UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

Academic Standards Committee

A meeting of the **Academic Standards Committee** will be held on **Friday 2 October 2020** at **9.30 am** via Zoom

Mrs R Cole
Clerk to Committee
ruth.cole@glasgow.ac.uk

AGENDA

Only items listed under Sections A and B will be discussed. At the beginning of the meeting members will be given the opportunity to request that any items listed under Section C be included in the Committee's discussion.

1.	**Note of the June 2020 Meeting held by Circulation**	ASC 20/01
2.	**Matters Arising**	
2.1	*Update on PGT Dissertation Marking Practices within ASBS (ASC/2019/39)*	ASC 20/02
2.2	*PGT College Annual Monitoring Summaries for 2018-19: College of Arts (ASC/2029/41.2.1)*	
3.	**Convener's Business**	

Section A: Items for Discussion

4.	**Report on Academic Policy Response to Covid-19: The No Detriment Policy and Other Measures**	ASC 20/03
5.	**Periodic Subject Review**	
5.1	*Pilot Outcome*	ASC 20/04
5.2	*Disruption in 2019-20 and Arrangements for 2020-21*	ASC 20/05
5.3	*Full Review Report*	
	5.3.1 Economic & Social History	ASC 20/06
5.4	*Update Reports*	
	5.4.1 Celtic & Gaelic	ASC 20/07
	5.4.2 School of Veterinary Medicine	ASC 20/08
	5.4.3 Short Courses	ASC 20/09
	5.4.4 Undergraduate Medical School	ASC 20/10

6. Programme Approval

6.1   Report on Programme Approval 2019-20   ASC 20/11

7.   Annual Report to the SFC: Institutional Report on Quality Assurance and Enhancement 2019-20   ASC 20/12

Section B: Items for Formal Approval

---

8.   Items Referred from Edinburgh Theological Seminary

8.1   Report of the Meeting of the Joint Board of the University of Glasgow and Edinburgh Theological Seminary held on 5 November 2019   ASC 20/13

8.2   Report of the Meeting of the Joint Board of the University of Glasgow and Edinburgh Theological Seminary held on 21 April 2020   ASC 20/14

9.   Items Referred from Scotland's Rural College

9.1   Proposal to Separate the Institution-led Review and Revalidation Procedures   ASC 20/15

9.2   Report of the Meeting of the Joint Liaison Committee of the University of Glasgow and Scotland's Rural College held on 27 November 2019   ASC 20/16

10.   Remit, Composition and Membership 2020-21

10.1 Remit and Composition   ASC 20/17

10.2 Membership   ASC 20/18

Section C: Items for Noting or Information

---

11.   Audit Reports on Course Approval Activity

11.1 College of Arts   ASC 20/19

11.2 College of Medical, Veterinary & Life Sciences   ASC 20/20

11.3 College of Social Sciences   ASC 20/21

12.   Report on Items Approved under Summer Powers   ASC 20/22

13.   Any Other Business

14.   Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Academic Standards Committee will be held on **Friday 20 November 2020** at **9.30am** via Zoom.

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee

Note - June 2020 by circulation

ASC/2019/36 Minutes of the Meeting held on Friday 24 January 2020

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

ASC/2019/37 Matters Arising

ASC/2019/37.1 Responses to Issues Raised in the Undergraduate and Postgraduate College Annual Monitoring Summaries 2017-18 (ASC/2019/27.1)

Ms Phelan provided the following update on students' continuing access to Mahara following graduation:

This was raised with the VLE Development Board. They indicated that the proposal had previously been considered and rejected, mainly due to lack of policy around extending account access beyond graduation. Reconsidering the proposal with the option of users having personal accounts rather than extended GUIDs, the group agreed to add the proposal to the development backlog. However, this was given a low priority relative to other items on the list, due to the small number of people who would benefit. The backlog is reviewed regularly and items are selected for development and scheduled for delivery. It was also noted that the work may require purchase of hardware and investment would need to be secured if this was to go ahead.

ASC/2019/38 Convener's Business

There was no Convener's business.

ASC/2019/39 Update on PGT Dissertation Marking Practices within ASBS

In response to ASC's request for further clarification on several issues, ASBS provided the following response:

- Whether further sampling or a full second marking was triggered when second marking revealed a difference in grades of more than a certain number of secondary bands. Specifically, what action had been taken in the case of the scripts where there had been 9, 8, 5, 4 and 3 secondary band differences in the grades awarded?

  o ASBS response cited the Marking Protocol point 2) *Carry out automated statistical analysis to review variance across markers for a cohort, and to compare with previous cohorts,* adding that this action, introduced in 2019/20, was now standard and is designed to identify significant variances across the markers. The Convener commented that the response did not address the question asked but restated the marking protocol. The original concern related to, when discrepancies were noted with a marker, while discussion and use of second and third markers was appropriate for the noted discrepancies what is done with regard to additional dissertations marked by that marker. ASBS should be asked to provide a response to this particular issue.

  o The Convener welcomed the initiative whereby continued discrepancies led to adjunct services being dispensed with.

Action: Clerk

- Whether the analysis involved comparison of dissertation grade and taught courses grades.

    o The ASBS response highlighted that Dissertation convenors were encouraged to examine routinely the consistency of grades between taught courses and dissertation performance. Significant discrepancies were investigated further and may result in the second marking of the dissertation. The Convener commented that given the first answer it was expected that significant discrepancies WOULD rather than may, result in the second marking of the dissertation.

- An outline of the nature of options alternative to the traditional dissertation that were to be piloted in the School. This information would be of interest to other areas of the University that were looking for ways of managing projects for high student numbers.

    o ASBS provided examples of two different approaches, Economics and Management, however they added that these may not proceed as planned due to uncertainty caused by the current pandemic. The Convener considered that the approach proposed for Economics appeared to provide the structure for a dissertation that was an independent piece of work for each student.

ASC/2019/40 Quality Management

ASC/2019/40.1 Update on Quality Management in Response to Covid-19

The paper noted that, due to the impact of Covid-19, the Annual Report to the Scottish Funding Council on Institutional-led Reviews of Quality would not be available to ASC until late summer for review at the first meeting of the new session. The paper detailed the University's approach to Quality Management for immediate future. The main issues were:

- Course Approval – emergency measures had been introduced which provided Schools with the authority to make appropriate changes to courses without consulting their College, in order to facilitate approval of conversions of courses for remote delivery in the current academic year and Semester one of the new session. There would be ongoing work in this area in an attempt to identify further streamlining and support, where required.

- Annual Monitoring would continue in a modified form for 2019-20 and 2020-21. The proposed amendments to the Annual Monitoring process had been paused for the immediate future, however the existing Annual Monitoring arrangement would be adapted to incorporate a lighter touch focussing on key issues.

- The External Examiners system would operate as normal, albeit with remote attendance at Board meetings

- A number of the University's Periodic Subject Review events for session 2019-20 had been disrupted by both Covid-19 and industrial action, and further impact was anticipated in 2020-21. The University would have ongoing discussions with the QAA and SFC on possible modifications to the process for 2020-21.

- Student Representation and Student-Staff Consultation Committees would be maintained fully as the student voice would be particularly useful in identifying what elements of the University's response to Covid-19 had worked well.

ASC/2019/40.2 Course Change Procedures

This paper was not circulated to members but will be included in the business of the first meeting of session 2020.

ASC/2019/41 Annual Monitoring

ASC/2019/41.1 Update on Review of Annual Monitoring Process

The paper outlined the further amendments made to the revised Annual Monitoring Process, however, as outlined in ASC/2019/40.1 above, further to the disruption resulting from Covid-19, the implementation of the revised Annual Monitoring Process was suspended for the immediate future.

ASC/2019/41.2 PGT college Annual Monitoring Summaries for 2018-19

ASC/2019/41.2.1 College of Arts

The Convener noted specifically the following issues from the College of Arts report:

- The absence of any pastoral/funding/academic administrative and regulatory support systems for management and administration of PGT cohorts and courses is of concern given the comments also made in ELIR.

- Sustainability of programmes with low numbers and the added difficulties of offering such programmes of a part time basis. If these programmes are to run, it would appear that it is necessary to revisit the regulations governing such programmes to align programme requirements i.e. the availability of core courses to when courses are being run.

- It is not clear from what is written in the AMR exactly what is the issue with space in Kelvin Hall. Does the space needed not exist or is it the availability of the space that is limited for the unique object-based teaching?

- MPhil Textile Conservation/Mahara electronic portfolio, they should be put in touch with Lesley Nicolson, Lubna Nasir and Jenny Hammond at the School of Veterinary Medicine as they have extensive experience with Mahara portfolios and have overcome aspects of student unhappiness with this platform.

Action: Clerk

ASC/2019/41.2.2 College of Social Sciences: Adam Smith Business School

The Convener commented on the following issues:

- Language skills has now arisen as a concern across AMRs for a number of years. It is of concern that there is a 'failure of … recruitment processes to enforce IELTS requirements'

- It was noted in the AMR that 'Concerns have been expressed about the dissertation experience' this is of concern given that this has been a subject of discussion between ASBS, Senate and ASC.

ASC/2019/42 Annual Report on Postgraduate External Examiner Reports – Session 2018-19

ASC received the Annual Report on Postgraduate External Examiners' Reports from 2018-19. Of 232 expected reports, 206 had been received so far. Of these, 19 reports (9%) contained comments requiring a response from the School/Subject Area.

ASC/2019/43 Periodic Subject Review

ASC/2019/43.1 Responses to Recommendations

ASC/2019/43.1.1 Celtic & Gaelic

ASC received the six-month update from the review of Celtic & Gaelic, which detailed the responses and progress made to date in implementing the recommendations. ASC welcomed the full responses provided but noted the following:

Recommendation 3: ASC noted that this recommendation would be raised at the next Language Strategy Group meeting, therefore a further update to ASC would be appropriate.

While the reviewers raised some concerns regarding the response to recommendation 6, this has been, in large part, overtaken by the broader review of lecture recording and, as such, no follow up is required.

Recommendation 10: ASC requested an update on the development of this issue.

Recommendation 11: ASC considered that an update would be beneficial to see the outcome of the consultation and whether the college GTA handbook has been progressed.

Recommendation 12: The response did not necessarily address the recommendation which was framed relative to the reviewers and not the HOS/DOR. In addition, no mention was made of the suggestion of use of the SLS model. As such, an update is requested. While the PDR process has been cancelled for this year, it would be beneficial for meetings with early career staff to take place.

ASC/2019/43.1.2 School of Veterinary Medicine

ASC received the six-month update from the review of School of Veterinary Medicine, which detailed the responses and progress made to date in implementing the recommendations. ASC welcomed the full responses provided but noted the following:

Recommendation 2: In view of the level of planned activity detailed, an update would be beneficial.

Recommendation 3: An update is required with regard to the review of the levels of administrative support that will be conducted with academic staff with teaching management roles. It would also be beneficial to ascertain if there had been any changes with regard to how 'stretched' staff were if they are still 'struggling with morale' and whether there has been less 'churn'

Recommendation 4: An update will be required as it was recommended that any action is dovetailed with the College review of IT support and the actions noted were on hold due to absence of the trainer.

Recommendation 5: This was addressed, in part in the matters arising for this meeting, which detailed that provision was in the development backlog but it does not resolve the issue and as such a response is required from the Convenor of the VLE board, noting the comments in the College of Arts AMR that they are also developing the use of portfolios on Mahara.

Recommendation 6: An update is required

Recommendation 7: The response provided indicates how the network of external and associated staff may be increased but does not address how their expertise could be more effectively used within the programme.

Recommendation 9: The response does not indicate how the success of the initiative is being evaluated, an update will not only detail this but provide the data as well.

Recommendation 10: An update on the planned activities is required.

Recommendation 11: The response made reference to the planned actions in the first instance on which an update would be required with any details of the further elements of planned action.

Recommendation 13: No response provided

Recommendation 14: An update is required as to whether the changes to HR recruitment have addressed the administrative difficulties experienced previously.

ASC/2019/43.1.3 Undergraduate Medical School

ASC received the six-month update from the review of Undergraduate Medical School, which detailed the responses and progress made to date in implementing the recommendations. ASC welcomed the full responses provided but noted the following:

> *Recommendation 1*: Update required.

> *Recommendation 2*: Evidence of the strategy should be provided along with an update as to the progress made in the activities documented in the response.

> *Recommendation 4*: The response given, details communication with staff but does not address how they are consulted or are able to contribute to L&T strategy.

> *Recommendation 5*: An update on the outcome of planned activities is required.

> *Recommendation 6*: The response details how existing activity is recorded and circulated but does not address how opportunities are provided for early career staff and how this process can be facilitated with LEADS, as such an update is requested.

> *Recommendation 7*: The response does not specifically address what is being put in place during induction to aid the student transition to active learning. The response details a series of planned activities and it would be beneficial to get an update on their progress/success.

> *Recommendation 11*: The response primarily addresses mock exams and marking schemes, but does not clarify the opportunities available for formative feedback – the availability of exemplar papers with and without answers, for example, does not necessarily mean that students are able to access formative feedback on their own responses. This response needs further consideration.

ASC/2019/44 Items Referred from Scotland's Rural College

ASC/2019/44.1 Proposed Expansion and Transfer of the BA (Hons) Rural Business Management and BSc (Hons) Agriculture Programmes to the SRUC Barony Campus

Academic Standards Committee (ASC) was asked to **consider and approve** the proposal to expand and transfer the delivery of the BA (Honours) Rural Business Management and BSc (Honours) Agriculture programmes from SRUC's Ayr campus to its Barony Campus, in line with the timetable outlined in the documentation.

In consideration of the proposal, ASC queried if these programmes were mirrors of the courses run at Edinburgh and Aberdeen, what systems are in place to ensure consistency of provision?

Subject to a satisfactory response to the query regarding consistency of provision, ASC **approved** the proposal to expand and transfer the delivery of the BA (Honours) Rural Business Management and BSc (Honours) Agriculture programmes from SRUC's Ayr campus to its Barony Campus, in line with the timetable outlined.

ASC/2019/44.2 Proposed Expansion of the BSc (Hons) Veterinary Nursing Programme to the SRUC Aberdeen Campus

Academic Standards Committee (ASC) was asked to **consider and approve** the request to extend the delivery of the BSc (Honours) Veterinary Nursing programme from SRUC's Barony Campus, Dumfries (South and West Faculty) to its Aberdeen Campus (North Faculty).

ASC had the following questions and observations:

- What systems are in place to ensure consistency of provision in Barony and Aberdeen?

In the main document

- In the 'Work based and College Attendance section Should work placement be year 3 and not 3 3?

- The wording 'The BSc Veterinary Nursing will require minimum attendance over 3 years' is ambiguous ie it could be read that should they attend for the minimum amount of time for three years,it is suggested that this is reworded 'The BSc Veterinary Nursing will require successful completion of years 1-3 of the programme'.

Apart from the above ASC **approved** the request to extend the delivery of the BSc (Honours) Veterinary Nursing programme from SRUC's Barony Campus, Dumfries (South and West Faculty) to its Aberdeen Campus (North Faculty).

ASC/2019/44.3 Scotland's Rural College (SRUC): Institution–led Review and Revalidation of Engineering, Science and Technology Programmes and Responses to Revalidation Conditions and Recommendations

ASC was asked to consider the reports, noting in particular the planned changes to curriculum and delivery sites as appropriate, and approve. The reports submitted related to the Institution–led Review and Revalidation of Engineering, Science and Technology Programmes at Scotland's Rural College (SRUC).

Paper 1 - Report of the SRUC Institution-led review (ILR) of Engineering, Science and Technology Provision, which was held at SRUC's Ayr Campus on 30th April 2019;

Paper 2 - Report of the SRUC Engineering, Science and Technology Revalidation Event which was held at SRUC's Edinburgh Campus on the 17th December 2019; and

Paper 3 - SRUC Response to the Engineering, Science and Technology Revalidation Report.

ASC raised the issue of Equality Implications as currently throughout these papers there only appeared to be consideration of equality with regard to gender. Consideration should be given as to whether this should be expanded to include widening participation and race.

Apart from the point noted above ASC **approved**:

1. The revalidation of the BSc (Honours) Applied Animal Science programme, as a four year degree.
2. The revalidation of the BSc (Honours) Agricultural Bioscience programme under a new title, BSc (Honours) Sustainable Food Production and Land Use.
3. The revalidation of the BSc (Honours) Renewables and Environmental Technology programme under a new title, BSc (Honours) Agricultural Technology.

ASC/2019/44.4 Scotland's Rural College (SRUC): Institution–led Review and Revalidation of Environment and Countryside Programmes

ASC received two papers, related to the Institution–led Review and Revalidation of Environment and Countryside Programmes at Scotland's Rural College (SRUC). ASC was asked to consider the reports, noting in particular, the planned changes to curriculum and delivery sites as appropriate and approve:

Paper 1 - Report of the SRUC Institution-led review (ILR) and Revalidation of Environment and Countryside Provision, which was held at SRUC's Elmwood Campus on 4th and 5th March 2020;

Paper 2 - SRUC Response to the Environment and Countryside Review and Revalidation Report.

ASC noted that with regard to Recommendation D, there was no evidence of peer observation of teaching provided.

Apart from the point noted above ASC **approved**:

1. The revalidation of the BSc (Honours) Countryside Management programme, under a new title, BSc (Honours) Wildlife and Conservation Management. Including expansion of delivery to the SRUC Edinburgh Campus.

2. The revalidation of the MSc Countryside Management programme, under a new title, MSc Wildlife and Conservation Management.

ASC/2019/45 Dates for Next Session

Friday 2 October 2020
Friday 20 November 2020
Friday 22 January 2021
Friday 19 March 2021
Friday 21 May 2021

ASC/2019/46 Any Other Business

There was no other business.

ASC/2019/47 Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Academic Standards Committee will be held on **Friday 2 October 2020** at **9.30am.**

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 2 October 2020

Update on PGT Dissertation Marking Practices within ASBS (ASC/2019/39)

Professor R Paton, Professor G Stoner and Mrs F Baxter, Adam Smith Business School

Request from previous meeting

ASC/2019/39 Update on PGT Dissertation Marking Practices within ASBS

o The Convener commented that the response did not address the question asked but restated the marking protocol. The original concern related to, when discrepancies were noted with a marker, while discussion and use of second and third markers was appropriate for the noted discrepancies what is done with regard to additional dissertations marked by that marker. ASBS should be asked to provide a response to this particular issue.

Response to ASC – September 2020

ASBS would like to assure the ASC that if any discrepancy is discovered with a set of marking, then ALL of the dissertations in this markers sample will be second marked.

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee - Friday 2 October 2020

Report on Academic Policy Response to Covid-19: The No Detriment Policy and Other Measures

Ms H Butcher and Mrs R Cole, Senate Office

The No Detriment policy was introduced in response to the global Covid-19 pandemic. This set out special arrangements to be applied to assessment taking place in the period 16 March to 11 September 2020.

The Policy was developed by an Academic Policy Group consisting of: Professor Neil Evans (Convener, Academic Standards Committee), Professor Marc Alexander (Convener, Academic Regulations Sub-Committee), Helen Butcher (Head of Senate Office), Ruth Cole (Clerk to ASC and ARSC).

The Policy Group worked closely with the Clerk of Senate as different sections of the policy were being developed. The Principal and Senior Management Group were consulted on key principles (such as the introduction of the general 'No Detriment' approach and the adoption of 65% completion of assessment as the minimum threshold for awards to be made). Other key stakeholders (e.g. Deans of Learning & Teaching) and SRC representatives were consulted on particular issues as necessary, and developments were reported to the Covid-19 Assessment Management Operations Group so that implications of the policy could be considered and actions passed to the appropriate areas.

During the spring of 2020 the policy and five supporting Appendices were released covering a range of issues such as calculation methods for determining proportion of assessment completed, final grade point average, course grades and reassessment opportunities. A sixth Appendix will be released shortly covering the application of the policy to awards to be made in 2020-21 and subsequent sessions. Guidance on other affected areas of academic policy was issued in April 2020.

In April 2020 all students were emailed with information about the No Detriment policy. This was supported by the document 'Notes for Students' and FAQs that were included on the University's Covid-19 webpages. Students were advised that they would receive details of local arrangements from their Schools but a helpdesk was also made available to provide initial responses. This was covered by staff centrally and was particularly busy over the Easter closure period.

The No Detriment policy aimed to create a framework for assessment during the pandemic taking into account the impact of the national lockdown which began in March 2020. Its key features were:

1. to promote and encourage the completion of assessment where possible;
2. acknowledge the unprecedented and challenging circumstances the pandemic created for students;
3. enable awards to be made that maintained the University's high academic standards.

Analysis of online participation in assessments indicates that levels of student engagement in assessment throughout the No Detriment period were high and initial feedback also suggests that completion levels were good.

The policy established a range of novel requirements in relation to the handling of assessment data (calculation of GPAs and course grades). The successful implementation of this required a very significant amount of additional work by central support services within IT Services and by academic and professional support staff in the Schools and Colleges.

Data is currently being gathered on the following and a detailed report will follow at a later meeting:

Rate of engagement with assessment due after 15 March: online exams and coursework/dissertations.

Overview of awards/classifications made at June boards compared with previous years.

Overview of awards/classifications made at autumn boards compared with previous years and data on changes to awards/classifications that had initially been made at June boards (e.g. amended honours classifications following exam resits).

Number of senior honours students electing to resit the full exam diet and number where classification remained unchanged.

Number of honours/integrated masters students completing further assessment in August (not the full exam diet, i.e. who were not previously eligible to graduate).

Number of students who were due to graduate/complete their studies in 2019-20 and are yet to complete.

Any increase in the number of other continuing students taking August assessment. E.g. Ordinary/DD and PGT who would normally be able to take reassessment only if they had failed to meet threshold grade.

Information on number of discretionary cases uplifted because GPA at >=.5

Number of discretionary cases referred to Clerk of Senate (GPA .1 - .4), number accepted.

Course grades/CA: Information on course grade profiles, particularly for third year and above. Information about use of CA.

Academic appeals: Information on cases relating to aspects of NDP and any such cases resolved informally.

Student conduct: Information on how cases arising from the relevant period compares with what would normally have happened at the spring and August diets. E.g. cases arising from exam misconduct, how they have been detected, commentary on outcomes. Observations on plagiarism cases.

Complaints: Information on number and nature of complaints regarding the ND policy itself.

Good Cause: The Good Cause process was paused during the relevant period. While Schools did not need to hold Good Cause committees or otherwise deal with claims, the disruption and other additional assessment workload required in the relevant period will no doubt have masked the benefits of this. Figures will be gathered on typical number of cases being handled in spring and August diets, for context.

The ND policy included provision for exceptional cases to be referred to the Clerk of Senate for award of the honours degree without a D3 having been achieved in the dissertation. To date, no such awards have been made.

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 2 October 2020

Periodic Subject Review Process – Pilot Outcome

Helen Butcher, Senate Office

Brief description of the paper

A report on the pilot of the revised process for PSR that was run for one subject review in 2019-20 in preparation for implementation in the fourth PSR cycle which will run from 2020-21 to 2025-26.

Action Requested

Academic Standards Committee is asked **to approve** the recommendation that the revised approach taken in the pilot in March 2020 is continued for the PSR reviews scheduled for 2020-21.

Recommended Person/s responsible for taking the action(s) forward

Senate Office.

Resource implications

None identified.

Timescale for Implementation (where appropriate)

Actions highlighted within the Report will be taken forward during Session 2019-20.

Equality implications

No specific implications identified.

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 2 October 2020

Periodic Subject Review Process – Pilot Outcome

Helen Butcher, Senate Office

In May 2019 ASC received a report on the review of the Periodic Subject Review process and proposed key changes for the fourth PSR cycle which would commence in autumn 2020, with a pilot due to be undertaken in 2019-20.

The pilot took place in March 2020 with the review of Computing Science. As noted to ASC previously, the proposed revisions to the PSR process were that Schools/Subjects would produce a shorter and more clearly structured Reflective Analysis (rather than the current Self Evaluation Report), and that there would be greater reflection on data. The final report would also be shorter providing more of an overview of the Panel's findings, with a revised process for finalising recommendations in dialogue with the School/Subject and the possibility of incorporating responses to recommendations into an action plan that would be monitored as part of annual monitoring.

Key objectives for the pilot:

- The subject area should get added value from the process.

- Facilitate collective ownership and broader understanding of the student experience across the wider university support services as relevant.

- Provide the University with further evidence of Enhancement which can be used for multiple external reporting purposes including QAA Scotland and the SFC and for marketing and recruitment purposes relating to the enhancement of the student experience.

- To assure academic standards and complied with the University quality assurance framework and the UK Quality Code.

Key changes included:

- The introduction of a Reflective Analysis (RA) as the main documents supported by a suite of appendices.

- The preparation for the PSR to be collaborative and include the student voice.

- The focus of the RA to be structured around into four key areas of thematic activity (Strategy for Development, Learning & Enhancement, the Student Voice and Supporting Student Wellbeing).

- The format of the outcome report was amended to reduce narrative and includes the addition of an action plan which can be used to monitor progress against the recommendations as well as detailing more explicitly the associated responsibilities of University professional support services.

- Evidence of good practice and commendations should be shared to ensure maximum benefits for the subject as well as the College and the wider University.

- All documentation to be submitted via a shared/online folder to reduce duplication and confusion.

Initial feedback from the pilot exercise:

- The School suggested the structure of the RA helped to bring more focus to thematic discussions with staff and students and encouraged them to be more forward thinking.

- Feedback from the panel was positive with confirmation that interviews and discussions with staff and students focused on enhancement activities.

- The agenda structure provided an early opportunity for the assurance of academic standards (primarily from the external subject expert, with agreement from the Panel), allowing the dialogue for the meetings with staff and students to focus on enhancement.

- The School confirmed the new RA provided them with a more focused and reflective approach to PSR. However, the School suggested the time to prepare for PSR was still significant and further work would need to be done at central and local level regarding the production of data.

- The PSR helped to evidence gaps in knowledge and shared understanding of the student experience (within the wider university support services in particular). It also evidenced a mixed understanding within the School of the breadth of University support services available to them. Both these outcomes provide the University with an opportunity to promote and embed professional support services into the work of the Colleges/School to provide professional support staff with a broader understanding of their role and contribution to the student experience.

- The focus on enhancement made it easier for the School to demonstrate a transparent culture of embedding the student voice within the development of the curriculum and the School portfolio.

- The outcome report/action plan provides the University with another opportunity to evidence enhancement and also demonstrate progress against its ELIR recommendations.

- The new method was discussed in detail with colleagues from QAA Scotland at the annual engagement meeting in May. Feedback was supportive and encouraging.

- No formal feedback has been ascertained due to the refocusing of priorities as a result of the planning for the impact of the pandemic.

Key Benefits identified so far:

The preparation and planning for PSR suggested good support was given from Academic Services to the School prior to the event in order to maximise the benefits of the pilot. Initial comments and feedback would suggest an overall level of satisfaction with event. The outcome report should provide the University with an opportunity to evidence enhancement which is a key component to monitoring the outcome from ELIR and also provides information to include in the final report on the Evidence for Enhancement Theme (QAA Scotland) which is due in October. The outcome/action plan from the PSR should also provide an opportunity for the University to develop a shared understanding of the "student experience" across central support services and academic areas which is challenging for a large devolved institution.

Pilot Outcome

The Senate Office is grateful to the School of Computing Science for their willingness to participate in the pilot and the constructive approach taken. In the absence of any further opportunity to obtain more formal feedback, it is **proposed that the revised approach taken in the pilot is continued for the PSR reviews scheduled for 2020-21**. In addition, the following changes will be adopted:

- Readiness to run the events fully online if necessary in light of the ongoing social distancing and workplace requirements associated with the Covid-19 pandemic;

- Initial steps to improve the co-ordination of gathering data for each PSR. Planning Insights & Analysis (PIA) are operating an online forum with representatives from each PSR subject to facilitate access to subject data available from central sources, they will also use this year's activity to identify key support needs to improve access to data for reviews in 2021-22.

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 2 October 2020

Periodic Subject Review Process – Disruption in 2019-20 and Arrangements for 2020-21

Helen Butcher, Senate Office

Brief description of the paper

An overview of PSR activity during 2019-20 and the revised schedule for 2020-21 and future years.

Action Requested

Academic Standards Committee is asked **to note** the Report.

Recommended Person/s responsible for taking the action(s) forward

Senate Office.

Resource implications

None identified.

Timescale for Implementation (where appropriate)

As noted in the report.

Equality implications

No specific implications identified.

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 2 October 2020

Periodic Subject Review Process – Disruption in 2019-20 and Arrangements for 2020-21

Helen Butcher, Senate Office

Events held in 2019-20

The table below summarises the agreed schedule for PSR in 2019-20 and the subsequent disruption to two events due to industrial action and the national lockdown. Both of the postponed PSRs will take place in the next cycle in 2020-21.

Subject	Due date	Status
Theology & Religious Studies	Feb 2020	Complete
Sociology	February 2020	Complete
School of Computing Science	March 2020	Complete
Economic & Social History	March 2020	Complete
Philosophy	March 2020	Postponed to 2020-21 Due to Industrial Action
College of MVLS Graduate School: PGT Cluster2: Medical Professions, Health & Wellbeing and Medical & Clinical Science	June 2020	Postponed to 2020-21 due to Covid

Arrangements for 2020-21

Following dialogue with QAAS and the Funding Council, we have adopted a reduced load of PSR activity during 2020-21 in order to release capacity for the priorities around delivering teaching and assessment under the current challenging circumstances. Five PSR reviews are now planned for 2020-21 and a revised schedule for the full six-year cycle of PSR up to 2025-26 has been drawn up (see **Appendix 1**). In managing the risks around deferring reviews within a six-year cycle we have ensured that no Subject will have their review deferred by more than one academic session, so as not to build up any unduly large gaps between reviews.

Agreed schedule for Periodic Subject Review events for the 2020-21 academic session:

Subject Review	Original Date	Status	Revised Date
Philosophy	March 2020	Postponed. Industrial Action	Feb/Mar 2021
College of MVLS Graduate School: PGT Cluster2: Medical Professions, Health & Wellbeing and Medical & Clinical Science	June 2020	Postponed. Covid-19	June 2021
Nursing & Health Care	Nov 2020	Moved from Sem 1 to Sem 2 event in 2020-21	Mar 2021
Geographical & Earth Sciences	2020-21	No change	Mar 2021
Urban Studies	2020-21	No change	Mar 2021

The following five subjects were originally scheduled for review in 2020-21 have been deferred to 2021-22:

- Chemistry
- Classics
- Economics
- History
- Theatre, Film & TV Studies

Periodic Subject Review (PSR) – Revised Schedule 2021 to 2026 (Pandemic adjustments)

College	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
Arts	Philosophy ~~Theatre, Film & TV Studies~~ ~~Classics~~ ~~History~~	Theatre, Film & TV Studies History Classics ~~Archaeology~~ ~~English Language & Literature and Scottish Literature~~	Archaeology English Language & Literature and Scottish Literature Information Studies ~~History of Art~~	History of Art ~~School of Modern Languages & Cultures~~ ~~Music~~	School of Modern Languages & Cultures Music ~~Celtic & Gaelic~~	~~Philosophy*~~ Theology & Religious Studies Celtic & Gaelic
	1	3	3	1	2	2
Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences	Nursing & Health Care MVLS Graduate School: **PGT Cluster 2**: Medical Professions, Health & Wellbeing and Medical & Clinical Science	Dental School	School of Life Sciences	Medical Undergraduate School	School of Veterinary Medicine ~~MVLS Graduate School: PGT Cluster 1: Biomedical Science, Animal & Plant Sciences~~	~~MVLS Graduate School:? PGT Cluster 2:~~ ~~Medical Professions, Health & Wellbeing and Medical & Clinical Science*~~ MVLS Graduate School: **PGT Cluster 1:** Biomedical Science, Animal & Plant Sciences
	2	1	1	1	1	1
Science and Engineering	School of Geographical & Earth Sciences ~~School of Chemistry~~	~~School of Mathematics & Statistics~~ School of Chemistry	School of Mathematics & Statistics ~~School of Psychology~~	School of Psychology School of Physics & Astronomy	School of Engineering TNE	School of Computing Science
	1	1	1	2	2	1
Social Sciences	Urban Studies ~~Economics~~	~~School of Interdisciplinary Studies~~ Economics	School of Interdisciplinary Studies ~~Accounting & Finance~~ Central & East European Studies	Accounting & Finance School of Education ~~School of Law~~ ~~Management~~	School of Law Management Politics	Economic & Social History Sociology
	1	1	2	2	3	2
Other PSR activity		LEADS (PG CAP and MEd)		Short Courses		
	0	1	0	1	0	0
Total PSR	5	7	7	7	8	6
Year of Cycle	1 of 4th	2 of 4th	3 of 4th	4 of 4th	5 of 4th	6 of 4th

*To be deferred to PSR Cycle 2027-2032 as already featured in 2021-26 cycle.

	PSR deferred from 2020/21		PSR deferred from 2021/22		PSR deferred from 2022/23		PSR deferred from 2023/24
	PSR deferred from 2024/25						

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 2 October 2020

Periodic Subject Review: Review of Economic & Social History held on 6 March 2020

Cover Sheet

Mr Robbie Mulholland, Clerk to the Review Panel

Brief description of the paper

Report of the Periodic Subject Review of Economic & Social History held on 6 March 2020.

Action Requested

Academic Standards Committee is invited to receive the report and **approve** the 8 recommendations contained therein for onward transmission to those identified for action.

Recommended Person/s responsible for taking action(s) forward

As identified in the report.

Resource implications

Not applicable.

Timescale for Implementation

An update to the recommendations will be provided to the May 2021 meeting of ASC.

Equality implications

As identified in the report.

