</td>
<td>Paper E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Policy updates approved by the Deans/Proctor</td>
<td>Paper F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Policy on Credit Structures for PGT Programmes</td>
<td>Paper G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ELIR Year-On Report</td>
<td>Paper H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Update from the Vice-Principal (Proctor)</td>
<td>Paper I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SFC Report on Internal Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Supervisor Training</td>
<td>To hear about new opportunities for PGR supervisor training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Next meeting: Wed 16 Nov 16, 2pm-4pm, Parliament Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Emily Feamster
Postgraduate Administrative Officer
Proctor’s Office

21 September 2016
1. Presentation from Ms Rhona Frood, Space Planning Manager
Ms Frood provided an update on progress at the Guardbridge site and informed PGRC members about the plans to relocate some of the Professional Services Units to Guardbridge. The move will free up space in the town centre for teaching activities. Staff relocation is expected to take place between August and October 2018.

2. Apologies for Absence
Apologies were noted. The Proctor informed PGRC members that a new Postgraduate Academic Convenor has been elected, but was unfortunately unable to attend the meeting on such short notice. Mr Euan Grant will be invited to future PGRC meetings to represent postgraduate students.

3. Minutes of 13 April 2016 and Matters arising
The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted as a correct record. There were no matters arising.

4. Research Integrity Concordat
Dr Malham provided an update on the Research Integrity Concordat and the working group that has been formed to implement the Concordat. The Concordat requires that all researchers working under the umbrella of the University, including postgraduate research students, adhere to the same research expectations. Minor changes to the Policy for Supervisors and Students in Research Postgraduate Programmes were presented to PGRC members and approved. It was requested that the working group consider providing more guidance on the difference between Academic Misconduct and Research Misconduct.

5. PGR Progress Reviews Working Group Report
The working group presented final amendments to the policy and guidance, as well as drafts of the Supervisor’s Report Form, Student Self-Assessment Form and Reviewers’ Report Form. PGRC members approved the policy and forms as presented and these will go to the June 2016 Academic Council for final approval. A timeline for full implementation of the policy is still dependent on IT resource but DoPGs were encouraged to start adopting the forms, policy and guidance in as many ways as they see fit.

6. PGR Student Representation and Community
The Director of Representation gave an overview of the representation structures for PGR students. Class reps are elected to represent the PGT and PGR populations in each school, along with class reps for each UG year. All class reps are invited to the Staff Student Consultative Committee, although PGR issues often differ greatly from UG and PGT issues. It was suggested that PGR students be offered a separate avenue to discuss concerns with staff members, and an example of a recent successful event was given from Philosophy. Overall PGRC members felt that representation arrangements are working well.

7. Policies and Regulations
Independent Learning Week

The Proctor introduced the paper on Independent Learning Week and clarified that the paper is not confidential, having been approved by Academic Council on 26 April. Independent Learning Week will come into effect for the 2016/17 academic year and schools will receive more guidance on appropriate learning tasks from the Proctor’s Office prior to the start of the Autumn semester.

8. Papers for Information
Papers for information were received without comment.

9. Discussion Topic
The Dean of Arts gave an overview of three initiatives that are being organised through his Higher Education Research Development Programme. Further details of the workshops will be circulated to PGRC members.

10. Date of Next Meeting
It was noted that the next meeting would be held on Wednesday 12 October 2016 in Parliament Hall from 2-4 pm (tea/coffee available from 1:30pm).

Emily Feamster
Postgraduate Administrative Officer
9 May 2016
### POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE
### ACTIONS ARISING FROM MEETING HELD ON 3 MAY 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Items:</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Research Integrity Concordat      | • Provide additional guidance in final working group documents on the difference between academic misconduct and research misconduct.  
• Submit to June Academic Council | Richard Malham  
Emmy Feamster |
| PGR Progress Reviews              | • Consider implementing key policy elements, as far as is practical.  
• Submit to June Academic Council | All DoPGs  
Emmy Feamster |
| PGR Student Representation        | • Consider providing a separate SSCC for PGR students                  | All DoPGs               |
| Independent Learning Week         | • Provide additional guidance to school on acceptable learning tasks to be included in Independent Learning Week | Proctor                |
POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE
REMIT AND MEMBERSHIP

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

Emily Feamster
Postgraduate Administrative Officer
Proctor's Office

27 September 2016
UNIVERSITY OF ST ANDREWS
POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Remit

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

Membership: 2016-17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Principal (Proctor)</td>
<td>• Professor Lorna Milne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Principal (Research) &amp; Provost</td>
<td>• Professor Derek Woollins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans of the University</td>
<td>• Dean of Arts/Divinity, Professor Paul Hibbert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dean of Medicine, Professor David Crossman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dean of Science, Professor Alan Dearle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro Dean of the University</td>
<td>• Pro Dean (Postgraduate Research), Dr James Palmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors of Postgraduate Studies for Schools</td>
<td>• Art History, Dr Linda Goddard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Biology, Professor Thomas Meagher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Chemistry, Professor Nicholas Westwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Classics, Dr Myles Lavan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Computer Science, Dr Miguel Nacenta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Divinity, Professor James Davila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Economics &amp; Finance, Professor Miguel Costa-Gomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• English, Dr Peter MacKay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Geography &amp; Geosciences, Dr Nissa Finney or Dr Michael Singer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• History, Dr Riccardo Bavaj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• International Relations, Dr Gabriella Slomp (S1) and Dr Fiona McCallum (S2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Management, Dr Philip Roscoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics &amp; Statistics, Professor Clare Parnell (S1) and Dr James Mitchell (S2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine, Dr Paul Reynolds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Languages, Professor Mary Orr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical, Social Anthropological &amp; Film Studies, rep tbc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics &amp; Astronomy, Dr Jonathan Keeling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology &amp; Neuroscience, Dr Ines Jentzsch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Student Representatives |
| SRC Director of Representation, Mr Jack Carr |
| Postgraduate Convenor, Mr Euan Grant |

| Service Units |
| CAPOD & Quality Monitoring, Mrs Carol Morris |
| Careers Centre, Dr Bhavya Rao |
| English Language Teaching, Ms Jane Brooks |
| IT Services, Mr Kevin Donachie |
| Library, Ms Hilda McNaе (S1) or Ms Vicky Cormie (S2) |
| Registry, Dr Alison Sandeman |
| Student Services, Dr Lara Meischke |
| Proctor’s Office, Mrs Nicola Milton |

| Clerk |
| Administrative Officer (Postgraduate), Ms Emily Feamster |

**Reports to**
Academic Council

**Frequency of Meetings**
5 meetings per annum (venue Parliament Hall)
UNIVERSITY OF ST ANDREWS

ACADEMIC BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Remit

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

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

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

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

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

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

Composition and Membership

Vice-Principal (Proctor), Convenor Professor Lorna Milne
Dean of Arts & Divinity Professor Paul Hibbert
Dean of Science Professor Alan Dearle
Two UG/PGT Academic Representatives Dr Alun Hughes, Dr Ryan Beasley
One PGR Academic Representative Dr James Palmer
Academic Registrar Mrs Ester Ruskuc
Executive Officer to the Proctor Mrs Nicola Milton

Emily Feamster
Postgraduate Administrative Officer
Proctor’s Office

27 September 2016
POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH PRIORITIES

The undernoted topics will be the main focus for PGR activities for the coming year. Formal discussions on some of these issues will take place at the Postgraduate Research Committee and Academic Monitoring Group.

- Graduate School and PGT Portfolio
- PGR Progress Review: complete MMS updates to enable full implementation of policy
- PGR Tutors: (if approved), roll out of new policy
- School support for PGRs who start outwith the normal admissions cycle (tie in with PGR start dates)
- Updating and streamlining PGR webpages

PGRC members are asked to consider whether there is any other business which should be considered this year or scheduled for AY 17/18. Possible areas for review are detailed below:

- Examinations using Skype or Videoconferencing (clearer guidelines and rules)
- Publishing prior to thesis submission (clearer guidelines)
- PGR Supervision: Definitions and Eligibility
- Co-tutelle Degrees (clarification of exam processes and supervision arrangements)
- Extenuating Circumstances (consider whether there is clear process for dealing with students who, for example, declare extenuating circumstances which should be taken into account during the examination)
- Examining Committee Reports (review what constitutes an acceptable minimal amount of written feedback; process to follow if examining committee may be potentially difficult; clear protocols for advising student of outcome)
- Embargoes (review whether the PGR policy, regulations and library guidance are in alignment)
- Digital copy of thesis (consider whether this should be submitted prior to viva to allow the use of plagiarism detection software)
- Hard bound thesis (review the requirement to submit hard bound copy of final thesis to library)

Finally, PGRC members are also asked to note the following sector/external developments.

- Engagement with the Teaching Excellence Framework
- Quality Enhancement Framework *(possible changes to allow alignment with TEF)*
- Postgraduate Research Experience Survey 2017 *(new questions)*
- Higher Education Academy

Emily Feamster
Postgraduate Administrative Officer
Proctor’s Office

29 September 2016
The PGR Tutoring Working Group was formed following a recommendation from ELIR to ensure that all postgraduate tutors received adequate support for their teaching roles. The group, made up of Paula Miles, Heather McKiggen-Fee, David Evans and Emmy Feamster, was asked to create one policy document which outlines the University’s expectations, processes and rights in relation to postgraduate tutoring. Areas we were asked to address included:

- Recruitment and selection
- Role outline & expectations
- Level at which tutors may teach/teaching and assessment duties
- Orientation/induction
- Designated point of contact with School
- Structured training (centralised and local)
- Supervision and monitoring
- Ongoing support, development/review and mentoring
- Rights and responsibilities as staff members
- Recognition: guidance on eg HEA accreditation

The group has now drafted a unified policy and created a number of templates for Schools to use to help maximise consistency across the University. The group has worked closely with colleagues in Human Resources to ensure that the policy satisfies their requirements and is complementary to planned updates to University contracts for tutors.

The group undertook a round of initial consultation with a select group of DoTs from both Arts and Science Schools and amended the policy according to the feedback received. The policy and templates have also been presented to Academic Business Committee, Learning and Teaching Committee and the Postgraduate Research Student Executive Representatives.

The proposed policy and complementary templates are presented to Postgraduate Research Committee for information.

Emily Feamster
Postgraduate Administrative Officer
Proctor’s Office

21 September 2016
### UNIVERSITY OF ST ANDREWS

POLICY ON DOCTORAL STUDENTS WHO TEACH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Title</th>
<th>Doctoral Students who Teach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>Applies to all Schools and Postgraduate Research Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Proctor’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approving Committee</td>
<td>Learning &amp; Teaching Committee (LTC), then Academic Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy approved date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy effective from date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy review date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNIVERSITY OF ST ANDREWS

POLICY ON DOCTORAL STUDENTS WHO TEACH

The opportunity to participate in teaching can be a valuable experience for doctoral students, allowing them to develop additional skills that will be useful in a wide range of careers. This policy outlines the requirements of Schools and the University in terms of selecting and supporting postgraduate teachers and all other hourly-paid teaching staff. The policy begins with a list of key points, each of which is explained in more detail later.

1. **Scope of Duties**: Doctoral students may routinely teach and mark coursework at sub-honours level. There are certain restrictions regarding doctoral students teaching and/or marking at 3000/4000 level. They should not normally teach at 5000 level. Doctoral students on hourly paid contracts should not co-ordinate, convene or teach modules independently.

2. **Limits on Teaching Time**: The School must ensure that teaching and marking responsibilities will not endanger the prospect of a student completing a degree programme within the time set by the University and funding agencies. In addition, external regulatory requirements must be adhered to (e.g. restrictions placed on paid employment by UKVI or external funding bodies).

3. **Selection Process**: Schools must have a clear process in place for selecting postgraduate teachers, with selection criteria published in advance. When offering teaching opportunities Schools must use Templates 1 and 2 below.

4. **Initial Training**: Before a doctoral student begins teaching, the School must confirm that they have completed all mandatory training courses. The School must provide an induction for all doctoral students who are teaching in the School for the first time.

5. **Ongoing Support**: Schools must ensure that all postgraduate teachers have a mentor and receive appropriate development and support throughout the period of teaching, including instruction in effective and appropriate marking.

6. **Monitoring Performance**: Schools must monitor and provide feedback to postgraduate teachers on their teaching and marking performance. Marking by doctoral students must be second-marked or moderated by sample (see policy on Assessment: Marking and Standard Setting).

7. **Evaluation by Postgraduate Teachers**: Postgraduate teachers must have the opportunity to provide their views on the modules on which they have taught, and to give feedback on the support and development they have received in that role.

The policy should be read in conjunction with the following Templates. These resources can be edited to some extent to customise them to the needs of each School (e.g. adding local role titles), whilst ensuring there is a consistent approach to supporting postgraduate teachers across the University.

1. Application Instructions – mandatory
2. Postgraduate Teaching: Expectations & Responsibilities - mandatory
3. School Induction Checklist - optional
5. Module Description Document: Science version - optional
6. Postgraduate Teacher Feedback Prompts - optional
1. **Scope of Duties:**

Doctoral students who are contracted for teaching and assessment duties must be paid the appropriate standard hourly rate (see Pay rates and arrangements for hourly paid casual teaching staff). Any contract for such work should be agreed with the Head of School in advance of the performance of the duties. If there are no contractual obligations to teach, doctoral students cannot be compelled to undertake any teaching or marking duties.

Doctoral students can:

- Routinely give tutorials and seminars;
- Assist in lab/practical demonstration classes;
- Mark coursework and exams at 1000 and 2000 level;
- Teach and/or mark at 3000 and 4000 levels subject to the requirements noted below.

Doctoral students should not:

- Be responsible for regularly setting tutorial topics;
- Develop essay questions;
- Be routinely expected to put in more time preparing for a tutorial than they are paid for.\(^1\)
- Co-ordinate, convene, or teach modules independently at any level;
- Normally teach or mark work at 5000 level.

Requests for exceptions to these constraints must be submitted to the Dean of the relevant Faculty for approval. If a School is in doubt about the possibility of allowing teaching and/or assessment by a doctoral student, specific cases should be discussed with the Dean. This would include employing an MPhil student.

Doctoral students may only undertake **teaching** at 3000 and 4000 level when:

- Permission has been granted by the Director of Teaching;
- The doctoral student has previous teaching experience or relevant practical skills and knowledge;
- The total teaching by doctoral students is ≤30% of the total taught contact hours for the module;
- There is close oversight by the module coordinator.

Doctoral students may only undertake **marking** at 3000 and 4000 level when:

- Permission has been granted by the Director of Teaching;
- The doctoral student has been involved in the teaching of the content being assessed (e.g. delivering a lab practical);
- A clear marking schema and guidance are provided;
- Assignments marked by doctoral students comprise ≤30% of the final module grade;
- There is close oversight by the module coordinator.

\(^1\) It is recognised that those new to tutoring/demonstrating, or those who chose to work outside their specialist subject area, may initially require more preparation time. This does not justify additional paid hours. This also applies to tutors/demonstrators who chose to do more in depth preparation because it benefits their own professional development.
Doctoral students may only undertake teaching or marking at 5000 level when:
- All of the above conditions are met, and;
- An exception has been granted by the Dean of the relevant Faculty;
- The topic being taught and/or assessed is closely related to the doctoral student’s own research studies.

Doctoral students will not usually deliver lectures but when it is appropriate to a module (by virtue of the student’s research specialism) it is permissible for doctoral students to give an occasional “guest” lecture.

2. Limits on Teaching Time:

The School must ensure that teaching and marking responsibilities will not endanger the prospect of a student completing a degree programme within the time set by the University and funding agencies. The number of hours spent on teaching, marking and preparation should not normally exceed the appropriate amount of time a student may spend on non-academic work in a working week. For a full-time student, this would amount to no more than half of their working week. In addition, external regulatory requirements must be adhered to, such as restrictions placed on paid employment by external funding bodies or UKVI (consult the International Student Advisor for advice).

When allocating teaching and assessment duties care should be taken to ensure the weekly workload is reasonable and will not be so great as to have a negative impact on a doctoral student’s research. Any paid teaching or assessment undertaken by a doctoral student is subject to the approval of their supervisor. While it is not expected that a supervisor would prevent their student from teaching, they do retain the right to raise concerns with the student and DoT (or named delegate) if they feel the requested or allocated teaching load may jeopardise the student’s progress.

3. Selection Process:

Schools should seek to appoint doctoral students who will be committed and enthusiastic, have sufficient knowledge of the subject to be taught and appropriate communication skills. Schools may determine their own criteria for selecting postgraduate teachers and allocating teaching and assessment duties but these must be communicated to potential applicants in advance.

When advertising teaching opportunities, Schools must provide potential applicants with appropriately customised versions of Templates 1 and 2. Some elements can be edited to make them School-specific (e.g. adding local role titles), but the use of standard templates by all Schools will ensure that there is a consistent approach to supporting postgraduate teachers across the University.

- Template 1 Application Instructions: Provides all the necessary information required by University policy and the School to make an informed choice about applicants.
- Template 2 Postgraduate Teaching: Expectations & Responsibilities: Postgraduate teachers, and the academic staff that support them, have clear and shared expectations of roles and responsibilities as required by this policy.

It is essential that Schools provide details for each module about the approximate time demands required for class preparation, teaching, office hours and marking, and any particular skills required to teach on the module. Skills developed by teaching on a module should also be outlined. Schools may use the optional Module Description Documents.
Templates 4 and 5) for this purpose, or may have an alternative procedure for providing this information.

4. Initial Training:

The University requires that doctoral students employed to teach or assess receive appropriate development for this purpose. This relates to their involvement in such activities as:

- Occasional lecturing
- Seminars and tutorials
- Workshops
- Laboratory and other practical classes
- Dissertation project support
- Assessment and marking

Training delivered centrally:

Doctoral students must complete three mandatory training requirements before engaging in teaching related activities:

- Two face-to-face courses from CAPOD (on Tutoring/Demonstrating and Assessment & Academic Misconduct);
- The online course on Diversity in the Workplace;
- The online course TGAP (part of matriculation).

Schools are responsible for checking that students have completed the above training requirements before any teaching contract is issued. Where an individual’s existing competence in teaching can be clearly demonstrated (e.g. appropriate prior accreditation or experience), they may apply to CAPOD for exemption from certain elements of the courses (this is not guaranteed).

Training delivered within the School:

The School must provide a local induction for all new postgraduate teachers, as well as appropriate training and support throughout their time teaching. This induction might be delivered simultaneously to all new postgraduate teachers in the School, to cohorts of tutors/demonstrators on a single module, or on a one-to-one basis, as best suits the needs of the School. It is the responsibility of the Director of Teaching (or other delegated person) to ensure that all new postgraduate teachers have received an induction (see the “School Induction Checklist”). The induction must cover the following at a minimum.

- If there are multiple tutors/demonstrators on the same module, they should be introduced to each other.
- Identify and, if possible, provide an introduction to key staff: e.g. DoT, AMO, DoPG, PG Secretary, Office Manager, year co-ordinator.
- Explain contracts and pay and identify the person in the School who is responsible for this. Remind postgraduate teachers who are on a Tier 4 Visa that they can work no more than 20 hours per week in any form of employment.
- Clarify who the tutor/demonstrator should contact if they have concerns about a student (e.g. aggression, health issues, suspected misconduct); which issues should they deal with themselves, which should they refer to staff to deal with?
- Explain key deadlines, such as turnaround time for reporting grades.
• Explain marking scales used in the School, and how marks are reported (e.g., do tutors upload grades to MMS themselves, or submit them to the module co-ordinator?).
• Describe how feedback is provided for students (e.g., is it distributed via MMS, in tutorials?).
• Discuss the recording and reporting of attendance at tutorials/labs.
• Explain how extensions are granted; how penalties for late work and exceeding word count are applied.
• Explain self-certification of absence.
• Explain academic alerts (are tutors/demonstrators expected to issue them?).
• Provide a brief introduction to any software (e.g. Moodle, MMS) and how they are expected to use it.

Schools may provide this information via a combination of face-to-face sessions and a Postgraduate Teacher handbook (see optional templates).

5. Ongoing Support:

School Mentor:

Every postgraduate teacher must be assigned a mentor to support them in their teaching role, who will:

• Provide a recognised point of contact in the School.
• Advise on subject-specific aspects of teaching and learning, including suggestions for how to engage students and structure tutorials or lab classes.
• Observe and comment constructively upon the postgraduate teacher’s performance, or ensure that this is done by another experienced teacher.

How the mentor role is implemented may vary. It may be done by the Director of Teaching, by the module co-ordinator, or by individual academics leading lab classes for particular demonstrators. What is essential is that postgraduate teachers always have an experienced staff member who they know will be willing to answer their questions about teaching and marking.

Support for Marking:

All new postgraduate teachers that will be marking written work (e.g. essays, lab reports, short answer questions, exam scripts) must be given a clear explanation of the marking scale used within the School. They must be given guidance on time-scales, rules on extensions, late work, etc. as noted in the School Induction Checklist. They must be provided with a clear marking scheme and/or grade descriptors for each piece of work they are marking, and be reminded of how to provide effective formative feedback. Postgraduate teachers who undertake marking should be supervised by an appropriate member of staff (e.g. module co-ordinator or Director of Teaching).