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 2 October 2020

Periodic Subject Review: Review of Economic & Social History held on 6 March 2020

Mr Robbie Mulholland, Clerk to the Review Panel

Review Panel:

Professor Frank Coton, Vice Principal, Panel Convener

Professor Lucy Newton, University of Reading, External Subject Specialist

Professor Simon Kennedy, Senate Assessor on Court

Ms Anna Makova, Student Member

Dr Amanda Pate, Learning Enhancement & Academic Development Service

Mr Robbie Mulholland, Senate Office and Clerk to the Panel

Observer: Dr Andrew Struan, Learning Enhancement & Academic Development Service

Apologies: Dr Niall Mackenzie, Adam Smith Business School, Cognate Member

1. Introduction

1.1.1 Economic & Social History (ESH) is one of five constituent Subject Areas which make up the School of Social & Political Sciences (SPS) and part of the College of Social Sciences (CoSS). Two institutional centres, the Centre for Business History in Scotland and the Centre for the History of Medicine are based in ESH. A third institutional centre, the Centre for Gender History, based in the History Subject Area also includes ESH staff membership.

The Economic & Social History Subject Area is located in Lilybank House in Bute Gardens.

1.1.2 Preparation of the ESH Self Evaluation Report was led by Professor Ray Stokes, Head of the ESH Subject Area, with input and consultation involving several members of ESH academic staff. This included Dr Hannah-Louise Clark, Miss Maelle Duchemin-Pelletier, Dr Rose Elliot, Dr Jeff Meek, Dr Jim Phillips, Professor Neil Rollings, Dr Duncan Ross and Dr Helen Yaffe. Additional support and advice was provided by Ms Suzanne Hendry and Mr Aidan Simpson, ESH administrators, Dr Michael McEwan, Learning Enhancement & Academic Development Service (LEADS), Ms Amy Broad, Student Lifecycle Support & Development, and Dr Matt Dawson, Head of the Sociology Subject Area.

1.1.3 The Panel met with the following members of ESH staff and students:- Head of Subject; nine members of academic staff (four of whom are Early Career Staff); three other Early Career Staff; two ESH administrative staff; two Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs); two Tutors; four undergraduate students (Levels 1, 2, 3 and 4); and one postgraduate taught student. The Panel also met with the Head of the School of Social and Political Sciences and the Professor of Scots Law, School of Law (standing in for the Dean of Learning & Teaching, College of Social Sciences.

2. Context and Strategy

2.1 Staff

The headcount delivering teaching in ESH is 15 as of early 2020. The Self Evaluation Report (SER, p5) notes that 'this includes two staff members who have 50% workload allocations for senior administrative positions, three members of staff who have research grant buyouts, and

four members of staff who are on time limited contracts.' Furthermore, the SER (p5) states that 'the actual FTE of staff available for teaching is approximately 12.7 as of late 2019/early 2020' and 'a total of 3.13 FTE of this figure involves staff on time-limited contracts.'

2.2 Students

Student numbers as reported for sessions 2015-16 to 2018-19 are summarised below:

Student Numbers by Year of Programme – Undergraduate

Headcount	Term	Term	Term	Term
Year of Prog	2015	2016	2017	2018
1	11	20	17	17
2	38	29	44	25
3	36	35	28	42
4	22	34	33	28
5				1
Grand Total	107	118	122	113

Student Numbers by Year of Programme – Postgraduate

Head Count	Term	Term	Term	Term
Year of Programme	2015	2016	2017	2018
1	23	31	27	117
2	1	1	1	19
Grand Total	24	32	28	136

2.3 Range of Provision under Review

Undergraduate:

- MA Social Sciences (MA Soc Sci [Honours]), Single Honours degree in ESH

- MA Social Sciences with Quantitative Methods (MA Soc Sci [Honours])

- Combined Honours degrees in ESH and another subject offered from a range of subjects within the Colleges of Social Sciences; Arts; and Science & Engineering, subject to timetabling restrictions

- Level 3 courses contributing to the three-year, non-Honours MA within the College of Social Sciences

- Honours courses that are available to students on other subjects and/or programmes

- Teaching on courses on the MBChB and BSc Medical Humanities programmes including undergraduate courses in History of Medicine and also supervision of dissertations.

Postgraduate:

- MSc in Global Economy (ESRC recognised 1+3 pathway)

- Erasmus Mundus International Masters programme (IntM) Global MarkESH, Local Creativities (GLOCAL)

In addition, ESH offers or has recently offered course/s that contribute to the:

- MSc in History (ESRC recognised 1+3 pathway)

- MSc in History with emphasis on History of Medicine (ESRC recognised 1+3 pathway)

- Other MSc programmes across the School of Social & Political Sciences and the College of Social Sciences including Management programmes in the Adam Smith Business School

- MSc programme in International Relations offered at the University of Glasgow's strategic partner, the University of Nankai.

2.4 Strategic Approach to Enhancing Learning and Teaching

2.4.1

The Review Panel met with the Head of Subject who outlined his key strategic objectives for the Subject. Principal amongst these was the goal to preserve and sustain the Subject. He, and key staff that the Panel met with, considered that one of the great strengths of Economic & Social History as a subject was its interdisciplinary nature and the extent to which it drew on many different branches of knowledge. The Head of Subject pointed out that despite this interconnectedness, it was important that Economic & Social History be seen as a distinct and coherent discipline and that the Subject Area was able to consolidate its position structurally within the School and College.

It was noted that the University of Glasgow was one of only two higher education institutions in the UK which offered Economic & Social History – the other being the London School of Economics (LSE). Both the Head of Subject and staff the Panel met with stressed that although the Subject's academic staff had a variety of different subject specialisms, they all had a collective belief in the importance of Economic and Social History as a discipline and the role of the Subject Area as a near-unique provider in the UK.

Staff Demographic and Workload

2.4.2

The Head of Subject considered that another key objective for the Subject was to continue to provide a high-quality student experience in the face of a substantially changed staff demographic. Overall staff numbers had remained relatively stable over several years, but the age profile of staff had changed markedly. Two senior members of staff had retired and two (one senior and one junior) had taken up other posts outside the University. This meant that 38% of staff were under 45 years of age while 46% were 56 or over. These figures suggested that there would be a continuing trend of departure (through retirement) of senior staff. This presented a considerable challenge for the Subject, particularly in the face of the very large increase in PGT student numbers in both the MSc in Global Economy and GLOCAL programmes. [The headcount for the MSc in Global Economy programme had risen from 29 in session 2014-15 to 85 in session 2019-20.] The dramatic increase in numbers on this programme had coincided with the introduction of the GLOCAL programme which attracted an average of 600 applicants each year.

The Head of Subject and staff the Panel met with recognised that the very large increase in PGT numbers had placed an unsustainable workload on staff - a matter which would become particularly acute if the existing upward trend in PGT numbers continued. The loss of several senior staff had also inevitably impacted on established experience and institutional knowledge within the Subject. The Panel acknowledged these concerns and noted also that a lot of undergraduate work was being undertaken by staff on fixed-term contracts. This could present additional challenges for the Subject in future should these staff leave. The Panel enquired whether the Subject had examined the possibility of making teaching appointments on Learning, Teaching and Scholarship (LTS) contracts. The Head of Subject advised that he wanted to avoid the hierarchical staff structure that he thought might accompany such a move.

Approach to Curriculum Development

2.4.3

The Head of Subject noted that a further key strategic objective for the Subject was to further incorporate global history and its contemporary relevance within the curriculum, at all levels from pre-Honours to PGT. The curriculum at Levels 1 and 2 was being recast to place key themes such as industrialisation and social change in a more global and comparative context.

This shift in emphasis was also taking place in the MSc in Global Economy and GLOCAL programmes.

As part of this, the Subject had utilised the new research and teaching expertise of recently appointed staff to offer several new courses, eg ones which related to Latin America and this region's impact on the global economy and international politics. The Head of Subject considered that developments such as these demonstrated the considerable work that the Subject continued to make to realise the University's strategic objectives in relation to internationalisation, interdisciplinarity and collaboration, particularly in the context of the MSc in Global Economy and GLOCAL programmes.

He pointed out, however, that many international students on the Subject's PGT programmes had less interest in the historical dimension of their studies than they did in economic aspects. The Subject had responded to this by adopting several new approaches to help further engage students with historical aspects of the curriculum. [See section 3.4.1].

The Panel was advised that the Head of Subject attached considerable importance to being able to 'mesh' the curriculum at undergraduate and postgraduate level. Recent academic staff appointments had been made with a view to further globalising the curriculum, in line with University, College, School and Subject strategies but also with the aim of achieving greater integration of programmes across undergraduate and postgraduate provision. Several staff, equivalent to 2.5 FTEs, had recently been appointed and would join ESH in spring and summer 2020. In addition, the Subject had a vacant post and consideration was being given as to how this should be filled. A key consideration would be the post-holder's ability to teach across the Subject, and at different levels, in the areas of economic, social and business history. The vacancy also provided an opportunity to make an appointment which would help address the current imbalance in the Subject's staff profile between junior and senior members.

The Panel acknowledged the considerable efforts that the Subject had made, and continued to make, to address the various challenges presented by staff retirals and departures. The Panel **suggests**, that in making the case for future staff appointments, the Subject emphasises how the post-holder would contribute to the Subject's perceived future provision - and not just the extent to which the appointee would address an immediate staffing need in a particular area of the curriculum.

The Panel welcomed the Head of Subject's comments on the importance of Economic and Social History promoting itself as a distinct and coherent discipline. In this regard, it noted that several undergraduate students remarked that while they were very enthusiastic about the diversity of the learning experience in ESH, they were sometimes unclear how certain aspects of the curriculum fitted in with the overall aims of the Subject. The Panel **suggests** that the Head of Subject reflect on the Subject's identity and how this is perceived by the student body.

3. Enhancing the Student Experience

3.1 Admissions, Retention and Success

3.1.1 *Admissions and Recruitment*

The Head of Subject advised the Panel that over the last few years, undergraduate numbers in Economic & Social History had been quite stable and displayed no discernible trend. It was clear, however, that very few undergraduate students came to the University with the intention of studying Economic & Social History.

Although there were fairly large numbers in Level 1 ESH courses, the number of students who had the subject in their study programme from the start was quite low. This could be explained, at least in part, by the fact that Economic and Social History was not offered as a subject in secondary schools and there was a consequent lack of general awareness of the subject amongst school leavers. It was evident that many students decided to take up the subject

explicitly after their first year of study. The numbers of students opting to continue with ESH into Honours was a reflection of the level of student interest and satisfaction with the subject at Levels 1 and 2, in spite of students not having had the benefit of taking the subject previously at school. This was in contrast to the situation with many other subjects which were taught at school level, whereby there was often a drop in the number of students choosing the subject explicitly from point of entry through to Honours.

One of the undergraduate students the Panel met with advised that they had come to the University with the intention of studying History and Politics but had decided to study ESH on the back of reports of the quality of teaching in the subject. All the undergraduate students the Panel met with reported that the richness and diversity of the learning experience they encountered once they had taken up ESH was a big factor in their desire to pursue the subject in later years of their programme. The rate of retention from Level 1 to Honours was therefore very high, eg 20 students in Level 1 in 2015, to 60 in Honours in 2018.

The Panel noted from the Self Evaluation Report (SER) that the gender profile of students in ESH was broadly similar at both UG and PGT level, in that the majority were female. However, in 2018, while the trend towards female participation at undergraduate level continued, there was a near equal proportion of males and females at PGT level. Regarding domicile, the vast majority of undergraduate students were from the UK and the EU with approximately 12-21% being international in any given year.

3.1.2 *Widening Participation and Direct Entry*

The Panel noted from the Self Evaluation Report (SER) that the School of Social and Political Sciences operated a new articulation programme whereby HNC social sciences students at Glasgow Clyde College could progress to the University to take Level 2 subjects, including Economic and Social History. Preparations were also underway to extend this scheme to West College (Paisley) in session 2021-22. The Subject also received international students who had taken degree preparation programmes, eg the Foundation Certificate in Business and Social Sciences at Glasgow International College (GIC) - one of the University's partner institutions.

3.1.3 *Retention and Progression*

As noted in section 3.1.1, the retention of students who had studied Economic & Social History at Levels 1 and 2 was quite high, particularly in view of the fact that few students had much awareness of the subject prior to coming to the University. In addition, nearly all students admitted to Honours in ESH completed the programme with good degree outcomes, e.g. in 2018, Honours classifications were awarded as follows: First – 21; 2i – 36; 2ii – 9; Third Class – 0.

The Panel noted from the SER that attainment amongst students on PGT programmes was also high with the vast majority completing their studies successfully, and in most cases with Merit or Distinction.

3.1.4 *Postgraduate Taught Provision*

The Panel noted from the SER that PGT numbers were also relatively stable between 2015 and 2017, but from 2018 and in contrast to the undergraduate population, PGT numbers had increased dramatically, quadrupling from previous levels. This increase was due largely to a considerable upturn in student numbers on the MSc in Global Economy programme which coincided with the introduction of the GLOCAL International Masters programme. While student numbers on the latter programme had decreased slightly, the numbers on the MSc in Global Economy programme had remained at a high level with applications for entry in 2020 being four times the number received for entry in 2019.

The composition of the postgraduate population in terms of domicile also differed markedly from the undergraduate population in that the vast majority of students were international – the figure being between 70-78% between 2015 and 2018. The composition of the Subject's

two PGT programmes also showed significant differences in terms of the nationality/ethnicity of its students. The students in the MSc in Global Economy programme were mostly Chinese while GLOCAL students came from over 20 different countries. The Head of Subject reported that there appeared to be no obvious reason which explained the large upturn in numbers in the MSc in Global Economy programme in 2018.

With regard to the GLOCAL programme, however, the large number of applicants could be explained, at least in part, by the high quality of the programme, the availability of scholarships for students and the recognition it had received from the European Union's (EU) Education, Audiovisual & Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). The EU's initial funding amounted to over 3 million Euros. The Head of Subject considered that the UK's departure from the EU posed many challenges for this programme and it would require to be thoroughly recast going forward.

With regard to the MSc in Global Economy, the Panel advised the Head of Subject that careful consideration would have to be given to how numbers on the programme were managed in future. The recent large increase in numbers might continue, but on the other hand, the programme's reliance on international students, and particularly those from one country – China, could potentially leave the programme very susceptible to market fluctuation. In addition, the onset of the coronavirus in many countries was likely to have a significant impact on international recruitment generally. The Head of Subject advised that a process of scenario planning was on-going within the Subject with regard to PGT admissions to enable a managed response to possible outcomes. The Panel stressed that the Subject should consider the balance between its UG and PGT numbers in planning its future development.

3.2 Equality and Diversity

3.2.1

The Economic & Social History SER outlined the Subject's commitment to equality and diversity at various levels. Themes linked to equality and diversity ran through the Subject's teaching at all levels and the LEADS representative who undertook student focus groups in ESH prior to the PSR reported that 'inclusion (as participation) is actively encouraged in classes through both pedagogy and culture by many/most staff.' (SER, p17). Also, a new lectureship in Global Inequalities had been proposed by the Subject, and approved by the College of Social Sciences, with the new member of staff due to take up post shortly.

The Panel heard that over the last few years the Subject's student population had become more diverse with more mature students, including some with caring responsibilities. One of the undergraduate students the Panel met with reported, that as a parent, they had received strong support from Subject staff.

At undergraduate level there was an increasing number of students whose first language was not English, and at PGT level this group constituted a majority. The Head of Subject considered that diversity in the student body also helped to bring a range of perspectives to the learning and teaching environment.

Good Cause

3.2.2

The Panel heard from both the Head of Subject and many staff regarding two matters which they considered impinged significantly on Equality & Diversity, namely, the increasing incidence of Good Cause claims linked to mental health issues and the availability/accessibility of suitable teaching rooms.

The Head of Subject reported that the number of students applying for an extension to work deadlines and/or Good Cause had grown exponentially in recent years. He considered that lack of appropriate support capacity across the University made this situation unsustainable going forward. The Panel understood the concerns expressed by the Head of Subject and

staff and confirmed that steps were being taken across the University to address these matters. The Panel observed that the increasing incidence of issues linked to mental health was a matter which affected large parts of society and not just the higher education sector.

The Panel recognised the very considerable efforts which the Subject was making to support students affected by mental health concerns.

Teaching Accommodation

3.2.3

The Head of Subject and staff the Panel met with highlighted a range of difficulties they had experienced with the central room booking system. A significant number of teaching rooms across the campus were not accessible to students and staff with disabilities. Furthermore, room booking requests were required to be made before information on student disability was available. Also, it was often impossible for students with disabilities to move between rooms far apart on campus in the 10 minutes allocated for this. The Head of Subject added that teaching in certain Courses, particularly at PGT level, often took place in different rooms week to week. All in all, the Subject considered that these factors were significant impediments to the learning and teaching experience and impacted directly on issues around equality and inclusion. The Panel shared many of the concerns that the Subject had expressed regarding the room booking process and confirmed that this matter was in the process of being examined across the University.

3.3 Supporting Students in their Learning

Learning Environment

3.3.1

All the students the Panel met with felt that the Economic & Social History Subject Area provided a highly supportive and stimulating learning environment. They reflected enthusiastically on the richness and diversity of the curriculum, high quality teaching and the level of autonomy they had in their learning. The students considered that they benefitted greatly from the Subject's desire to link student learning and teaching to the research expertise of staff. They also felt that most Economic and Social History students had a general awareness of what the research interests of Subject staff were.

The students appreciated the excellent library and archival resources that were available to them, including the collections contained in the University Library, the Mitchell Library and those in the two institutional centres based within Economic & Social History – the Centre for Business History in Scotland, and the Centre for the History of Medicine. The students the Panel met with also welcomed the new courses that had been introduced (see section 2.4.3).

The students considered that the Subject, in general, relied heavily on a traditional lecture-followed-by-seminar model of teaching, but didn't feel this detracted from their overall learning experience. They did note that there were several examples of innovative teaching that most students particularly enjoyed. This included the historical hackathon in archival research, and also the use of musical playlists in one course as a learning tool to give historical context to the study of cultural movements.

One of the students the Panel met with expressed a preference for more group work, but several others felt they learned better when working individually. They all considered that given the range of nationalities in the ESH student body, there was inevitably going to be different cultural approaches to learning and a range of preferred learning styles. The Panel heard that the structure of seminars was well-received by students who felt they were conducted in a very inclusive manner where full student participation was encouraged.

The Review Panel **commends** Economic and Social History for its high quality teaching across all levels of provision, as evidenced by the comments of the External Subject Specialist and the students the Panel met with.

Induction and Support

3.3.2

The students the Panel met with indicated that they were generally content with the induction activities that they received at the beginning of their studies. Members of the Panel did wonder, however, if the Subject could do more to engage with new students prior to beginning their studies, over and above the current arrangement whereby (PGT) students received a welcome letter.

Students advised that both academic and administrative staff in ESH were very approachable and supportive regarding any problems they might have. One student did point out, however, that they occasionally had difficulty booking an appointment to meet with a member of academic staff.

The Panel noted that at PGT level, dissertation supervision was undertaken in groups. A PGT student remarked that this arrangement worked satisfactorily, in general, however they considered that the process of allocating Supervisors to students did not always bring about the best alignment between student and staff interests. The Head of Subject explained that the process of allocating Supervisors to students was based on the proposed topic and the workload commitments of staff. A PGT student also remarked that they would prefer more explicit advice from Supervisors on how dissertations should be presented in terms of format and structure.

Advisers of Study

3.3.3

The Panel was advised by both students and staff that they felt considerable confusion existed regarding the role of Advisers of Study. Students reported several instances where there had been mutual confusion between the staff member recorded as being their Adviser of Study on MyCampus, and students as to the purpose of meetings between them. In practice, at undergraduate level, students relied mostly on the team of administrative staff based in the advising offices of the Colleges of Social Sciences and Arts. At PGT level, Programme Convenors fulfilled the role of Adviser of Studies. In view of the uncertainty expressed by students and staff regarding the responsibilities attached to the role of Adviser of Study, the Panel **recommends** that the Clerk of Senate considers what additional steps could be taken to establish greater clarity around the responsibilities of the role for both staff and students.

Communications

3.3.4

The students the Panel met with were of the opinion that the sense of community within the Subject was strong, particularly at Honours level where there was small classes. One student expressed a wish that there was more engagement between PGT and undergraduate students but acknowledged that the Subject was trying to address this in terms of its approach to curriculum development (see section 2.4.3). The Panel observed that Economic & Social History did not have a student society and wondered if students might want to consider forming one, perhaps in liaison with the Student Representative Council (SRC), as a means of fostering greater student interaction.

Several students the Panel met with felt that there was some room for improvement regarding general communications across the Subject. Students expressed a general feeling that the content of notifications they received from staff (normally issued via Moodle email and University email accounts) could benefit from being more explicit and consistent. Acknowledging these observations, the Review Panel **recommends** that Economic & Social History undertakes a review of communications within the Subject Area with a view to improving the efficiency and effectiveness of information sharing between:

1. Individual members of staff in the Subject Area; and

2. Members of staff in the Subject Area and students.

As part of this review, the Subject Area should consult with student stakeholder groups to gain a better understanding of their experience of current communications and to identify specific opportunities for improvement.

Writing Support

3.3.5

The Panel noted that, in line with University policy, all first year undergraduate and new PGT students in Economic & Social History undertook the Academic Writing Skills Programme (AWSP) run by the Learning Enhancement & Academic Development Service (LEADS). The students the Panel met with advised that the range of resources and expertise provided by LEADS was recommended to them strongly by staff in ESH.

Staff the Panel met with advised that a member of ESH staff gave study skills seminars on writing skills and supplemented this by giving additional group supervision sessions for Chinese students. The Head of Subject advised the Panel that undergraduate and PGT Convenors also engaged with international students on a regular basis to offer support for any problems they might have. This included offering help with comprehension and written English. A PGT student the Panel met with whose first language was not English, advised that one of the reasons they came to the UK was to improve their English skills and they had benefitted greatly from writing support. The student also stressed, that given the majority of PGT students in ESH were international, the writing support they received was particularly welcome.

Graduate Attributes

3.3.6

Several staff the Panel met with expressed the view that the interdisciplinary nature of Economic and Social History meant that the content of the subject often overlapped with that of other academic disciplines. They considered that this contributed to a very diverse student learning experience. This diversity helped students to develop a variety of personal and intellectual strengths which the Subject tried to build on in its work to develop graduate attributes and employability skills.

The Panel was informed that, as part of induction, both undergraduate and PGT students attended sessions given by the College of Social Sciences Employability and Careers team on skills development. The same team gave a more detailed presentation to Junior Honours students at the Reading Party held each year in the first semester. The Subject also sought to embed graduate attributes within their modes of assessment, eg in Level 1 tutorials, students received feedback on academic writing and communication skills. This support continued through Level 2 and into Honours where study skills and careers sessions formed part of the programme. Experiential learning opportunities and skills-based assessments also formed an important part of PGT courses. Most of the students the Panel met with were aware of the Subject's efforts to link course/programme Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) with the development of graduate attributes.

The Panel considered that the Subject had worked hard to align its teaching with the University's Graduate Attributes Roadmap, particularly with regard to issues such as internationalisation and the development of self-aware, confident graduates.

3.4 Student Engagement

Approaches to Teaching Delivery

3.4.1

The students the Panel met with were very complimentary about the support and advice they received from staff in ESH who they felt were highly committed to the student learning

experience. They considered them to be approachable and any student concerns raised with them were addressed and acted on. The Panel noted that, following a recommendation made at the last Periodic Subject Review, the Subject had introduced improved practice in relation to Staff Student Liaison Committee (SSLC) meetings to ensure that meetings were clearly documented and actions arising assigned to specific individuals. A PGT student noted, however, that SSLC meetings were not particularly well attended by students.

Students advised the Panel that, in the main, the Subject relied on a traditional lecture-followed-by-seminar model of teaching delivery. As noted in section 3.3.1, students indicated that they were generally content with this approach. The students the Panel met with did recognise, however, the benefits of new teaching methods where they considered this added value to the learning experience.

The Panel heard about several new teaching activities introduced by the Subject which had been very well received by students, as evidenced by course evaluation questionnaires. This included, in particular, the historical hackathon – this being an active learning activity which involved students conducting group research in archives and other historical repositories to develop a greater awareness of the value of primary source materials. The Panel noted from the SER (p23) that staff from ESH had received, through LEADS, an award from the Learning & Teaching Development Fund for a six-month pilot project linked to the hackathon initiative. This led to the publication of an open-access resource which was subsequently highlighted by The Wellcome Trust and JISC as a model for teaching involving archival collections. The Panel **commends** Economic & Social History on the use of the history hackathon as an innovative learning tool in the field of archival research.

The Head of Subject advised the Panel that in semester one of the current session, the School of Social & Political Sciences had canvassed student feedback on individual courses at UG and PGT courses using an on-line method only. This had resulted in a very low level of feedback, with many courses having less than a 20% response rate. This matter was being reviewed through the School Executive.

National Student Survey

3.4.2

Feedback from graduating students was obtained through the National Student Survey (NSS). The Head of Subject observed that, in the NSS, the results for Economic & Social History were amalgamated with those for the History Subject Area, so it was difficult to draw any meaningful conclusions from the response. However, ESH Subject staff did discuss NSS free-text answers which related specifically to ESH at Subject meetings. With the above consideration in mind, the NSS results for ESH (and History) in the 2019 survey included the following outcomes:

- Assessment & Feedback – 72.6%, compared with the School of Social & Political Sciences (71.5%); College of Social Sciences (69.8%); College of Arts (70.2%); University (66.8%);

- Teaching Quality – 88.4%; compared with the University (86.5%); and

- Overall Satisfaction – 87.2%, compared with the School of Social & Political Sciences (87.0); College of Social Sciences (87.0); College of Arts (87.2); University (86.1).

4. Enhancement in Learning and Teaching

4.1 Learning and Teaching

Study Abroad

4.1.1

Undergraduate

The Panel was advised that, in common with the rest of the College of Social Sciences, the take up of study abroad opportunities by undergraduate ESH students was fairly low. The Subject was working with the College Mobility Adviser to develop their provision in this regard.

The students the Panel met with were aware of the educational benefits of study abroad but several highlighted factors which served to discourage them from participating. They were wary of interrupting their studies out of concern that this might negatively impact their final degree outcome. They had reservations about moving to a country where English was not widely spoken and were aware that the structure of the teaching year in terms of semesters/terms might not fit well with the structure of their own programme.

The Panel acknowledged these concerns but suggested that the Head of Subject continue to look at ways which might improve the take-up of study abroad opportunities at undergraduate level. Further development in this area would also align well with the Subject's ambitions to embed global perspectives within the curriculum. At the Panel's suggestion, the Head of Subject agreed to examine whether there might be scope to shorten the length of time a student would require to be abroad. This might help mitigate some of the concerns that students had expressed. The Head of Subject would take this forward with the School of Modern Languages in the first instance.

Postgraduate Taught

The Panel noted that, at PGT level, extensive student mobility was an integral part of the Erasmus-Mundus International Masters GLOCAL programme and that some students on the MSc in Global Economy programme had spent time at Kyoto University in Japan. The Panel observed that the Subject might consider using the experience of its PGT students who had spent time abroad to encourage greater participation from its undergraduates.

Placement Learning

4.1.2

The Panel noted from the SER that Economic & Social History did not in general, engage in work-based learning. The Subject attributed this to the level of administrative support involved in such activity. However, some students on the GLOCAL programme had undertaken work-based learning organised by partner universities. The Panel acknowledged that work-based opportunities were difficult to support but noted that there were other forms of work-related learning which the Subject might consider which were less onerous in terms of the administrative support required. In addition, there might be scope for the Subject to help students look for appropriate summer internships and other opportunities.

Curriculum Design and Development

4.1.3

The Self Evaluation Report noted that ESH's overarching approach to curriculum design and development reflected the guiding principles contained in the History Benchmarking Statement, the University's Learning & Teaching Strategy and the College/School Learning & Teaching Strategies. These principles were expressed at Subject level through Programme Specifications which outlined Programme Aims and Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs).

As noted in section 2.4.3, the Subject had incorporated themes around global history and its contemporary relevance within the curriculum, particularly at PGT level. At Levels 1 and 2, the

curriculum was being recast to include a range of other themes in a more global and comparative context, and at Honours level curriculum innovation such as the history hackathon had been introduced.

Several staff noted that another aim of the ESH curriculum was to show how study of the industrial and social heritage of Glasgow could help illuminate wider global issues, and vice-versa. Curriculum developments were intended to further support the Subject's aim to produce critically engaged and resourceful graduates equipped with strong graduate attributes and employability skills.

The Head of Subject stressed the importance that the ESH curriculum be research-led and research-informed and advised that proposed changes were reviewed with the research expertise of new and existing staff in mind. The Panel acknowledged the efforts that the Subject had made with regard to curriculum design and development. It wondered, however, if the Subject could do more to highlight specific strengths in its approach to curriculum design and, in particular, how it incorporated innovation in its provision. The Panel considered that strengthening this aspect would help set the Subject's offering apart from similar programmes in the University and elsewhere.

Course Approval Process

4.1.4

The Head of Subject and staff the Panel met with expressed frustration with the current Course Approval process in the College of Social Sciences. At present, the process for approving new courses involved the submission of new proposals to Subject meetings; SSLCs and external examiners; the School Portfolio Review Committee; and finally the College Board of Studies (UG or PGT). The relevant Board of Studies met once a year – although recently a second round of consideration for new courses (and programmes) had been introduced.

The Head of Subject advised the Panel that because of the fixed timing of the approval bodies it was often not possible for new staff to deliver courses at Honours and PGT levels in their own areas of expertise timeously. On occasion, staff had been unable to deliver new courses until the year after their appointment. The Head of Subject advised the Panel that this also had the effect of restricting the range of courses on offer at a time when the subject wanted to grow the curriculum to support the demands of the increasing number of students, especially at PGT level.

The Panel shared the frustration expressed by the Head of Subject and staff over this matter. The Convenor noted that he had already recently brought this matter to the attention of the Head of the College of Social Sciences and consideration was being given to possible re-design of the current process.

Approach to Intended Learning Outcomes

4.1.5

The Panel noted from the SER(p25) that the Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) of individual programmes were included in programme specifications and reference was made to them in induction sessions. ILOs for individual courses were placed on Moodle and issued to students in course documentation. The Head of Subject advised the Panel that, at Levels 1 and 2, ILOs were linked broadly to themes aimed at marrying historical and social scientific approaches to the subject. At Honours level, ILOs were more closely articulated and fed into the general ILOs of the programme. At PGT level, the principles of ILOs at undergraduate level were extended to reflect matters related to training for postgraduate social scientists and also research skills.

One student observed that their understanding of ILOs was helped by their experience as a senior student, however, they were not sure that all students were fully aware of the intention behind ILOs. The student thought it would be helpful to have a rubric on the front page of

assignments which outlined the ILOs that the particular piece of work was intended to promote, as a way of reinforcing the relevant concepts for students.

Technology-Enhanced Learning and Teaching

4.1.6

The Panel noted that the Subject used Technology-Enhanced Learning & Teaching (TELT) in several areas of its work. It used the Learning on Screen audio and video archive resource and also Padlet. The Subject had trialled online marking in two courses which was well-received by students, and also audio recording in one course. The broader roll-out and format of lecture recording was under discussion within the Subject. The Subject was clear, however, that lecture recording was not intended as a substitute for lecture attendance.

Several students the Panel met with welcomed the extension of lecture recording, not just as an important educational tool, but also as a means of promoting both access to learning and inclusivity. This was particularly important in the case of international students for whom English was not their first language. The students shared the staff's view, however, that lecture recording should not be seen as a substitute for physical attendance at lectures.

The Head of Subject and many staff the Panel met with reiterated their concern that the issue of availability of suitable teaching rooms was an impediment to supporting the use of TELT. Staff often taught in different rooms week to week and were uncertain what IT and other facilities would be available to them at various locations.

The Panel acknowledged the efforts that the Subject had made regarding the increased use of TELT but wondered whether there might be opportunity to expand this activity further. The Subject had experienced a very large increase in student numbers in the period since the last review which had placed an increased work burden on staff. The Panel considered that there may be opportunities, through the increased use of TELT, to reduce staff workload.

For example, several students and staff the Panel met with had expressed a desire to undertake more innovative group work, especially at PGT level, and one student advised that they would like the opportunity to participate in seminars via Skype. The Panel noted that Microsoft Teams has a Moodle Plug-in and wondered whether the Subject might like to consider the increased use of such collaborative tools to support learning. The Panel **suggests** that the Subject takes steps to increase its use of Technology-Enhanced Learning & Teaching. This could involve seeking advice from the Adam Smith Business School on how it used TELT to support the teaching of large groups of students, or liaising with the Learning Enhancement and Development Service (LEADS) on possible development opportunities.

A student attending the pre-PSR student focus group commented that the use of lap-tops, or similar, in class was not allowed - in at least one course. The Panel considered that it would benefit students if the Subject clarified arrangements around the use of mobile devices.

4.2 Assessment and Feedback

4.2.1

Range of Methods of Assessment

The Panel noted from the Self Evaluation Report (p27) that assessment in Economic & Social History was 'based primarily on essays and unseen examinations as well as, to a more limited extent, presentations and peer and self-assessment.' Formative assessment was offered in several ways but mainly through seminar discussions. Summative assessment took several forms with a mixture of coursework and examinations, however, at PGT level, summative assessment was undertaken entirely through coursework and presentations.

The SER (p27-28) states that 'in Level 1 and 2 courses there are three assessments: an examination, which constitutes 50 per cent of the overall grade; and two items of coursework, an essay plus source-criticism exercise in Level 1 and an essay plus project in Level 2'. Also, 'at Honours level, most courses involve one or two coursework assignments, weighted at 40

per cent, and an examination weighted at 60 per cent.' At PGT level, 'virtually all assessment in all courses involves short assignments or essays'.

The students the Panel met with were generally content with the range of assessment used within the Subject. They pointed out that the sequence in which assignments were given was important and they appreciated the efforts that the Subject made to stage assessments so that early ones attracted the least marks. The students noted that opportunities to have different types of assessment, eg formative assessment related to archive work were well-received. One student advised the Panel that they would welcome the opportunity to have more active learning related to assessment.

4.2.2

Engagement with the Code of Assessment and Assessment Policy

The Panel noted from the SER (p28) that 'the University Code of Assessment is augmented at all levels by discipline-specific grade descriptors which are included in all course documentation'. These had been designed to help students understand how the grades they were awarded reflected their level of achievement in a range of subject-specific skills. The students the Panel met with advised that they understood the Code of Assessment and what the grades they received represented.

Several students advised the Panel that as they did not receive examination feedback, they had to derive the result of their performance in the exam from their overall grade on MyCampus. The Panel noted that this occurred elsewhere in the University.

4.2.3

Feedback on Assessment

The Panel noted that feedback was communicated to students via standard feedback sheESH. The sheESH allowed markers to record the Code of Assessment level of achievement in tick-boxes. Free text could be used to highlight particular strengths and weaknesses in the piece of work.

Both UG and PGT students the Panel met with considered that arrangements regarding feedback were generally acceptable but highlighted several aspects which they wished the Subject to consider. The students advised the Panel that feedback they received on assignments was not always received within the prescribed 15 working days turn-around time, and it was often too general. They expressed a wish that feedback be more specific on the detail of their submission. As noted in section 4.2.2, they also advised that they did not receive examination feedback and this was something that they would welcome. They pointed out that it was sometimes difficult to book an appointment to see a member of staff in connection with their work.

The students asked that the Subject might consider a secure hand-in system for completed assignments, eg a bar-code system with a date-submitted facility as was used elsewhere in the University. Several students reported that work had occasionally been mis-placed and such a hand-in system would be more robust than the current arrangement.

The Panel acknowledged the matters highlighted by the students and discussed whether the use of an Assessment & Feedback Calendar by the Subject might help address some of these issues. The Panel considered that the Subject used a range of assessment methods but noted the reference in the SER (p36) which stated that the Subject thought it had room for improvement regarding consistent and timely feedback to students.

The Review Panel **recommends** that Economic & Social History reviews its practice in relation to providing feedback on examinations, in line with University policy, and encourages staff to provide generic and, where appropriate, individual feedback on exam performance.

4.3 Resources for Learning and Teaching (Staffing and Physical)

4.3.1

Workload Model

As noted in Section 2.4.2, the Panel observed that one of the major challenges facing the Subject in the last few years had been how to sustain its existing level of activity in the face of a substantially changed staff demographic. As outlined elsewhere in the Report, the Subject had taken steps to capitalise on the research and teaching expertise of new staff in terms of curriculum development and new approaches to learning.

The Head of Subject and staff the Panel met with reflected on what they considered to be significant inadequacies of the College/School workload model and its ability to reflect an accurate picture of staff workloads. The SER(p5) stated that the workload planning model had 'exacerbated the mismatch between academic staff headcount and student headcounts at UG and PGT level'.

The Head of Subject advised the Panel that the workload model underestimated the activities of colleagues and omitted many important areas of activity, eg the Subject's teaching of the History of Medicine; its teaching in the Adam Smith Business School; work associated with the student admissions process; pastoral support and work associated with the setting up of a new course. The Head of Subject and staff the Panel met with considered that there were significant concerns regarding the transparency of the model and also the extent to which it accurately reflected the allocation and distribution of academic staff workload in the Subject. The Head of Subject was of the view that these and other shortcomings in the workload model had 'impeded effective and equitable deployment of staff.' (SER, p36).

The Panel acknowledged the concerns expressed regarding the workload model and considered that ideally the aim of such a tool should be to indicate core activities of staff while highlighting where space existed for creativity and development. The Review Panel **recommends** that the School of Social & Political Sciences working with the College of Social Sciences, reviews the application of the College/School Workload Model, with a view to delivering a meaningful and transparent mechanism for allocating and distributing academic staff workload in the Subject Area that is understood by staff.

Administrative Support

4.3.2

The Head of Subject and most of the staff the Panel met with advised the Panel that the Subject had inadequate levels of administrative support – this being in terms of the scale of the support available and not the staff themselves who worked very hard and were highly committed. The Panel heard that there had been a very high turnover of administrative staff with the consequent loss of expertise that went with it.

The Panel heard that administrative staff worked under significant pressure and this allied to other factors, such as perceived limited opportunities for career development, had led to an almost entire turn-over of administrative staff. The Panel was advised that the Subject had also experienced some delays in the HR recruitment process of filling vacancies. The staff the Panel met with advised that inadequate levels of administrative support impacted on the activity of academic staff and ultimately on learning and teaching.

Acknowledging the concerns that had been expressed, the Review Panel **recommends** that the School of Social & Political Sciences/College of Social Sciences as appropriate, reviews the effectiveness of the current administrative support arrangements in the Subject Area in light of the recent high turn-over of administrative staff in the Subject Area and to ensure that the level and quality of support continues to be fit for purpose.

Workload Credit

4.3.3

The Head of Subject advised the Panel that several instances had occurred where the Subject had not received resource credit for work undertaken on behalf of other Schools. He advised that this was an issue that had led the Subject, on occasion, to turn down requests from other Subjects to provide supervision for PGT dissertations. The Panel Convener undertook to raise this matter with the Head of the College of Social Sciences.

4.3.4

Resources for Learning and Teaching

The Panel noted from the SER that the Subject had developed close links with the University's Archives & Special Collections, the Mitchell Library and the Hunterian Museum. The Subject encouraged students to use the resources of local repositories to link into, and throw light on, global themes, e.g. Glasgow and Scotland's involvement in the slave trade. Several students the Panel met with expressed great satisfaction at this type of learning, and some of the materials they had 'unearthed' were being used by the Subject as teaching resources at Level 1.

The students the Panel met with expressed general satisfaction with the resources that were available to them in the University Library and the Subject library in Lilybank House. They also felt that the Subject made considerable efforts to re-fresh subject bibliographies and reading lists each year.

As already noted in section 3.2.3, the Subject considered that one of the biggest impediments to effective learning and teaching was the central room booking system which staff advised frequently allocated rooms to the Subject which were unsuitable or inaccessible to students and staff with disabilities. These concerns were shared by most of the students the Panel met.

4.4 Engaging and Supporting Staff

On-going Support and Development

4.4.1

One of the staff the Panel met with remarked that Economic & Social History was 'the most collegial University department I have worked in'. Several staff considered that this strong team ethic was evident in the willingness of staff to take on additional work commitments.

Staff were generally of the opinion that issues linked to the very large increase in student numbers had been their greatest challenge, but they also highlighted several other areas of concern, already highlighted in the Report, which included issues linked to administrative support, room bookings, the course approval process and the workload model. Staff advised the Panel that resolution of such issues would help them to focus on their core activities in learning and teaching and reduce the overall level of staff stress.

The Panel noted from the staff survey that several staff had expressed a wish for more Subject Area training and information regarding Learning & Teaching practice and the use of TELT. At present, although there was a School-level Learning & Teaching Forum, most discussion around teaching innovation in the Subject was done informally between staff. The Review Panel **suggests** that the Subject Area examines ways by which it could provide more Subject-level opportunities for staff training in learning and teaching.

Early Career Support

4.4.2

The Panel was advised by early-career staff that they had received little School-level induction on taking up post, something which had led to a delayed understanding of some key University systems and processes, eg MyCampus. Some staff considered that a handbook which

contained information on such matters would be useful but it was realised that this would date very quickly. The Review Panel **recommends** that the School of Social & Political Sciences, introduces a School-level induction day for all new ESH staff to facilitate their early introduction to the School's structure, policies and practices.

The early-career staff the Panel met with advised that staff on probation were formally assigned a mentor but noted that there was no recording of the meetings that took place. One member of staff also observed that the mentoring process would benefit from the greater involvement of senior female staff.

One of the early career staff that the Panel met with advised that they had undertaken the Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice (PGCap) and would recommend it very highly. The Panel was advised that the member of staff had used skills and expertise gained on the programme to inform several aspects of their teaching. The Panel heard, however, that staff undertaking the PgCap did not receive a reduction in their teaching load, something which the Head of Subject attributed to the shortcomings of the Workload Model. The Review Panel **recommends** that Economic & Social History ensures that ESH staff who undertake the Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice (PgCap) should have protected time and a corresponding reduction in their teaching load in recognition of the time commitment involved in undertaking the programme.

Role of Tutor

4.4.3

The Panel met with several Tutors who, at a junior level, had teaching and administrative duties as well as scholarship responsibilities. From discussion, the Panel formed the opinion that the role of Tutor was somewhat ill-defined and lacked support. Furthermore, there appeared to be no clear developmental structure around the role. With a view to increasing the effectiveness of the role, the Review Panel **recommends** that Economic & Social History, in liaison with the School of Social and Political Sciences:

1. Clarifies, and more clearly defines, the responsibilities of the role of Tutor within the Subject Area;

2. Puts in place more systematic and structured support for Tutors, this to include developmental opportunities; and

3. Ensures that both Tutors and their line managers are made aware of the above expectations.

Graduate Teaching Assistants

4.4.4

The Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) the Panel met with reported that they felt well-informed and part of a very supportive Subject community. They considered that they had adequate resources in terms of administrative support and materials and were satisfied with the level of training they had received.

GTAs were given reading lists for the course/s they taught and met with the relevant Course Convener ahead of the semester. GTAs were responsible for marking essays and other shorter papers and were guided in this by Course Conveners who moderated their work. The GTAs welcomed the fact that they were given autonomy to develop their own approaches to teaching and they felt that their input to academic staff decision-making was valued.

The Panel heard that GTAs were not expected to provide pastoral support and they were advised to refer students seeking support on these matters to the relevant Course Convener. GTAs also reported that they felt clear about what issues they should approach their Course Convener with, and which they should refer to their programme Supervisor.

Acknowledging the strong support that was in place, the Review Panel **commends** Economic and Social History on the very high level of satisfaction reported by Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) on the support they receive from the Subject Area.

5. Academic Standards

5.1.1 The Review Panel considered that Economic & Social History had a variety of robust and effective procedures in place which ensure that the Subject is engaged in a continual process of self-reflection and self-evaluation with regard to academic and pedagogical practice.

Currency and Validity of Programmes

5.1.2 The Panel, guided by the views of the External Subject Specialist, confirmed that, at the time of the Review, the programmes offered by Economic & Social History were current and valid in the light of developing knowledge and practice within the subject area.

6. Collaborative Provision

6.1 Key Features of the Subject's Context and Vision in Relation to Collaborative Provision

As noted in section 3.1.4, Economic & Social History, along with several collaborative partners, offered the Erasmus Mundus International Masters Programme (IntM) Global MarkESH, Local Creativities (GLOCAL). This EU-funded programme commenced in 2016 and involved collaboration involving three European partner institutions – the Universities of Barcelona, Gottingen and Rotterdam. The Self Evaluation Report (p10) noted that the EU grant covered 'tuition fees, mobility and living costs for three cohorts of approximately 22 students per year from around the world'. In 2019, a successful application to renew and extend the grant to three additional partners was made. The SER alluded to the programme's international profile and the fact that it attracted approximately 600 applicants each year.

6.2 Enhancing the Student Experience

The Panel noted that the GLOCAL programme was a highly innovative programme and allowed students to move between the (currently) four partners, depending on the year/semester they were in. The curriculum encouraged students to examine a variety of themes linked to globalisation and several internships and industrial placements were available to support these aims. Students from the programme were unable to attend the Review as they were abroad, but several had responded to an electronic questionnaire regarding their experience on the programme. The comments received and considered by the Panel were very positive.

6.3 Enhancement in Learning and Teaching

The Panel noted from the SER (p12) that ESH's provision was 'designed to encourage cross-national and cross-cultural comparisons and learning...'. The Panel considered that the aims of the GLOCAL programme met many of these ambitions. The programme also offered diverse opportunities in terms of internationalisation and innovative learning which aligned with the University's Learning & Teaching Strategy.

6.4 Academic Standards

The Panel was pleased to note that the External Examiner commented in 2018 that 'teaching and learning standards (on the GLOCAL programme) are set (at) a high level...and the commitment of the staff to the subject matter is evident'. The Panel noted, however, that one area identified by the External as requiring attention was the need 'for more in-course feedback formative and/or summative'. The External had commented, however, that this was being addressed.

The Panel made a general point that it was important that the Subject keep External Examiners (for all programmes) updated on action taken on their comments and feedback. It was pleased to see that the Subject had already acknowledged that it could do more in this regard (SER p36).

7.   Summary of Perceived Strengths and Areas for Improvement

7.1 Key Strengths

The Review Panel identified the following areas as key strengths:

- High quality learning and teaching

- Strong sense of community and collegial learning environment

- Innovative use of the hackathon to support archival research

- Strong support for Graduate Teaching Assistants

7.2 Areas for Improvement

The Review Panel highlighted the following areas as opportunities for improvement:

- Promotion of study abroad opportunities for undergraduate students

- Use of TELT in learning and teaching

- Support for work-based and/or work-related learning

- Perceptions of Subject identity

- Communications between individual members of staff in the Subject Area, and members of staff in the Subject Area and students

- Opportunities for subject-specific staff training in learning and teaching

8.   Conclusion

8.1

The Review Panel commended the Head of Subject and all staff for the open and constructive way in which they had engaged with the PSR process.

The Review Panel concluded that Economic & Social History demonstrated a clear commitment to excellence in learning and teaching. The Panel was very impressed by the quality and dedication of all staff they met during the Review and agreed that they had created a very collegial and supportive learning environment. The Subject had addressed the recommendations arising from the last Periodic Subject Review in a positive manner and, in the intervening period, had made particular progress in internationalising its curriculum and student base.

The Subject had been faced with several significant challenges in recent years but had responded to these with agility and a continuing commitment to broaden and enrich the student experience. This was evident in the development of new courses and the introduction of the collaborative GLOCAL programme.

The students the Panel met with conveyed great enthusiasm for their studies and the Panel noted, in particular, their strong engagement with the opportunities provided by the hackathon.

The Panel highlighted some areas where it saw opportunities for improvement and these are summarised above in section 7.2.

8.2 Commendations

The Review Panel commends Economic & Social History on the following which are listed **in order of appearance** in this report:

Commendation 1

The Review Panel **commends** Economic & Social History for its high quality teaching across all levels of provision, as evidenced by the comments of the External Subject Specialist and the students the Panel met with. **[Paragraph 3.3.1]**

Commendation 2

The Review Panel **commends** Economic & Social History on the use of the history hackathon as an innovative learning tool in the field of archival research. **[Paragraph 3.4.1]**

Commendation 3

The Review Panel **commends** Economic & Social History on the very high level of satisfaction reported by Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) on the support they receive from the Subject Area. **[Paragraph 4.4.4]**

8.3 Recommendations

The following recommendations have been made to support Economic & Social History in its reflection and to enhance provision in relation to teaching, learning and assessment. The recommendations have been cross-referenced to the paragraphs in the text of the report to which they refer and are **grouped together** by the areas for improvement/enhancement and are **ranked in order of priority within each section.**

Recommendation 1

Adviser of Study

The students and staff the Panel met with expressed uncertainty regarding the responsibilities attached to the role of Adviser of Study. The Review Panel **recommends** that the Clerk of Senate considers what additional steps could be taken to establish greater clarity around the responsibilities of the role for both staff and students. **[Paragraph 3.3.3]**

[For the attention of: Professor Morrison, Clerk of Senate]

Recommendation 2

Communications

The Review Panel **recommends** that Economic & Social History undertakes a review of communications within the Subject Area with a view to improving the efficiency and effectiveness of information sharing between:

1. Individual members of staff in the Subject Area; and

2. Members of staff in the Subject Area and students.

As part of this review, the Subject Area should consult with student stakeholder groups to gain a better understanding of their experience of current communications and to identify specific opportunities for improvement. **[Paragraph 3.3.4]**

[For the attention of: Professor Stokes, Head of Subject]

Recommendation 3

Examination Feedback

The Review Panel **recommends** that Economic & Social History reviews its practice in relation to providing feedback on examinations, in line with University policy, and encourages staff to provide generic and, where appropriate, individual feedback on exam performance. **[Paragraph 4.2.3]**

[For the attention of: Professor Stokes, Head of Subject]

Recommendation 4

College/School Workload Model

The Review Panel **recommends** that the School of Social & Political Sciences working with the College of Social Sciences, reviews the application of the College/School Workload Model with a view to delivering a meaningful and transparent mechanism for allocating and distributing academic staff workload in the Subject Area, that is understood by staff. [**Paragraph 4.3.1**]

> **[For the attention of: Professor Kerr, Head of School of Social & Political Sciences]**
>
> **[For information: Professor Stokes, Head of Subject; Professor Carter, Head of the College of Social Sciences; Professor Juster, Senior Vice-Principal]**

Recommendations 5,6,7 and 8

Staffing

Recommendation 5

Administrative Support

The Review Panel **recommends** that the School of Social & Political Sciences/College of Social Sciences as appropriate, reviews the effectiveness of the current administrative support arrangements in the Subject Area in light of the recent high turn-over of administrative staff in the Subject Area and to ensure that the level and quality of support continues to be fit for purpose. [**Paragraph 4.3.2**]

> **[For the attention of: Professor Kerr, Head of the School of Social & Political Sciences; Professor Carter, Head of the College of Social Sciences]**
>
> **[For information: Professor Stokes, Head of Subject]**

Recommendation 6

Early Career Staff – Reduction in Teaching Load

The Review Panel **recommends** that Economic & Social History (ESH) ensures that ESH staff who undertake the Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice (PGCap) should have protected time and a corresponding reduction in their teaching load in recognition of the time commitment involved in undertaking the programme. [**Paragraph 4.4.2**]

> **[For the attention of: Professor Stokes, Head of Subject]**
>
> **[For information: Professor Pittock, ECDP Programme Director; Ms Cummings, Director of Performance & Reward, Human Resources]**

Recommendation 7

Role of Tutor

The Review Panel **recommends** that Economic & Social History, in liaison with the School of Social & Political Sciences:

1. Clarifies, and more clearly defines, the responsibilities of the role of Tutor within the Subject Area;

2. Puts in place more systematic and structured support for Tutors, this to include developmental opportunities; and

3. Ensures that both Tutors and their line managers are made aware of the above expectations. [**Paragraph 4.4.3**]

> **[For the attention of: Professor Stokes, Head of Subject]**
>
> **[For information: Professor Kerr, Head of the School of Social & Political Sciences]**

Recommendation 8

Staff Induction

The Review Panel **recommends** that the School of Social & Political Sciences introduces a School-level induction day for all new Economic & Social History staff to facilitate their early introduction to the School's structure, policies and practices. **[Paragraph 4.4.2]**

[For the attention of: Professor Kerr, Head of the School of Social & Political Sciences]

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 2 October 2020

Periodic Subject Review: Updated Responses to the Recommendations Arising from the Review of Celtic & Gaelic held on 22 February 2019
Cover Sheet

Helen Butcher, Senate Office

Brief Description of the Paper

Under Summer Powers, ASC received the six-month update report from the review Celtic and Gaelic. The reviewers considered that the responses were overall, adequate however, ASC requested updates on the recommendations below and commented as follows:

Recommendation 3: ASC noted that this recommendation would be raised at the next Language Strategy Group meeting, therefore a further update to ASC would be appropriate.

Recommendation 10: ASC requested an update on the development of this issue.

Recommendation 11: ASC considered that an update would be beneficial to see the outcome of the consultation and whether the college GTA handbook has been progressed.

Recommendation 12: The response did not necessarily address the recommendation which was framed relative to the reviewers and not the HOS/DOR. In addition, no mention was made of the suggestion of use of the SLS model. As such, an update is requested. While the PDR process has been cancelled for this year, it would be beneficial for meetings with early career staff to take place.

Action Requested

ASC is asked to consider the adequacy of the updated response and the progress made.

Recommended Person/s responsible for taking the action(s) forward

Not applicable.

Resource Implications (where appropriate)

None other than those identified in the responses.

Timescale for Implementation (where appropriate)

Not applicable.

Equality Implications (where appropriate)

Not applicable.

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 2 October 2020

Periodic Subject Review: Updated Responses to the Recommendations Arising from the Review of Celtic & Gaelic held on 22 February 2019

Recommendation 3

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Subject gives consideration to marketing its Gaelic Studies programme together with programmes offered by the School of Modern Languages and Cultures, in order to raise awareness of the programme and maximise exposure to potential applicants with a language interest. The Subject should develop its recruitment strategy in liaison with External Relations. *[Paragraph 6.1.3]*

For the attention of: Heads of Subject; School of Modern Languages & Cultures; and External Relations

---

Response - Celtic and Gaelic:

Celtic & Gaelic are keen to develop closer links with the School of Modern Languages and Cultures (SMLC) in a wide range of areas whilst recognising that Celtic & Gaelic is within the School of Humanities and has close interdisciplinary links to a range of other subjects e.g History, Archaeology. Celtic & Gaelic were happy to consider the marketing of Gaelic Studies programmes together with programmes offered by SMLC, however SMLC felt that it was not appropriate for their needs to market the courses/programmes together. However, Celtic & Gaelic and SMLC have developed the following links in the period since the review:

(a) the development of a Gaelic section cohort for the SMLC Honours option, *Introduction to Translation Studies*. This is an Honours course offered by SMLC which is available to Celtic & Gaelic Hons students. The core lecture element of the course is taught by SMLC staff and the seminars are taught by Celtic & Gaelic staff. The 2019/20 session is the first time that the course has run and it has been an extremely positive experience for staff and students. The development of the course materials has been done in conjunction between C&G staff following advice and guidance from SMLC staff.

(b) An SMLC staff member was invited to be a key note speaker at a one-day conference organised by UofG Gaelic with input in planning by Celtic & Gaelic staff members. *An Ath Cheum: Gaelic in a gobal and Digital Age* was held in October 2019 and many C&G students and staff were in attendance at the conference and further links were developed with SMLC staff and PG students.

(c) A Celtic & Gaelic staff member has continued to develop and enhance links with SMLC by lecturing on the Comparative Literature 1A: Heroic Men course.

Update request: ASC noted this recommendation would be raised at the next Language Strategy group meeting, therefore a further updated to ASC would be appropriate.

Updated Response:

The Language Strategy Working Group has been discontinued and the Language Strategy will be reported on at ISG (International Strategy Group) going forward. At the last meeting of the LSWG it was felt that Celtic & Gaelic and SMLC both promoted their language courses separately at Open Days, and as such, could use the publicity material to further inform students of the language options in the College of Arts, rather than marketing the

programmes together. However both Celtic & Gaelic and SMLC continue to develop and further links with plans in place for the development of a 'Languages of Scotland' MOOC with input from Celtic & Gaelic, English Language and SMLC which, if successful, will lead to further collaboration at UG and PG level. SMLC are also exploring the potential for a Centre or Forum for minority languages and cultures which could include Gaelic and Scots with Basque, Catalan and Galician, and potentially other languages and cultures.

Recommendation 10

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Head of the College of Arts, together with other relevant staff, gives consideration to providing space which supports the development of Gaelic language and helps foster a sense of community within the Subject in the plans for the new College of Arts accommodation. *[Paragraph. 8.1.1]*

For the attention of: Head of the College of Arts

Response:

The College recognises the need for dedicated space to support the use of the Gaelic language, especially among though not limited to students. The College also recognises that management of Room 203 by CTT has impacted negatively on the Gaelic-speaking environment of Number 3. Access to dedicated space within Celtic & Gaelic (C&G), preferably adjacent to the Gaelic Language Initiative office, that re-enforces language skills and supports confidence of speakers is of particular importance given the launch next session of the innovative Gaelic Immersion Year funded by the SFC.

Equally, the College is keenly aware of the severe space challenges within the College and the University more generally. The HoC and DoCPS met with Karen Lee, the HoSub and the University's Gaelic Development Manager to discuss the challenges. It was agreed that C&G would ask the HoPS for Humanities to seek a conversation between the HoPS in CCA to explore the possibility of a transfer of one of their locally managed rooms to CTT in return for CTT transferring back local control of Room 203 to Humanities. If that option turned out not to be viable given current space constraints, the solution with most potential to support a Gaelic hub on the first floor of the Celtic & Gaelic building was a review and reallocation of locally managed space within Number 3 itself which the HoSub would take forward in consultation with C&G colleagues and the School.

Update request: ASC requested an update on the development of this issue.

Updated Response: Head of College

It should be clarified that the proposed College of Arts building will not be progressing in the immediate future. There is currently insufficient capacity to allow for a transfer of Room 203 back to local management. Although the pandemic has impacted on plans to develop a Gaelic-speaking environment on campus, a temporary local solution has been found within Number 3 involving reallocation of locally managed space.

Recommendation 11

The Review Panel **recommends** that the School of Humanities reviews the payment made to GTAs in the Subject, with a view to the GTAs being able to claim payment for at least one additional hour per week for undertaking extra administrative tasks that are over and above their core workload. *[Paragraph 8.2.2]*

For the attention of: Head of the School of Humanities

Response- Head of School:

The Dean of Graduate Studies in The College of Arts is currently reviewing GTA payment rates across the College of Arts with a consultation paper due to be presented to College Management Group in the coming months; the issue of additional allocations for administrative tasks will be fed into the response to the consultation at that time.

Response: Dean (Learning & Teaching), College of Arts

From a College perspective, Nick Fells and I are planning to take a paper to a CMG in the near future. The aim of this will be to increase parity across the College in terms of expectations around marking and preparation time in particular. We have also begun some work to increase the transparency of expectations on GTAs, by creating a College-wide GTA handbook to bring together the four School handbooks. This work, which will necessarily take some time to get right, does not, however, restrict Schools and Subjects from amending their practices to deal with matters as they arise, such as payments for administrative tasks as outlined in the PSR recommendation.

The University's GTA Support Working Group is also currently working to create a GTA Code of Practice which will set out expectations of Schools.

> **Update request**: ASC considered that an update wold be beneficial to see the outcome of the consultation and whether the College GTA Handbook has been progressed.

Updated response:

A proposal to standardise GTA payments across the College was considered by CMG at its meeting in June 2020. It was agreed at this meeting that further consultation and investigation of current rates of pay across all Schools required to take place to ensure not only full transparency in processes but also to ensure that standardising pay rates for certain activities did not result in some GTAs receiving less pay than they were currently receiving. It was agreed by CMG to conduct a thorough review of current practices and policies in session 20/21 with a view to brining a revised policy to CMG for implementation in session 21/22. This review and consultation will include input from all relevant stakeholders and be led by College HR.

Recommendation 12

The Review Panel **recommends** that any staff member carrying out the Performance Development & Review process for early career staff should either have completed the Early Career Development Programme themselves, or be provided with appropriate training. Also, instead of focussing on ECDP itself, PDR could highlight advice and support concerning career progression and promotion. In this regard, Celtic & Gaelic could consider adopting the model used by the School of Life Sciences whereby an early career mentor and the line manager both contributed to PDR. *[Paragraph 8.2.9]*

For the attention of: Director of Human Resources

Response:

Line managers are ultimately responsible for ensuring that PDR reviews take place. Implementation is through the agreed PDR hierarchy, which ideally, although not always possible, reflects the line management structure, at Unitary level. Schools/RIs/Services ensure that: there are a sufficient number of trained and competent reviewers; each reviewer conducts a sufficient number of reviews to be able to recognise differences in performance levels thus ensuring a consistent approach, whilst maintaining a manageable load. Ideally,

reviewers should conduct no more than a maximum of 12 reviews. Where not acting as reviewers, line managers are responsible for ensuring that nominated reviewers have access to relevant information to carry out the PDR review.

Given the number of staff currently enrolled onto the ECDP Programme (c 500) it is neither realistic nor viable to expect that all reviewers undertake and complete the ECDP Programme. We are planning to hold an 'ECDP Lunch and Learn' session in semester 1 2019-20, specifically for Heads of School/Directors of Research Institutes and Heads of Service. We would aim to run this session once every academic year. In addition, Hos/DRIs/Mentors, etc. are invited to attend the ECDP Induction and Strategic Induction sessions which take place on a quarterly basis each academic year.

Recommendation 12 update request from ASC: The response did not necessarily address the recommendation which was framed relative to the reviewers and not the HOS/DOR. In addition, no mention was made of the suggestion of use of the SLS model. As such, an update is requested. While the PDR process has been cancelled for this year, it would be beneficial for meetings with early career staff to take place.

> **Update request**: The response did not necessarily address the recommendation which was framed relative to the reviewers and not the HOS/DOR. In addition, no mention was made of the suggestion of the use of the SLS model. As such, an update is requested. Whilst the PDR process has been cancelled for this year, it would be beneficial for meetings with early career staff to take place.

Updated Response:

The PDR process continues for staff members on ECDP and C&G follow the guidance from HR. However, with regard to this recommendation, C&G requested that one of the reviewers earmaked by HR for reviewing be changed for another senior staff member who has more knowledge and training on the ECDP process. Following the guidance from HR, the reviewer is normally the line manager or a senior member of staff from within the subject area. C&G encourage members of staff on ECDP to discuss their PDR with their ECDP mentors and also the PDR process is used as an opportunity to focus on career progression and promotion opportunities. Although, Covid-19 restrictions have meant that a 'normal' PDR process is not taking place this year, a PDR-lite opportunity is offered for non ECDP staff, where issues relating to career progression and promotion are discussed and highlighted. C&G will encourage mentors to be involved in the PDR process and also all reviewers of ECDP staff members will be chosen based on their knowledge and training in ECDP.

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 2 October 2020

Periodic Subject Review: Updated Responses to the Recommendations Arising from the Review of the School of Veterinary Medicine held on 18/19 February 2019

Cover Sheet

Helen Butcher, Senate Office

Brief Description of the Paper

Under Summer Powers, ASC received the six-month update report from the review of the School of Veterinary Medicine. The reviewers considered that the responses were overall, adequate however, ASC requested updates on the recommendations below and commented as follows:

Recommendation 2: In view of the level of planned activity detailed, an update would be beneficial.

Recommendation 3: An update is required with regard to the review of the levels of administrative support that will be conducted with academic staff with teaching management roles. It would also be beneficial to ascertain if there had been any changes with regard to how 'stretched' staff were if they are still 'struggling with morale' and whether there has been less 'churn'

Recommendation 4: An update will be required as it was recommended that any action is dovetailed with the College review of IT support and the actions noted were on hold due to absence of the trainer.

Recommendation 5: This was addressed, in part in the matters arising for this meeting, which detailed that provision was in the development backlog but it does not resolve the issue and as such a response is required from the Convenor of the VLE board, noting the comments in the College of Arts AMR that they are also developing the use of portfolios on Mahara.

Recommendation 6: An update is required.

Recommendation 8: The response provided indicates how the network of external and associated staff may be increased but does not address how their expertise could be more effectively used within the programme.

Recommendation 9: The response does not indicate how the success of the initiative is being evaluated, an update will not only detail this but provide the data as well.

Recommendation 10: An update on the planned activities is required.

Recommendation 11: The response made reference to the planned actions in the first instance on which an update would be required with any details of the further elements of planned action.

Recommendation 14: An update is required as to whether the changes to HR recruitment have addressed the administrative difficulties experienced previously.

Action Requested

ASC is asked to consider the adequacy of the updated response and the progress made.

Recommended Person/s responsible for taking the action(s) forward

Not applicable.

Resource Implications (where appropriate)

None other than those identified in the responses.

Timescale for Implementation (where appropriate)

Not applicable.

Equality Implications (where appropriate)

Not applicable.

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 2 October 2020

Periodic Subject Review: Updated Responses to the Recommendations Arising from the Review of the School of Veterinary Medicine held on 18/19 February 2019

Professor T. James Anderson, Associate Head of School (Learning, Teaching & Assessment)

BVMS Programme board responses

Recommendations 1, 2, 7, 8 and 9

Recommendation number and responsibility	Recommendation	ASC comments/ Actions undertaken by BVMS Programme Board and others
1 Head of School Delegate BVMS programme board	The Panel recommends that, in the context of the different forms of active learning used within the BVMS curriculum, the School reflect on how best to communicate to students the reasons for, and the benefits arising from, this approach, and whether a more staged introduction of active learning would be appropriate. [Paragraph 4.1.5]	• A dedicated active learning (AL) group has been created to liaise with LEADS and to develop/gather online explanatory resources for students and staff and support staff in using technology. • Updating of Moodle layout and timetable labelling to give clear and consistent signposting of AL throughout the BVMS programme is completed. • AL group represented on Programme Board.
		No further response required

2 Head of School Delegate BVMS programme board	The Panel recommends that the School consider how best to articulate to BVMS students the value and purpose of the portfolio. This could involve insights from Associate Staff and recent graduates being shared, and also possibly from the BSc students who appeared more comfortable with the portfolio work than the BVMS students (though it is recognised that the scale of the undertaking on the BVMS is significantly greater). [Paragraph 4.2.9]	• Panel/alumni sessions to be introduced into BVMS 1 & BVMS 3 to highlight relevance and importance of reflective practice and portfolio in academic session 2020 - 2021. • Portfolio workshops (current session) and induction materials for academic session 2020-2021 updated to clearly describe the role of portfolio in the BVMS programme as an independent piece of work related to SQCF level 11. • Introduction of a new Continious Assessment Task to BVMS 3 focused on developing and assessing reflection (academic session 2020 – 2021) • Current assessment review currently considering the contribution of the Professional Portfolio in the BVMS assessment scheme • Portfolio assessors group have reviewed portfolio templates and assessment criteria for 2020/21 to streamline/standardise portfolio format and reduce emphasis on formatting in the assessment process.
		<mark>In view of the level of planned activity detailed, an update would be beneficial</mark>
		Planned activies for the 2020-21 session • Portfolio assessors/alumni will be asked to provide short 'talking heads' videos for inclusion in Portfolio inductions for BVMS1 & 3 • New slides added to Portfolio introduction presentations highlighting the level 11 SCQF significance of the portfolio • Decision made to focus on reflection in Foundation phase portfolio (years 1 & 2) rather than year 3. Module 2 continual assessment task now focuses on writing a reflection, assessing other reflections and submission of own reflection for review.