Before marking student work for the first time, all new postgraduate teachers must receive some form of marking practical.

• If multiple postgraduate teachers are used on the same module, they should all participate in the same marking practical (as far as possible).
• At minimum this might entail the module co-ordinator explaining in detail the kinds of responses to expect for particular questions/assignments, and providing examples of previous work to review and discuss.

• Where possible, the practical should involve postgraduate teachers being given two or three pieces of student work from previous years of different quality (e.g. fail, 2:2, 1st), without being told what mark the work originally received. After marking individually they should compare the marks they awarded and discuss any variation, and then discuss with whoever is facilitating the marking practical what marks were awarded originally, and why (i.e. how were the grade descriptors applied?).

6. Monitoring Performance:

Schools must formally monitor and provide feedback on the teaching and marking performance of postgraduate teachers (the optional Postgraduate Teacher Feedback Prompts template is available for this purpose). If possible, postgraduate teachers should receive feedback on their teaching at some point during the module as well as at the end of the module. They must receive feedback on their marking for each round of assessment.

If postgraduate teachers work with groups of students without an academic staff member present (e.g. leading tutorials), they must undergo at least one teaching observation session during their first semester of teaching. A more experienced teacher must observe a full teaching session, and provide constructive feedback either by email or face-to-face. (See Teachers’ Talk for guidance on conducting teaching observations.) In many Schools this will be done by the module co-ordinator, but in some cases other members of academic staff may be appropriate. It is the responsibility of the Director of Teaching, or named delegated, to ensure that teaching observations have taken place for all new postgraduate teachers.

In cases where postgraduate teachers work alongside academic staff (e.g. demonstrating in lab classes), the academic should make a point of explicitly providing feedback on their teaching on several sessions.

Tutors/demonstrators should be included on the Module Evaluation Questionnaires (MEQs) so that undergraduate students have the opportunity to provide postgraduate teachers with feedback. A copy of this information should be provided to postgraduate teachers as another form of feedback.

All marking undertaken by postgraduate teachers must be second-marked or moderated by sample (see the section on Marking and Moderation in the policy on Assessment: Marking and Standard Setting). These arrangements must be explicitly brought to the attention of the External Examiners for review.

7. Evaluation by Postgraduate Teachers:

Module co-ordinators must give postgraduate teachers the opportunity to provide their views on the modules on which they have taught (e.g. suggestions for what worked well and areas for improvement). The Schools must also give postgraduate teachers the opportunity to give feedback on the support and development they have received in their teaching role.

Feedback from postgraduate teachers can be solicited in a variety of ways including face-to-face meetings, an evaluation form, or in conjunction with an informal social event (e.g., an end of year lunch where postgraduate teachers discuss their experiences during the semester). A summary of the postgraduates’ feedback should be provided to the Director of Teaching, or named delegate.
Instructions on how to apply for Postgraduate Teaching Positions

If you wish to apply for a postgraduate teaching position within the School of [School name], please submit a brief email detailing the following to [Name and email] by [date]. You must copy your supervisor in to this email so that they are aware of your teaching intentions.

- Confirmation that you have attended the two mandatory university teaching course provided by CAPOD or that you are registered for the next available session [provide dates/link to webpage] and confirmation that you have completed the online Diversity in the Workplace course and TGAP (completed as part of matriculation). Please note that you cannot do any teaching until after you have completed these courses;

- Details of any previous teaching experience (classroom teaching, marking, provision of written feedback, etc);

- Time availability throughout the year (e.g., do you wish to tutor/demonstrate/mark in both semesters or in only one; how many hours would you be willing to teach each week (within Tier 4 restrictions if applicable), etc);

- A list of the modules that you would be happy to assist with. While we will do our best, it will not always be possible to assign everyone to their preferred module, so please select multiple modules if you can.

Note: Please read the attached document ‘Postgraduate Teaching: Expectations and Responsibilities’ as it outlines the expectations of the [Tutor/Demonstrator] role within the School.

If you have any questions please contact [Name] (Role title, email, room number).
Postgraduate Teaching: Expectations and Responsibilities

The aim of this document is to outline for both Postgraduate Teachers and Staff what the expectations are of the [Tutor’s/Demonstrator’s] role within the School of [School Name]. It briefly explains what [Tutors/Demonstrators] can expect to gain from their teaching experience and provides guidelines for lecturers to help [Tutors/Demonstrators] maximise those gains.

Postgraduate [Tutors/Demonstrators]

Through your role as a [Tutor/Demonstrator], you will:

- Gain experience in a range of teaching related activities.
- Have the opportunity to try a variety of teaching techniques.
- Develop teaching abilities and skills in a supportive and engaged environment.
- Be assigned a Teaching Mentor who will provide individual feedback on your progress throughout your [Tutor/Demonstrator] role.
- Gain a range of transferrable teaching related skills.

You are expected to:

- Attend introductory, planning and feedback sessions organised by the module co-ordinator.
- Prepare thoroughly for each session that you teach.
- Be punctual and professional in your dealings with students and staff.
- Inform the module co-ordinator of any difficulties you might be experiencing with your teaching or marking.

Module Co-ordinators

Your commitments to the Postgraduate teachers assigned to your module require you to:

- Hold a formal induction/introductory meeting for all [Tutors/Demonstrators] on the module and assign a ‘Teaching Mentor’.
- Provide Tutors/Demonstrators with information and guidance such that the allocated preparation time is reasonable (i.e, postgraduate teachers should not be expected to prepare teaching sessions from scratch).
- Provide regular updates to the [Tutors/Demonstrators] of how best to teach the module content to students (this might be via meetings or email).
- Organise meetings, as required, to discuss class content or questions regarding marking.
- Provide an opportunity for our [Tutors/Demonstrators] to develop a range of teaching related skills.
- Ensure that all teaching materials are made available to [Tutors/Demonstrators] [specify amount of time appropriate for the module/School – minimum of 3 days] days before class to allow adequate preparation.
time. Only with the agreement from the [Tutors/Demonstrators] (and with you providing extra support) can you go under this period of time.

- Provide [Tutors/Demonstrators] with feedback on their performance both during and at the end of the module.
- Arrange at least one formal teaching observation of each [Tutor/Demonstrator] on your module (if they teach unsupervised).

Responsibilities of the School
The method of implementing these responsibilities will vary between Schools. These requirements may be combined with a social element, e.g. providing lunch. (*for info, delete before providing to students*).

The School will:

- Ensure that a teaching mentor has been assigned to all PG teachers.
- Provide a formal induction for all new postgraduate teachers at the start of the semester that covers general teaching guidelines and practical matters such as contracts, completing timesheets, marking deadlines, etc. (*see policy for full details and Template #3: School Induction Checklist*).
- Provide an opportunity for [Tutors/Demonstrators] to give feedback on the modules on which they have taught, including suggestions for improvements.

Social Events (Optional)

- Welcome lunch for [Tutors/Demonstrators] & Lecturers (date, time, location): an informal induction held at the start of the academic year that will allow you to meet fellow [Tutors/Demonstrators] and teaching staff. Our Postgraduate [Tutor/Demonstrator] Coordinator will run through some general teaching guidelines. Our [Finance Secretary] will discuss finalising your contracts and will explain how to submit monthly timesheets.
- End of Year Lunch for [Tutors/Demonstrators]: an opportunity to discuss experiences during the semester, which a nominee will then feedback to Lecturers (date, time, location).

Contacts
First port of call if any issues arise will be to speak directly to your Teaching Mentor or Module Co-ordinator. You are also always welcome to speak with:

- Name (Postgraduate Demonstrator Coordinator – if applicable in your School, email, room number)
- Name (Director of Postgraduates, email, room number)
- Name (Director of Teaching, email, room number)
Postgraduate Teaching: School Induction Checklist

Ensure that all postgraduate tutors/demonstrators have received information about the following people and procedures in the School. This may be done via a combination of face-to-face sessions and a Postgraduate Teacher’s Handbook.

- If there are multiple tutors/demonstrators on the same module, they should be introduced to each other.

- Identify and, if possible, provide an introduction to key staff: e.g., DoT, AMO, DoPG, PG Secretary, Office Manager, year co-ordinator.

- Explain contracts and pay and identify the person in the School who is responsible for this. Remind PG teachers who are on a Tier 4 Visa that they are restricted to 20 hours of paid work per week (including work both within and outside the university).

- Clarify who the tutor/demonstrator should contact if they have concerns about a student (e.g., aggression, health issues, suspected misconduct); which issues should they deal with themselves, which should they refer to staff to deal with?

- Explain key deadlines, such as turnaround time for reporting grades.

- Explain marking scales used in the School, and how marks are reported (e.g., do tutors upload grades to MMS themselves, or submit them to the module co-ordinator?).

- Describe how feedback is provided for students (e.g., is it distributed via MMS, in tutorials?).

- Discuss the recording and reporting of attendance at tutorials/labs.

- Explain how extensions are granted; how penalties for late work and exceeding word count are applied.

- Explain self-certification of absence.

- Explain academic alerts (are tutors/demonstrators expected to issue them?).

- Provide a brief introduction to any software the PG teachers have to use (e.g., Moodle, MMS) and how they are expected to use it.
This document includes a description of our Modules in the 2015-2016 academic year that require teaching assistance from postgraduate tutors. You will find a brief summary of each module outlining times and dates of classes, the hours we would expect you to spend on the module (e.g., preparing, demonstrating, marking etc) and any prerequisite skills required.

Please note that this document is subject to change. We have done our best to estimate our postgraduate teaching needs over the next year but these needs may change depending on student numbers/staffing changes etc. We are also still in the process of developing some of our second semester modules.

If you have any questions about specific modules, please do not hesitate to contact the staff member in charge (as noted in the document).