		• Assessment review has yet to report, however PB has agreed some initial adjustment to Portfolio contribution in years 1-5, specifically the simplification of portfolio expectations (focus on checklist and reflection only) in the Foundation phase of the programme (Years 1 & 2 – implemented over 2 years 20/21 and 21/22). • Checklists have been updated for 2020/21 with reduced requirements overall and increased guidance on formatting requirements.
7 Head of School Delegate BVMS programme board	The Panel recommends that the School reflect on the initial induction information provided to students about the resources available through Moodle and Mahara, as well as the live guidance, to best ensure that students make optimum use of the excellent resources, particularly where these materials are intended to facilitate active learning. [Paragraph 4.1.13]	• Once per Semester meetings between GUVMA reps and BVMS programme Team have been instigated. The staff member point of contact is Cameron Beattie, Student Support Officer. • BVMS Foundation phase team to review induction materials for academic session 2020 - 2021, focusing on non-academic checklist (e.g. banking, finding accommodation, moving to Glasgow). • BVMS Phase leader team have contacted LEADS to elicit input into enhancing existing programme of learning and assessment literacy throughout the BVMS programme (assessment literacy sessions introduced into BVMS 1 in current session).
		No further response required
8 Head of School Delegate	Following on from the commendation of the School for its training and support of both Associate Staff and demonstrators, the	• BVMS programme board are of the opinion that creating an larger network with good communication with the BVMS programme team would facilitate engagement with the profession and promulgate the opportunities for external contribution to the suite of external contact opportunities related to the BVMS programme (e.g. DOPs, OSCE and Professional portfolio assessment; specialist teaching; Professional phase careers fair)

BVMS programme board	Review Panel recommends that the School consider (within the bounds of available funding) how to make optimum use of such a valuable resource on the BVMS programme, emphasising the 'authentic' value of their insights as experienced practitioners. [Paragraph 4.4.16]	- UoG platform 'The Network' has a "Vet Group" under development with Alumni Office to engage with recent graduates (class of 2019 intially). Other groups to be added in future. - The Vet Group Network will require a point of local point of contact; to be established once Vet Group Network thought to be established.
		<mark>The response provided indicates how the network of external and associated staff may be increased but does not address how their expertise could be more effectvely used within the programme.</mark>
		Planned activies for the 2020-21 session - Increasing visability of external lecturers to students and staff through biographies on Moodle - Invitations to external speakers as part of student careers presentations particularly in BVMS 3 and BVMS 5 Induction week (career panels) and Career Fair - Expanded team of external portfolio assesors - Current request for restraint related to non-pay budget precludes some potential activities related to including external staff - Development of new selective opportunities e.g. primary care exotic animals and remote and rural primary care
9 Head of School Delegate	The Panel heard that plans were in train for the introduction, on a pilot basis, of specialised counselling support at	- A new Student Support Officer Cameron Beattie was appointed to the SoVM in session 2019 – 2020. Cameron is based at Garscube part time. - BVMS programme board are working with Cameron and the student support team to raise awareness of his role and other resources available

BVMS programme board	Garscube from the beginning of the 2019-20 session. The Review Panel recommends that the School reflect carefully on how to encourage and facilitate students' use of this resource (noting the intensive timetabling of teaching during the day) while also promoting complementary resources such as the on-line Big White Wall. Noting that the counselling support was to be introduced on a pilot basis, it would also be important to consider at an early stage how (in conjunction with Student and Academic Services) to evaluate its success. [Paragraph 3.3.4]	- CaPS to provide enhanced over the phone services (date to be confirmed in semester 2 academic session 2019 – 2020) - Cameron Beattie and student support team to collect feedback/service use statistics according to accepted best practice in this area. - Cameron Beattie to work with staff and student groups to develop and promote wellbeing resources. - CaPS to provide a trial Wednesday afternoon session at Garscube (date to be confirmed in semester 2 academic session 2019 – 2020) with support for registered students and drop in appointments (3 clinical hours)
		The response does not indicate how the success of the iniative is being evaluated, an update will not only detail this but provide the data as well.

		Student Support Officer role
		The Student Support Officer initiative will be assessed by the Student Engagement team at a point when the group have been in post for longer period (Kirsty Mcconn-Palferymann, September 2020). Cameron Beattie has recorded broad parameters of his activity, which he reported to the BVMS programme board (1st September 2020).
		The headline outcomes are:
		In post 10 months (0.46 FTE), furloughed 6 weeks due to covid pandemic
		91 substantive student interactions
		The breakdown of the types inquiries were as follows:
		11- Academic
		10- Accommodation
		7-Finance
		12- Other
		51 - Mental Health
		Some specific reflections:

		Mental Health. I don't have the raw data from SSOs at Dumfries Campus or The School of Computing Science. But from the regular meetings we have to discuss issues and catch up it is clear to me that I have been getting a far greater number of mental health enquiries compared to the other SSOs. I don't think this is necessarily due to there being a higher prevalence of Mental Health issues at the School of Veterinary Medicine (SVM). I think it is in part a result of how the role has been communicated to the students and staff at the SVM compared with the other schools. The way the role has been communicated at the SVM has focused on the Mental Health and Wellness aspects of the role as opposed to the more broad remit communicated at the other locations. This was the case even before I was in post. I also think it is due to there being more clear established avenues of support for other issues at the SVMe. going to the your course leaders for academic issues and the good working relationship students to have with them and the teaching unit. In the case of the School of Computing Science it being situated close to the Counselling and Psychological Services (CaPS) students may be more inclined to go there directly for mental health support. **Step back/Stepping Stone** Some of the issues that students have come to me with I think they would've been very unlikely to have gone to anyone else at the SMV with, or there certainly would've been a great reluctance to do so. I think being seen as slightly removed from the SVM has its benefits in this regard. **Part-time** Having casual conversations with students at school events such as GUVMA meetings, one school many voices events and attending lunches etc proved to be a good way to interact with students. I think this is key to building and promoting the service. This is made a little difficult by the part-time nature of the role. Being part time also makes it a little difficult to balance the active and proactive parts of the role. Due to limited time there is a conflict between being available to students and taking on work and or

		projects to pro-actively engage with student and the issues facing them. I have prioritised being available to the students.
		CaPS to provide a trial Wednesday afternoon session at Garscube (date to be confirmed in semester 2 academic session 2019 – 2020) with support for registered students and drop in appointments (3 clinical hours)
		Reflections from Cameron Beattie; "CaSPs have now decided that 'There is now no need for a separate pathway for Dumfries/Garscube, (as) any student who is unable to attend in person (when face to face contact resumes) will be provided by an appointment on MS Teams. Everyone at UofG has an MS Teams account, the app for smartphones is free and this contact method meets the BACP requirements for confidentiality.' I was in contact with Patricia, who does the phone counselling for students from the school of veterinary medicine, at the beginning of the summer. She informed me that students were still engaging and she was continuing to support them. I understand that students were finding this service beneficial even before it was made more a necessity due to social distancing measures."

Head of Adminstration and Undergraduate School Manager

Recommendations 3 and 14

Recommendation number and responsibility	Recommendation	Response
3 Head of School Delegate Head of Administration and UGS manager	The Review Panel formed the view that the professional support staff were highly dedicated to supporting the student experience, willing to take on new ways of working and embracing advances brought by technology but who were also highly	The Head of Administration and Undergraduate School Manager met with their counterparts in the School of Engineering for two 1.5 hour meetings. Information was shared to compare and contrast educational provision, student demographics, facilities and support staffing in each School. While there are similarities between the Schools, there are notable differences too, particularly in relation to the complexity of the BVMS programme, the MPA staffing resource required to support it and the amount of "churn" in posts. This churn has added to the pressures on the team. The major area of difference in relation to how the MPA team operates is that the ENG teaching office has held its own away days. This has long been a wish for the SVM UGS team and the HoA and UGSM agree that it is important that time is carved out for this activity. In addition, the HoA and UGSM will review levels of administrative support with academic staff with teaching management roles. On a separate note,

	stretched and struggling with morale. In the current PSR round the School of Engineering was commended for the administrative support provided by its teaching unit. The Panel **recommends** that the Vet School meet with staff from that unit with a view to the sharing of best practice. [Paragraph 4.4.7]	as observed by the Panel, the UGS has embraced advances brought by technology and two areas where ENG is keen to learn from good practice in SVM are Teleform and the Assessment Management System. Accordingly, the SVM UGS will host a visit from colleagues from ENG to share their good practice in these areas.
		An update is required with regard to the review of the levels of administraive support that will be conducted with academic staff with teaching management roles. It would also be beneficial to ascertain if there had been any changes with regard to how 'stretched' staff were if they are stll 'struggling with morale' and whether there has been less 'churn'
		The Head of Administration and Undergraduate School Manager held series of meetings with academic staff and with the administrative team (all via Zoom) in April/May. A Teams site was created to support the discussions. Agenda topics were: relative roles and responsibilities, ownership, processes, standard operating procedures, IT tools and administrative capacity. Given the significant academic and administrative staff time given to the WCGT project on UG administration, the HoA asked in April and again in May whether any outputs from the project would be made available to inform the School's discussions (and to avoid duplication of activity at a local level). As of September nothing has been forthcoming. With that limitation, and given the pandemic, the discussions within the School progressed as well as might be expected but more needs to be done and this will be revisited after the start of the semester.

Staff morale improved following some staffing changes but new working arrangements under the pandemic have contributed to a different set of challenges in relation to team spirit, morale and the |

		extent to which colleagues feel "stretched". The UGS Manager holds regular Zoom meetings with the team (initially daily) and provides one-to-one support where necessary.
		"Churn" has continued to have a negative impact with 2 MPA vacancies "frozen" by the University early in lockdown. One was subsequently released and will be filled in early October. The second has not yet been submitted as the School currently has 23 posts awaiting release.
14 Head of School Delegate Head of Adminstration	The Review Panel noted a number of issues relating to Human Resources which were having a significant impact on School staff. These included delay in the recruitment of staff and administrative complexity associated with on-going demonstrator contracts. The Panel **recommends** that guidance on best practice in these matters be explored with MVLS College HR, and with the School of Life Sciences, which the Panel understands to have recently reviewed recruitment practices. [Paragraphs 4.4.6 and 4.4.13]	The HR recruitment procedures underwent significant change in December 2019/January 2020 and the SoVM is currently assessing how these changes have addressed the administrative difficulties experienced previously.
		An update is required as to whether the changes to HR recruitment have addressed the administraive difficulies experienced previously.

		The "new" College HR recruitment service is very good with the assigned LRO providing proactive and responsive support. However, as noted under the response to recommendation 3, the pandemic has had an impact on recruitment with essential, core, in budget posts being frozen for extended periods.

Garscube Information Services commitee

Recommendation 4

Recommendation number and responsibility	Recommendation	Actions undertaken by BVMS Programme Board and others
4 Head of School	In discussion with the Review Panel, professional support staff referred to pressures they experienced as a result of a lack of IT support based at Garscube. There was an on-going review of IT support in the College but there was a suggestion that the support being sought by students could perhaps be met locally by appropriately trained peers. The Panel **recommends** that the School explore with	A rolling programme of training student volunteers was commenced. This programme is currently in abeyance due to the trainer being on long term absence due to illness.

	Information Services the possibility of student intern based front line provision for student IT queries such as the support that will be integral to the new University student service model. Such discussions should be dovetailed with the College review of IT support to ensure a coordinated and holistic provision for the Vet School that reflects developments in the wider University. [Paragraph 4.1.14]	
		An update will be required as it was recommended that any ac.on is dovetailed with the College review of IT support and the actons noted were on hold due to absence of the trainer.
		As previously noted, the training of student volunteers was suspended due to long term sickness of the trainer. There have also been significant changes in the provision of IT support moving from a College based IT service to a more central provision. Furthermore, any plans to take this forward were overtaken by the Covid situation. We need a stable environment to be able to progress this, however we have recently appointed two individuals (Learning Technology Specialist and Information Coordinator) who will work with the Schools Academic TELT representative, interested students to establish an effective framework for trained

		student peers to support UG students across the School. This group will also liaise with the Reach Out team to ensure coordination with wider University developments.

Associate Head of School (Learning, Teaching and Assessment)

Recommendations 10 and 11

Recommendation number and responsibility	Recommendation	Actions undertaken
10 Head of School	The Review Panel **recommends** that the School consolidate its focus on supporting the development of scholarship from recent and on-going curricular developments within the School. The Review Panel heard about a number of areas that could be pursued such as peer teaching (third years working with first years, fourth with second), active learning (perhaps to involve other areas such as the Dental School), and in due course the impact of the counselling support pilot. The	The School is continuing to progress in this area. Following discussions with colleagues who have implemented the successful "CIDERS" Scholarship Strategy at the Dental School, an operational plan is being developed which identifies a number of key areas for activity in the coming months including: - an audit of current activity - identification of themes to create Scholarship interest groups across the School and encourage cross College/University links - support from the College Scholarship Champion and the College Dean for Learning and Teaching to help understanding of progression on the LTS track - identification of potential funding opportunities It is expected that the activity resulting from implementation of this strategy will result in one or more applications to LTDF (and other funding sources) to take forward projects in line with the activities outlined by the panel.

	School is encouraged to consider the Learning and Teaching Development Fund as a possible source of funding for some of this work. [Paragraph 4.4.2]	
		<mark>An update on the planned activities is required.</mark>
		Plans for the audit of current scholarship activity within the School and the subsequent identification of key themes for development were well advanced in March. An Operational Plan and survey for the audit were virtually completed and were due to be presented the to the School Executive in late March. The proposal was to complete the audit in April/May and run a focussed session to explore the data and identify themes in June as part of our normal annual VetEd Forum. This activity was suspended as a result of the pandemic and we will recommence when we are able. Discussions relating to the development of the Operational Plan involved both the College Scholarship Champion and the College Dean for Learning and Teaching. Again the current pandemic stalled progress and we will return to these conversations when we are able. A successful bid was made to the LTDF fund on a project entitled "Are learners intrinsically active or do they need shaped?" The outcomes from this study will be used to design and implement appropriate interventions to support and develop the active learning initiatives within the BVMS programme.
11 Head of School Delegate Associate Head of School (Learing, Teaching and Assessment)	The Review Panel **recommends** that the School liaise with LEADS in the first instance, to review the way that staff are supported to engage with training events at Gilmorehill, in	In the first instance this recommendation is being addressed through a broader college based approach to LEADS being developed by Professor Susan Jamieson, MVLS Champion for Scholarship.

	particular to explore ways of supporting online participation. [Paragraph 4.4.10]	
		<mark>The response made reference to the planned actions in the first instance on which an update would be required with any details of the further elements of planned action.</mark>
		The rapid transition to online delivery of many training and "Upskilling" sessions has been a positive outcome which has enabled many staff to engage with such sessions remotely. We do not have substantive data to support the level of engagement, however anecdotally, engagement has been good and many staff are reporting positive experiences of the sessions. We have established a TEAMS site to disseminate information about events and share Q&A. We have also worked closely with LEADs staff (Nathalie Sheridan and Vicki Dale) to run a number of specific SVM and/or College events which have been very useful and well attended. E.g. SVM Active Learning Theme workshop (Supported by Vicki and Nathalie) 30 SVM staff attended, Workshop on Ethics Applications in the Context of Scholarly Activity (supported by Professor Jesse Dawson) - 15 SVM staff attended, Top Tips for Teaching Online (internal) - 40 SVM staff attended.

The Director of IT Services, Assistant Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching) and the Senate Office

Recommendations 5, 6, 12 and 13

Recommendation number and responsibility	Recommendation	Actions undertaken by SoVM
5 Direc tor IT Services	The Review Panel noted that it was a source of considerable frustration to staff and students that the students' portfolio work on Mahara did not remain available to them after graduation. The Panel	***Response from Mark Johnston, Director of IT Services:*** Information Services implement systems based on requirements and policy, and if requirements and policy are changing, then there are different requirements to meet. You are asking me to provide authenticated services for alumni when we only setup to provide services to existing registered/enrolled students – that is a substantial change that is a policy change in the first instance, not a technology change. **This recommendation has now been forwarded to the Convener of the VLE Board for response.**

	recommends that this situation be reviewed by IT Services, in consultation with the School and other areas of the University that use portfolio work, to investigate possible means of either facilitating access to the work post-graduation or enhancing the materials available to be downloaded by students prior to graduation. [Paragraph 4.2.7]	This was addressed, in part in the matters arising for this meeing, which detailed that provision was in the development backlog but it does not resolve the issue and as such a response is required from the Convenor of the VLE board, noting the comments in the College of Arts AMR that they are also developing the use of portfolios on Mahara.
		This was addressed, in part in the matters arising for this meeing, which detailed that provision was in the development backlog but it does not resolve the issue and as such a response is required from the Convenor of the VLE board, noting the comments in the College of Arts AMR that they are also developing the use of portfolios on Mahara.
		Response from Donald Spaeth, Convenor of VLE Development Board Access to Mahara portfolios by graduates is a long-standing issue, and is required for pedagogical reasons by several schools in the University. We have highlighted the requirement to LTC, to whom we report, because it is primarily a matter of policy, rather than one that can be addressed by technical changes to Mahara. Mahara and Moodle, like other IT systems across the University, require students and staff to login using their GUID for authentication. There are good security reasons for this, and some licences require it. It is necessary for the University to have a single system of authentication, which works for MyGlasgow, Moodle, Mahara, Core HR, Library e-resources, etc.

		There are two possible ways to make portfolios available to graduates: use other software or set up a second instance of Mahara, which does not rely on the GUID for authentication. The first option would require a procurement process, led by ITS, to identify alternative software against an agreed specification. Board members and ITS staff have in the past seen a demonstration of PebblePad, which might address the issue, but have not carried out a full review. An alternative would be to encourage schools to use external software, such as LinkedIn, which was the focus of an LTDF-funded project promoting graduate attributes. However, since the focus of a portfolio is personal data, this might not be permissible under GDPR, and a risk analysis would be required.

An alternative would be to install a second instance of Mahara on another server, using an alternative authentication method. By analogy, a second version of Moodle is currently administered by MVLS, and this has proved useful under Covid-19 for supporting new students who do not yet have a GUID. However, there is a cost to this option, for hardware, support, and administration, which would need to be carried by ITS.

The VLE Development Board provides governance for Moodle, Mahara, and associated plugins, but it has no budget and employs no staff.   Decisions about policy and funding lie with EPSC, to whom ASC reports, and IPSC. We are grateful to ASC for highlighting the continued need for graduate access to Mahara, and would support a proposal to these two committees to solve it. |
| 6
The Assistant Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching) | The Review Panel recommends that the difficulties associated with enrolments that fall outwith standard semester times and the roll-over of timetabling at Garscube be explored with the Digital Experience Unit. [Paragraph 4.4.5] | At the request of the Assisstant Vice-Principle the SoVM was contacted by the WCGT Responsive Solutions team in this context on 24 February 2020 and a meeting was held on 27 February 2020 to clarify the issues with a view to finding a solution to the problem |
| | | An update is required |

		As a result of the February 2020 meeting developing a solution was added to the Responsive Solutions Service Team work stream. In response to the Covid 19 pandemic the activities in this workstream were reprioritised in April 2020 and currently this project is not being developed.
12 The Assistant Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching)	A number of issues were raised in relation to the ECDP and PGCAP that do not lend themselves readily to specific recommendations. The Panel therefore **recommends** that the PSR Convener raise this feedback with the ECDP Programme Director (Professor Murray Pittock) and with the Director of LEADS in order that it is acted on appropriately through the ECDP Champions in the Colleges and other appropriate ECDP committees as part of the wider governance of the ECDP programme. [Paragraph 4.4.10)	This recommendation refers to the delivery of more online CPD/PGCAP provision to support staff who are not based at the Gilmorehill campus. Unknown to the panel, this PSR recommendation was made at a point when LEADS were already developing some of the PGCAP courses so that they could be made available online or in blended format. Since Sept 2019, several courses have been delivered in this more flexible manner. Thus, although I did raise the matter with Dr Matthew Williamson, Director of LEADS, following the PSR, there was little that needed to be progressed vis a vis PSR. LEADS were also considering how more of their CPD could be made available online. Dr Williamson is on the ECDP Governance Committee and undertook to report to that group on the expansion of online provision, as such, I have not additionally brought this to the attention of Professor Pittock, but could still do so if it is deemed necessary. If ASC wishes further information in relation to wider CPD events and their availability online, I could ask Dr Williamson to provide an update on that.
13 The Senate Office	The Panel recommends that the review of PSR that is currently underway within Academic Services	This will be added to the guidance notes to PSR Conveners to flag that some recommendations may fall out with ASC's remit and this would be recorded in the PSR Reports accordingly.

	give consideration to how issues relating to broader University initiatives (such as ECDP), that don't lend themselves to specific recommendations that ASC might follow up on, could be more meaningfully recorded and addressed in future. [Paragraph 4.4.10]	

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 2 October 2020

Periodic Subject Review: Updated Responses to the Recommendations Arising from the Periodic Subject Review of Short Courses held on 1 and 2 May 2018

Cover Sheet

Mrs Irene Bruce, Senate Office

Brief Description of the Paper

At its meeting on 24 May 2019, Academic Standards Committee received the responses to the recommendations arising from the Report of the Periodic Subject Review of Short Courses. A number of recommendations had not been fully addressed and ASC subsequently requested that an update on the following recommendations to be provided to the May 2020 meeting:

Recommendation 1: A number of initiatives in relation to the training of tutors were reported for implementation or further development in 2019-20.

Recommendations 5, 6 and 7 all concerned access to and use of Moodle and other online developments.

Recommendation 9: A number of actions to be taken forward during 2019-20 had been outlined.

Recommendation 10: Some initial work had been carried out towards improving the Resource Base for part-time tutors.

Recommendation 13: Amended arrangements for briefing Access tutors on Level 1 curriculum changes were to be introduced in 2019-20.

Recommendation 14: ASC was disappointed to note the limited progress on the issue of making learning spaces accessible to disabled students and the fact that there appeared to be no clear plan for a way forward.

Action Requested

Academic Standards Committee is asked to **consider** the adequacy of the response and the progress made.

Resource Implications

No direct resource implications have been identified.

Timescale for Implementation

As outlined.

Equality Implications (where appropriate)

No specific implications identified, although the School should continue to embed consideration of equality and diversity in all its procedures and provision.

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 2 October 2020

Periodic Subject Review: Updated Responses to the Recommendations Arising from the Periodic Subject Review of Short Courses held on 1 and 2 May 2018

Sharing Good Practice

Recommendation 1

In order to ensure greater consistency in how tutors are supported in their development needs, the Panel **recommends** that Short Courses, in consultation with Learning Enhancement & Academic Development Service (LEADS) puts in place a formal training structure for part-time tutors which will allow them to engage with other part-time tutors/other staff and learn/share best practice as part of a wider community of learning. [4.1.8]

For the attention of: Director, Short Courses

For information: Director, LEADS

Response:

Subject Coordinators all provide training and development for their individual cohorts of tutors. However, to ensure a minimum level of consistency in tutors' understanding of the general requirements of teaching for Short Courses, for the academic year 2019/20 a short, Moodle-based induction process has been developed. This has been formulated as a Moodle lesson plug in, where tutors will be navigated to training on critical aspects of their role (such as assessment and feedback, good cause procedures, Moodle minimum standards, etc.). A short test is included at the end of the process to enable tracking of completion rates.

The induction process will be supported by the recently relaunched Moodle site for Short Courses tutors, which will be regularly reviewed and updated to ensure all tutors have access to key information such as dates of teaching blocks, deadlines for new course submissions to Scrutiny Group/Board of Studies, dates for Boards of Examiners etc. This site will also operate as a platform for sharing best practice, with Subject Coordinators taking turns to post relevant material such as: the Assessment Feedback proforma; Moodle minimum standards; minutes from the Staff-Student Liaison Committee; pedagogical research; and information on upcoming LEADS CPD events. All tutors have been made aware of this new repository, and are being encouraged to share ideas for good practice.

All Short Courses tutors are eligible to attend LEADS training events. However, because tutors are not paid to attend such training, take-up is limited. To address this, Short Courses has discussed with LEADS the production of a range of topic-based CPD materials, to be delivered online, to support the development of key aspects of professional practice such as writing aims, objectives and intended learning outcomes, and engaging with Moodle. This work will be progressed during the 2019/20 academic year.

Because of the difficulties associated with bringing large numbers of part-time tutors together on a regular basis, much of the focus for development around training and the sharing of best practice has been online. However, from 2019/20 Short Courses will introduce a number of informal events to which all tutors will be invited. The days and times of these will vary to allow all tutors an opportunity to attend. There is no formal training element

associated with these events; they are intended to be informal opportunities for tutors to meet each other and to raise matters of mutual interest or concern with Subject Coordinators.

Updated Response - June 2020:

The Moodle based induction was piloted between August and October 2019, with further development taking place in December 2019 in response to tutor feedback. The final version of the induction went live in January 2020.

Due to staffing changes within both Short Courses and LEADS during 2019/20, work on the production of the online CPD materials has been delayed. However, a schedule for delivery of the following topics has now been agreed:

- o April 2020: Teaching with technology
- o June 2020: An introduction to Moodle quizzes
- o September 2020: Making the most of Moodle
- o January 2021: Aligning Aims, ILOs and Assessment.

Discussion with LEADS colleagues will continue to inform planning, and we are also actively seeking tutor feedback in relation to future topics. Academic Planning and Management Group (APMG) will receive regular updates from Subject Coordinators on tutor requests.

There is now an established timetable of informal tutor events with these taking place quarterly in February, May, July and October of each year.

Technology Enhanced Learning and Teaching

Recommendation 5

The Panel **recommends** that Short Courses brings to the attention of the VLE Board the possibility that students on non credit-bearing courses have access to Moodle or have some Moodle presence. [Paragraph 4.1.9]

For the attention of: Director, Short Courses

For information: Convener of VLE Board; Director, LEADS

Response:

The Director, Short Courses met with the Convener of the VLE Board in October 2018 to discuss this recommendation, and the Convener of the VLE Board indicated that he was supportive of students on non-credit-bearing courses having Access to Moodle. However, at a follow-up meeting with IT colleagues in December 2018, it became evident that there are considerable obstacles to opening up the University's Moodle site to non-credit-bearing courses. These include the fact that courses would need to be manually set up in Moodle, allocating students to courses would also be a manual process, and students would need to be individually checked to ascertain whether they are already studying on a credit-bearing course. Short Courses does not have the resources to manage the manual processing associated with enabling students on non-credit-bearing courses to be able to access the University's Moodle site, however see also Recommendation 7 below.

Updated Response – June 2020:

It remains the case that Short Courses does not have the resources to manage the manual processing that would be necessary to enable students on non-credit-bearing courses to access the University's Moodle site.

> **Recommendation 6**
>
> The Panel **recommends** that Short Courses arranges for all credit-bearing courses to have a Moodle page, and that these courses all adhere to Moodle minimum standards. [Paragraph 4.1.9]
>
> **For the attention of: Director, Short Courses**
>
> **For information: Director, LEADS**

Response:

The majority of credit-bearing courses now have a Moodle page, however further work is required to encourage better engagement with Moodle by a number of tutors. To this end, during 2019/20 an audit will be undertaken across all credit-bearing courses to establish the extent of Moodle use, and through the forum of Academic Planning and Management Group Subject Co-ordinators will then develop a strategy to increase Moodle usage by their tutors (including through possible CPD opportunities, see Recommendation 1 above).

The University's Moodle minimum standards have been shared and discussed at Academic Planning and Management Group, and Subject Co-ordinators have communicated to tutors the requirement that Moodle pages now adhere to Moodle minimum standards. During 2019/20 Subject Coordinators will report regularly to Academic Planning & Management Group on the extent to which the courses they oversee adhere to Moodle minimum standards, and identify ways in which to encourage their adoption.

Updated Response – June 2020:

Since the initial report on the recommendations to Academic Standards Committee (ASC) in May 2019, work has continued to encourage better engagement with Moodle by all Short Courses tutors who deliver credit-bearing courses. Subject Coordinators have worked proactively with course tutors to encourage the adoption of Moodle (where there was none before), and/or to encourage adherence to Moodle minimum standards (MMS) and the adoption of other good practice.

This progress report is based on an audit of Short Courses' Moodle usage, undertaken during February-March 2020, and uses both a simple count of Moodle pages and Subject Coordinators' reporting and reflections since the PSR.

Table 1 summarises levels and rates of Moodle use across all credit-bearing courses for the academic year 2019-20. Please note that, with the exception of the Access courses, not all courses are offered every year, so the data reflects something of a snapshot in time.

Table 1: Number of Moodle pages, by subject area, 2019-20

Subject area	Number of courses with Moodle pages	Percentage of courses with Moodle pages
Access	21[1]	100%
Archaeology	4	100%
Art & Art History	17[2]	94%

---

[1] A number of Access courses have two classes, each with their own Moodle page. In addition, there are 'Access programme information 2019-20' and 'UCAS 2019-20' Moodle pages.

[2] The course 'Introduction to art psychotherapy' offers two classes, each with its own Moodle page. There is one practical art course 'Creative drawing and painting: developing skills and techniques' (delivered in Girvan) that does not use Moodle.

Classics & Egyptology	8	100%
Creative Writing & Literature	9	100%
Earth Sciences	1	100%
Languages	102[3]	79% of classes/72% of tutors
Law	1	100%
History, Politics & International Affairs	9	100%
Philosophy	4	100%
Psychology & Counselling Skills	10[4]	100%

The Access courses are characterised by long-standing use of Moodle. Nevertheless, Subject Co-ordinators report a significant enhancement in the use of Moodle over the last two years, with most Access Moodle pages meeting Moodle minimum standards (MMS) and many being described as 'MMS+'. Examples of Access Moodle pages that have significantly improved include History of Art; Social & Economic History; medieval History; Classical Studies; and Theology & Religious Studies. In some cases, the catalyst for improvement has been a new tutor taking over delivery of a course.

The Languages provision is the largest subject area in Short Courses, in terms of the number of courses and classes offered (a significant number of courses offer multiple classes at different days and times, with a pool of tutors delivering those classes). All courses/classes have Moodle pages, but these range from well-developed pages, to those where the tutors have never engaged with Moodle. The Subject Coordinator reports that approximately 80% of the 'live' Moodle pages meet MMS. The Subject Coordinator also considers it a priority to address the relatively small number of tutors (approximately 10) who do not engage with Moodle. The Subject Coordinator considers these as falling into two groups: those who are also tutors elsewhere in the University, so should be proficient in the use of Moodle, and it should therefore be relatively straightforward to require them to use Moodle in their language class(es); and a very small core of long-standing tutors with less experience of using Moodle, which may include a technical gap.

Elsewhere in Short Courses, there have been significant developments in the use of Moodle since the PSR. In almost all subject areas, each course/class has a Moodle page and, in almost all cases, these meet MMS. Beyond that, there are many examples of courses where the use of Moodle as part of learning and teaching strategies significantly exceeds threshold expectations, so that this use of Moodle might be described as 'MMS+' or 'MMS++'.

In Archaeology, Philosophy and Psychology courses there is extensive and sophisticated use of Moodle, so that all meet MMS and several MMS+. Moodle is also used extensively in Classics & Egyptology, where there has also been significant growth of credit-bearing courses delivered wholly online. In History, Politics & International Affairs, there has been considerable progress over the last year in the use of Moodle, and all courses meet MMS. In Art & Art History, the number of courses using Moodle has grown over the last year, and approximately half of these meet MMS. Historically in Creative Writing there was no culture of using Moodle. However, during 2019-20, this has fundamentally changed, with all courses offered using Moodle. It is now recognised that there is much potential for Creative Writing students to use Moodle to share and discuss their work.

---

[3] Many languages courses offer multiple classes, each of which have their own Moodle pages. 100% of courses/classes have Moodle pages (as set up by the Subject Co-ordinator) but, in practice, some tutors do not use Moodle.

[4] The course 'COSCA Counselling Skills' has two classes, each with its own Moodle page.

Subject Coordinators have adopted a range of strategies to increase use of Moodle, and adherence to MMS. These strategies include the following:

- Including Moodle as a topic for discussion in periodic line management meetings with tutors (Art & Art History)

- Providing technical Moodle support and advice to tutors (Art & Art History; Psychology; Counselling Skills; Law; History, Politics & International Affairs)

- Direct 'back-door' work by Subject Coordinators to tutors' Moodle pages (Psychology & Counselling Skills; Law; Access Law)

- Encouraging tutors to share their Moodle good practice with each other, to promote enhancement of existing Moodle pages (Classics & Egyptology; Languages)

- Inclusion of Moodle tutor-led 'peer-exchanges' in an annual tutor induction event (Languages). In addition, the recently developed online tutor induction course for all Short Courses tutors (itself delivered via Moodle) includes MMS as a core topic.

Recommendation 7

The Panel **recommends** that Short Courses encourage Subject Specialists to consider incorporating more learning innovation into their teaching, such as the use of blended and online learning, in partnership with, and where necessary, drawing on the training opportunities provided by, the University's Learning Enhancement & Academic Development Service (LEADS). [Paragraph 4.1.9]

For the attention of: Director, Short Courses

For information: Director, LEADS

Response:

For 2019/20 Short Courses will have an increased number of credit-bearing courses available on a blended or wholly online basis, including a growing portfolio of Archaeology and Egyptology courses. Online development has been supported by the purchase of additional and upgraded Camtasia licences, and there has been recent investment in specialist recording equipment that will capture content in creative and innovative ways. Following work that has been undertaken during 2018/19 with the MVLS Digital Education Unit, a number of non-credit-bearing online Philosophy courses have been developed for delivery via the MVLS external Moodle site in 2019/20.