For any general queries please contact [Name, email].
Module: [Module Code and Title]

Module Co-ordinator: ____________________

Number of PG Tutors required: _____________

Detailed breakdown of the tutor requirements for this module indicating the approximate number of hours to be spent on each task, by each tutor, across the full semester:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class Preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total # hours per tutor: ___________

Specific dates/times that tutors will be required:

- Class times:
- Dates of classes:
- Location of classes:
- Marking Dates:

Prerequisite skills required by tutors:
**Skills Checklist:**

The skills that you will acquire through tutoring on this module are ticked below:

### Presentation & Communication Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentation skills</strong></td>
<td>Teach a tutorial/seminar on a set subject, with guidance from the lecturer. Learning to communicate and explain concepts clearly, simply and effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitation skills</strong></td>
<td>Develop skills to guide and encourage effective and appropriate class discussion. Sensitively manage class dynamics (e.g., encourage participation from quiet students). Manage a group of students with a range of abilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem solving</strong></td>
<td>Ability to adapt to students’ needs by thinking on your feet (e.g., answering challenging questions; helping students make links between ideas; helping students to develop critical analytical perspectives on unfamiliar material). Ability to explain concepts in a variety of ways to suit the student(s), ensuring that all students are able to understand class content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marking (Feedback)</strong></td>
<td>Learning to effectively provide constructive, supportive and level appropriate written feedback, which will allow students to learn and improve upon their performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Preparation & Organisational Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material development</strong></td>
<td>Supporting your lecturer in developing and checking teaching materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class preparation</strong></td>
<td>Ensure familiarity with class topics using content provided by the lecturer. Develop your own strategy and methods for exploring seminar material with students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time management (Teaching related)</strong></td>
<td>Managing PhD studies alongside teaching requirements (preparation and contact time).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time management (Marking related)</strong></td>
<td>Planning ahead for bulk marking at set periods of the semester. Marking dates will be advised at the beginning of the semester and will require strict time management due to turnaround times set by the University.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This document includes a description of our Modules in the [2015-2016] academic year that require teaching assistance from postgraduate tutors/demonstrators. You will find a brief summary of each module outlining times and dates of classes, the hours we would expect you to spend on the module (e.g., preparing, demonstrating, marking etc) and any prerequisite skills required.

Please note that this document is subject to change. We have done our best to estimate our postgraduate teaching needs over the next year but these needs may change depending on student numbers/staffing changes etc. We are also still in the process of developing some of our second semester modules.

If you have any questions about specific modules, please do not hesitate to contact the staff member in charge (as noted in the document).

For any general queries please contact [Name, email].
Module: [Module Code and Title]

Module Co-ordinator: ____________________
Number of PG [Tutors/Demonstrators] required: _______________

Detailed breakdown of the [Tutor/Demonstrator] requirements for this module indicating the approximate number of hours to be spent on each task, by each [Tutor/Demonstrator], across the full semester:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class Preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring/Small group teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrating (lab practical/demonstration classes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invigilating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total # hours per [tutor/demonstrator]: __________

Specific dates/times that [tutors/demonstrators] will be required:
- Class times:
- Dates of classes:
- Location of classes:
- Invigilating dates:
- Marking dates:

Prerequisite skills required by [tutors/demonstrators]:
**[Module Code] Skills Checklist:**

The skills that you will acquire through [tutoring/demonstrating] on this module are ticked below:

### Presentation & Communication Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentation skills</strong></td>
<td><strong>(small group teaching)</strong>: Develop presentation skills by aiding students in learning (e.g., running through examples and demonstrating techniques with individuals and/or small groups of students). Learn to communicate and explain concepts clearly, simply and effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentation skills</strong></td>
<td><strong>(large group teaching)</strong>: Lead the teaching of a class on a set subject, with guidance from the lecturer. Learn to communicate and explain concepts clearly, simply and effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitation skills</strong></td>
<td><strong>(small group teaching)</strong>: Develop skills to guide and encourage effective and appropriate class discussion. Sensitively manage class dynamics (e.g., encourage participation from quiet students). Manage a group of students with a range of abilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem solving</strong></td>
<td>Ability to adapt to students’ needs by thinking on your feet (e.g., answering challenging questions; helping students make links between ideas; helping students to develop critical analytical perspectives on unfamiliar material). Ability to explain concepts in a variety of ways to suit the student(s), ensuring that all students are able to understand class content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marking (Feedback)</strong></td>
<td>Learning to effectively provide constructive, supportive and level appropriate written feedback, which will allow students to learn and improve upon their performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Preparation & Organisational Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material development</strong></td>
<td>Supporting your lecturer in developing and checking teaching materials (e.g., running through and editing worksheets ahead of class time to make sure all content is well explained, in understandable terms).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class preparation</strong></td>
<td>When required (as indicated by the lecturer), ensure familiarity with class topics using content provided by the lecturer (e.g., textbook chapters, lab guide, SPSS worksheets, and/or practising multiple choice questions that students will be completing in upcoming classes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time management</strong></td>
<td><strong>(Teaching related)</strong>: Managing PhD studies alongside teaching requirements (preparation and contact time).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time management</strong></td>
<td><strong>(Marking related)</strong>: Planning ahead for bulk marking at set periods of the semester. Marking dates will be advised at the beginning of the semester and will require strict time management due to turnaround times set by the University.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Postgraduate Tutors/Demonstrators: Feedback Prompts

Potential discussion points:

Personal attributes
- Approachability
- Punctuality
- Professionalism

Delivery & Presentation
- Clarity of expression
- Appropriate level of explanation
- Listening to and understanding students’ needs
- Tailoring your responses to specific needs of students

Classroom management
- Preparation for classes
- Time management within class settings
- Confidence with talking to students
- Awareness of students who require extra help/support
- Providing lecturer with informal feedback of student progress

Marking
- Appropriate constructive feedback
- Sufficient, but not overwhelming, feedback
- Consistency across pieces of work
- Completing marking in a timely fashion
**POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE**

**UPDATE ON RECENT POLICY AMENDMENTS**

The Postgraduate Research Committee is asked to note the following updates which have been progressed over the summer.

| Policy Updates (minor) to be reported to LTC and/or PGRC in Oct16 for information only |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Policy** | **Proposed by** | **Approved by** | **Amendment** | **Rationale** |
| Academic Alerts (Guidance for Staff) | Pro Deans Advising & Registry | Proctor, Deans (Aug16) | Additional guidance to clarify the procedures for issuing Alerts and in particular how alerts are used to monitor students’ academic engagement. | To ensure that a) all Schools are able to report absences and missed coursework deadlines, which is central to the University’s academic intervention processes b) we fulfil our legal obligations in terms of UKVI compliance. |
| Assessment Policies & Procedures | Executive Officer to Proctor | Proctor & Deans (Aug16) | Inclusion of new sentence: ‘The outcome of a request for S-coding, including the rationale, may be communicated verbally in the first instance, but this must be followed up formally and in writing within 10 working days of the date of the decision’. | In response to a recommendation received from the Scottish Public Service Ombudsman as a result of a recent case. |
| Good Academic Practice | Pro Deans UG | Deans (Aug16) | Policy scope changed to ‘all matriculated students’ The Dean will ordinarily accept the Board’s sanction, but may propose impose an alternative sanction. Examples of cases which do not clearly fall between academic and non-academic misconduct to include ‘falsification of research findings’. | To ensure that there is no ambiguity about the policy applying to pre-degree, evening degree or other cohorts. To make clear that the Deans have the ultimate authority on selecting the most appropriate penalties. Introduces alignment with new Good Research Practice policy. |
| Plagiarism Detection Software | Pro Deans UG | Deans (Aug16) | Removal of references to named third party software ie Turnitin and Urkund. Clarification about the issues relating to data protection and copyright. | Removal of named software makes the policy more generic and less likely to require updating if there are further software changes. |
### PGR Progress Review (Guidance)

**Proctor’s Office**

**Proctor, Deans & Pro Dean PGR (Aug16)**

Additional guidance to clarify the new position with regard to students and/or supervisors raising confidential issues.

To address concerns about progress review not necessarily providing a confidential route for discussing supervisor arrangements. The updates make clear where such issues can be raised.

### Regulation of Curriculum Changes to Comply with Consumer Protection Legislation

**Deans/Registry**

**Deans (Jun16)**

New guidance which outlines established dates and processes for changes and/or withdrawals to curriculum content.

In order to comply with CPL timely communication of curriculum changes to current students and applicants is necessary.

### V-Coding

**Pro Deans UG**

**Deans (Jul16)**

Inclusion of new sentence:

“A condition for the application of the V-code is that either (a) the student provides evidence that the exceptional circumstances have now been resolved, or (b) the student takes Leave of Absence until such evidence can be provided.”

The sort of exceptional circumstances that would necessitate V-coding have clearly interfered with the student’s engagement—if the exceptional circumstances are not resolved then the situation can be expected to recur.

---

### Policy Updates submitted directly to Sept16 Academic Council for approval following consideration by the Proctor and/or Dean(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Proposed by</th>
<th>Approved by</th>
<th>Amendment</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fitness to Practise Medicine</td>
<td>School of Medicine</td>
<td>Proctor (Aug16)</td>
<td>Policy now includes reference to the new GMC publication; new text suggested by the GMC; provision for the Dean to issue ‘undertakings’ before a panel hearing; separating out ‘undertakings’ from ‘conditions’; making provision for students to be advised on what to expect at a panel hearing; making clear that the Dean communicates the outcome to the student and not the secretary.</td>
<td>Updates in response to new Guidance published by the GMC in May16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness to Study</td>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>Deans and Proctor</td>
<td>Changes to the timeframes (introduction of new referral template), sharing of information and process.</td>
<td>To address challenges which can sometimes cause delays in a Fitness to Study assessment; permitting updates on the process to be shared by Student Services with the referring person (as the outcome may require further academic decisions to be made).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Postgraduate Senate Regulations | Dean of Science | Proctor | Change the post-nominal letters for Doctor of Engineering  
From: DEng  
To: EngD/DEng | To ensure that the degree title is compatible with funding that the institution holds for an EngD, with advertising for EngD Degrees and with associations of Universities offering EngD degrees. |

Nicola Milton  
Executive Officer to the Proctor  

19 September 2016
POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

PROPOSAL TO INTRODUCE A COMMON MODULE STRUCTURE FOR PGT MASTERS PROGRAMMES

The following paper is presented to the Postgraduate Research Committee for information. The proposal has been considered by the Curriculum Approvals Group, PGT Portfolio Review Group, Academic Business Committee and Learning and Teaching Committee.

Proposal

All new full-time residential PGT programmes will be constructed of three equally weighted 60 credit semesters. Each of the first two semesters will deliver 60 taught credits constructed from either all 15 or all 30 credit modules, or a combination of 15 and 30 credit modules. The final semester is the 60 credit final dissertation or project module.

Changes to the credit structure of existing programmes will not be required however module amendments to change existing 10, 20, and 40 credit modules to either 15 or 30 credit modules, where Schools have identified the benefits of doing so, will be welcomed.

Rationale for Proposal

Currently PGT programmes across the University are structured in a wide variety of ways in different Schools, with the delivery of 10, 15, 20, 30, 40 and 60 credit modules and some modules being delivered across both semesters. The variety of amount of credit attributed to modules makes it difficult for students to compile a balanced degree; for example, students in one School working to a 20 credit structure find it difficult to incorporate a module offered by another School working to a 30 credit structure. Students are forced therefore to have a credit imbalance across both semester and perhaps take more taught credit than the required 120 credits. Additionally, Schools find it difficult to be innovative in new programme design incorporating relevant modules offered by other schools because of the incompatibility of the module credits.

The proposed credit structure enables:

- innovation of interdisciplinary programmes at the University of St Andrews; new programme designers can readily ‘tile’ modules together to build new programmes from modules offered in different Schools;
- students to select relevant modules from other schools and easily incorporate them into their programme of study;
- students to exit with a PG Certificate 60 credits at the end of Semester 1 or a PG Diploma 120 credits at the end of Semester 2 should personal circumstances prevent continued study;
- students to receive feedback on 60 credits of modules at the end of first semester with time to respond appropriately in second semester.
Supporting Information

Masters programmes under SCQF guidelines are composed of 180 credits and full-time students normally complete within one academic year in the UK. The normal structure of a taught Masters programme is 60 taught credits in each of two semesters followed by a 60 credit dissertation. 1 Exit qualifications of the PGCert (60 credits) and PGDip (120 credits) should be possible at the end of semester 1 and 2 respectively. At University of St Andrews some programmes offer these qualifications as stand-alone awards.

Currently PGT programmes across the University are structured in a wide variety of ways, with 10, 15, 20, 30, 40 and 60 credit modules being taught and some modules being delivered across both semesters.

Modules delivered across two semesters (year-long modules) neither facilitate interdisciplinary study nor provide grades to students at the end of Semester 1 to promote early feedback and reflection on performance.

Year-long modules also inhibit flexibility of study in terms of exit qualifications and Leave of Absence, as necessary.

A 4 x 30 credit model is quite common at other Universities; it adapts well into distance and part-time structures.

A model of 15 or 30 credit modules fits with the majority of current programmes and enables more pedagogical freedom in module and programme structure. Modules can be either team taught and core modules fundamental to the programme (30 credits) or elective, optional modules enabling students to select modules to suit interest and requirements (15 credits).

A model of 15 or 30 credit modules enables Science Schools (Physics, Biology, Computer Science but not Chemistry) that use 15 credit 5000-level modules for both Integrated Masters programmes and stand-alone PGT programmes to be able to maintain this practice. Chemistry currently uses a 10 credit structure.

A model of 15 or 30 credit modules enables students who dip-down for credit in languages to have more flexibility in how they achieve the 90 taught credits required at 5000-level by Senate regulations (90 is divisible by 15 and 30 but not 20).

The PGT Portfolio Review Group endorses this proposal and considers 30 credits a good credit weighting for core modules at PGT level but recognises that a 15 or 30 credit structure will be needed.

A 30 credit model better encourages team taught modules as opposed to 15 or 10 credit modules which are generally taught by a single member of staff. This is to be encouraged in the light of CPL and the need to run advertised modules. If one person is away due to illness or research leave on a team taught module normally some restructuring internal to the module can be achieved rather than having to cancel a module offered by one member of staff.

Clare Peddie
Pro Dean (Taught Postgraduate)
20 September 2016

---

1 The exception to this structure are new programmes taught ‘with English Language” which are delivered over 18 months.
In February/March 2015, the University participated in an Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR) and emerged with the highest possible judgement outcome. One year after the publication of the ELIR report, institutions are required to produce a year-on response for submission to the Quality Assurance Agency for Scotland and Scottish Funding Council.

The report is to focus on the action taken by the University following the ELIR, identify any matters that have not been addressed and any other matters which the University wishes to highlight. The report also provides a focus for the annual ELIR discussion held between the QAA and University.

The following report was considered by the Audit and Risk Committee and endorsed by Court (a Scottish Funding Council requirement).

The Postgraduate Research Committee is asked to note this report for information.

Professor Lorna Milne
Vice-Principal (Proctor)

20 September 2016
1. **Endorsement**

   This year-on report was endorsed by the University Court on 17 June 2016.

2. **Introduction**

   The University of St Andrews welcomed the review team for ELIR 3 in the spring of 2015. Preparations for ELIR were well supported by the QAA, and University staff and students appreciated the collegial and open dialogue fostered by the review team.

3. **ELIR 2015: Outcome**

   The University acknowledged the team’s judgement that the University has ‘effective arrangements for managing academic standards and the student learning experience’ and that the team expected that ‘these arrangements are likely to continue to be effective in the future’.

   The University was pleased to note that several areas of positive practice were identified by the review team. It was especially gratifying to see praise for St Andrews’ positive approach to widening participation, given that the University has been unjustly criticised in this area in the press. It was also pleasing that the University’s promotion of equality and diversity was appreciated.

   The key themes identified by the University in its RA – i.e., streamlining and reducing bureaucracy; shared responsibility for educational excellence; and secure transitions in student progression – were central to the review and led to some valuable dialogue with staff and students.

4. **Monitoring and review of ELIR Report**

   The ELIR report was made available to all staff and students and presented to University Court. Areas for development were considered by the University’s Learning & Teaching Committee (LTC), Postgraduate Research Committee (PGRC), Academic Monitoring Group, Academic Assurance Group and the Audit & Risk Committee. An action plan was created and we are systematically working through this. Actions defined have been included in the LTC and PGRC agendas and have resulted in the formation of short-life working groups led by committee members, and including student representation and other key colleagues from Schools and Professional Services.

   A half away-day was arranged for key staff to discuss in detail three key areas for development: the role and status of teaching-only staff; use of technology to support learning and teaching; and marking criteria and the use of the Common Reporting Scale. Action plans arising from this event are being taken forward under the auspices of LTC.

   Response to the ELIR report is led by the Proctor’s Office and development work is managed through the committees chaired by the Proctor. The University will continue to monitor
progress on areas for development through its regular operational and strategic review processes.

5. Progress on Areas for Development included in the ELIR report

5.1. Academic oversight of collaborative activity

The Head of Academic Partnerships & International Experience has responsibility for managing the University’s suite of collaborative programmes and study abroad opportunities. She provides a report each year to the Academic Monitoring Group on collaborative agreements and study abroad. From now on this report will provide data reflecting student performance on all collaborative programmes to assure the University that students on these programmes are achieving satisfactory results. Further development in this area includes:

- Creation of a new Collaborative Provision framework that has been disseminated as guidance for academic staff considering a new collaborative programme.
- A new policy on the Management of Work Placements was presented, discussed and approved at LTC on 6 April 2016.
- A training meeting is to be held in May for all Study Abroad Coordinators to clarify their role and responsibilities in Schools.

5.2. Role and status of teaching-only staff

This topic has been on the University’s radar for some time, but only recently has there been an opportunity to progress discussions and activity. The topic has now been widely discussed – at LTC, at an LTC away afternoon, at Academic Council, and more informally with Directors of Teaching and Heads of School – to identify what shape a review of the role and status of teaching-only staff should take. In addition, in January 2016 the University hosted a seminar by colleagues at another Scottish University to explain the process they used to extend career paths for teaching only staff. In light of these discussions:

- The Master, Proctor and Human Resources have been working to initiate a review of contracts for teaching-only staff on fixed-term contracts.
- A high-level working group comprising the Master, Proctor, Trade Union, two Heads of School, a Principal Teaching Fellow and the Director of HR has been formed. Its remit is to examine the role of teaching in career paths for academics in both teaching and research and teaching-focused roles, and to make recommendations which will be considered by the Principal’s Office in the first instance.

5.3. Contextualised support for postgraduates who teach

In May 2015, Directors of Teaching met to discuss the role of postgraduate tutors and to share examples of good practice in relation to induction, training, support, development and review. Building on feedback from this event, a working group has now been set up to take forward this discussion, to make recommendations about the support that should be available to PG Tutors at a School level and to create a single policy document that will outline the University’s expectations and processes. This group will report to LTC and PGRC in the next year.

At the same time, colleagues in HR are reviewing the contracts, terms and conditions and appointments processes used across the University to engage PG Tutors. The two groups are in touch to ensure a coordinated approach to the issue.

5.4. Academic engagement in annual monitoring
As reported in our RA, the annual monitoring process has been reviewed and revised over recent years to reduce the amount of documentation required from Schools and to gather information from central sources to support the process wherever possible. We have also adapted the format of the Annual Monitoring report to be more concise and evidence-based. It is a condition of submitting a School’s Annual Academic Monitoring report that it must have been discussed at the School’s Teaching Committee, and for all staff to have an opportunity to contribute to its production. To increase academic engagement further, we have in addition:

- Raised the profile of Annual Academic Monitoring (AAM) through discussions at various fora.
- Broadened the invitation to attend the Annual Monitoring Dissemination Event: by popular demand, the event held in November 2015 was attended by a wide range of academic staff and by School Presidents as well as Directors of Teaching, yielding the event’s highest attendance so far.
- Reiterated at April 2016 LTC the importance of all academic colleagues’ having an opportunity of contributing to the AAM report and emphasised that it should be approved by a School’s Teaching Committee prior to submission.

5.5. Use of technology to support learning and teaching

Around the time of ELIR, the University was in the process of appointing a Head of Learning Technology & IT Skills Development in CAPOD. The role-holder is making a great success of raising the profile, and use, of our VLE, Moodle. She is also moving forward with commitment to support the high quality use of technology in learning and teaching.

At the same time, related progress includes the following actions:

- A first version of a Technology-Enhanced Learning strategy has been drafted and is currently under consultation involving relevant staff.
- At the time of ELIR the University was also looking into carrying out pilot studies of kit to enhance the use of technology in teaching. Over the last year, lecture capture technology has been reviewed and is currently being piloted in the School of Psychology and Neuroscience.
- Moodle has been upgraded so we are now working on the most recent, well-tested version; the VLE has also been customised for the University of St Andrews. A number of new plug-ins are now installed and in use, and training opportunities on their use are available.

5.6. Further integrate School of Medicine

Progress has been made in this area through closer involvement of key Medicine staff in University committees and working groups. This has helped Medicine meet regularly with colleagues across the University, with the aim of improving mutual understanding of School and University-wide initiatives and issues. For example:

- The Dean of Medicine is now a member of the Curriculum Approvals Group so has an opportunity to gain a wider knowledge of programmes and modules across the whole University.
- The Director of Teaching in Medicine is a member of the Academic Business Committee, which prepares business and sets the agenda for LTC and PGRC.
- The School of Medicine’s Fitness to Practise document was re-written this academic year with University-wide consultation on content, form and the processes described.
5.7. Engaging with the student experience

Work continues in this area across the University. The recent appointment of a Project Developer in Student Services has allowed new focus on Student Experience Projects, including Revision Week events, workshops on managing stress and a newly-designed student induction for Orientation in September 2017. In response to a prompt in the ELIR report, other actions include:

- Renewed contact, monitoring and support of the Commuter Student networks.
- Establishment of regular diarised meetings between Student Services management and student representatives to identify joint projects for action by (amongst others) the Project Developer.
- Redesign, following discussions between the University and student representatives, of arrangements for student representation at Postgraduate level.
- Continued growth and enhancement of Student Development activities offered by CAPOD (see below).