A preliminary discussion has taken place with LEADS to identify the best way to support further online development for Short Courses, and to this end a LEADS workshop for all Subject Coordinators, as well as identified part-time tutors, will take place in May/June 2019, with a focus on how to create an effective learning experience in a digital environment. It is anticipated that this will be the first of a regular series of workshops drawing on the expertise provided by LEADS.

Updated Response – June 2020:

In June 2019 Short Courses, in collaboration with LEADS, ran the planned workshop on creating an effective learning experience in a digital environment. This was well-received by all participants. A follow-up workshop is scheduled for June 2020, which will focus on the development of innovative modes of assessment to support online student engagement.

Although there has been a steady increase in the number of Short Courses credit-bearing courses available on a blended or wholly online basis since 2018/19, the impact of Covid19

means that the majority of our provision, including all Access courses, will be offered online from 2020/21.

Student Feedback Mechanisms

Recommendation 9

The Panel **recommends** that Short Courses keep the effectiveness of its current student feedback mechanisms under review. [Paragraph 3.4.3][5]

For the attention of: Director, Short Courses

Response:

A number of actions have been identified in order to consider the effectiveness of student feedback mechanisms, including through Evasys. In order to benchmark Short Courses performance using Evasys against University norms, a review will take place in autumn 2019 of student response rates. The appropriateness of the timing and content of the Evasys questionnaire will also be reviewed, including through consultation with Short Courses' Staff-Student Liaison Committee, and will be revised accordingly. It is also intended to review and evaluate the effectiveness of tutors' responsiveness to student feedback and the ways in which tutors' responses and actions are communicated back to students, in order to identify ways of 'closing the loop' more effectively. Academic Planning & Management Group will take oversight of this review and will report at the end of the 2019/20 academic year.

The effective operation of the Short Courses Staff-Student Liaison Committee is also under review. The Committee has been consulted on the frequency and timing of meetings, and the introduction of reporting from Staff-Student Liaison Committee meetings as a standing item on the Academic Planning & Management Group agenda (see Recommendation 3 above) will help to improve in closing the feedback loop between students, Subject Coordinators and tutors.

Updated Response - June 2020:

Since the initial report on the recommendations to Academic Standards Committee (ASC) in May 2019, several steps have been taken to enhance the effectiveness of our student feedback mechanisms. In relation to Short Courses use of EvaSys, four areas were identified for action:

1. Review the timing and content of the EvaSys questionnaire: This was completed during 2018-19 (discussed at APMG meetings March – May 2019 and approved at the APMG meeting 10 July 2019). The EvaSys questionnaire has been reviewed and revised, with input from the SSLC (meeting of 11 April 2019) and tutors (via APMG), and now contains fewer questions, with a more appropriate focus for our students. The timing of the EvaSys questionnaire has been fine-tuned, and administrative processes also modified, to ensure that Subject Co-ordinators and tutors are now aware of when the questionnaire is issued.

2. Review student response rates, and benchmark against University norms: This has been undertaken, and a paper reporting the findings was considered by the December 2019 meeting of APMG. One of the key findings of this review (using data for 2018-19) was that our average student response rate (40%) was broadly comparable to that for the University as a whole (43%). However, within that average, there was significant variation in student response rates between subject areas. The response rate for Access courses was particularly low (18%) and,

---

[5] Recommendation 9 was an additional recommendation requested by Academic Standards Committee which has been agreed by the PSR Panel Convener.

accordingly, APMG (meeting of 4 December 2019) has decided to prioritise improving the student response rate across its Access courses for 2019-20, with the aim of achieving more meaningful formal feedback from this particular student cohort. To help achieve this, and following approaches taken elsewhere in the University, Subject Co-ordinators will ask Access tutors to set time aside in the last 2 weeks of classes for students to complete the questionnaire (using mobile technology) and/or to encourage students to complete the EvaSys questionnaire out with class.

3. Review and evaluate tutors' responsiveness to student feedback: A review highlighted that, overall, some 38% of Short Courses tutors complete and return the 'Tutor Summary and Response' form though, again, there is considerable variation across subject areas. APMG agreed (meeting of 4 December 2019) that Subject Co-ordinators will monitor more closely tutors' completion and return of these forms, with the Administrative Team supporting this by providing periodic updates on which tutors have (or have not) returned their form(s). In addition, we have revised and updated the 'Tutor Summary and Response' form (updated in November 2019 and again in February 2020), and the accompanying guidance for tutors. We are also in the process of updating a 'bank' of generic responses to student feedback on non-teaching and learning matters (for example, the quality of teaching accommodation; heating; café facilities), that tutors can use if required. We expect that these combined revisions will encourage more tutors to engage with the student feedback cycle.

4. 'Closing the loop' – communicating back to students the tutor's responses and actions: APMG has discussed how tutors' responses are communicated back to students (meeting of 4 December). This remains a challenge for Short Courses, as students 'come and go' frequently (perhaps more so than elsewhere in the University), and we lack long-term continuity in student cohorts. Nevertheless, we consider 'closing the loop' to be important, and informing a current cohort of students on how we have acted on a previous cohort's feedback should help give students confidence in our student feedback mechanisms and encourage them to engage more. APMG has agreed that, as a minimum, all completed Access 'Tutor Response and Feedback' forms will be shared with our SSLC and, also, that all completed forms (for credit-bearing courses) will be posted on the relevant course Moodle pages. Additionally, for non-credit bearing courses, Subject Co-ordinators have agreed to email students the completed 'Tutor Response and Feedback' form for their course(s) (APMG meeting of 4 December 2019).

The implementation of all the above actions will be monitored throughout 2019-20, and the collective impact evaluated after the completion of the academic year.

Resource Base

Recommendation 10

The Panel **recommends** that Short Courses work with the part-time tutors to ensure the Resource Base is furnished in a way that meets their needs. If the current space proves to be too small then Short Courses should work with Estates & Buildings to identify alternative accommodation. [Paragraph 4.3.2]

For the attention of: Director, Short Courses

Response:

An assessment of the tutors' base took place in December 2018, which identified a number of issues. These relate to the constraints of the current physical space as well as the outdated resources and facilities within it. Following the assessment, recommendations were

made to update flooring and walls, improve lighting, and increase the usable space by removing an existing partition wall which is adjacent to an empty room. This would provide additional space to install more desks and PCs, as well as a new photocopier. The renovated space would also have short-term storage for tutors' materials and a door lock so personal items could be left securely whilst teaching. In January 2019 a request for drawings and quotes was passed to Estates & Buildings, and we are currently awaiting a response from them.

Updated Response – June 2020:

There has been no response from Estates & Buildings since the request for drawings and quotes was passed to them in January 2019.

Access Programme

Recommendation 13

The Panel **recommends** that Short Courses put in place measures to ensure that all Access tutors meet with relevant Level 1 Course Coordinators on a more regular basis than that which is done at present to ensure that tutors are up-to-date with curriculum developments at Level 1. [Paragraph 4.1.6]

For the attention of: Director, Short Courses

Response:

Since the Periodic Subject Review took place there has been a change to the arrangements for the management of Access courses. Academic oversight of each Access course is now the responsibility of the relevant Subject Coordinator, and line management responsibility for Access tutors is also now with the Subject Coordinators. For this reason it is intended that engagement will mainly be between Subject Coordinators and Level 1 Course Coordinators, and the process of scheduling meetings between relevant staff has now begun. Level 1 Course Coordinators will also be invited to attend the Access tutors' induction session (in September 2019) to provide an opportunity for everyone to get to know each other.

Updated Response – June 2020:

Relationships have now been established between Subject Coordinators and most Level One course coordinators. Regular meetings are scheduled for October and June each year, and a standardised agenda for these meetings has been introduced, which includes consideration of any changes or developments to the Access courses, as well as changes or developments in relation to the Level One curriculum.

Equality and Diversity

Recommendation 14

The Panel **recommends** that Estates and Buildings continues to examine ways to ensure that all Short Courses' learning spaces are accessible to disabled students, in accordance with the University's Equality & Diversity Policy and the Equality Act 2010. [Paragraph 3.2.3]
For the attention of: Director, Estates & Buildings

For information: Director of Short Courses; Director of Equality & Diversity Unit; Central Timetabling Team

---

Response:

The Art Studio used by Short Courses is one room in a suite of 3 art studios in the St Andrew's building (the other two being locally managed).

The area of the building where this suite is located is on a half-level accessed via a short flight of steps.

There is one lift which provides level access to the room, though it is not sufficiently sized to accommodate a large, motorised wheelchair.

Short Courses requires a fully equipped art room (with running water) for their courses which run Wednesdays (10-4) and Saturdays (10-1) for 9 weeks per semester.

The allocated room (559, capacity 22) is not used for any other teaching as it is not suitable for general teaching currently.

The split-level nature of the building makes providing level access to the room challenging and options explored to date (e.g. providing ramped access) have proven not to be viable.

The potential to install a platform stair-lift (similar to those used elsewhere on campus) is being investigated.

The central teams continue to explore options for using alternative spaces either within or proximate to the main campus, noting that there are costs associated, particularly with the latter.

It should also be noted that any move of this one studio would result in the loss of beneficial adjacencies with the other art studios and the requirement for running water in the room could limit the suitability of other spaces.

Estates and Commercial Services continues to work with colleagues across the University to ensure allocation of suitable and accessible accommodation within the constraints of the Estate.

Updated response – June 2020

We have now conducted surveys of the area in question to determine whether improvements to the accessibility can be made. Unfortunately it was found that the usual interventions could not be applied in this area.

The specific requirements for an art lab (including running water) present challenges in terms of easily moving the facility to another location and means the room is unsuited to other uses, thus effectively reducing the general teaching capacity if another space was used.

In the immediate future it is unlikely any improvements or alternatives can be achieved within the current location.

Consideration should be given to whether space within Kelvin Hall (e.g. the community room) could be used for these classes, given the community-facing audience and the very limited number of hours space is required for these courses. Should this be possible it should be noted that this would require separate storage of equipment between classes.

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 2 October 2020

Periodic Subject Review: Updated Responses to Recommendations Arising from the Review of Undergraduate Medical School held on 20 and 21 November 2018

Cover Sheet

Ms Helen Butcher, Senate Office

Brief Description of the Paper

Under Summer Powers 2019, ASC received the six-month update report from the review Undergraduate Medical School. The reviewers considered that the responses were overall, adequate however, ASC requested updates on the recommendations below and commented as follows:

Recommendation 1: Update required.

Recommendation 2: Evidence of the strategy should be provided along with an update as to the progress made in the activities documented in the response.

Recommendation 4: The response given, details communication with staff but does not address how they are consulted or are able to contribute to L&T strategy.

Recommendation 5: An update on the outcome of planned activities is required.

Recommendation 6: The response details how existing activity is recorded and circulated but does not address how opportunities are provided for early career staff and how this process can be facilitated with LEADS, as such an update is requested.

Recommendation 7: The response does not specifically address what is being put in place during induction to aid the student transition to active learning. The response details a series of planned activities and it would be beneficial to get an update on their progress/success.

Recommendation 11: The response primarily addresses mock exams and marking schemes, but does not clarify the opportunities available for formative feedback – the availability of exemplar papers with and without answers, for example, does not necessarily mean that students are able to access formative feedback on their own responses. This response needs further consideration.

Action Requested

ASC is asked to consider the adequacy of the updated response and the progress made.

Recommended Person/s responsible for taking the action(s) forward

Not applicable.

Resource Implications (where appropriate)

None other than those identified in the responses.

Timescale for Implementation (where appropriate)

Not applicable.

Equality Implications (where appropriate)

Not applicable.

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 2 October 2020

Periodic Subject Review: Updated Responses to Recommendations Arising from the Review of Undergraduate Medical School held on 20 and 21 November 2018

Strategic Planning for future growth

Recommendation 1

The Panel **recommends** that the Undergraduate Medical School works with the College, the Central Timetabling Unit and local Education providers to develop a forward plan to support the predicted growth in student numbers. This plan should include specification of how teaching will be delivered, associated space and staff requirements. [Paragraph 2.3.4]

For the attention of: The Head of Undergraduate Medical School

For information: The Head of School of Medicine, Dentistry & Nursing and Head of College & Vice Principal MVLS, Central Timetabling Unit and NHS Sub Deans

---

Response – Undergraduate Medical School:

Our intake of Scottish domiciled students has grown by around 40% in the last 3 years, and in addition to our Glasgow Access Programme (a 1-year premedical course) we anticipate a further increase in Scottish students in the coming 2 years. This increase will place further pressures on teaching capacity and real estate within the Wolfson Medical School Building and the broader university. We have carried out some refurbishment around WMSB to optimise teaching space for our early phase teaching and may require provision for ancillary spaces for live streaming of lectures if adequately sized lecture theatres are unavailable. The increase in class size in Year 3 has left us struggling for lecture theatre space and required sourcing of lecture spaces out with University campus. Priority booking for the large lecture theatre in the Queen Elizabeth University Hospital's Teaching and Learning Centre would be of benefit in reducing reliance on external venues for Year 3, mindful that many of the comments about poor organisation in the NSS reference the organisation within the earlier phases of the course. Flexibility in room size limits may allow some more agility in allocating rooms, allowing for the reality of less than 100% attendance at set lectures. The introduction of app-based timetabling has been trialled for Y1 in 19-20 and will be extended to Y2 in 20-21.

Future:

Despite the future growth, we need to ensure that once online learning needs are relaxed then our early phase small group teaching (Vocational Studies and Problem Based Learning) continues to take place within the WMSB, purpose-built originally for such teaching, in order to maintain the quality of the student experience. The Level 3 PBL rooms have recently been placed on the central room booking system adding to the challenges of maintaining a good learning experience for the students. Proactive booking of teaching spaces to ensure in-house placement of the range of small-group teaching events will require significant and recurring administrative input.

Provision of adequate clinical teaching time has required ongoing liaison with the surrounding Health Boards – the current project to 'map' the amount of teaching time allocated to each unit will help direct teaching funding where it is most needed, and allow for proactive recruitment of the most suitable teaching staff.

Further infrastructural changes will be needed in the years to come – attracting and confirming this from external sources (donations and ACT funding) will require some degree of certainty that the resultant facilities will be utilised predominantly for undergraduate medical education.

Response: Head of School of Medicine, Dentistry, Nursing & Health Care

This recommendation has been taken forward by the Undergraduate Medical School team. I receive regular progress updates of the action arising from this recommendation at the weekly meeting I hold with the heads of each clinical professional school and the head of school administration.

Update request: Update required.

Updated response: September 2020

Current reduction in Face to Face teaching will mitigate this pressure in the short term. We anticipate that once online learning is reduced the increase in class size in Year 3 will leave us struggling for lecture theatre space and we will be required to source lecture spaces outwith University campus. It would be of benefit to reduce long term reliance on external venues for Year 3, mindful that many of the comments about poor organisation in the NSS reference daytime site changes within the earlier phases of the course. Priority booking for the large lecture theatre in the Queen Elizabeth University Hospital's Teaching and Learning Centre would help us utilise this for our Year 3 lectures, and reduce constant changes in venue.

Flexibility from Room Bookings wrt room size limits may provide some more agility in allocating rooms, allowing for the reality of less than 100% attendance at set lectures.

The introduction of App-based timetabling for Year 1 is almost complete – and should in due course be rolled out across Year 2 in Semester 2 – this will help smooth organisation around the earlier phases of the course.

Increases in Year sizes will place further pressures on teaching capacity and real estate within the Wolfson Medical School Building and the broader university. We have carried out some refurbishment around WMSB to optimise teaching space for our early phase teaching and may require provision for ancillary spaces for live streaming of lectures if adequately sized lecture theatres are unavailable.

IT Support

Recommendation 2[1]

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Undergraduate Medical School articulates an overall Technology Enhanced Learning and Teaching (TELT) strategy and develops a requirement specification for IT systems that support teaching within the Undergraduate Medical School, engaging with the University's Assessment and Feedback project to identify what elements of the specification could be delivered centrally. The Undergraduate Medical School should seek to secure College support for its delivery. The Review Panel further **recommends** that the College and School should review and, where appropriate, reconfigure IT support for the School to improve its effectiveness. In doing so, it should consider how staff and students in the School use IT and how it can evolve to improve resilience. [Paragraph 4.1.11]

For the attention of: The Head of Undergraduate Medical School
For information: Head of College and Vice Principal MVLS

---

[1] The reference to articulation of an overall TELT Strategy was an additional recommendation requested by Academic Standards Committee which has been agreed by the PSR Panel Convener

Response:

The VALE system we are using has proved stable but inflexible in adapting to the increasing numbers of students and the increasing demand for granularity around monitoring of individual progression and training. In order to mitigate this we have taken on a Lecturer with significant TELT responsibilities to ensure optimisation of Mahara's capabilities in tracking individual competencies and training, maximising its potential as a longitudinal training portfolio to inform undergraduate training. This should allow a seamless transition to those systems in use in the postgraduate arena. We are working with Central IT to enhance the utility of MyCampus to improve enrolment functionality and this will facilitate use of the timetabling app noted in response to Recommendation 1. The intention is to extend app-based timetabling to the mid-point of the programme, after which students are primarily off campus on clinical placement.

Future:

The merger of the MVLS IT Team with IS has been utilised to look critically at the functionality that could be accessed from existing systems such as My Campus and Mahara. Increasing Mahara's role, and enhancing MyCampus, will significantly improve the student experience around organisation of timetables in the early years. The move away from an external ePortfolio will prove to be cost saving without impeding our organisation. The centralisation of IT services could lead to a dissociation between the College and IT which may hinder further progress. The reliance on VALE should continue to progress with the evolving attendance monitoring systems. The UMS is also, in partnership with IS, employing a Business Analyst to identify the gaps that would exist after this had been done. It is likely that "off the shelf" solutions would be sought for these gaps (eg Practique) rather than an ongoing reliance on a different internally produced system. The University has stated its desire to have VALE replaced, or at least rendered unnecessary by associated systems, partly due to its inflexibility, but also in anticipation of the increasing demands caused by increased student numbers.

> **Update request:** Evidence of the strategy should be provided along with an update as to the progress made in the activities documented in the response.

Response:

We have had mixed experience of centralisation of IT services; for many of our assessment and timetabling processes, we continue to survive with last-minute interventions without the ability to have long-term proactive plans. We remain reliant on VALE and its modifications, a system that remains solid but inflexible, and without a critical mass of expertise around the adaptations in our systems.

There have been several helpful meetings with IT services to lay out plans for IT development but no concrete measures have been undertaken to move to a bespoke system.

We have moved much of the early year's eportfolio activity to Mahara – this will be the preferred platform for tracking competencies.

The roll-out of Practique has been delayed by the postponement of all of our face-to-face clinical assessments (OSCEs). We will require some testing of Practique among some formative exams before we can bring this to bear in our high-stakes assessments.

Recommendation 3

The SER, Staff survey and at all the PSR meetings with staff, issues with the administrative support for teaching within the School had been highlighted. This was having a significant impact on all staff. The Review Panel **recommends** that the Head of the School of Medicine, Dentistry and Nursing, should work, in consultation with the Head of College, to identify and resolve any issues causing staff turnover and develop and implement a plan to resolve current administrative difficulties in a manner that is resilient to the planned future growth. [Paragraph 4.3.4]. In addition, The Review Panel **recommends** that the UMS develop systems to anticipate and react to sources of stress and pressure, particularly in light of the imminent significant numbers of students. [Paragraph 4.4.9]

For the attention of: The Head of School of Medicine, Dentistry & Nursing
For information: Head of College & Vice Principal MVLS and Head of Undergraduate Medical School

---

Response: Head of School of Medicine, Dentistry, Nursing & Health Care

Since the visit, a review of administration within the Undergraduate Medical School has been undertaken. The strategy involves eventual provision of dedicated PSS staff for each Year Group, and rationalising of support to other parts of the course. This initiative aims to improve the efficiency of our administrative processes, to ensure that the significant skills and abilities of our administrative team are optimally deployed, and to harmonise the interfaces between the Undergraduate Medical School and important stakeholders, most particularly the Health Boards with whom we work to deliver high quality clinical teaching.

This review was at an advanced stage with a view to implementation in 2020, and a new medical school manager has been appointed to take the process forward. Many of the plans have been stalled with upheaval related to the pandemic, particularly with the freeze on new appointments this academic year. It is worthy of note that staff turnover in our administrative teams is broadly aligned with other areas of the College, indeed other than the planned retirement of our previous medical school manager in 2018, no administrative colleague has left the Undergraduate Medical School.

Response – Undergraduate School of Medicine:

A plan is in place and in the early stage of being actioned to review the PSS staff supporting the MBChB to review and change the current organisation and job descriptions to make it more effective, efficient and more able to have the flexibility to anticipate and respond to change. The appointment of a new UMS Manager (Dr Helen Lloyd) has already allowed the UMS to take a massive step forward in addressing this area.

Recommendation 4

At the staff meeting, it was unclear as to how the whole School community was consulted in relation to learning and teaching strategy and what opportunity was given to have input into decision making. The Review Panel **recommends** that the Undergraduate Medical School reviews communication, engagement and inclusion of all staff to ensure all staff are given an opportunity to contribute to strategy and teaching developments in an open and transparent environment. [Paragraph 4.4.8]

For the attention of: The Head of Undergraduate Medical School

---

Response:

All members of University lecturing staff in the Early Phases will have access to the papers from the Teaching & Learning Committee and resulting minutes, alongside the minutes from subcommittee meetings. SoMDN 'Town Hall' meetings happen three times a year and are open to all staff in the School, including UMS staff, and aim, amongst other priorities, to keep staff informed of imminent and future developments to teaching and assessment practice. School communications to our academic, clinical and administrative staff has been improved through the use of Sympa mailing lists.

In order to promote best practice across all grades of clinical teachers, we are instituting annual Teaching & Learning Events (for GP tutors), as well as Educators' Days (for hospital clinicians). Teaching and training sessions will be held as our 'Mid-Wednesday' meetings for WMSB Lecturers during academic session. We intend to enhance our relationship with and contributions from our cadre of NHS clinical Honorary staff by establishing evening and afternoon teaching and training sessions for all members of our Honorary Staff to increase the range and quality of input. We are working with IS to complete the 'Contributors Database' which will provide information on all staff contributing to the MBChB and hugely facilitate targeted communications.

We have ensured that all members of University lecturing staff in the Early Phases will have access to the papers from the Teaching & Learning Committee and resulting minutes, alongside the minutes from subcommittee meetings. Since the onset of the COVID lockdown our SoMDN 'Town Hall' meetings have been taking place on a monthly basis. These are flagged up in advance to all staff in the School, including UMS staff, which includes the opportunity to submit questions or agenda points for the meeting itself. Amongst other priorities, this are to keep staff informed of imminent and future developments to teaching and assessment practice. School communications to our academic, clinical and administrative staff has been improved through the use of Sympa mailing lists.

> **Update request:** The response given, details communication with staff but does not address how they are consulted or are able to contribute to L&T strategy.

Update: September 2020

Regular meetings are planned with WMSB Lecturers (Wednesday afternoon meetings during academic session) to allow us to consult with staff on emergent problems and / or suggestions for improvement, as well as giving the chance to shape any future curricular developments.

We had intended to enhance our relationship with, and contributions from, our cadre of NHS clinical Honorary staff by establishing evening / afternoon teaching and training sessions for all members of our Honorary Staff to increase the range and quality of input. These have been prevented by COVID related issues.

We have almost completed our 'Contributors Database' which will provide information on all staff contributing to the MBChB and hugely facilitate targeted communications.

Recommendation 5

It was not apparent to the Panel how the Undergraduate Medical School provided feedback or recognised the efforts of facilitators and tutors and therefore the Panel **recommends** that the School provides annual feedback to PBL/CBL/VS facilitators to allow them to improve their practice and to assure them that the value of their contribution is recognised. [Paragraph 4.4.6]

For the attention of: The Head of Undergraduate Medical School

---

Response:

We have undertaken to provide sessions for enhanced training for our facilitators for Vocational Studies and PBL/CBL. This will take place during our TALE and Educators' Days (these are annual events) as well as Wednesday meetings described above (response to Recommendation 4) for WMSB lecturers which run during the academic session.

A PBL Facilitators' Day ahead of the beginning of the academic session is being provided for training, with enhanced structured feedback for a proportion of our VS facilitators on a rolling basis each year. Feedback will be provided, although the way in which this is structured and delivered remains under consideration. It is aimed to roll out for session 20/21.

> **Update request:** An update on the outcome of planned activities is required

Update September 2020

PBL facilitators' days and the Educators' days proceeded as planned. COVID-related pressures have stalled the implementation of a series of sessions for our Honorary Staff members (clinicians within our partner health boards) on training the Trainers. This initiative will help improve the extent and the quality of our teaching provision.

> **Recommendation 6**
>
> The Review Panel **recommends** that the Undergraduate Medical School work with LEADS to consider opportunities for early career staff to undertake scholarship activity and create a sense of identity and community for L&TS staff. [Paragraph 4.4.13]
>
> **For the attention of: The Head of Undergraduate Medical School**
> **For information: Director of LEADS and LEADS MVLS representative**

Response:

We recognise the benefits of monitoring and facilitating the academic output of our scholarship activities. Dr Shepherd (Deputy Head of UG Medicine) has undertaken the process of establishing a directory listing available scholarship projects and, where available, their outputs. This will provide further opportunities for staff wishing to take part, but also allow oversight and where necessary help us plan rationalisation of our scholarship activities. Annually those colleagues who have presented or published in the course of the year will be invited to showcase their scholarship across the School with colleagues from other areas at a Town Hall meeting.

Future:

Once delivered, the Contributors' database will ensure that all staff are able to track their training and monitor background qualifications (eg Equality and Diversity training).

> **Response requested**: The response details how existing activity is recorded and circulated but does not address how opportunities are provided for early career staff and how this process can be facilitated with LEADS, as such an update is requested

Updated response: September 2020

We have established a central database of scholarship research activities currently underway in the UMS, as well as a list of 'available' projects that can be picked up by teachers with specific interest or expertise in the relevant area.

Recommendation 7[2]

The Panel **recommends** that the Undergraduate Medical School consider further what could be done during induction to support students in their preparation for independent learning. [Paragraph 3.3.6]

For the attention of: The Head of Undergraduate Medical School

For information: Director of LEADS and LEADS MVLS representative

---

Response:

The current Year 1 induction programme includes a pre-attendance pack including information on University systems and services. This is delivered utilising online resources. All incoming students are strongly encouraged to take advantage of it and participation is monitored. We would welcome input from LEADS early in the first Semester of Year 1, specifically covering generic and transferable skills to facilitate the transition towards students becoming independent learners.

We have put in place the mandatory Academic Writing Skills Programme for Year 1 students and propose to establish a project correlating uptake in this with progression through Phase 1 of the MBChB and beyond. This will be developed as part of the ongoing scholarship activity amongst the UMS lecturing staff.

We are in discussion with the University Library about introduction of their Reach Out team to the medical school library from 20-21, offering roving library support and enhanced library skills advice to students – COVID-related issues have stalled this initiative at present.

We are also giving consideration to how we can engage in more proactive discussion and advice to students around wellbeing.

> **Response requested:** The response does not specifically address what is being put in place during induction to aid the student transition to active learning. The response details a series of planned activities and it would be beneficial to get an update on their progress/success.

Library changes have not taken place in the current year but are planned for when the library is fully open to students. The Induction pack and the Academic Skills pack are both in place for all year 1 students, and their engagement with this is monitored.

Student wellbeing is covered in presentations to all years at the onset of the Academic Year from our Student Support service.

Recommendation 11

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Undergraduate Medical School review the opportunities that students have to gain formative feedback on assessments that replicate the methodology used in summative assessments, before the summative assessments are undertaken. [Paragraph 4.2.4]

For the attention of: The Head of Undergraduate Medical School

---

[2] Recommendation 7 was an additional recommendation requested by Academic Standards Committee which has been agreed by the PSR Panel Convener

Response:

In each year, exemplar papers are provided with and without marking schemes to help students to develop skill in free text answers. In Early Phases the formative exams and coursework already mirror the subsequent summative assessment. The assessment processes in clinical placements include clinical assessments that are similar to the OSCEs. In preparation for the national Medical Licencing Assessment we will seek to improve the provision of 'mock OSCE' exams during clinical placements to ensure student readiness for the UK-wide Professional Skills Assessment due to be introduced in 2024.

We have harmonised ILO's for different clinical specialties, introducing a clear progression from early to later attachments. This will lead to the development of better exam questions and, in turn, clearer marking schedules.

> **Response requested:** The response primarily addresses mock exams and marking schemes, but does not clarify the opportunities available for formative feedback – the availability of exemplar papers with and without answers, for example, does not necessarily mean that students are able to access formative feedback on their own responses. This response needs further consideration.

Updated response: September 2020

There are sessions provided for each Year group where the students will be taken through responses to formative MCQ and MEQ papers to illustrate the keys to optimal performance. We actively encourage the development of peer-led learning (Peer-Assisted Learning Initiative – PALI) who set a series of clinical and written examinations, with set questions, clinical scenarios, and answer sheets all quality-controlled by staff within the Undergraduate Medical School.

We have harmonised ILO's for different clinical specialties, introducing a clear progression from early to later attachments. This will lead to the development of better exam questions and, in turn, clearer marking schedules. We have made our Clinical Teaching Fellows responsible for teaching and providing individual assessments of specific system examination to ensure adequate preparation for the summative OSCE in Years 3,4, and 5.

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 2 October 2020

Report on Programme Approval 2019-20

The College Boards of Studies have approved the following new programmes and programme amendments to be introduced in 2020-21 (unless otherwise stated).

College of Arts

New Programmes:

Cert HE/MA Honours Gaelic with Immersion

MSc Global History (*commencing in 2021-22*)

PgCert/PgDip/MSc Museum Studies

Programme Amendments:

Six programmes

College of Medical, Veterinary & Life Sciences

New Programme:

MSc/PgDip/PgCert Digital Health Interventions

MSc/PgDip/PgCert Palliative Care

MSc/PgDip Chemical Biology

MSc Precision Medicine - new pathways:

   MSc Precision Medicine (Cancer)

   MSc Precision Medicine (Cardiovascular Disease)

   MSc Precision Medicine (Immunology)

PgCert/PgDip Critical Care & Leadership

PgCert Positive Behaviour Support

Programme Amendments:

Two programmes

College of Science & Engineering

New Programmes:

MSc Medical Device Engineering

MSc Robotics & Artificial Intelligence

MSc Earth Futures Research

BSc/MSci Environmental Geoscience

Programme Amendments:

20 programmes

College of Social Sciences

New Programmes:

International Master in Museum, Heritage & Education Studies

LLM in International Law of Global Security, Peace & Development

MRes Global Health

MSc Data Analytics for Economics & Finance

MSc Digital Society

MSc Marketing

MSc/PgDip/PgCert End of Life Studies

Programme Amendments:

58 programmes

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 2 October 2020

Annual Report to the SFC: Institutional Report on Quality Assurance and Enhancement 2019-20

Cover Sheet

Helen Butcher, Senate Office

Brief description of the paper

The Annual Report to the Scottish Funding Council on Institutional-led Reviews of Quality which is being submitted for ASC endorsement. The Report covers all summaries of ILR outcomes undertaken during Session 2019-20. This includes a summary of Periodic Subject Review outcomes which notes recommendations, commendations and good practice.

ASC also receives PSR reports which detail all recommendations and further updates on progress with actions taken in response to these.

Action Requested

Academic Standards Committee is asked **to endorse** the Report and **to consider** whether any further University-wide action is merited.

Recommended Person/s responsible for taking the action(s) forward

Senate Office.

Resource implications

None identified.

Timescale for Implementation (where appropriate)

Actions highlighted within the Report will be taken forward during Session 2020-21.

Equality implications

No specific implications identified, although Schools should continue to embed consideration of equality and diversity in all its procedures and provision.

University of Glasgow

Annual Report for the Scottish Funding Council

Institutional Report on Quality Assurance and Enhancement Academic Session 2019-2020

At the University of Glasgow, our mission is to bring people together in a world-class environment for learning and research, empowering staff and students to discover and share knowledge that can change the world.

Since 2015, this vision has been articulated via our Strategic Plan: Inspiring People Changing the World. The Strategy, governed by its focus on People, Place and Purpose, has enhanced the staff and student experience, expanded our reach across the globe and ensured that – no matter their background – each of our world-changing students has a platform to realise their full potential.

Our Strategy for 2020 is near completion having been revisited in light of the Covid-19 pandemic, to ensure that our focus reflects the impact of the pandemic on the University and on the wider sector.

1.   Introduction

The University of Glasgow submits this annual report in accordance with the Scottish Funding Council guidance to higher education institutions on quality SFC/GD/11/2017 and the supplementary request to provide information on the impact of Covid-19 on our ILR activity. The format and content of the report takes consideration of the technical guidance in section 2.

Following a successful ELIR 4 in February/March 2019 and a productive QAAS annual discussion meeting in May 2020, the University is confident it has effective mechanisms in place to demonstrate compliance with and consideration of the Quality Enhancement Framework (QEF) which is outlined in section 1 of the above SFC guidance.

The University continues to build on the recommendations from ELIR and progress on these activities are outlined in ELIR year on follow-up report which was submitted to QAAS in July 2020.

2.   Context

This report was written taking consideration of the impact on key institutional quality process which were disrupted following industrial action in February and March 2020 and national lockdown due to the Coronavirus Pandemic.