5.8. Future development of CAPOD

5.8.1. Consider extending the existing positive work of CAPOD to include further development of the community of practice in pedagogical research

CAPOD was not set up as an academic unit, and as such the University has not included pedagogical research in CAPOD’s remit. However, the community of practice in pedagogic research is being developed through initiatives led by the Proctor’s Office as follows:

- Beginning in April 2016, the institution of a year-long Pedagogic Research Development Programme in association with the University’s Centre for Higher Education Research. This programme will support individual engagement with pedagogic research from concept to draft publications.
- Encouraging engagement with disciplinary pedagogic communities associated with journals and learned societies, through leadership by example. For example, the Dean of Arts & Divinity is now an Associate Editor of the Journal of Management Education and Management Teaching Review, and the Professional Development Workshop Chair of the Academy of Management’s Management Education and Development Division. A workshop open to all staff, on working with disciplinary journals and learned societies in these kinds of roles, will be offered later in the year.
- Engagement with key international partners where pedagogic research communities (allied to academic development and reward processes) are more strongly developed, to share learnings. We have particularly engaged with the University of Queensland and a leading pedagogic researcher from that institution will be delivering a workshop in Summer 2016. This is intended to be one of a series of exchange visits as part of long-term collaboration.

5.8.2. Support for mid-career and longer serving researchers

Since CAPOD’s formation, support for this group has been considered an important part of its remit. However, pitching support at the right level and finding suitable times for workshops has been a challenge.

Recruiting the University’s own experienced staff to co-deliver some of CAPOD’s workshops on the Academic Staff Development Programme has been successful. Other current activity includes:
• The University has recently been fortunate to receive a donation towards the development of academic staff and pedagogy. CAPOD has made recommendations as to how this fund should be used and will support its allocation going forward.
• A review of induction and development of Heads of School is underway by CAPOD and Human Resources. The proposal includes a series of preparatory workshops, and mentoring of new Heads by experienced Heads of School. A framework is expected to be in place during AY 2016/17.
• CAPOD is further considering how its ‘Heads of School toolkit’ can be used to better effect.

5.9. Student performance and assessment
5.9.1. Cohort analysis

The University’s Data Team based in Registry have been working on the provision of improved data for Annual Academic Monitoring and strategic planning processes, which staff will be able to access via Qlikview. It is expected that a trial version will be available in the summer to assess whether needs have been met.

A topic arising from LTC discussion and URLT reports is whether Joint Honours students are disadvantaged in any way in comparison to Single Honours students. For this reason, we have planned a focused analysis of Honours entry and degree outcomes at the end of this academic year, comparing Single Honours and Joint Honours results to assess whether there are any notable trends or outcomes.

In addition, a review of the University’s webpages has begun to rationalise and clarify information on the Common Reporting Scale.

5.10. Publication of external examiner reports

Following consultation, the University has amended its External Examining policy and made it a requirement for Schools to summarise the key issues raised by their External Examiners, to list the actions to be taken in response to the reports, and to present these items to relevant Student Staff Consultative Committees. Students may request copies of any report from the Head of School. Students have been made aware of the change and of the availability of reports.

6. Update on areas of positive practice

We believed it might be helpful to provide an indicative update on the areas of positive practice identified in the ELIR Report. The University was delighted to receive commendation on these activities, but continues further to enhance its work in these areas.

6.1. Staff and student development

A significant new initiative in student development at the University is the launch of the Laidlaw Undergraduate Internship Programme in Research and Leadership. This is an exciting programme that aims to equip students with the skills and values to become leaders in their chosen occupations beyond University. Students accepted onto the programme design, pursue and report on a research question, supervised by an academic in their School during the summer vacation. In addition, they complete two bespoke Leadership training weekends designed by CAPOD. The summer project lasts from 8 to 10 weeks and students are paid a generous weekly stipend. All elements of the programme are compulsory including the
Leadership weekends. The award is open to matriculated undergraduate students in their penultimate year of study. 50 places are available in 2016, the second year of the programme.

6.2. Identification and dissemination of good practice

We have continued our regular and successful Dissemination Event in October with the biggest attendance so far in November 2015. For the first time, School Student Presidents were also invited. Regular fora for dissemination of good practice continue, with a deliberate intention to bring together research and teaching discussions. In addition, in May 2016 we have introduced a new Good Practice Exchange, an informal drop-in event which will showcase and share some of the projects and initiatives recently funded by our Teaching Development Fund and Enhancement Theme.

6.3. Enhanced role of Proctor's Office

Responsibility for postgraduate research students has been absorbed into the remit of the Proctor's Office, with a refresh of the PGRC which has this year processed a large amount of outstanding business on behalf of postgraduate research students.

6.4. Positive approach to widening participation

Work continues under the heading of our widening participation agenda, with outreach activities, summer schools, open days and partnership schemes with local schools. As ever, students are involved in our initiatives and are an immense credit to the institution. CAPOD have formed a closer relationship with Admissions staff and over the last year have helped support various outreach and WP initiatives. Spring 2016 saw a highly successful visit to the USA by the first students on the new First Abroad programme (a scheme to encourage Study Abroad among students from disadvantaged backgrounds).

6.5. Proactive engagement and representation

CAPOD's Head of Student Development and the Students' Association Director of Representation trialled a flipped classroom approach to class rep training in 2015/16 and following successful feedback will continue to use this method of training where possible.

6.6. Graduate identity and co-curriculum

A review of the St Andrews Award and CAPOD’s Professional Skills Curriculum (PSC) during 2015/16 has led to a decision to incorporate successful aspects of the St Andrews Award into the PSC, giving a single award that students can pursue. Participating student numbers have increased with a flurry of reflective essays (the final aspect of the PSC award) being submitted during April.

6.7. Integrated student advice and support

The University is proud of its reputation for close personal contact between staff and students, and the excellent advice and support offered by our academic as well as our professional colleagues. The Advice and Support Centre (ASC) is a first class example of an integrated approach to answering questions and dealing with problems. In the last 18 months, it has increased its scope and enhanced its service by including staff from Residential and Business Services in its operation.
However, students have recently raised questions about the process of Academic Advising, which it appears has become poorly understood. During 2016/17, therefore, the University plans to release the Pro Deans (Advising) from other duties in order for them to focus closely on the review, redesign and re-launch of Academic Advising for the following academic year. This will be supported by a new online Advising system delivered under the programme of Senate Efficiency Review (SER) projects.

6.8. Promotion of equality and diversity

The University is pursuing the Athena Swan Silver Award with Academic Schools going for either Bronze or Silver. Various events have been held during 2015/16 to discuss equality and diversity, including a lecture on women in technology delivered by Professor Maria Klawe. In February 2016, staff and students united for St Andrews' first ever Pride March. Who Cares? Scotland training has been undertaken by senior staff across the University.

6.9. Student mobility

The University is putting an even greater emphasis on study, work and internships abroad, in recognition of the benefits that students receive from these opportunities. New developments in the collaborative BA (International Honours) programme have been approved, preparing the way for Degrees in Classics and Film Studies as part of this programme from 2017/18.

7. Recent developments at the University (outwith the above)

7.1. A new Principal was appointed in early 2016. Professor Sally Mapstone will join the University on 1 September 2016 from the University of Oxford.

7.2. The three key themes stated in the University’s RA (streamlining and reducing bureaucracy; shared responsibility for educational excellence; effective student transitions) continue to guide projects in the enhancement of Learning and Teaching: examples of progress are the Professional Services relocation programme of work; implementation of completed SER projects; and formation and dissolution of short-life working groups to improve policy and processes. Recent short-life working groups have completed projects on Honours entry, academic alerts and clarifications or updates to policy and senate regulations.

7.3. Recent postgraduate work includes a new policy on parental leave, tidying up of postgraduate regulations and the formation of a working group that has led a very thorough and successful review of our processes for progress review.

7.4. A new Careers Adviser role has been created to focus on jobs in Asia and the taught postgraduate market, following identification of a gap in this area.

7.5. Capital Planning has focussed on upgrading teaching space as well as a number of improvements in extra-curricular space, e.g. new sports facilities, support for Music and the professional services relocation project at Guardbridge.

7.6. The University Strategy has been finalised (at the time of the ELIR visits it had not been published) and has been in place for some months. Open meetings for all staff were led in February by the Acting Principal, to allow an opportunity for further explanation and questions. Actions arising from the strategy are moving forward swiftly across the institution.
8. Conclusion

The University welcomed the considered comments of the review team included in the Outcome and Technical reports. We have drawn on the detailed information provided in the Technical Report to construct our action plan and to assess priorities in moving forward.

We found the ELIR process to be particularly helpful on this occasion as the review team provided ample opportunity to discuss enhancement and innovation, having satisfied themselves with quality assurance aspects of ELIR in the early days of the process. This was helped in part by the requirement for a structured Advance Information Set, an innovation to the process that we found very positive.

Professor Lorna Milne
Vice-Principal (Proctor)

4 May 2016
An independent review of the Research Excellence Framework was commissioned by Jo Johnson last November. The findings of that review have now been published — see the Stern report, ‘Building on Success and Learning from Experience’: July 2016. LTC members may wish to note that the report discusses the links between teaching and research, the relationship between the REF and Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) and the proposal that the REF impact element ‘...more broadly recognises the impact of research on teaching.’ (para 112, pg31). The report is available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/541338/indic-16-9-ref-stern-review.pdf

Teaching Development Fund
The Teaching Development Fund is designed to fund collaborative projects that will have an impact on the organisational culture of learning and teaching within a group of Schools, Faculties or across the University. Staff in Schools and Units are eligible to apply for funding. Students may also apply, but applications must be led by a member of staff. A maximum of £5,000 can be awarded for any one project. There is one funding call per semester: the next deadline for applications is 14 November 2016. Further information about the application process can be found at http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/staff/teaching/funding/development/

Enhancement Theme update: Student Transitions
In the third and final year of the Student Transitions Theme, the institutional team will focus on: building student confidence, resilience and independence via a plan of work; supporting School/Unit-based initiatives via the funding scheme; and developing resources on personal and academic transitions within the University’s orientation app. The funding scheme is open to all staff and students. **Up to £1,000** is available for events, projects and resources that aim to improve a transition for our students. Further information is available via http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/staff/teaching/funding/enhancement/funding/

New Programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Programme Title</th>
<th>w/e from</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>BA (International Honours)</td>
<td>BA Int.Hons Classical Studies</td>
<td>2017/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>EngD</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>2016/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science &amp; ELT</td>
<td>MSc</td>
<td>MSc Computer Science (with English Language)</td>
<td>2016/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film Studies</td>
<td>BA (International Honours)</td>
<td>BA Int.Hons Film Studies</td>
<td>2016/7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Classroom Refurbishments**
The following rooms were refurbished during AY 15/16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AV Refresh</th>
<th>IT Refresh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maths lecture theatre A, C &amp; D</td>
<td>Clinical Skills room in Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Econometrics PC classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan Multi Media Suite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bute PC Classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway tutorial rooms in Basement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castlecliffe room F2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine PC classroom &amp; seminar room 310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to this work, over the summer there have been extensive works in the Irvine building, including major refurbishments of the PC Classroom and Seminar Room 310, as well as work to improve access to the building.