2.1 Industrial Action

A period of Industrial Action took place during February and March 2020. The University put in place a series of support measures which ensured that all students were treated fairly, no student was disadvantaged by any amended arrangements and that students were not assessed on any subject area for which they have not been adequately prepared. A detailed paper was issued to all Colleges, Schools and Research Institutes (this is available on request). Information and Frequently Asked Questions were published and made available to students. The University worked collaboratively with the Student Representative Council (SRC) during this period.

2.2 Covid-19 impact and planning

The University established a strategic team with responsibility to manage the impact of Covid-19 on the institutional priorities. Information was shared with staff and students on a weekly basis including FAQ's, video updates and periodic question and answer sessions with the Principal and members of his senior team which were broadcast live and also recorded for wider viewing. All information was published on dedicated [webpages](#) accessible from a banner on our front page. Certain elements of this information have been updated as we have moved through the academic year and into the new session for 2020-21. During this critical time the University worked continually in partnership with the SRC.

As with other universities, the period since the commencement of the pandemic lockdown has seen large-scale and rapid cross-institutional work to convert provision to an online delivery mode to enable teaching for the remainder of 2019-20 to be completed. Similarly, all remaining assessment activities for the academic year were, where possible, converted to online means. Alongside this there was development and implementation of the University's 'No Detriment' policy to take account of the largescale disruption to students undertaking assessment from the middle of March 2020.

Alongside the necessary activity to continue students' education in the second half of the academic year, there has been significant and extensive work required in preparation for teaching and assessment in 2020-21 in the context of the ongoing pandemic, phased lifting of lockdown and ongoing social distancing and other safety requirements. Some of the key aspects of the planning are as follows:

- Staggered start dates so that most undergraduates and some PGTs will commence as scheduled in September 2020, a significant range of PGT programmes will commence in November, and a further large number of PGT programmes will start in January 2021.
- No lectures will be scheduled for on campus for 2020-21.
- On campus examinations will largely be replaced by online assessment.
- Within social distancing guidelines, small group classes, laboratories and skills-based sessions will be scheduled as much as possible on campus.
- A range of measures will be implemented outside the classroom to help manage movement and ensure that staff can access the campus safely.
- The new build James McCune Smith learning hub will be available from January for 2021 for teaching and study purposes.
- Special precautions will be put in place for members of staff who for medical reasons are at particular risk from Covid-19.
- Contingency planning for delivering all activity remotely in the event of a further lockdown.

2.3 Quality Management in the context of Covid-19

Given the significant impact of the pandemic and the intensive activity required throughout the University to prioritise business continuity and deliver a high quality student experience, there have been some necessary adjustments to our approach to quality management. This has involved the need to both respond to direct disruption of quality arrangements caused by the pandemic, and to re-focus some activity in light of the rapid pace of change required in this unprecedented global situation.

Two ILR events were postponed as a direct impact from the national lockdown which started in late March 2020: the Periodic Subject Review for PGT Medicine, and the Graduate School Review for Medical, Veterinary & Life Sciences. The postponed PSR will take place in the next cycle in 2020-21 and the GSR will be deferred at least until summer 2021, but may be later, while further development around PGR management takes place (see section 8.6 below). Following dialogue with QAAS and the Funding Council, we have adopted a

reduced load of PSR activity during AY 2020-21 in order to release capacity for the priorities around delivering teaching and assessment under the current challenging circumstances. Five PSR reviews are now planned for 2020-21 and a revised schedule for the full six-year cycle of PSR up to 2025-26 has been drawn up (see section 4 below). In managing the risks around deferring reviews within a six-year cycle we have ensured that no Subject will have their review deferred by more than one academic session, so as not to build up any unduly large gaps between reviews. In order to guard against future disruption caused by social distancing, travel restrictions or full lockdown, we will make contingency plans to run the review events fully or partially online. The pandemic has also caused some disruption to other quality processes: to planned development in annual monitoring – pausing a planned enhancement of the process which had been developed and approved for implementation in April 2020 (see section 5.1 below); and for course evaluation, where the roll-out of aggregate reports for Deans of Learning & Teaching and other key stakeholders has been deferred until the end of Semester 1 of 2020-21 (see section 5.3 below).

A temporary modification was agreed for our course and programme approval process in preparation for the development of online provision for 2020-21. This was to facilitate the urgent and large-scale work required across Schools to convert on-campus delivery to online. Blanket approval for temporary adjustments to delivery in 2020-21 was devolved to Schools, on the basis that: i) these changes did not fundamentally digress from the original Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) or the aims of any courses, or disrupt the assessment of ILOs. ii) any changes made for 2020-21 which were subsequently to be adopted for use in 2021-22 and beyond would require approval under standard processes by the spring of 2021. These changes are [online](#) and were developed with reference to QAA guidance issued in early June: [Preserving Quality and Standards Through a Time of Rapid Change](#).

Annual monitoring of provision over 2019-20 has also been revised in light of the pandemic. Implementation of the new process was paused, and instead, academic colleagues were asked to review the last session with a very clear focus given to the exceptional circumstances which unfolded over Semester 2. Given the extensive pressure on academic staff over the summer and into the new academic year, the reporting has been streamlined to focus only on two key questions - on the student experience and student performance. This will allow Colleges and the University to reflect on the management of provision during the pandemic and identify actions for enhancement as we move forward with a revised model of delivery in 2020-21. Work is underway to develop more regular pulse surveys with students to evaluate their satisfaction with their experience, and to determine their level of engagement with their studies. The first of these was issued on the 29th September 2020.

3.   Summary of Institutional Led Review Outcomes 2019-2020

The University's main ILR mechanism for learning, teaching and assessment for all undergraduate and taught postgraduate credit-bearing provision is Periodic Subject Review (PSR). The postgraduate research student experience is reviewed through the Graduate School Review (GSR) process. This approach enables all subject areas to be reviewed under PSR in line with the national six-year cycle. There is one Graduate School in each of the University's four constituent Colleges, with each reviewed on a four-yearly cycle.

The University places great value in both types of review mechanism – this is borne out in the reports of all ELIR exercises undergone since 2004 and most recently in 2019, as well as in the annual reports to the Funding Council. These and the other quality management arrangements utilised also attest to the sustained quality and standards of our provision.

The table below outlines the approved schedule for 2019-20.

Subject	Due date	Status
Philosophy	March 2020	Postponed to 2020-21 Due to Industrial Action.
Theology & Religious Studies	Feb 2020	Complete.
Nursing & Health Care		Postponed to 2020-21 PSR cycle due to the curriculum change being implemented to meet revised requirements from the Nursing & Midwifery Council. Agreed with SFC in September 2019.
College of MVLS Graduate School: PGT Cluster2: Medical Professions, Health & Wellbeing and Medical & Clinical Science	June 2020	Postponed to 2020-21 due to Covid.
School of Computing Science	March 2020	Complete
Economic & Social History	March 2020	Complete
Sociology	February 2020	Complete

Details of the programmes covered by the reviews are listed in Appendix 1.

3.1 Pilot for new methodology

The opportunity was taken to pilot a new method for PSR at the review of Computing Science. The revised approach aims to reduce the burden on the School while at the same time providing them with an opportunity to be more reflective; and for the outcome to be more helpful while at the same time ensuring compliance. The format and panel remained the same and the guidance was amended to reflect the introduction of a Reflective Analysis. The key aims were to demonstrate the assurance of academic standards, and to produce an outcome that would provide the School with more ownership of the outcome and also demonstrate a more collective and shared responsibility for the student learning experience and its enhancement across the wider College and University. The format of the outcome report was amended to reduce narrative and includes the addition of an action plan which can be used to monitor progress against the recommendations as well as detailing more explicitly the associated responsibilities of University professional support services.

3.2 Commendations

A total of 22 commendations were noted from the 4 reviews. This confirms a commitment to enhancement and development which is evidenced across subjects. The commendations focused on the following thematic areas.

- Innovative approach to the *enhancement of teaching and learning*. Innovative use of technological methods and maximising the benefits from a research to develop the curriculum.
- A clear and explicit focus on the *student voice* across the subject groups and evidence of closing the loop with regard to formal and informal feedback. Also benefits arising from the good use of the Student Staff Consultative Committees.
- *Collaborative approach to working and innovation*. With examples of good collaboration with internal and external stakeholders as a way of sharing and developing good practice and innovative and alternative ways of working.
- Strong commitment to *working with employers and external agencies* as a way of broadening the student experience and making the learning relevant.
- Internal collaboration between a school and student support services to facilitate the *embedding of student support* into the subject.

- *Inclusive and reflective approach to strategic planning* with strong commitment to reflection and bottom up approach to developing priorities.
- *Explicit graduate attributes* demonstrated through a graduate apprenticeship programme.
- Continued and *improving outcomes in the NSS scores*.
- Explicit evidence of *student support services* working flexibly and supportively with students to facility their learning.
- *National and international reputation* maintained during periods of significant growth in student numbers.

3.3 Good practice

A total of 7 areas of good practice were identified from across the 4 PSRs undertaken. The key themes supporting the good practice focused primarily around:

- The innovative use of resource to support the student learning experience and maximising when possible the use of technology.
- The collegiate and inclusive approach to develop academic staff (ECRs and GTAs)
- A strong culture of collegiate teaching ambition.
- The further development of Academic Workload Models as a way of managing academic resources and developing staff.

3.4 Enhancement recommendations

The University was pleased to note that no issues were raised within the reviews undertaken that raised any cause for concern or were unknown. This is in line with the ethos of the Scottish enhancement approach. The recommendations primarily built on work identified by the Schools in the PSR documentation and on activities already identified as good practice. The thematic foci of the recommendations are as follows:

- Further develop the Academic Workload Model as a way of maximising the benefits of planning resources, building resilience and developing academic staff with further consideration of university norms.
- Make more explicit the learning outcomes within the programme documentation, in particular if work and assessment is being managed remotely in the coming academic year.
- Ensure the use of new technologies, including developments to MOODLE (virtual learning environment), is fully maximised as a way of sharing and communicating key information with students in a timely manner.
- Enable lecture recording to be undertaken wherever possible and review practice of uploading lecture materials to ensure students are not disadvantaged and the Accessible and Inclusive Learning Policy is followed.
- Consider ways to further develop and integrate the work of the GTAs to maximise the benefits to students and subject areas.
- Continue to review School and College governance committee structures in line with good practice to ensure representation and membership remain relevant.
- Continue to review assessment and feedback mechanisms locally.
- Continue to review and support the adviser of studies system.
- Explore approaches to build a sense of community among student cohorts.
- Continue to develop the student voice with strategies to improve student response rates to course evaluation and review of processes for responding to student feedback including communication back to student representatives.
- Seek to reinforce Learning and Teaching group activity for staff to enhance the identification and sharing of good practice across the subject.
- Continue to work collaboratively with central University support departments to foster a shared understanding of and approach to the wider student experience.

- Continue to work collaboratively and in partnership with key University departments to maximise the benefits of marketing which can inform recruitment targets.
- Continue to work collaboratively with student services department to maximise the benefit of support for students.
- Continue to review the learning spaces within the wider estate to maximise benefit to the learning experience.
- Continue to build collaborative partnerships with business and industry in order to maximise graduate employability.

4. Institutional Led Review schedule for 2020-2021

Following discussions with QAA Scotland and the Funding Council the following schedule for Periodic Subject Review events has been agreed for the 2020-21 academic session.

Subject Review	Original Date	Status	Revised Date
Philosophy	March 2020	Postponed. Industrial Action	Feb/Mar 2021
College of MVLS Graduate School: PGT Cluster2: Medical Professions, Health & Wellbeing and Medical & Clinical Science	June 2020	Postponed. Covid-19	June 2021
Nursing & Health Care	Nov 2020	Moved from Sem 1 to Sem 2 event in 2020-21	Mar 2021
Geographical & Earth Sciences	2020-21	No change	Mar 2021
Urban Studies	2020-21	No change	Mar 2021

The following five subjects were originally scheduled for review in 2020-21 have been deferred to 2021-22:
- Chemistry
- Classics
- Economics
- History
- Theatre, Film & TV Studies

Other subjects scheduled for 2021-22 will be deferred to ensure an even spread of reviews across Schools and Colleges and the full period of the cycle. The proposed revision to the full cycle has been shared with the QAA and is presented in Appendix 2. In order to mitigate risks of delaying the overall review of subject provision, the revised schedule ensures that no review has been postponed for more than one year.

5. Reflection from other quality assurance activities

The University is confident that its quality assurance framework is robust and supports and maintains the development of academic standards and the enhancement of the student learning experience. The outcome from ELIR 2019 and the annual discussion with QAA Scotland reinforces this confidence. The section below outlines some information collated from key QA activities.

5.1 Annual Monitoring

Annual Monitoring at the University of Glasgow is carried out at three levels: School, College and University. School Quality Officers are responsible for collating and analysing information for consideration at School level, and College Quality Officers undertake this activity at College level. Issues requiring University-level action are reported for consideration by Academic Standards Committee (ASC). Relevant services or Groups provide updates and responses to these University-wide matters.

During AY 2019-20 there was reflection on activity in previous session with the following key themes arising from the Undergraduate and Postgraduate Annual Monitoring Summaries for Session 2018-19:

- Suitability and quality of teaching spaces
- Student mental health support
- IT facilities across the campus
- Staffing levels
- Assessment and feedback (particularly the timeliness of feedback)
- Disability reporting and provision
- Student recruitment and admissions
- MyCampus (the student records system)
- Standards of English amongst international students

Good practice

The following good practice from the Undergraduate and Postgraduate Annual Monitoring Summaries for Session 2018-19 were:

- Assessment and feedback
- Innovative teaching practices
- Developing graduate attributes and employability
- Student support and inclusivity
- Staff Development

Enhancement Review of the University's Annual Monitoring process

In line with the University's enhancement agenda, a review of the University's Annual Monitoring process was presented to the University's Academic Standards Committee in November 2019 and a set of changes was approved and due for implementation in March 2020. However, due to the impact of Covid-19, the proposed amendments were paused for the immediate future and the existing Annual Monitoring arrangements were adapted to incorporate a lighter touch focussing on key issues including reflection on the student learning experience in the context of Covid-19 adjustments and monitoring of grades. Planning for the implementation of the approved amendments to the process (which include redefined remits for college and school staff with responsibility for quality enhancement and assurance) will be resumed during 2020-21. Further progress on this will be included in next year's annual report.

5.2 External Examiners

The University has a robust process for managing and monitoring external examiner reports. Thematic reports derived from externals' reports on both UG and PGT programmes are submitted to the Academic Standards Committee (ASC). ASC has delegated authority from Senate for these matters. Since the start of academic year 2018-19, there has been separate reporting on UG and PGT external examiner reports. The University continues to receive positive feedback on its programmes which confirms the assurance and development of academic standards.

Themes concerning Assessment and Feedback note good practice and some room for improvement. Similar comments are made on marking criteria and IT support. Other themes identified relate largely to resource allocation for academic staff and support. Comments and feedback are monitored at School, College and University level via the appropriate academic governance committee. Suggestions for enhancement are dealt with at School level when relating to the programme and comments relating to issues outwith the School are referred to the College. University-level matters are overseen and referred to the relevant areas by

the Senate Office. Examples of good practice highlighted from external examiner reports are as follows:

- Creative low stakes assessment
- Academic standards of programmes
- High-quality feedback to students
- Rigour of marking/grading criteria
- Staff engagement
- Learning & Teaching leadership

The percentage of undergraduate reports received for session 2018-19 was 98%. As this is the first year where there has been separate commentary on undergraduate reports, it is not possible to do a direct comparison with previous years. However, a figure of 98% is most satisfactory. For PGT reports there was an 88% submission rate, this runs over a later and longer reporting period, and therefore the latter end of the cycle overlapped with the beginning of the main period of Covid disruption. However, as a general rule, PGT response rates are lower, so strategies to improve engagement will be reviewed.

5.3 Course Evaluation

The University's Course Evaluation Policy requires that questionnaires are sent to all students enrolled on a given course (equivalent to module), and that the all questionnaires should contain, at a minimum, five 'core' questions, with standard wording agreed in consultation with all Schools and Colleges. In addition to the five core questions asked for every course, Schools and individual members of staff are permitted to add additional questions. Following completion of surveys, the University's course evaluation software automatically generates a report for each course, which provides a statistical summary of student responses to each of the closed questions, and a list of all textual responses to open questions.

Engagement across the University with course evaluation remains high and Schools continued to use course evaluation surveys as the primary means for eliciting student feedback. A number of central departments have been working collaboratively with Information Services to develop an aggregated report which could be considered alongside National Student Survey data and student feedback gathered from other sources. The report will give the average percentage agreement to each of the three closed core questions included in every course evaluation questionnaire for each level of study within every Subject, School and College. It is hoped that this level of granularity will enable each Subject and School to identify areas of good practice and areas requiring enhancement or support. To ensure that staff have confidence in the data reported, the reports will undergo a process of quality control. Technical issues identified last year with the mapping of non-standard course codes into the data aggregation table have been resolved, and it was planned that the aggregated report would be made available to Deans of Learning & Teaching and other key stakeholders at the end of Semester 2 of the 2019-20 academic session. However, due to the disruption caused by Covid-19, this has not been possible and the roll-out of the aggregated report is now planned for the end of Semester 1 of the 2020-21 academic session. The outcome and evaluation of the new process will be included in the annual report next year.

5.4 Graduate School Reviews (GSR)

The Graduate School Review for Medical, Veterinary & Life Sciences (MVLS) was to have been held on 9 June 2020 but was cancelled due to the disruption from the Covid-19 pandemic. Plans to re-schedule this remain under review and discussion to date with the Quality Assurance Agency (Scotland) has noted a planned pause of the Graduate School Review cycle during 2020-21 in light of our planned steps to systematically improve our understanding of the PGR experience as detailed in section 8.6 below.

5.5 Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Bodies (PSRB)

A schedule of programmes accredited by PSRB is attached as Appendix 3. The University continues to work collaboratively with professional bodies and there has been dialogue and re-scheduling of activity due to the disruption caused by the Coronavirus pandemic. Our No Detriment policy was discussed with PSRBs, as necessary, and included provision to ensure that PSRB requirements continued to be met, for example the assessment waiver for the Spring examination diet applied to most first and second year students was not applied on professional degrees such as Medicine, Dentistry & Veterinary Medicine; instead, these examination were deferred. The following review visits were postponed during the 2019-20 academic cycle due to the pandemic.

School of Veterinary Medicine

European Association of Establishments for Veterinary Education (EAEVE)

2019/20 Review Postponed (11-15 May 2020). Visit rescheduled to 15-19 February 2021. Our BVMS degree programme remains accredited on an ongoing basis, until 2023.

American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA); Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons (RCVS); Australasian Veterinary Boards Council (AVBC); South African Veterinary Council (SAVC)

2019/20 Review Postponed (27 April-1 May 2020). Visit rescheduled to 5–12 March 2021 with current accreditation extended by 12 months, to September 2021.

School of Engineering

Institution of Mechanical Engineers (IMechE)

Accreditation visit scheduled for April 2020 was postponed to March 2021. Existing accreditation up to end July 2020 applies to the intake year 2019-20, so the delayed accreditation event to March 2021 will seek backdated accreditation to the 2020-21 intake to ensure continuity of accreditation for all students.

6. Student Support Services / Student Wellbeing

As detailed in the ELIR Year-on report we are continuing to develop our framework of activity to support review of student-facing professional services, building on the University's current broad-based approach to monitoring service unit performance that involves a range of mechanisms. As noted in our report, our plans to operationalise reviews from September 2021 will be developed during the autumn once the new Deputy Secretary & Director of Planning is in post. In the meantime, for the remainder of 2020 our activity will focus on the current review of Professional Services support for disabled students as requested by QAAS in order to provide assurance that we are providing an appropriate level of service to our disabled students.

7. Student Participation in ILR processes

We have continued our strong partnership with the Student Representatives' Council (SRC) Sabbatical Officers as reported last year and commended in the ELIR 2019 report. Student representatives have continued to be fully engaged in our quality management processes and to participate in all our academic and student support committees. (These continued to meet online following lockdown.) This positive relationship was fundamental to the planning and communication of priorities for the completion of the 2019-20 academic year during the period of lockdown and also preparation for the new session in 2020/21.

A good example of student participation in quality enhancement and assurance and student feedback is how the University manages the outcome from the course evaluation process. Following completion of the survey, the summary report is sent to all members of staff who

taught on the course, and those staff members are required to produce a Summary and Response Document (SARD) highlighting any comments/concerns raised by students and any proposed actions to address those concerns. Following this, the SARD is posted onto Moodle for students to view - the document is also made available to incoming students for the next offering of the course. The SARD is a standing item on every Staff-Student Liaison Committee agenda, allowing for discussion and periodic progress updates on issues that were raised in previous academic sessions. We work closely with the Students' Representative Council (SRC) to ensure that course evaluation is taking place consistently across the University and that SARDs are being made available to all students. To assist with this, course evaluation is included as a compulsory component of the SRC class representative training and is included in the new 'MyClass Rep' toolkit which was introduced as an online information resource during the 2019-20 academic session. Furthermore, SARDs are included in the documentation reviewed by panel members during each School/Subject's Periodic Subject Review.

In the coming year there will also be increased focus on enhancing the representation of the PGR students as detailed in section 8.6 below.

"I can only commend our student body for their resilience and patience in what has been a very difficult year for everyone. As a University, we have shown ourselves to be adaptable and creative in transforming our delivery of services. We know that the student experience next year will be different, but the lessons of the last few months tell us we can achieve amazing things when we come together as a learning community." *The Principal, Professor Sir Anton Muscatelli. Statement from NSS press release 2020.*

8. Progress and priorities

8.1 Reputation and Ranking

This year's NSS rankings show improvements in a number of areas of the student experience at the University of Glasgow. Our overall satisfaction rating has gone up to 87.1% - up 1% point from last year. Assessment and Feedback (overall) has also risen - to 67.5% - up 0.74% points from last year. In terms of ranking, the University of Glasgow is now second for overall satisfaction among Russell Group universities (up three from last year). Our position among other Scottish universities has also risen – up two to fifth. For Assessment and Feedback overall, the University of Glasgow's ranking among other Russell Group universities has risen to 10th – up seven from its position last year; among other Scottish universities we are also 10th, a rise of three from last year. At a University level, all themes improved year on year, with the exception of Learning Community. The most significant improvement was for Organisation & Management with a 2.74% point climb to 75.2%. This was specifically driven by the question 'Any changes in the course or teaching have been communicated effectively', which climbed 4.47% year on year to 75.1%. Three subject areas achieved 100% satisfaction this year: Earth Sciences, Animal Sciences and Ecology and Environmental Biology.

The University has improved its position among the top 100 universities in the 2021 THE (Times Higher Education) World University Rankings by rising seven places to 92nd of 1,527 universities in the THE World University Rankings. Its improved position is attributed to its better performance in the Citations pillar of the rankings, which has a weighting of 30%. Glasgow also showed improvements in both the Research and Teaching reputation metrics which are weighted at 18% and 15% respectively. The seven-place climb in THE is the highest rise of any UK university within the top 100 this year.

8.2 ELIR reporting

In line with sector requirements, the University has reported progress against the outcome of its most recent ELIR. The content of the report was discussed with the QAA at the annual meeting and received positive feedback.

8.3 QAA Annual Meeting

The annual meeting with QAA was held in May 2020. The agenda included discussions on the preparation of the ELIR year-on report, PSR progress to date and the impact of the industrial action. Further discussions focused on the outcome and future ambitions for the new PSR method, student engagement activities, the QAA Enhancement Theme (Evidence of Enhancement). The University outlined its approach to dealing with the pandemic and also provided updates on key projects supporting learning and teaching, assessment and feedback and the campus development plan.

8.4 QAA Evidence of Enhancement Theme

The University will submit its final report at the end of October 2020 as required in order to close this theme.

8.5 Progress with Priorities highlighted in our report for 2018-19

While there has been inevitable disruption to the planned actions associated with the priorities reported last year, progress was still made in a number of areas. Most notably:

Progress with a number of short-term initiatives from the Assessment & Feedback Working Group including:

- Online guidance (video) on course design developed and published.
- Guidance on reducing and removing high stakes assessment has been produced to provide guidance to staff who are (re) designing assessments to allow staff to evaluate the assessment proposed, with examples of how high stake assessment can be reduced or re-designed.

In addition, arising from the Covid pandemic, the large-scale move to on-line assessment in spring 2020 proved to be successful, resulting in plans to continue with and enhance this form of assessment widely across the University. The centralised queries for students via the IT Helpdesk allowed an analysis of challenges faced by students during the assessment diet and action to be taken to address these. In total there were 609 queries arising from a total of 40,711 exam instances (exams x students) during the online assessment diet in April/May 2020. A checklist of common problems in online assessments will be added to the annual guidance on assessment provided to staff.

Guidelines on Content Advice on academic delivery for students were developed and approved by the Student Experience Committee in March 2020.

Introduction of an Induction Moodle course which was distributed to all Schools and Research Institutes. Initial feedback has indicated that this has been well utilized acting as the backbone for establishing programme of events for new students arriving.

Other developments which remain in progress include:

Development of a comprehensive Graduate Teaching Assistant (GTA) Code of Practice, covering University, College, School as well as GTA responsibilities, along with development of an Induction template for new GTAS and guidance on how GTAs should be supported and developed, with examples of best practice given. GTAs and staff with responsibilities for GTAs, both academic and professional, are represented on the Group taking forward this work and it is anticipated that the Code will be ready in January 2021.

While the work of the Graduate Attributes & Employability Working Group was paused after January 2020, this will be resumed to continue with development of the Graduate Attributes & Employability webpage (specification agreed in January).

Development of the University's Learning & Teaching Strategy for 2020-25 has been active throughout the year and is nearing completion with a draft strategy due to be submitted to the autumn meetings of the Learning & Teaching Committee and Education Policy & Strategy Committee.

8.6 Key Priorities for 2020-21

As well as a focus on business continuity to ensure an optimal student experience at a time of significant change in our delivery of teaching and assessment, our key priorities will include:

Implementation of the Learning & Teaching Strategy

Following finalisation of the 2020-25 Learning & Teaching Strategy, an action plan will be drawn up which will be aligned to the three pillars of the strategy: (1) Evolving our approach to teaching and learning; (2) transforming curricula and assessment; and (3) professional and skills development. This will build on the successes of the last few years and focus on evolving our learning and teaching approaches, in particular building on approaches to online and blended learning that are in place now; strengthening the curriculum in terms of its connection to global challenges; and developing students' professional and academic skills for a changing global environment.

Assessment & Feedback Transformation Project

As reported previously, the World Changing Transformation Team is running a project on Assessment & Feedback as the University has committed to enhance how we undertake assessment and feedback (A&F) so that students have the best opportunity to learn from their studies. We know that this is needed because of the consistent feedback we receive from our students including from the NSS results. For example, in the 2020 NSS we rank 14th in the UK for overall satisfaction, yet on the set of assessment and feedback questions, we rank 95th. The advent of Covid-19 meant the University needed to reconsider use of resources and as a result, the initial budget for the A&F Project was reduced. After some exploratory work the initial work of the Project will build on our current capabilities and in particular we will introduce two simple and powerful capabilities to the University community; a grade aggregation tool and a student portal.

The grade aggregation tool will be designed to calculate students' course grades. This will reduce some of the data manipulation currently required for calculating students' grades, so freeing our colleagues' time to engage in more meaningful work, teaching, and research, and reduce the risks and stress associated with this work. The student portal will enable our students to see all of their assessments, feedback, and grades in one place allowing them to consolidate their feedback and have easy access to their assessments. The portal will also be useful for facilitating meaningful discussions about improving learning between students and their advisers. Both of these tools will gather assessment data from Moodle.

Design work has come with proof-of-concept work and phased roll out planned over the coming months with the target of achieving full roll out by Easter 2021, with all students and staff in all four Colleges having access to both tools.

Academic Regulations

A planned review of academic regulations in light of lessons learned from the impact of the pandemic.

PGR Student Experience

The Vice Principal (Research) is leading a wholesale review of PGR governance arrangements including consideration of data and systems, with support being provided by the University's Transformation team. We anticipate that enhancements to the provision of data for each Graduate School and Research Institute, including more detailed scrutiny of data from the Postgraduate Research Experience Survey will improve the effectiveness and streamlining of the Graduate School Review process as well allowing these data to be used to drive activity and highlight good practice.

Alongside this the SRC President has prioritised work on developing PGR student representation and partnership within the developing governance structure. This will build on preparatory work undertaken during 2019-20 which included a mapping exercise of current PGR representation in each Graduate School which highlighted good practice which will inform the development of the new structure.

Approved by Planning and Business Intelligence

Approved by Academic Standards Committee

Approved by Vice Principal (Learning & Teaching)

University of Glasgow

Annual Report for the Scottish Funding Council

Institutional Report on Quality Assurance and Enhancement Academic Session 2019-2020

Periodic Subject Reviews

Subject Areas and Programmes Reviewed in Session 2019-2020

Computing Science

Undergraduate
BSc Honours (Combined) in Computing Science (and another subject)
BSc Honours Computing Science
BSc Honours Computing Science (Joint with SIT)
BSc Honours Computing Science (SIT)
BSc Honours Electronic & Software Engineering
BSc Honours Informatics
BSc Honours Informatics (Faster Route)
BSc Honours Software Engineering
BSc Honours Software Engineering (Graduate Apprenticeship)
MSci (Combined) in Computing Science (and another subject)
MSci in Computing Science
MSci in Informatics
MSci in Informatics (Faster Route)
MSci in Software Engineering
MSci in Software Engineering with Work Placement
MSci in Software Engineering with Work Placement (Faster Route)

Postgraduate
MSc Computing Science
MSc Computing Science and Psychology
MSc Data Science
MSc Information Security
MSc Information Technology
MSc IT Cyber Security
MSc Software Development

Economic and Social History

Undergraduate
MA Social Sciences (MA Soc Sci [Honours]), Single Honours degree in ESH
MA Social Sciences with Quantitative Methods (MA Soc Sci [Honours])
Combined Honours degrees in ESH and another subject offered from a range of subjects within the Colleges of Social Sciences; Arts; and Science and Engineering, subject to timetabling restrictions

Postgraduate
MSc in Global Economy (ESRC recognised 1+3 pathway)
Erasmus Mundus International Masters programme (IntM) Global Markets, Local Creativities (GLOCAL)
In addition, ESH offers or has recently offered course/s that contribute to the:

MSc programme in International Relations offered at the University of Glasgow's strategic partner, the University of Nankai.

Sociology

Undergraduate
MA (Soc Sci) Single Honours in Sociology
MA (Soc Sci) Joint Honours in Sociology (with Social Science subjects)
MA Joint Honours in Sociology (with Arts subjects)
MA (Soc Sci) Sociology with Quantitative Methods
MA (Soc Sci) Social Science (Three year 'Ordinary' Degree)

Postgraduate
MRes Criminology
MRes Equality & Human Rights
MRes Global Migrations & Social Justice
MRes Sociology & Research Methods
MSc Criminology & Criminal Justice
MSc Equality & Human Rights
MSc Global Migrations & Social Justice
MSc Media, Communications & International Journalism
MSc Sociology
MSc Transnational Crime, Justice & Security
PGCert Art Trafficking & Art Crime

Theology & Religious Studies

Undergraduate
BD Honours and General Degree
BD (Min) Honours and General Degree
MA Honours in Theology & Religious Studies (single honours)
MA Honours degree in Theology & Religious Studies (joint honours)

The Subject also contributes to the three-year general MA degree overseen by the College of Arts.

Postgraduate
MTh in Ministry, Theology & Practice

Periodic Subject Review (PSR) – Revised Schedule 2021 to 2026 (Pandemic adjustments)

College	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
Arts	Philosophy ~~Theatre, Film & TV Studies~~ ~~Classics~~ ~~History~~	Theatre, Film & TV Studies History Classics ~~Archaeology~~ ~~English Language & Literature and Scottish Literature~~	Archaeology English Language & Literature and Scottish Literature Information Studies ~~History of Art~~	History of Art ~~School of Modern Languages & Cultures~~ ~~Music~~	School of Modern Languages & Cultures Music ~~Celtic & Gaelic~~	~~Philosophy⁴~~ Theology & Religious Studies Celtic & Gaelic
	1	**3**	**3**	**1**	**2**	**2**
Medical, Veterinary & Life Sciences	Nursing & Health Care MVLS Graduate School: **PGT Cluster 2:** Medical Professions, Health & Wellbeing and Medical & Clinical Science	Dental School	School of Life Sciences	Medical Undergraduate School	School of Veterinary Medicine ~~MVLS Graduate School: PGT Cluster 1: Biomedical Science, Animal & Plant Sciences~~	~~MVLS Graduate School:? **PGT Cluster 2:**~~ ~~Medical Professions, Health & Wellbeing and Medical & Clinical Science⁵~~ MVLS Graduate School: **PGT Cluster 1:** Biomedical Science, Animal & Plant Sciences
	2	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**
Science & Engineering	School of Geographical & Earth Sciences ~~School of Chemistry~~	~~School of Mathematics & Statistics~~ School of Chemistry	School of Mathematics & Statistics ~~School of Psychology~~	School of Psychology School of Physics & Astronomy	School of Engineering TNE	School of Computing Science
	1	**1**	**1**	**2**	**2**	**1**
Social Sciences	Urban Studies ~~Economics~~	~~School of Interdisciplinary Studies~~ Economics	School of Interdisciplinary Studies ~~Accounting & Finance~~ Central & East European Studies	Accounting & Finance School of Education ~~School of Law~~ ~~Management~~	School of Law Management Politics	Economic & Social History Sociology
	1	**1**	**2**	**2**	**3**	**2**

Other PSR activity		LEADS (PG CAP and MEd)		Short Courses		
	0	1	0	1	0	0
Total PSR	5	7	7	7	8	6
Year of Cycle	1 of 4th	2 of 4th	3 of 4th	4 of 4th	5 of 4th	6 of 4th
Other ILR activity	Review of **Glasgow International College** (GIC) – provision covered by MoA **Professional Services Review**: Support for Disabled Students					

*To be deferred to PSR Cycle 2027-2032 as already featured in 2021-26 cycle.

	PSR deferred from 2020/21		PSR deferred from 2021/22		PSR deferred from 2022/23		PSR deferred from 2023/24		PSR deferred from 2024/25

Reviews by Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Bodies (PSRB)

PSRB Reviews conducted in Session 2019-20

The table below shows the PSRB outcomes for reviews held during session 2019-20.

School/Research Institute	PSRB	Outcome
School of Chemistry	Royal Society of Chemistry	Programmes have been reaccredited.
School of Education	General Teaching Council for Scotland	Programmes have been reaccredited.
School of Engineering	Institution of Engineering & Technology	Programmes have been reaccredited.
	Institute of Mechanical Engineers	*Review affected by Covid-19 (rescheduled to March 2021).*
School of Mathematics & Statistics	Royal Statistical Society	Programmes have been reaccredited.
School of Medicine, Dentistry & Nursing	Nursing & Midwifery Council	Programme has been reaccredited.
School of Veterinary Medicine	American Veterinary Medical Association	*Review affected by Covid-19 (rescheduled to March 2021).*
	Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons	*Review affected by Covid-19 (rescheduled to March 2021).*
	European Association of Establishments for Veterinary Education	*Review affected by Covid-19 (rescheduled to Feb 2021).*
	Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons	Programme has been accredited.

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 2 October 2020

Report of the Meeting of the Joint Board of the University of Glasgow and Edinburgh Theological Seminary held on 5 November 2019

Cover Sheet

Robbie Mulholland, Academic Collaborations Office

Brief Description of the Paper

The attached paper is the report of the meeting of the Joint Board of the University of Glasgow and Edinburgh Theological Seminary (ETS) held on 5 November 2019.

Action Requested

Academic Standards Committee is asked to **approve**:

- The remit and membership of the Joint Board of the University of Glasgow and Edinburgh Theological Seminary for 2019-20 (**Appendix 1**);

- The appointment of an ETS staff member as an Associate University Lecturer (**Appendix 2**).

Academic Standards Committee is asked to **note** the remainder of the report.

Recommended Person(s) responsible for taking action(s) forward

As indicated in the report.

Resource Implications

No resource implications for the University have been identified.

Timescale for Implementation

As indicated in the report.

Equality Implications

The paper does not propose a new or modified policy or practice for which an Equality Impact Assessment is required.

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 2 October 2020

Report from the Meeting of the Joint Board of the University of Glasgow and Edinburgh Theological Seminary held on 5 November 2019

Robbie Mulholland, Academic Collaborations Office

1. Remit and Membership 2019-20

The Board **agreed to recommend** the remit and membership of the Joint Board of the University of Glasgow (UoG) and Edinburgh Theological Seminary (ETS) (2019-20), to Academic Standards Committee (ASC) as detailed in **Appendix 1.**

2. Links with the University (Postgraduate Research Supervisor Training)

Staff from the College of Arts Graduate School had been in contact with colleagues at ETS to arrange Postgraduate Research (PGR) supervisor training and provisional dates had been arranged. Relevant ETS colleagues would be kept informed regarding arrangements.

3. Annual Report from ETS for Session 2018-19

The ETS Principal introduced the ETS Annual Report for session 2018-19 and acknowledged the support he had received from the ETS Vice-Principal in its preparation.

3.1 Learning and Teaching

- The Board was advised that the MTh in Missiology programme, which had been introduced in session 2018-19, had proved to be a very attractive offering and 6 students had registered in the first intake, with 17 MTh students admitted in total. Student engagement and satisfaction with the programme had been excellent. The work of the Centre was designed to have positive impact in four key areas:- the training of top-level educators in the mission sector; the employability of ETS students; the promotion of life-long learning; and engagement with the local community.

- The availability of Distance Learning (DL) technology continued to offer a flexible learning option for ETS students. A considerable number of students were engaged in part-time ministry and/or had young families, the demands of which often took them away from Edinburgh. DL allowed them to continue their studies off-campus. At the same time, ETS wanted to ensure a strong collegiate learning environment and encouraged DL students to attend in person where at all possible. This blended learning model offered both online and classroom learning and provided a flexible and workable learning environment for many ETS students.

- The vacant post in Scottish Church History remained unfilled - a recent round of recruitment having not identified a suitable candidate. He noted that filling this vacancy was made more challenging by the focus of the post which was specifically Scottish, however ETS considered it important to retain this dimension in view of the institution's expertise in this area.

3.2 Visas and Immigration

Following an inspection in early 2019, ETS had been advised by the UKVI of a shortcoming with regard to its Tier 4 licence arrangements which required review. However, following the resultant process of review and appeal, ETS had passed the UKVI Basic Compliance check.

Furthermore, as a result of ETS having met four years of UKVI Basic Compliance requirements and also four years of satisfactory outcomes in respect of QAA Review of Educational Oversight (Alternative Provider) visits, the UKVI had designated ETS as a Higher Education Provider (HEP). This brought with it some additional privileges for ETS in terms of Tier 4 sponsorship capability, something which ETS considered more accurately reflected its standing as an educational institution than had previously been the case while deemed by the UKVI to be an Alternative Provider (AP).

The Board was advised that the process of review and appeal had been a demanding one but the eventual outcome had been of real benefit to ETS as it had clarified the regulatory status of the institution and helped staff better understand UKVI rules governing Tier 4.

3.3 Student Recruitment and Recording of Admissions Interviews

The Board was advised that the ETS 2018-19 student intake which had brought the institution to near capacity underlined the need for ETS's admissions procedures to continue to be as robust as possible. All ETS applicants were interviewed prior to admission and ETS members enquired what the experience of UoG members had been in respect of admissions interviews, particularly with regard to the recording and use of interview information.

The Convener advised that interviews were usually only required as part of the University's admissions process for professional degree programmes such as Medicine or Law. Experience in the School of Medicine, Dentistry and Nursing suggested that the use of interviews was a useful aid to the admissions process in that it allowed participating staff and applicants the opportunity to draw out aspects of an application not always apparent from a written application. With regard to the recording of interviews this could be very useful in a number of ways:- for example, recordings could be used to demonstrate that interviews were carried out in a transparent and equitable manner; it was a useful visual record of meetings which could be used for various purposes such as appeals handling and could also be used to illustrate good interview practice for other admissions staff. Members observed that although, at present, ETS envisaged their recording of interviews to be undertaken via note-taking rather than by video-recording, compliance with Data Protection (DP) law would still be required. This would include being able to demonstrate a valid purpose for the collection of personal data and that systems and procedures were DP compliant.

3.4 Student Performance and Experience

- The ETS Principal noted that ETS was pleased with overall student achievement and progression in session 2018-19. In terms of retention there had been four withdrawals (three from illness and one for personal reasons). A total of 46 students had continued into session 2018-19 from 2017-18 (36 BTh and 10 MTh students).

- Student feedback at ETS was gathered via two separate questionnaires – one was a Course Quality Questionnaire (which covered a particular course) and the other a Student Satisfaction Questionnaire (which related to the whole student experience). Students were also encouraged to provide regular informal feedback where deemed appropriate. Student appreciation of the institution's strong collegiate ethos continued to be a recurring feature of feedback, and something that the institution placed great emphasis on. Activities such as communal dining and student peer support were encouraged and helped contribute to a strong sense of collective identity amongst the student body. Students had been asked to establish their own peer pastoral group and this would operate alongside the care provided by the Senate, Principal and Directors of Studies.

  An issue to emerge from feedback was in relation to perceived over-assessment in one particular department. This was being addressed via collaboration between the Board of Studies and the External Examiner and steps had been taken to ensure a

greater awareness in distinguishing between the demands of Level 2 and Level 3 courses.

- The number of female students at ETS had increased in recent years and the increased female participation on the new MTh in Missiology programme seemed likely to continue this trend. ETS had one female visiting lecturer and a female head of administration who provided pastoral support for students. The Board stressed that it was important that female students have access to a female academic role model who could provide academic guidance and direction from a female perspective.

  The ETS Senate had considered this matter and that proposals currently under consideration for an expanded Senate contained specific provision for female participation. ETS was very aware that female input to institutional decision-making at a senior level would be of great benefit. The Board was advised that female candidates were welcome to apply for any teaching vacancies that arose at ETS but such applications were rare. ETS continued efforts to diversify its teaching staff, however members noted that as women were not permitted to be ordained in the Free Church, this was perhaps a factor which affected the gender balance, of both staff and students, at ETS.

  ETS was investigating the scope to expand the role of a visiting female staff member to specifically include an element of academic counselling. Rev. Martin agreed to bring this matter to the attention of the ETS Senate.

3.5 Quinquennial Review

The Board was advised that ETS had undergone a Quinquennial Review during the period from September 2018 to April 2019. The review was undertaken by the Quinquennial Review Committee appointed by the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland.The purpose of the review was to assess the effectiveness of ETS as a vehicle for equipping students for various types of pastoral ministry, with particular regard to Free Church ministry. The Board was reminded that the Free Church did not have input to the academic content of ETS provision and sole authority in this regard rested with ETS.

The report of the Review commended ETS on its work but also included several recommendations that were aimed primarily at addressing the extent to which the current training of students provided good preparation for modern ministry. Two of the Quinquennial Review recommendations brought to the attention of the Board were:

1. A recommendation to enlarge the ETS Senate to incorporate:- two additional members; the Chair of the Seminary Board; the President of the ETS SRC and two additional advisors. It was expected, however, that not all new members would have voting rights. The new appointees would include female members. The Seminary Senate would meet shortly to discuss the details of the enlargement with any agreed changes to be implemented during the course of session 2019-20.

2. A recommendation that ETS, in collaboration with the Free Church Board of Ministry investigate the feasibility of reframing the Bachelor of Theology (BTh) as a four year programme which would incorporate a part-time ministry training module. It was envisaged that the BTh programme would still be offered as a three-year programme. Under the new model, each of the four years would carry 90 credits, compared to the current model of 120 credits in each of the three years. The remainder of the student's time would be given over to ministry work. The Quinquennial Review Committee's view was that the experience gained while studying under the suggested new format would provide a more effective transition to full-time ministry upon graduation. It had also been suggested that this would help alleviate the financial pressure faced by some students by allowing them to undertake paid employment during their studies.

The Board noted that, at present, the only option which facilitated study and employment concurrently was the part-time BTh programme. Given that the part-time option could take up to six years, the new model might help lessen the financial burden on some students while avoiding the need for them to transfer to part-time study. The ETS Principal considered that the specifically academic content of the programme was unlikely to change much, but recognised that a major programme amendment such as what had been suggested would require the approval of the University's Academic Standards Committee (ASC).

The Board was advised that the idea of reframing the structure of the BTh programme was speculative at this stage and no decision had been taken by ETS regarding whether the model in question should be adopted. The Board agreed that ETS should keep the University's Academic Collaborations Office (ACO) informed regarding developments in this regard.

3.6 PhD Joint Supervision

The ETS Principal advised the Board that, in the course of his overseas recruitment work on behalf of the Seminary, he had become aware of a substantial demand for PhD study in various fields in which ETS had expertise. He acknowledged, however, that the degree of PhD was not one of the validated programmes under the terms of the ETS-UoG Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) - although there was provision for ETS staff to undertake joint supervison of PhD students registered at the University, subject to the agreement of the College of Arts. ETS was therefore unable to guarantee the involvement of ETS staff in a supervisory capacity for a UoG PhD applicant, given that admissions, registration, supervisor allocation and award of the degree were the responsibility of the University.

The Board considered that it would be useful to establish what the MoA provided for with regard to PhD study and the Dean of Graduate Studies would consult the section of the document which referred to this matter. He also undertook to consult with colleagues in the College of Arts Graduate School regarding what scope, if any, they envisaged for expanded collaboration with ETS regarding PhD study.

3.7 Funding for Postgraduate Taught (PGT) Study

The Board noted reference in the Annual Report to the fact that students on PGT programmes at ETS were not eligible to receive funding from the Student Awards Agency for Scotland (SAAS) and some other funding bodies. ETS was a privately-funded institution and the funding bodies in question provided funding for programmes at publicly-funded institutions only. ETS were keeping this matter under review.

4. Report from the ETS Student Representative

The President of the ETS SRC gave an oral report on the student experience at ETS in session 2018-19:

- The student experience at ETS over the last session had been a very positive one with a strong sense of engagement apparent amongst the various cohorts. The increased number of students at ETS, particularly amongst the postgraduate cohort, had helped to further enhance the learning experience across the whole ETS community. He added that the ETS SRC had had some initial reservations regarding the potential impact which increased student numbers might have on the cohesion of the student body, but it was now generally acknowledged that the experience and enthusiasm brought by this new group of students had been of real benefit.

- The working relationship between students and staff at ETS continued to be very cordial with students highly appreciative of the quality and approachability of teaching staff. Students were also reassured by the pastoral support which was available to them should they require it. The teaching provided by Visiting Lecturers was also greatly appreciated

and students were pleased to welcome the appointment of a former Visiting Lecturer to the part-time staff complement.

- A new bookshop had opened in the ETS premises and this was proving extremely popular with students. It was particularly helpful in enabling students to source less well-known texts; and

- The President noted that ETS students were very aware of the Seminary's link with the University of Glasgow. They appreciated that the relationship not only allowed them the chance to earn a degree from a prestigious institution, but also the opportunity to draw on a range of digital resources and other sources of information and advice offered by the University.

5. Appointment of New Member of ETS Staff as Associate University Lecturer (AUL)

The Board **agreed to recommend** a new member of ETS staff to Academic Standards Committee for confirmation as an Associate University Lecturer (AUL), as detailed in **Appendix 2.**

6. New External Examiner – Biblical Studies (Old and New Testament)

The Board **received** the CV of the undernoted and **approved** his appointment as External Examiner at ETS in the field of Biblical Studies (Old and New Testament):

- Professor Andrew Clarke

  Honorary Professor, University of Aberdeen;

  Associate Lecturer, University of the West of Scotland; and

  Director of the Scottish Baptist College

7. Convener's Business

The Convener drew members' attention to the following matters of interest:

- As uncertainty continued to surround the UK's future relationship with the European Union (EU), the University had put in place several sources of information and advice to assist staff and students who might be affected by related matters, e.g., the requirement to apply for Settled Status under the EU Settlement Scheme.

- A new round of industrial action concerning pay and pensions was due to commence in the coming weeks. It was hoped that disruption to teaching would be kept to a minimum.

- The University's 'new' Senate had been established in August 2019 and its first meeting had taken place in October 2019. The creation of the 'new' Senate followed the approval of an Ordinance by the Privy Council and was intended to bring the body into line with the requirements of the Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act 2016.

- The University was in the process of finalising both its Learning and Teaching, and IT Infrastructure and Development Strategies. It was likely that some aspects of the two plans would overlap. Both Strategies would be in place for the next five years.

- The University's submission for the next Research Excellence Framework exercise (REF 2021) was nearing completion. The timetable for this exercise was strict and the review represented a substantial undertaking for an institution the size of the University of Glasgow. Staff engagement had been excellent, however, and the University remained on course to complete its submission on time; and

- The University's Campus Development Programme continued and the McCune Smith Learning and Teaching Hub was nearing completion. Some noise disruption had been experienced in teaching spaces in the nearby Boyd Orr Building but steps were being

taken to coordinate the periods of construction work with the teaching timetable in order to minimise disruption. Other major projects underway as part of the Campus Development Programme included the construction of the Research Hub and the Clarice Pears Building (Institute of Health and Well-being).

University of Glasgow and Edinburgh Theological Seminary

Title: Joint Board of the University of Glasgow and Edinburgh Theological Seminary

Remit:

1. To oversee the following programmes (taught or by research):

    (a) Bachelor of Theology

    (b) Master of Theology (by research)

    (c) Master of Theology in Scottish Church History and Theology

    (d) Master of Theology in Missiology

2. To make recommendations to the Senate of the University and to the Senate of the Seminary in respect of the validation of the above programmes.

3. To conduct periodic reviews of the above programmes, and make recommendations to the Senate of the University of Glasgow on the basis of their outcomes.

4. To make such recommendations as are appropriate to the Senate of the Seminary.

5. To consider, for transmission to the Senate of the University of Glasgow for its approval, all nominations of external examiners to the University Court for the programmes listed in item 1 above.

6. To consider annually:

    a) the recommendations of, and comments contained within, the reports of external examiners and the response of the Seminary to the reports;

    b) a report on the numbers and qualifications of students admitted to the validated programmes, and on the progress of students within the programmes;

    c) the nomination of members of the Seminary for recognition as teachers of the University;

    d) the nomination of members of the Joint Appeals Committee;

    e) To monitor and ensure that the terms and conditions and expectations that were originally approved have been, and continue to be, met;

    f) Ongoing risk management and maintenance of a risk register.

7. To receive annual reports on, and keep under continuing review, the operation of the Seminary's quality assurance procedures for all programmes overseen by the Joint Board.

8. To foster mutual understanding and co-operation and to encourage and review collaboration between the Seminary and the University in areas of common interest.

Quorum:

The quorum of the Joint Board shall be four and shall comprise at least two representatives from each institution

Joint Board of the University of Glasgow and Edinburgh Theological Seminary

Membership 2019-20

University of Glasgow

Clerk of Senate (Convener)	Professor Jill Morrison
Head of College of Arts (or nominee)	Professor Nick Fells (Dean of Graduate Studies)
Representative from the School of Critical Studies	Professor Charlotte Methuen
Representative from the School of Critical Studies	Dr Sean Adams
Representative from the College of Arts	Professor Nick Fells
SRC President (or nominee)	To be confirmed
Head of Academic Collaborations Office (or nominee)	Mr Robbie Mulholland

Edinburgh Theological Seminary

Principal of the Seminary (Vice Convener)	Reverend Iver Martin
Vice-Principal of the Seminary	Professor John A MacLeod
A Representative of the Teaching Staff	Dr Alistair Wilson
President of the ETS SRC	Mr Donald MacLeod

In attendance

Academic Collaborations Office (Minute taker)	Mr Graeme Shedden

New member of ETS staff nominated as an Associate University Lecturer (AUL):

Dr Harrison N Perkins

PhD, Queen's University Belfast

Master of Divinity, Westminster Seminary, California

Bachelor of Science in Communication Arts, University of Montevallo

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 2 October 2020

Report of the Meeting of the Joint Board of the University of Glasgow and Edinburgh Theological Seminary held on 21 April 2020

Cover Sheet

Robbie Mulholland, Academic Collaborations Office

Brief Description of the Paper

The attached paper is the report of the meeting of the Joint Board of the University of Glasgow and Edinburgh Theological Seminary (ETS) held on 21 April 2020.

Action Requested

Academic Standards Committee is asked to **approve**:

- The appointment of ETS staff members as Associate University Lecturers (AULs) (**Appendix 1**).

Academic Standards Committee is asked to **note** the remainder of the report.

Recommended Person(s) responsible for taking action(s) forward

As indicated in the report.

Resource Implications

No resource implications for the University have been identified.

Timescale for Implementation

As indicated in the report.

Equality Implications

The paper does not propose a new or modified policy or practice for which an Equality Impact Assessment is required.

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 2 October 2020

Report from the Meeting of the Joint Board of the University of Glasgow and Edinburgh Theological Seminary held on 21 April 2020

Robbie Mulholland, Academic Collaborations Office

1. Remit and Membership

The Board's remit and membership (2019-20) which had been approved at the last meeting still had to be approved by Academic Standards Committee (ASC). ASC had not met as expected in March 2020 owing to the Covid crisis. It was expected that the remit and membership would be considered when ASC next met.

2. PGR Supervisor Training

It was noted that the College of Arts had indicated that they would provide PGR supervisor training for relevant ETS staff, however restrictions brought about by the pandemic had prevented this being developed at this time. Planning for this was therefore at a preliminary stage and it was hoped to be able to take this forward when circumstances had stabilised. Members observed that this type of training did lend itself to remote delivery.

3. Staffing

The ETS Principal had communicated to the ETS Senate that the Board and ETS faculty staff were in favour of expanding the role of an existing female visiting staff member to include academic counselling, primarily for the female student population.

The issue of gender diversity in the faculty was being considered and the Seminary leadership remained cognisant of the importance of diversifying the make up of the teaching staff complement.

4. ETS Quinquennial Review

Among the outcomes of the ETS Quinquennial Review had been a recommendation that ETS give consideration to restructuring the BTh programme. The ETS Principal noted that ETS would benefit from guidance on creating a proposal document should ETS decide to go ahead with restructuring. Advising staff in the College of Arts would be asked to advise the ETS Principal on this matter.

5. PhD Joint Supervision

In relation to joint PhD supervision arrangements, it was noted that further discussion was necessary to establish whether additional formal provision was required in areas such as admissions, fee splits and general administration. It was agreed that a meeting involving the Dean of Graduate Studies, College of Arts, the ETS Principal and other relevant ETS and UoG staff be arranged to discuss this matter further.

6. ETS Interim Report (Session 2019-20)

The ETS Principal noted that the Seminary had been guided by the University in the nature and timing of its actions in response to the Covid pandemic. Some uncertainty over the modes of assessment to be employed this year had been resolved and ETS leadership was currently reviewing its response to the crisis on a day-to-day basis. Proposals to review the composition and size of the Seminary Senate had also been delayed.

The institution's policy on the process of admissions for session 2020-21 had been finalised. At the time of the meeting, the mode of teaching for semester one had not been entirely settled upon, but it was noted that remote teaching had been a popular feature of learning at the institution for some time.

Student engagement had unfortunately been limited by the circumstances, and ETS leadership were attempting to re-schedule a meeting with the ETS Student Representative Council (ETS SRC) which had been postponed in late March.

7. Student Representative Report

The ETS Student President introduced the SRC report.

- The President was pleased to note that the strong collegiate atmosphere that existed among the ETS student body had continued despite the Covid crisis, and the students remained an invaluable source of support for one another.

- ETS students had a very positive view of the remote learning relied upon since the crisis began, and they were expected to be entirely supportive should this form of teaching be used at the beginning of the next academic year.

- The launch of a new process to allow students to engage further with Mission across the Church had unfortunately been postponed, but it was hoped to continue with this in the new session.

8. New Members of ETS Staff (Associate University Lecturers)

The Board **agreed to recommend** new members of ETS staff to Academic Standards Committee for confirmation as Associate University Lecturers (AULs), as detailed in **Appendix 1.**

9. Items Remitted from the Seminary Senate

The ETS Principal drew members' attention to recent discussion at the Seminary Senate.

In the course of planning for the next academic session, the Seminary Senate had sought guidance from the University on whether face-to-face teaching was anticipated in semester one of session 2020-21. The Convener noted that, at the time of the meeting, the University leadership was considering a range of different options, including online teaching at the maximum feasible level, and blends of learning types in different proportions. It was hoped that a rough outline of the University's plans in this regard would be available within the next four weeks.

The University was conscious of the need to establish clarity around these issues as soon as possible, particularly for international students. The Convener noted that the University would be in communication with its partner institutions as the policy was developed.

10. Convener's Business

- The Convener noted the rapid and substantial changes that had been made to the learning and examination environments at the University. Almost all teaching had been

successfully moved online, and the examination diet was proceeding at the time of the meeting, with exams being held remotely and arrangements subject to continuous review.

The Convener paid tribute to all of the University's academic, administrative and IT staff involved in the development of the policy and technical elements of the process, noting the great speed with which these solutions had been reached. Some policy issues around the exam diet were likely to evolve further as circumstances developed. This was expected to continue until the completion of the relevant exam boards – however, the concept of 'no detriment' would be the University's guiding principle in all of these decisions.

- Sadly, the restrictions had necessitated the cancellation of physical graduation ceremonies in summer 2020, although it was hoped to arrange a ceremony of celebration for this year's cohort when circumstances allowed.

- Building work on the University's campus development programme had been paused. Although it was intended to complete the James McCune Smith Learning and Teaching Hub, potentially for use in early 2021, the timetable for the remainder of the programme would be subject to review, given the financial impact the pandemic was expected to have across the Higher Education sector.

The Dean of Graduate Studies, College of Arts noted that the Convener had been instrumental in shaping many aspects of the University's response to the challenges facing learning and teaching, and on behalf of the Board, expressed his gratitude for her efforts in this regard.

11. Publications/Publicity Materials

The Convener thanked ETS members for continuing to send the University copies of their publicity materials which referenced the University. Under the QAA Quality Code, the University was responsible for reviewing such materials published by its validated institutions prior to publication.

12. Electronic Resources

The Board was advised regarding the great value that ETS students and staff placed on having access to the University's electronic library resources and noted that there were some limitations on this dependent on academic status. He noted that guidance on the permissions associated with electronic access would be very helpful particularly in view of the restrictions that were in place on physically accessing resources at some libraries. The Clerk would liaise with the University Library and relevant colleagues to seek guidance on this matter and to establish whether there was any scope to relax these limitations for ETS members in the current circumstances.

13. Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Board would be held in, or around, November 2020.

New members of ETS staff nominated as Associate University Lecturers (AULs):

New members of staff CVs:

David Miller

Year	Place of Study	Subject	Grade Achieved
1980	Pembroke College, Oxford	BA Modern History	3rd class Honours
1984	University of London (as external student while at the Bible Training Institute, Glasgow)	BD	Upper 2nd class Honours
1998	University of Edinburgh	MTh in Non-Western Christianity	Distinction
2010	University of Manchester	PhD – "Choosing the Other – Conversion to Christianity in Japan"	Passed with minor corrections

Dates	Employer	Position Held/ Responsibility
2016 - present	Highland Theological College (University of the Highlands and Islands)	Visiting lecturer in Mission Studies
2014 - present	Tilsley College, Motherwell	Visiting lecturer in World Religions
January 2014 to present	United Free Church of Scotland	Minister at Millerston United Free Church of Scotland
1998 – 2014	International Christian College, Glasgow	Lecturer in Mission Studies (Vice-Principal 2009-13) Part-time from September 2013 – June 2014
1997 – 98	Queen Margaret University College, Edinburgh	Visiting lecturer in Japanese language
1984-97	OMF International	Missionary, in Japan from 1986-96, also working on home staff from 1984-6 and from 1996-7
1980-81	St. Ebbe's Church, Oxford	Lay assistant

YAZMIN SMART

EDUCATION

Clinical Pastoral Education CPE: Adventhealth Tampa. Tampa, Florida, USA. August 2019 – December 2019.

MTh in Reformed Theology: University of the Highlands and Islands. Highland Theological College. Dingwall, Scotland. 2015.

Ordained as a Minister of Religion: Iglesia Cristiana Misionera el Sol. Denomination Pentecostal. Bogota, Colombia. 02/2002.

Theological Studies Degree (B.Th. Honours): Seminary Biblical of Colombia. Medellín. Colombia. BA Honours.1999.

Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN. Honours): Fundación Universitaria Ciencias de la Salud, Hospital San José. Bogotá, Colombia. South America. BA Honours.1995.

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 2 October 2020

Scotland's Rural College (SRUC): Proposal to Separate the Institution-led Review and Revalidation Procedures

Cover Sheet

Robbie Mulholland, Clerk, Joint Liaison Committee of the University of Glasgow and Scotland's Rural College (SRUC)

Brief Description of the Paper

The attached paper outlines a proposal from Scotland's Rural College (SRUC) to change its current practice of conducting Institution-led Review and revalidation of programmes concurrently, to a process whereby Institution-led Review will be held in advance of the revalidation event. The paper outlines current practice, the rationale for the change and the proposed revised procedure.

Action Requested

Academic Standards Committee (ASC) is asked to **consider** and **approve** SRUC's proposal to separate its Institution-led Review process from its revalidation procedure as outlined in the attached paper.

Recommended Persons Responsible for Taking the Action(s) Forward

SRUC's Head of Learning & Teaching, Registrar and Quality Assurance Lead.

Timescale for Implementation

Subject to ASC approval, the revised procedure will be implemented in session 2021-22 as per the attached proposed schedule. ASC is asked to note that there are no SRUC programmes due for revalidation in session 2020-21.

Equality Implications

SRUC promotes equality and diversity in all aspects of its activities. It will consider the need for an Equality Impact Assessment to be undertaken with respect to the proposal in due course.

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 2 October 2020

Scotland's Rural College (SRUC): Proposal to Separate the Institution-led Review and Revalidation Procedures

Karen Gray, Quality Assurance Lead, Scotland's Rural College (SRUC)

SRUC is proposing to change the current practice of running both the Institution-led Review and Revalidation of programmes concurrently to a process whereby the Institution-led Review will be held in advance of the revalidation event.

Current Practice

SRUC's Institution-Led Review (ILR) process operates on a six-year schedule, with subjects with similar focus being grouped together for review. Previously, this operated via our departmental structure. Following restructure of the Academic Division, which dismantled the old departments, Boards of Studies were introduced to oversee revised subject groupings. This has resulted in changes to the anticipated ILR schedule submitted in 2019 (see appendix one for revised schedule).

Being a small, specialist institution, no more than two subject groups are reviewed each year, allowing full support of teams undergoing the process. Currently, SRUC combines the ILR process with revalidation. This requires teams to prepare all documentation for both events at the same time. This is then reviewed together, over a period of two consecutive days.

Rationale for change

During 2018/19 the Engineering, Science and Technology Department underwent Institution-led Review, but the revalidation of the degree programmes was delayed (with approval from the Academic Standards Committee) due to institutional restructuring within SRUC. The revalidation of the Engineering, Science and Technology programmes subsequently took place in 2019/20. Staff noted at the time, that separating the two processes allowed them to focus more effectively on reflection in the first instance enabling a greater impact on the revalidation process. The majority of the actions arising from the review helped to inform the development of the revised programmes.

In 2019/20 the Countryside and Environment programmes underwent the normal Institution-led Review and revalidation concurrently and although they achieved very high quality outputs for both, they agreed that having the process separated would have allowed them to focus more on each aspect individually, potentially improving the overall outcome in terms of the revalidated programmes.

Proposal

As noted above, SRUC is proposing to separate the ILR and revalidation procedures. Appendix 1 indicates the planned schedule for both activities.

In 2020/21, there are no programme scheduled for revalidation. The subject groupings scheduled for ILR do not currently have any degree programmes.

In 2021/22, all Animal Care, Equine and Veterinary Nursing programmes are due to undergo ILR as per the original schedule. The BSc Veterinary Nursing was newly validated in

2017/18 with the first year of delivery in 2018/19 so the plan to revalidate in 2022/23 will fit effectively with this proposal. These programmes are all now part of the Animal and Veterinary Science Board of Studies which will undergo ILR again in 2024/25, so will be reviewed again at that time, taking a lighter touch to bring them back into line with the rest of the schedule.

For the majority of the existing degree programmes e.g. Agriculture, the ILR event will take place a year earlier than previously planned but the revalidation will still take place as per the original timetable.

The underpinning processes supporting the validation and revalidation of programmes within SRUC have recently been reviewed and this review will be extended to the ILR process in the coming academic year. It is anticipated that the new processes, templates and support planned for these activities will assist programme teams to make the best use of the opportunity presented by separating out these two significant events in the lifecyle of a programme.

Appendix One: Revised Schedule of ILRs

Table 1: Revised ILR/Revalidation Schedule

Subject Grouping/Thematic Area	ILR	Revalidation
Golf, Greenkeeping and Hospitality	2020/21*	N/A
Work-Based Learning	2020/21	N/A
Veterinary and Animal Science	2021/22**	2022/23 (BSc Veterinary Nursing only)
Horticulture and Landscape	2021/22	2022/23
Agriculture and Business Management	2022/23	2023/24
Student Support Services	2022/23	N/A
Postgraduate Research	2023/24	N/A
Forestry, Forgework and Landbased Engineering	2024/25	2025/26
Veterinary and Animal Science	2024/25**	2025/26
Environment and Countryside	2025/26	2026/27

* We have petitioned for GGH's ILR to take place in 2021/22 due to extenuating circumstances relating to one of teams involved.

** Owing to the new groupings under the new Boards of Studies, HN Animal Care, HN Equine Studies and BSc Veterinary Nursing are due for review in 2021/22, while BSc Applied Animal Science is not due until 2024/25. It is anticipated that while the first undergo review in 2021/22, they will also be incorporated in the 2024/25 review activity, but with a light touch approach. This should bring the programmes within these subject groupings in line.

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 2 October 2020

Report of the Meeting of the Joint Liaison Committee of the University of Glasgow and Scotland's Rural College (SRUC) held on 27 November 2019

Cover Sheet

Robbie Mulholland, Academic Collaborations Office

Brief Description of the Paper

The attached paper is the report of the meeting of the Joint Liaison Committee of the University of Glasgow and Scotland's Rural College (SRUC) held on 27 November 2019.

Action Requested

Academic Standards Committee is asked to **approve**:

- The Remit and Membership of the Joint Liaison Committee of the University of Glasgow and Scotland's Rural College (SRUC) (2018-19) as detailed in **Appendix 1**;
- The appointment of SRUC staff members as Associate University Lecturers (AULs) as detailed in **Appendix 2.**

Academic Standards Committee is asked to **note** the remainder of the report.

Recommended Person(s) responsible for taking action(s) forward

As indicated in the report.

Resource Implications

No resource implications for the University have been identified.

Timescale for Implementation

As indicated in the report.

Equality Implications

The paper does not propose a new or modified policy or practice for which an Equality Impact Assessment is required.