The following work is planned for AY 16/17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AV Refresh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maths lecture theatre B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swallowgate PC classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bute room C26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliament Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper College Hall, Schools 5 and 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary’s seminar rooms 1 and 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Postgraduate Research Updates**

**PGR Progress Review**
Colleagues are asked to note that a training session for Schools on the new MMS progress review tool will held on Tues 25 October 2016, 11am-12noon in School 5. A formal invitation will be sent out to Schools shortly.

**Supervisor Training Events**
The PGR Supervisor Training session will run on 25 October 2016 from 12.30pm-4pm. Please encourage any staff members who will be supervising postgraduate research students for the first time to attend. This session would also be useful for anyone who hasn’t attended before, or who would like a refresher on key PGR policies and procedures.

There will also be two additional supervisor training workshops later in the year. The first is PhD Viva Examinations: Best Practice taking place on 7 December 2016 from 1.30pm-4.30pm and is for any academic staff new to the process of leading viva. On 16 February 2017 the Dean of Arts & Divinity will host a Critical Incidents Workshop which is open to anyone with supervisory responsibilities. The workshop will take a mutual/collaborative learning approach, where people can share ‘critical incidents’ in the supervision process and how they led to insights about the supervision process.

**Thesis Declaration Form Update**
The Thesis Declaration Form has been updated so that students may now opt to embargo their thesis abstract and/or thesis title. It is not expected that this will be used very often, but might occasionally necessary to accommodate patenting or funding body concerns.

**GRADskills Innovation Grant & PG Conference Fund**
Applications are invited from research postgraduate students and staff for up to £2000 to support innovative projects to develop transferable skills training resources or activities that can be made available to postgraduate students. Up to £1000 of matched funding is available to support the
organisation of research postgraduate conferences. There are three funding rounds each academic year, with deadlines in August, November and March.

Seven applications were received for the **November funding round** (3 for Innovation Grant projects, 4 for PG conferences), and the following received funding:

*Innovation Grant Projects*
- Making your PhD Work for You: Academic Careers and Beyond in the Humanities
- 3 Minute Thesis Competition
- Writing the Body in the City: An Anthropological Creative Writing Workshop

*Postgraduate Conferences*
- Dare to Tell: Silence and Saying in Ben Jonson
- 3rd European Student Conference on Behaviour and Cognition
- UK and Ireland Regional Student Chapter Conference for Society of Marine Mammalogy

Eight applications (and one re-submission) were received for the **March funding round** (4 for Innovation Grant projects, 5 for PG conferences), and the following received funding:

*Innovation Grant Projects*
- Workshop: GIS for beginners
- Workshop: Biological Data Processing for the NGS Age

*Postgraduate Conferences*
- Conflict at the critical juncture of international, regional and domestic spheres
- Young Researchers in Mathematics (YRM) 2016
- Living with the Law: Society and Legal Dispute c. 1200-1700

Nicola Milton
Executive Officer to the Proctor
22 September 2016
As part of the Quality Enhancement Framework, Scottish HEIs are required to operate a system of internal reviews of subject provision. Although the QAA has an annual dialogue with the University on the outcomes of internal reviews, the University is also required to provide to the Scottish Funding Council an annual summary report on its internal quality assurance arrangements.

This report, which is attached for PGRC’s information only, has been considered by the Audit & Risk Committee and approved by Court.

CAROLA. MORRIS
Director of CAPOD & Quality Monitoring
(Centre for Academic, Professional & Organisational Development)
August 2016
Annual Institutional Statement of Internal Subject Review  
for Academic Year 2015-16 

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

1. Introduction
Over the last year, the University has continued to work on ‘areas for development’ from its ELIR held in the spring of 2015. At the same time, we have also given attention to areas of activity marked for commendation, where we remain committed to continuous improvement. A helpful and collegial annual meeting with the QAA took place in May, and the University’s Follow-Up Report was delivered in June 2016 and published on the QAA website in July 2016. 

http://www.qaa.ac.uk/reviews-and-reports/provider?UKPRN=10007803#.V495zKIYn3Y

2. Academic Monitoring Group
In the University’s 2014-15 report to the SFC, we advised that we had taken the decision not to include external participation as standard in our Academic Monitoring Group (AMG) meetings, but to seek external views when deemed necessary. This has worked well with members of AMG sharing views on various sectoral activities, including the review of the QEF, TEF and the new developments for ELIR. Continued attendance at Teaching Quality Forum by two members of AMG (one of whom is now TQF Vice-Convenor), our membership of Universities Scotland committees and our relationships with other universities, notably via the Students’ Association Director of Representation’s, all bolster a comprehensive Quality Assurance and Enhancement knowledge-base for the University.

In addition, we have re-focussed and extended our meetings to allow more thorough discussion of agenda items, e.g., University-led Reviews of Learning & Teaching (URLT) outcomes. We have also re-formulated a clear schedule of annual reports to be delivered to AMG on various key activities, e.g. collaborations, student appeals, etc. The report authors are invited to present findings to the group as appropriate.

3. University-led Reviews of Learning & Teaching (URLT)
During the programme of reviews for each year, a note is kept of all potential enhancements and problem areas in the URLT process. The Director of CAPOD & Quality Monitoring and the Academic Monitoring & Development Advisor hold an annual URLT planning and review day each year in June. This allows them to consider whether these potential enhancements should be incorporated into normal practice, and identify how any problems arising can be handled effectively in the future. If of an operational nature, guidelines and practice are amended accordingly. If of a wider-ranging nature, a request will go to AMG for full consideration. In the last year for example, a Guidance Note for School Presidents (SPs) has been created to clarify the role in preparation for a School’s URLT. This provides advice to SPs on gathering views from students and a template for reporting back findings.

An Action Plan is submitted following each URLT and is considered by AMG. Previous practice had been for the Director of CAPOD & Quality Monitoring to follow-up on these plans after an appropriate time and report back on progress to AMG. This will continue; however, AMG has recently decided to provide a more formal response to most Action Plans, highlighting activity that requires further information to be provided, or requesting a formal note of progress on particularly important activity.
URLTs were carried out in the following Schools, and Departments during Academic Year 2015-16: School of Art History, School of Biology, School of Chemistry, School of Psychology & Neuroscience and the Department of Music. No Professional Service Units were due for review in 2015-16.

The AMG agreed that the planned URLT of the School of Medicine should be postponed from AY 2015-16 to 2016-17 to allow sufficient time for the School to consolidate ideas for, and make progress on, planned development. Meanwhile, the AMG instructed that an internal interim review led by the Dean of Science should be conducted to provide an opportunity for discussion with staff and students of the School. The following themes formed the basis of the review:

- Feedback on coursework
- Progression (including Honours entry)
- Support for international and struggling students
- Integration with the rest of the University

Recommendations arising from this interim review will form part of the full review planned for early in semester 1, 2016-17.

A planned first review of the PG Cert in Computational Chemistry was postponed until the programme is fully implemented.

3.1. School of Art History
The School of Art History is one of the University’s smallest Schools, but has around 400 students studying on its modules each year. The Review Team praised the School’s commitment to research-led teaching and the collaborative relationship fostered between staff and students. The School was commended for its innovative assessment practices, its excellent approach to advising and support for new staff following well-considered appointment-planning. Activity identified for review and action included turnaround times for coursework, collaboration with the Careers Centre and dissertation word length requirement, all of which are currently being addressed. Confidence reported

3.2. School of Biology
The School of Biology is divided across three broad themes embodied by the Biomedical Sciences Research Centre, the Centre for Biological Diversity and the Scottish Oceans Institute. A strong overarching emphasis on research-led teaching, research practice, data analysis, experimental design and numeracy was found by the Review Team, along with an impressive quality of teaching delivery. Recommendations included advice to undertake a mapping exercise in relation to the delivery of ethics, science communication and microbiology to ensure all students benefit from relevant provision and so the School could evidence that they are fully compliant with the QAA Subject Benchmark Statement. There was no doubt here, but the Team felt the exercise would be valuable. The School were also asked to review at what point their small class sizes would no longer be sustainable. Further, there was encouragement to consider how the breadth of the PGT offering could be increased. Confidence reported

3.3. School of Chemistry
The School of Chemistry had celebrated its 200th anniversary since it was last reviewed in 2010. Despite its age, or maybe because of it, the Review Team found that students are fortunate to benefit from a dynamic approach to using IT in laboratories and attitude towards using innovation in teaching. It was agreed that students receive an excellent range of laboratory training and placement opportunities, and therefore graduate with a strong skills set. The School was also found to be rightly proud of achieving an Athena Swan Silver Award. Activity flagged for further review
included induction and mentoring for new members of staff, and in-house training provision for postgraduate demonstrators to supplement that provided at a University level.

Confidence reported

3.4. Department of Music
The Department of Music offers academic modules at 1000-, 2000- and 3000-levels. There are currently no plans to develop a degree programme in the discipline. However, students who are excellent and experienced performers as well as those who have no background in music welcome the opportunity to learn within the discipline. The Review Team noted that the range of modules offered are interesting, engaging and well-considered, providing an overall developmental experience and cultural enrichment. The Team praised the enthusiasm of staff who have provided so much with limited resource, and the breadth and quality of teaching. The Department were asked to consider the possibility of interdisciplinary connections with other Schools as a way of developing joint modules, potentially building towards the development of interdisciplinary programmes.

Confidence reported

3.5. School of Psychology & Neuroscience
The School of Psychology & Neuroscience was formed in AY 2013-14, so this was its first review following that move. The School had seen a dramatic rise in the number of neuroscience students as well as an increase in undergraduate student numbers in psychology. The Review Team were impressed by the high levels of teaching quality, in a broad and BPS compliant undergraduate curriculum. High levels of student satisfaction were evidenced by the NSS and helped by a commitment to small group teaching and availability of staff. The Review Team recommended that the School conducts a mapping exercise for transferrable skills and communicates specific skills through module descriptors and when outlining assessments. Advice was also given to consider offering a dedicated module on individual differences and an optional module on organisational psychology.

Confidence reported

4. Schedule for 2016-17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Academic School</th>
<th>Service Unit/Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Language Teaching (ELT)</td>
<td>Careers Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of International Relations</td>
<td>Social Sciences 5000-level modules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Medicine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Social Anthropology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Annual Academic Monitoring
The Annual Academic Monitoring process continues to be effective, with good evidence-based reports that are frank in content, reflective and providing valuable information to the AMG. Dialogues between AMG and a third of Schools (Head of School, Director of Teaching and School Student President) each September are widely held to be useful and constructive. Interest in the topics presented at our Annual Monitoring Dissemination Event in October and attendance at the event has grown in a manner that we did not envisage when it was first introduced: in response to wide demand, the event this year was opened to a larger number and range of colleagues. Varied presentations for the event in October 2015 included Just in Time Teaching; Encouraging Independence in Students; and Student Progressions and Transitions.

6. Module Evaluation Questionnaires
End of Semester Module Evaluation Questionnaires were fully transferred from paper to online technology two years ago. While response rates have dropped in some areas, they have increased in others. The institutional average has been between 40 and 50% in that time. It is hoped that a
collaborative campaign between the Students’ Association and the University will improve these response rates. Sector colleagues tell us that we are already achieving a better response rate online than they achieve on paper: however, we do not wish to be complacent and are determined to find a way to engage more students in providing appropriate feedback on their experience of modules.

7. Development needs/good practice identified from review processes
Following the June review of academic monitoring processes mentioned in 3 above, common commendations and recommendations were identified. Areas noted where improvement is required will be taken to the October meeting of the AMG for discussion.

7.1. Key themes from 15-16 reviews

Common themes for commendation:
- a) High quality teaching
- b) Research-led and research-informed teaching
- c) High quality students
- d) Commitment to small group teaching
- e) Innovation in assessment
- f) Collegiality and sense of community between staff and students
- g) Curriculum review and redesign
- h) Breadth and depth of curricula
- i) Successful engagement between School/Department and the Student President
- j) Provision of comprehensive Reflective Analysis and documentation for the URLT

Common themes for recommendation:
While each School had specific recommendations to follow up, those that occurred more than once and could potentially become causes for concern at an institutional level were:

- a) Review whether turnaround times for feedback on assessment are being routinely met
- b) Review a perception that different standards of marking and feedback occur between different tutors and/or tutors and staff
- c) Review clarity of marking criteria, and ensure these and related guidance are freely available to students
- d) Review School-based training for PGR tutors/demonstrators, especially in relation to marking assignments

Academic Monitoring will continue to focus on these themes.

7.2. Key themes for 2011-16 cycle of reviews
Having reached the conclusion of the University’s planned cycle of URLTs, the University took the opportunity to review common themes for the whole cycle. These are as follows:

Common themes for commendation:
- a) High quality teaching
- b) Research-led and research-informed teaching
- c) High quality, motivated, enthusiastic and articulate students
- d) Commitment to small group teaching
- e) Innovation in teaching and assessment
- f) Collegiality and sense of community between staff and students
- g) Curriculum review and redesign
- h) Breadth and depth of curricula
- i) Successful engagement between School/Department and the Student President
j) Provision of comprehensive Reflective Analysis and documentation for the URLT
k) Availability of staff and open door policy
l) Quality and quantity of feedback
m) Engagement with the Enhancement Themes agenda
n) High quality support from the School’s administration team

Common themes for action:

a) Check whether turnaround times for feedback on assessment are being routinely met (a common complaint from students is a failure of feedback being returned prior to submission of next assignment)
b) Address the perception held by students that different standards of marking and feedback occurs between different tutors and/or tutors and staff
c) Review clarity of marking criteria/grade descriptors, and ensure these and related guidance is freely available to students
d) Improve School-based training for PGR tutors/demonstrators, especially in relation to marking assignments
e) Review lack of coordination in assessment deadline setting
f) Articulate to students which transferrable and professional skills they will acquire via their studies and assessment
g) Review management of PGT student expectations
h) Review School-based induction, mentoring arrangements and reduced teaching load for all new academic staff
i) Ensure a balanced teaching and administration load for staff, where all staff have a share in teaching at all levels, and administration
j) Ensure staff contribute to, and have an understanding of, the vision and strategy for their School
k) Review research methods teaching
l) Address teaching space – availability, size and location, and office space for PGR students
m) Review whether there are too few copies of key texts in the Library
n) Review coordination of Computing Officers

While items a-d remain current for the 2015/6 academic year, we are confident that all concerns are addressed appropriately and that items e-n are either no longer of concern, or are being effectively dealt with under a ‘watching brief’.

8. Diversity in the Curriculum/Equality of Opportunity
An update of the suite of high impacting equality initiatives being undertaken at the University:

Athena SWAN Charter
In April 2016 a renewal submission of the University’s institutional Bronze award was made to the ECU. Current School award holders: Silver for Chemistry, and Bronze for Biology; Earth & Environmental Sciences; Mathematics & Statistics; Medicine; Psychology & Neuroscience. Physics & Astronomy hold the JUNO Practitioner equivalent. Arts schools have commenced working on Athena SWAN (http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/hr/edi/sex_gender/athenaswansupport).

Inclusive Curriculum Toolkit
Designed for Directors of Teaching, the online guidance is used in preparation for HEA E&D in the Curriculum workshops line with latest guidance from the ECU and HEA ‘Embedding Equality into the Curriculum’ events (http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/hr/edi/inclusivecurriculum).

Carer Positive Scotland Award
In recognition of institutional policy and provision, the University attained ‘Carer Positive at Engaged Level’ accreditation (Jul 2016) (http://www.carerpositive.org/carer-positive-employers).
Race Equality Charter
A resubmission for the charter was made (July 2016) through the institutional Race Equality Group chaired by the VP(Enterprise and Engagement) and involving academics, HR; CAPOD; Student Director of Representation; and Student Representative Council for Race Equality (http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/hr/edi/race/charter).

In compliance with the Scottish Specific Duties (2012); the Equality Act (2010); and SFC Outcome Agreement, the institutional strategic and operational equality plan is being reviewed to be published in April 2017 (http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/hr/edi/equalityschemeandpolicies/reports).

Stonewall Diversity Champion Award
The University renewed its award (June 2016) and is making its second ‘Workplace Equality Index’ submission in September 2016 (http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/hr/edi/sexualorientation/stonewall).

Training & Awareness
A new online Unconscious Bias Training Module was launched (April 2016). It is the first of its kind within the UK for training staff on student assessment and admissions. This builds on our suite of online provision: Recruitment; Diversity in the Workplace (HE); Student Diversity; and Diversity. A Micro-Messages video is an additional training resource, together with in-person sessions conducted for managers and staff at all levels (http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/hr/edi/training).

Student Diversity Data
Each School has an E&D Committee that analyses student diversity data, which also forms part of Athena SWAN.

9. PSRB Accreditation 2015-16
No PSRB reviews were held during 2015/16.

10. Monitoring and Analysis of Data
Following information provided in the University’s 2014-15 return, all Senate Efficiency Review projects are now planned to be completed by December 2016. The intention of this work was to provide easy, self-service access to data and to streamline a variety of processes associated with the student lifecycle and University administration. The University is already benefitting from this work.

10.1 Overview of Module Evaluation Questionnaires (MEQs)
A new facility has been developed this year to allow appropriate staff access to an overview of all MEQ outcomes by School. A grid showing all modules and questions is colour-coded (essentially blue-excellent, green-good, red-poor), and sets mean scores against a University average to highlight areas of concern at an easy glance in a layout commonly referred to as ‘the tartan rug’. This is made available in the University’s Module Management System for AMG, Heads of School and Directors of Teaching, who have all found this tool extremely helpful in easily identifying problem areas in modules, and highlighting where modules are receiving high levels of student satisfaction. It has also been used as evidence to instigate conversations with teaching staff who have a lower than expected satisfaction rating in particular areas (e.g. ‘the lecturer was good at explaining things’), and can therefore aid in the identification of development needs.

10.2 Teaching Quality Factsheets
Teaching Quality Factsheets developed in collaboration between the AMG and the University’s data team received good feedback when issued for the first time last academic year. Timing of delivery of these was agreed to be most appropriate and useful in terms of data availability and confirmation in early September. The next round of Teaching Quality Factsheets will therefore be issued to Schools in September 2016.
10.3 NSS
The University participated in the NSS for the 10th time in 2015, with an overall satisfaction rate of 89%, placing us joint third in Scotland and 25th amongst mainstream multi-faculty institutions. The University was ranked top in 4 subject areas (Neuroscience, Zoology, Computer Science, and Archaeology) and top 10 in 3 other subject areas (Medicine, Classics, and Mathematics & Statistics). A further 15 subjects scored 90% satisfaction or above, with another 8 subjects improving their performance.

While our 2015 scores would be regarded as satisfactory for many universities, we were disappointed to have dropped several places in national rankings, and held a series of discussions with Schools based on the annual analysis we carry out following receipt of the full data. In all subject areas, detailed scores for each question are routinely scrutinised by our Statistical Analysis & Benchmarking Team to provide reports for each discipline to help identify where improvements can be made. This is particularly helpful for subject areas where student satisfaction has decreased. This analysis is a key part of URLT and strategic planning dialogues with AMG and members of the University’s Principal’s Office. Overall issues in 2015/6 were tricky to define: however, it was easier to identify them when broken down by School. Having noted their particular results at the start of the 2015/6 academic year, Schools agreed action plans which were followed up by the Deans throughout the 2015/6 academic year. We are pleased to report a return to a leading position in the NSS 2016.

11. Student Participation
Student participation on all major committees continues, with students and staff working closely on a variety of projects. Structured training for class representatives, run jointly between the Centre for Academic, Professional & Organisational Development (CAPOD) and the Students’ Association (SA), has been reviewed and enhanced to make use of the flipped classroom approach. This was received well by class representatives. Training for School Presidents has also been enhanced in response to feedback and a growing realisation of the real value of this role.

11.1 Collaboration Statement
Following the election of a new Students’ Association Director of Representation time has been set aside to discuss an update to the Collaboration Statement.

CAROL A. MORRIS
Director of CAPOD & Quality Monitoring
(Centre for Academic, Professional & Organisational Development)
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