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 2 October 2020

Report from the Meeting of the Joint Liaison Committee of the University of Glasgow and Scotland's Rural College held on 27 November 2019

Robbie Mulholland, Academic Collaborations Office

1. Joint Liaison Committee (JLC) Remit and Membership 2019-20

Members received the proposed Remit and Membership of the committee for session 2019-20. It was noted that there was no time limit attached to membership appointments made to the JLC. Following discussion, members agreed that they were content for the current arrangement whereby members attended according to their remit within the relevant academic or administrative unit, without specified term of appointment, to continue. This, it was felt, would help to maximise the level of relevant expertise that the committee could draw upon.

The Committee **agreed to recommend** the remit and membership of the Joint Liaison Committee of the University of Glasgow (UoG) and Scotland's Rural College (SRUC) (2019-20) to Academic Standards Committee (ASC) as detailed in **Appendix 1.**

2. Associate University Lecturers (AULs) – Removal of Records

The Clerk updated the Committee on the removal from the University IT system of the records of former SRUC employees listed as Associated University Lecturers (AULs). A list of relevant staff members had been passed between the institutions, and removal would be performed as part of a wider exercise involving the former employees listed as AULs of all the University's Validated Institutions.

3. SRUC Enhancement-led Institutional Review

The SRUC Registrar advised members that SRUC had undergone Enhancement-led Institutional Review in the first half of 2019 – the planning visit took place in March and the review visit in May. The outcome of the review was that SRUC was found to have **effective** arrangements in place for managing academic standards and the student learning experience. Under the ELIR process, the grading of **effective** was the best result available to institutions. SRUC was pleased with the outcome and had found the process and recommendations arising from it to be very informative.

4. Interim Meeting for Administrative Officers

The Committee **received** the notes of the interim meeting for administrative officers held on 26 June 2019. This group comprised the SRUC Registrar and relevant staff from the University's Academic Collaborations Office (ACO) and provided a forum for the consideration of operational matters linked to the validation relationship.

The Committee heard that the interim meeting had considered whether there was a need to formalise within the Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) between UoG and SRUC, reference to the additional support required with regard to the BSc Veterinary Nursing programme. This related to several specific responsibilities placed upon SRUC and UoG, by the accrediting body (the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons (RCVS), regarding oversight of quality assurance arrangements.

The Clerk advised members that the interim meeting had agreed that the required quality assurance activity was already adequately accommodated by the existing terms of the existing

MoA. However, the Academic Collaborations Office (ACO) would keep the matter under review going forward.

5. SRUC Annual Report (2018-19)

The SRUC Registrar introduced the SRUC Annual Report for session 2018-19:

i Reviews

Two SRUC Institution-led Reviews (ILRs) were held in session 2018-19, with considerable preparatory work being undertaken by staff for these events. A thematic review of the postgraduate research student experience was now included in the SRUC ILR schedule and the first review of this activity had been held in September 2018. It had proved very positive in clarifying many aspects of the postgraduate research student journey. This was followed by an ILR of programmes within the Engineering, Science and Technology area in April 2019.

The programme of reviews had culminated in SRUC's Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR), which as mentioned in item 3 above, had found SRUC to be *'effective'* with regard to managing academic standards and the student learning experience. SRUC were very gratified to receive commendations in the following areas: communications with staff; academic staff development; supporting individual student journeys; and mental health awareness and support.

The ELIR report made 7 recommendations (summarised below) and these related to matters which SRUC had already identified as requiring development. Progress against the recommendations had been integrated into the institution's Action Plan which had been formally approved by SRUC senior management.

- Effective use of academic committee structures
- Distance learning student experience
- Preparation for teaching
- Responding to student views
- Feedback to students on assessed work
- Using data to enhance the student experience
- Careers advice

On the first recommendation, regarding the effectiveness of academic committee structures, the SRUC Registrar noted that significant changes in the SRUC management structure which had occurred shortly before the ELIR had meant that the attendant new committee structure had not been in place long at the time of the review. The JLC was assured that significant improvement had already been observed in the operation of committees.

ii Student Feedback

The SRUC Registrar reported that, in general, SRUC's National Student Survey (NSS) results had been disappointing. However, results had shown a slight increase in overall student satisfaction by 2.3 percentage points to 72.17%. This was against a benchmark of 84.42%, a Scotland rating of 84.18% and HE sector rating of 83.65%.

The institution had experienced a 10% increase in Year 4 participation, and it was noted that, as in previous years, due to the criteria governing student eligibility, only fourth year degree and some second year HND students were within the HESA-determined target audience. Consequently the NSS results were based on 232 responses, which accounted for 75% of the eligible target audience. It was noted that SRUC did not operate targets on a year-to-year basis, and the focus for this academic session had been on increased survey participation.

Over the course of the last session, SRUC had piloted the use of app-based student surveys during teaching. Although the particular app employed had proved to be somewhat disappointing, both the student reaction to it and the capacity to incorporate its use within teaching in real time had been excellent. This initiative would be continued in subsequent years with alternative apps.

iii *Progression to Honours*

Members were advised that improving progression rates to Honours level among undergraduates remained an issue in many SRUC programmes. Two main factors lay behind the trend not to continue to Honours – the first being relatively high level of employment opportunities in rural sectors, leading many students to enter paid employment on completion of the Ordinary degree rather than undertake Honours study. The second factor related to the fact that significant numbers of undergraduates initially entered SRUC for one-year further education courses, and so had already exceeded their qualification expectations by completing the Ordinary degree.

Although steps were being taken to encourage students to progress to Honours, such as the creation of internships within SRUC's consultancy arm, SRUC leadership acknowledged that the above trends were ones that the institution had little control over. Furthermore, these factors actually indicated successful attainment on the part of students.

iv *BA in Sports Coaching*

The transfer of the BA in Sports Coaching programme to the University of the West of Scotland (UWS) was now complete. The transfer had been managed successfully and SRUC members extended their thanks to the members of staff at UWS who had been involved in this exercise.

v. Annual Monitoring Reports

The SRUC Registrar noted that full copies of all annual monitoring reports had not been provided but the reports had been synthesised in the annual report. SRUC's Annual Monitoring Process, in summary involved:

- Preparation of annual monitoring reports, to include a quality enhancement plan, for all programmes;

- Collation of programme annual monitoring reports within the relevant Board of Studies to produce a subject report and quality enhancement plan;

- Submission of all Board of Studies and student support services reports to the Quality Team;

- Review of all Subject and Student Support Services reports by the quality Team to identify key themes; and

- Production of the annual institution monitoring report and enhancement plan by the Quality Team.

vi. Appeals

SRUC had received three appeals from final year honours students. One was from a student claiming mitigation that had not been disclosed during the academic year. It was not upheld. The second related to a coursework submission and was allied to a wider complaint about communication with the teaching staff. The appeal was not upheld and the complaint was investigated at stage two and also not upheld. The third appeal was against an Honours classification and was currently on hold pending the submission of medical evidence.

vii. Academic Misconduct

There were seven cases of academic misconduct during the year. One case escalated to major misconduct as the student had originally used a large amount of unreferenced material from the internet and then repeated the same offence later in the academic year.

All the other incidents were treated as minor misconduct. These related to plagiarism in a range of assessments and were dealt with by the Programme Teams, who applied appropriate penalties.

6. BSc Veterinary Nursing Programme

The BSc in Veterinary Nursing programme was now in its second year of operation. Although there had been challenges involved in converting the programme to a degree award from an HND, it had proved to be a great success.

The SRUC Registrar expressed her thanks to staff of the School of Veterinary Medicine for its support in helping to launch the degree programme. The Head of the School of Veterinary Medicine noted that the School was pleased to support this initiative, but noted that the current level of staffing support would be kept under review. He undertook to liaise with SRUC on this matter going forward.

7. Consideration of new Associate University Lecturers (AULs)

The JLC **agreed to recommend** new members of SRUC staff to Academic Standards Committee for confirmation as Associate University Lecturer (AULs), as detailed in **Appendix 2.**

8. Student Report

The President of SRUC's Student Association (SRUCSA) gave a verbal report on the activities of the Association in session 2018-19:

- SRUCSA was currently engaged in a process of restructuring. This had been thought necessary for some time and the organisational change programme being undertaken by SRUC was seen as a suitable time for SRUCSA also to review various aspects of its operation.

- SRUCSA continued to work with SRUC on the Healthy Learning and Wellbeing Strategy which was designed to support staff and students physical and mental health. The Association continued to promote good mental health and the support available included the Shady Black Dog campaign among other activities. SRUCSA was engaged in a mapping exercise to establish the level of support available across all SRUC campuses, and where these could be improved and homogenised.

- The activities grouped under the Student Participation in Quality Scotland (SPARQS) umbrella which helped to engage students with the running of the institution, continued to be a success. SRUCSA's Tea and Talk events commenced this year and the Speak Week initiative would take place shortly. Although SRUCSA remained accessible at all times for students to share their views, events of this nature were a way to reach students who might not otherwise engage.

- SRUCSA continued to engage in environmental initiatives, with the Environmental Sub-committee having been established to oversee these activities. This included the launch of several petitions. The Association continued to promote further engagement among stakeholders on a range of environmental matters including efforts to reduce the use of plastic and increase participation in cycling.

9. Convener's Business

The Convener drew members' attention to the following matters of interest:

- The University's campus development programme was proceeding well, with the James McCune Smith Learning and Teaching Hub nearing completion, and work commencing on the new Research Hub and Wellbeing Institution;

- The University was engaged in a number of transformation processes, involving consultation and review of several aspects of University business. The Convener would keep the Committee informed as these progressed;

- Industrial action had taken place during the week of the JLC meeting - the impact on students to date appeared to have been minimal;

- The Convener had participated in a very positive discussion on climate change at the last meeting of the University Senate; and

- The University looked forward to the appointment of a new Rector in the early months of 2020.

**University of Glasgow
Joint Liaison Committee for the University of Glasgow and SRUC
Remit and Membership
2019-20**

Remit

The Liaison Committee will meet annually to:

a) consider an annual report on the performance of all of the programmes leading to awards of the University delivered wholly or jointly by SRUC;

b) monitor and ensure that the terms and conditions and expectations that were originally approved have been, and continue to be, met;

c) ongoing risk management and maintenance of a risk register.

Membership

University of Glasgow

Clerk of Senate [Convener]	Professor Jill Morrison
Head of School of Life Sciences	Professor Simon Guild
Head of School of Veterinary Medicine	Professor Ewan Cameron
University Member (College of Medical Veterinary and Life Sciences) or SRUC Member of SRUC's Education Board (or its successor)	Professor Jim Anderson (nominee for Professor Maureen Bain, Dean of Learning and Teaching, MVLS)
University Member (Crichton Campus representative, College of Social Sciences)	Dr Donald MacLeod
Head of Academic Collaborations Office (or nominee)	Jackie McCluskey
SRC Representative (or nominee)	Hannah Mylin

Scotland's Rural College (SRUC)

Principal (or nominee) [Vice Convener]	Professor Jamie Newbold, Academic Director
Registrar	Dr Kyrsten Black
Head of Learning and Teaching	Dr Pauline Hanesworth
Quality Manager	Karen Martyniuk
Student Representative (SRUC Student Association Sabbatical President)	Hayley Colbert

In Attendance
Teaching Group Managers and/or Programme Leaders, as and if required.

Academic Collaborations Manager	Robbie Mulholland
Administrative Assistant (Academic Collaborations Office)	Graeme Shedden

New members of SRUC staff nominated as Associate University Lecturers (AULs):

New members of staff CVs:

Hannah Scorgie

Lecturer in Agriculture, Agriculture and Business Management Department

Qualifications:

BSc (hons) Agriculture

Previous posts:

Project Manager/Assistant Lecturer – SRUC

Lecturer in Agriculture – Dundee and Angus College

General Farm Worker – Ian Cooper and Partners

Craig Davidson

Lecturer in Agriculture, Agriculture and Business Management Department

Qualifications:

MSc in Agriculture Education, California Polytechnic University

Clear Subject and Agriculture Specialist Credential, California State University, Fresno

Bachelors of Science in Agriculture, California State University, Fresno

Previous posts:

Agriculture Instructor, Kern High School District, Bakersfield California, 2006-2019

Cath Milne

Lecturer in Agriculture, Agriculture and Business Management Department

Qualifications:

PhD in Agricultural economics, 2004

PGDip Farm business organisation and management, 1988

BSc Agriculture (Animal Science), 1983

Previous posts:

Course tutor for PG Dip/MSc Farm business organisation and management (FBOM) (validated by University of Aberdeen), 1999-2003

As a farm consultant, directly involved in transferring knowledge between researchers and industry in the 1980s and 1990s.

Work in recent years has been focused on research activities but involvement in teaching has continued and Cath is currently the 4th year tutor for students on the Agriculture degree programme at SRUC Edinburgh as well as being a guest lecturer at the Global Academy (University of Edinburgh) and SRUC.

Foteini Manolaraki

Researcher, Agricultural Professional Practice, Agriculture and Business Management Department

Qualifications:

Qualified from the Veterinary School of Thessaloniki, Greece, 2005

Master's degree, PhD and post doctorate studies in Parasitology at the National Research Institute (INRA)/Veterinary School of Toulouse (ENVT), France

Previous posts:

After completing her postgraduate studies in 2014, Foteini joined the SRUC Veterinary Services

Alex Reynolds

Lecturer in Agricultural Bioscience; Engineering, Science and Technology Department

Qualifications:

BSc Horticulture

MSc Landscape and Wellbeing (Pending qualification confirmation)

MCIoH (Member of Chartered Institute of Horticulture)

Previous posts:

Worked in Land Management for the National Trust

Commercial horticultural enterprises – Hayes and Notcutts

Lecturer at Edinburgh and Glasgow, 2018

Jos Houdjik

Researcher, Applied Poultry Science, Agriculture and Business Management Department

Qualifications:

PhD in Animal Nutrition

Previous posts:

PDRS, Research Scientist, Senior Research Scientist (SRUC/SAC 1998-2014)

Andrew Innes

Lecturer, Environmental Resource Management, Countryside and Environment Department

Qualifications:

BSc (Hons) Environmental Protection (SRUC/University of Edinburgh) (1st) - 2014

Ph.D. Environmental and Atmospheric Sciences (University of Edinburgh) – 2019

MSc in Education – Ongoing

Previous posts:

Scottish Government – Statistician (June 2018 – October 2018)

University of Edinburgh – Researcher in Environmental Geochemistry (2014-2019)

Elliot Meador

Researcher, Environmental Resource Management, Countryside and Environment Department

Qualifications:

Doctorate of philosophy in Rural Sociology, University of Missouri at Columbia, 2011-2015

PhD Minor in Applied Statistics, University of Missouri at Columbia, 2001-2015

Masters of Science in Community Development, Delta State University Cleveland, MS, 2008-2010

Bachelor of Social Science Education, Delta State University Cleveland, MS, 2033-2008

Previous posts:

Research Assistant for ExCEED, University of Missouri, 2011-2015

University of Mississippi, Researcher at Institute for Community-Based Research, 2010-2011

Petra Vergunst

MSc Supervisor, Organic Farming, Agriculture and Business Management Department

Qualifications:

PhD Rural Development, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Uppsala, 2003

MSc Forestry, Wageningen Agricultural University, The Netherlands, 1996

Previous posts:

Tutor on the Identiplant distance learning course hosted by the Botanical Society of Britain and Ireland and the Field Studies Council, 2019-ongoing

Field ecology (biological recording and public engagement) with a focus on vascular plants, bryophytes, butterflies, moths and other insects (various organisations), 2017 – ongoing

Freelance community artist working with a range of councils, museums and community organizations, often in rural settings, 2011 – 2017

Tutor on distance learning courses on sustainable communities and research and critical thinking skills (part-time), IBP Academy, Scotland, 2010 – 2013

Research Fellow in rural community development (part-time), Institute for Rural Research, School of Geosciences, University of Aberdeen, 2008 - 2010

James Dick

Lecturer in Rural Business Management (External RICS Specialist), Agriculture and Rural Business Management Department

Qualifications:

BSc (Hons) Agriculture

Dip Farm Business Organisation and Management

Fellow of the Association of Agricultural Valuers

Associate of the Chartered Institute of Arbitrators

Chartered Environmentalist

Recognised European Valuer

Past Member of the RICS

<u>Previous posts:</u>

Past President Scottish Agricultural Arbiters and Valuers Association

Past President Central Association of Agricultural Valuers

Convenor Valuation Compensation and Taxation Committee for CAAV

Part-time lecturer at SRUC and Aberdeen University

Chief Examiner for CAAV Exams in Scotland

Hazel Highet

Lecturer in Veterinary Nursing, Animal Care and Veterinary Nursing Department

<u>Qualifications:</u>

HNC & HND Animal Care then progressing into HNC Animal Nursing & HND Veterinary Nursing at the Barony College

Registered as an RVN in 2011

<u>Previous posts:</u>

Head Veterinary Nurse at Nithsdale Vets in Dumfries, 2012-2017

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 2 October 2020

Remit and Composition 2020-21

Mrs Ruth Cole, Clerk to the Committee

ASC is invited to approve its remit and composition for 2020-21 as detailed below.

The role of the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) is to assist the Education Policy & Strategy Committee (EdPSC) in its implementation of the University's Learning & Teaching Strategy through assurance and enhancement of the quality of educational provision and through maintenance of standards. ASC reports to EdPSC, and also oversees the approval process for undergraduate and postgraduate taught degree programmes on behalf of EdPSC and Senate.

Specifically ASC will:

1. Advise EdPSC on matters relating to the University's academic regulatory processes, including the revision and development of academic regulations in the University, and also the implementation of regulatory policy.

2.1 Develop and monitor the University's process for approval of new programmes and changes to its taught programme provision. In operating this process, where appropriate, approve (on behalf of EdPSC and Senate) College proposals for new undergraduate and postgraduate taught degree programmes and major changes to programmes, including those delivered in collaboration with other institutions.

2.2 On behalf of EdPSC and Senate, present for consideration by the University Court and General Council of the University Court, information to contribute to the formulation of Draft Resolutions instituting new awards or revising existing awards.

3. Receive a summary report on Annual Monitoring (via College Quality Officers) and monitor and disseminate responses to actions identified. Consider and recommend changes to annual monitoring procedures as necessary.

4. Monitor internal subject reviews (Periodic Subject Review) by receiving review reports, identifying issues or recommendations requiring action in other areas of the University and monitoring responses to actions or recommending further action as necessary. Consider and recommend changes to procedures for internal subject review as necessary.

5. Monitor external examiners' reports through receipt of the annual summary report from Senate Office identifying issues or recommendations requiring action in other areas of the University and monitoring responses to actions or recommending further action as necessary. Consider and recommend changes to external examining procedures as necessary.

6. Monitor the University's taught programme provision from accredited and associated institutions by receiving their validation/revalidation and joint committee reports.

7. Monitor accreditation reports from Professional and Statutory Bodies (PSBs) identifying issues or recommendations requiring action in other areas of the University and monitoring responses to actions or recommending further action as necessary.

Composition

Convener

Two members of academic staff from each College with a **third** member of academic staff from the College of Medical, Veterinary & Life Sciences

College Quality Officers

Clerk of Senate

Vice Principal (Learning & Teaching)

Head of the Registry (or nominee)

Director of the Senate Office (or nominee)

Director of IT Services (or nominee)

Representative from the Students' Representative Council

Representative from Learning Enhancement & Academic Development Service – attending member

Representative from Student Digital Experience Service – attending member

Sub-Committees[*]

Academic Regulations Sub Committee

Course & Programme Approval Steering Group

ASC Programme Approval Group

Quality Officers' Forum

---

[*] Each of the Conveners of these Sub-committees is an ex-officio member of Academic Standards Committee.

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 2 October 2020

Membership 2020-21

Mrs Ruth Cole, Clerk to the Committee

The membership of the Academic Standards Committee for Session 2020-21 is proposed as follows:

Membership

Professor Neil Evans, School of Veterinary Medicine *(Convener)*

College of Arts

      Ms Ann Gow

      Dr Louise Harris

      Dr Eamon McCarthy

College of Medical, Veterinary & Life Sciences

      Professor Jim Anderson

      Professor Joe Gray

      Professor Niall MacFarlane

      Mr Niall Rogerson

College of Science & Engineering

      Dr Donald Ballance

      Dr Margaret Martin

      Dr Helen Purchase

College of Social Sciences

      Dr Robert Doherty

      Dr Angus Ferguson

      Professor Anna Morgan-Thomas

Professor Jill Morrison, Clerk of Senate

Professor Moira Fischbacher-Smith, Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching)

Professor Douglas MacGregor, Convener of Course & Programme Approval Steering Group

Professor Marc Alexander, Convener of Academic Regulations Sub-Committee

Mr David Bennion, Registry

Ms Helen Butcher, Head of Senate Office

Ms Anna Phelan, IT Services

Mr Grigoris Kokkinidis, Students' Representative Council

Attending Members: Dr Scott Ramsay, LEADS

                      Ms Jane Broad, Student Digital Experience Service

Clerk: Mrs Ruth Cole, Senate Office

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 2 October 2020

Audit Report on Course Approval Activity from the College of Arts: 2019-20

Ailsa Boyd (UG) and Claire Smith (PGT), College of Arts

Under the current process, Schools have responsibility for considering and approving all course proposals (new, amend and withdraw). However, Colleges are required to audit this approval activity to ensure that the standard of proposal documentation remains high and that Schools are adhering to the published procedure.

In line with this recommendation, the College has spot-checked a sample of proposals, for which the full documentation for the proposals have been examined.

Proposals approved by Schools in the College of Arts during session 2019/20 date range 01/08/2019-20/05/2020:

Proposal Type	Number of proposals approved	Number of proposals audited
New course	43	10 (UG); 6 (PGT)
Amend course	108	15 (UG); 5 (PGT)
Withdraw course	Unable to calculate**	8 (UG); 0 (PGT)

** PIP only allows a search for joint course/programme withdrawals so again, without going through each one individually there is no way to calculate this.

The following **new course** proposals were audited:

Course Title	School	Documentation complete and of required standard*	Consultations completed prior to School approval*
Popular Music Research	Culture and Creative Arts	No	Yes
Approaches to Scots in Speech and Text	Critical Studies	No	Yes
Pottery in Archaeology	Humanities	Yes	Yes
Video Games Professional Practice	Culture and Creative Arts	No	Yes
History of Film and Television Studies	Culture and Creative Arts	No	Yes
Victorian Literature Beyond the Human	Critical Studies	No	Yes
The Gaelic Kingdom of Alba and the Formation of Scotland AD 800-1100 (Hons) ARCH4073	Humanities	No. Standard wording not used; exclusions, options and ILOs not complete.	No

Applied Dissertation with Placement in Celtic GAELIC4045P	Humanities	No. Standard wording not used	No – student missing
Polybius between Greece and Rome CLASSIC4086	Humanities	No. Standard wording not used	Yes
Applied Dissertation with Placement in Gaelic GAELIC4046P	Humanities	No. Exclusions and box 10 to be specified. Name changed	No
Sociolinguistics of the Spanish-speaking World HISP4122	Modern Languages and Cultures	No. ILO, formative assessment, and External Consultation query missing.	Yes
Manliness to #MeToo: A Global History of Modern Masculinities HIST4282	Humanities	No. Standard format not used, rewrite Aims.	Yes. Not on standard forms.
Past Futures: Time and Temporality in Contemporary Art HISTART4084	Culture and Creative Arts	No. Support Doc sections completed incorrectly	Yes
Censorship In Western Culture MODLANG4013	Modern Languages and Cultures	Yes, but associated prog missing.	Yes
Making Theatre for Philosophers THEATRE4089	Humanities	No. Support doc B missing; standard wording not used, ILO, and assessment to clarify	Yes
Advanced Latin LATIN3001	Humanities	No. Contact hours, assessment and progression not clear. Standard wording not used.	No

*'No' responses to these should be given further explanation, and information on how the problem has been resolved.

(UG and PGT) Reports were sent to the schools detailing the errors found by the Board of Studies asking them to make the changes and resubmit through PIP.

No follow up has taken place for PGT as we have left it to the schools to look after the updating themselves. UG Board has checked whether corrected proposals have been submitted and will follow up with schools.

The following **amend course** proposals were audited:

Course Title	School	Documentation complete and of required standard*	Consultations completed prior to School approval*
Cultural Memory Studies and Medieval Irish Literature (PGT)	Humanities	No	Yes
Early Modern Mythmaking	Critical Studies	No	Yes
Topics in Ancient Egyptian Culture 2	Humanities	No	Yes
Creative Lives and Cultural Industries (Creative Industries and Cultural Policy -Core 2)	Culture and Creative Arts	No	Yes
Applying Dress and Textile Histories	Culture and Creative Arts	No	Yes
Applied Dissertation with Placement in Gaelic GAELIC4046P	Humanities	No. Specify exclusions and associated programmes.	No Student Consult.
Applied Dissertation with Placement in Digital Media & Information Studies INFOSTUD4017P	Humanities	No. Specify exclusions	No
Contemporary Ethics PHIL4004	Humanities	No. Standard wording not used	No External
Writing For Performance THEATRE4016	Culture and Creative Arts	No. Standard wording not used.	No
Reflexive Archaeological Practice ARCH4065	Humanities	No. Show class times and exam diet.	No Student
Advanced Greek GREEK3001	Humanities	No. Pathway unclear overall	No Student or Subject consult.

*'No' responses to these should be given further explanation, and information on how the problem has been resolved.

(UG and PGT) Same as above: Reports were sent to the schools detailing the errors found by the Board of Studies asking them to make the changes and resubmit through PIP.
No follow up has taken place for PGT as we have left it to the schools to look after the updating themselves. UG Board has checked whether corrected proposals have been submitted and will follow up with schools.

The following **withdraw course** proposals were audited:

Course Title	School	Documentation complete and of required standard*	Consultations completed prior to School approval*
Hispanic Studies Level 3 (Socrates) HISP3004	Modern Languages and Cultures	N	N
Artists And The Art Market In Late 19th Century Britain HISTART4011	Culture and Creative Arts	N	N
Symbolism and Secession: HISTART4039	Culture and Creative Arts	N	N
Church & Congregation 1 TRS1001	Critical Studies	N	N
Church & Congregation 2 TRS2006	Critical Studies	N	N
Creation Culture & Context TRS2007	Critical Studies	N	N
Warship, Liturgy and Preaching TRS4082	Critical Studies	N	N
[various Honours] CELTCIV	Humanities	N	N

*'No' responses to these should be given further explanation, and information on how the problem has been resolved.

All withdrawn UG courses did not have consultation, and should not have been withdrawn if they are expected to run in future sessions. Schools have been contacted and have been asked to provide consultation where relevant.

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 2 October 2020

Audit Report on Course Approval Activity from the College of MVLS: 2019-20

Tracy Maxwell, College of Medical, Veterinary & Life Sciences

Schools have responsibility for considering and approving all course proposals (new, amend and withdraw). However, Colleges are required to audit this approval activity to ensure that the standard of proposal documentation remains high and that Schools are adhering to the published procedure.

In line with this recommendation, the College has spot-checked a sample of proposals, for which the full documentation for the proposals have been examined.

Proposals approved by Schools/RIs in the College of MVLS during session 2019-20

UNDERGRADUATE PROPOSALS

Proposal Type	Number of proposals approved	Number of proposals audited
New course	6	4
Amend course	22	3
Withdraw course	6	1

The following **new course** proposals were audited:

Course Title	School	Documentation complete and of required standard*	Consultations completed prior to School approval*
20640 **BIOL4287** Fisheries, Aquaculture and Marine Conservation 4C option	School of Life Sciences	Yes Extract of minutes should be included – comment will be passed on to SoLS.	Yes
20726 **VETSCI2011** Fundamental Topics in Veterinary Anatomy and Nutrition	School of Veterinary Medicine	Yes. Minor comments will be passed on to SoVM.	Yes
21542 **NURSING1011, 1012 and 1013**	School of Medicine, Dentistry and Nursing	Yes. Minor comments clarified with SoMDN.	Yes but student consultation not on correct form. Comment will be passed to SoMDN.
21700 **MED4057** BSc(Med Sci) & BSc(Dent Sci) Clin.Med.Specialist	School of Medicine, Dentistry and Nursing	Yes Extract of minutes should be included – comment will be	Yes

| Course Otolaryngology(ENT)/Head & Neck Surgery | | passed on to SoMDN. | |

*'No' responses to these should be given further explanation, and information on how the problem has been resolved.

The following **amend course** proposals for substantive changes were audited:

Course Title	School	Documentation complete and of required standard*	Consultations completed prior to School approval*
21253 **BIOL4236** **BIOL4237** Pharmacology 3A and Pharmacology 3B	School of Life Sciences	Yes. Minor comments clarified with SoLS.	Yes
21406 **VETSCI1005, 1006 and 2011**	School of Veterinary Medicine	Yes. Minor comments will be passed on to SoVM.	Yes. Course support doc has n/a for consultations but they are included.
21623 **DENT3002** BDS3	School of Medicine, Dentistry and Nursing	Yes. Minor comments will be passed on to SoMDN	Yes. Consultations there but not mentioned on Course Support doc.

*'No' responses to these should be given further explanation, and information on how the problem has been resolved.

The following **withdraw course** proposals were audited:

Course Title	School	Documentation complete and of required standard*	Consultations completed prior to School approval*
20493 **BIOL4280** Advanced Membrane Biology 4D option	School of Life Sciences	Yes.Extract of Minutes should be included – will be passed on to SoLS.	n/a

*'No' responses to these should be given further explanation, and information on how the problem has been resolved.

POSTGRADUATE PROPOSALS

Proposal Type	Number of proposals approved	Number of proposals audited
New course	16	3
Amend course	13	3
Withdraw course	1	1

The following **new course** proposals were audited:

Course Title	School	Documentation complete and of required standard*	Consultations completed prior to School approval*
ID: 20589 MED5596/5597/5598P/ 5599/5601/5600/5602/	Cancer Sciences	**Yes** Minor comments around the programme support doc will be passed back to the administration team for review. No reference to the minute excerpt, proposer or additional resources (A5.1).	Yes
ID: 20585 BIOL5349/5348/5351/ 5350P	Molecular Cells and Systems Biology	**Yes** Minor comments around the programme support doc will be passed back to the administration team for review. A5.1 should be ticked and no reference to the minute excerpt.	Yes
ID: 20510 MED5591	Health and Wellbeing	**Yes** Minor comments around the programme support doc will be passed back to the administration team for review. No reference to the minute excerpt.	Yes

*'No' responses to these should be given further explanation, and information on how the problem has been resolved.

The following **amend course** proposals for substantive changes were audited:

Course Title	School	Documentation complete and of required standard*	Consultations completed prior to School approval*
ID: 21340 VETMED5059	Veterinary Medicine	**Yes**	Yes
ID: 21300 MED5485	School of Medicine, Dentistry and Nursing	**Yes** External Consultation Proforma incomplete. Comments to be passed back to the administration team for review.	Yes
ID: 21024 MED5439/5442/5499	Health and Wellbeing	**Yes**	Yes

*'No' responses to these should be given further explanation, and information on how the problem has been resolved.

The following **withdraw course** proposals were audited:

Course Title	School	Documentation complete and of required standard*	Consultations completed prior to School approval*
ID: 20686 MED5404 Applied research in Human Nutrition and Metabolism	School of Medicine, Dentistry and Nursing	Minute excerpt should be included. Comments will be passed back to the administration team for review.	n/a

*'No' responses to these should be given further explanation, and information on how the problem has been resolved.

The following **withdraw course** proposals were audited:

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 2 October 2020

Audit Report on Course Approval Activity from the College of Social Sciences: 2019-20

Rosalind Wright, College of Social Sciences

Schools have responsibility for considering and approving all course proposals (new, amend and withdraw). However, Colleges are required to audit this approval activity to ensure that the standard of proposal documentation remains high and that Schools are adhering to the published procedure.

In line with this recommendation, the College has spot-checked a sample of proposals, for which the full documentation for the proposals have been examined.

Proposals approved by Schools/RIs in the College of Social Sciences during session 2019-20:

Proposal Type	Number of proposals approved	Number of proposals audited
New course	192	20
Amend course	184	20
Withdraw course	84	10

+ - the reporting from the PIP system is unable to differentiate clearly between academic changes and corrections and the College is therefore unable to report accurately on academic course amends only and so it should be noted that the number of amend proposals reported includes both academic amendments as well as corrections to courses.

The following **new course** proposals were audited:

Course Title	School	Documentation complete and of required standard*	Consultations completed prior to School approval*
20934 – The Dark Side of Marketing MGT5407	Adam Smith Business School	Yes	Yes
20943 – Economic Geography ECON4103	Adam Smith Business School	Yes	Yes
21276 – Brand Management MGT5411	Adam Smith Business School	No	Unable to open the pdf of External Consultation - followed up with a reminder email to School to ensure all documentation complete and available.
21357 – The Economics of	Adam Smith Business School	Yes	Yes

Migration ECON5117			
20647 – Education in Practice 1A: Learning and Values ECUD1109P	School of Education	Yes	Yes
20655 – Curriculum Enquiry 1A EDUC1111P	School of Education	Yes	Yes
20746 – MEduc 4 School Experience EDUC4112	School of Education	Yes	Yes
21722 – Contemporary Perspectives on Children and Childhoods EDUC51032	School of Education	Yes	Yes
20737 – Human Impact on the Environment DUMF2070	Interdisciplinary Studies	Yes	Yes
21032 – Biodiversity, Ecology and Ecosystems DUMF2071	Interdisciplinary Studies	Yes	Yes
21324 – Leadership and Teamworking DUMF2072	Interdisciplinary Studies	Yes	Yes
20809 – Introduction to International Investment Law LAW5182	School of Law	Yes	Yes
21214 – International Commercial Arbitration LAW5194	School of Law	Yes	Yes
21376 – Private Law and Public Policy LAW3035	School of Law	No	Student and external consultations missing – followed up with School with a reminder to ensure all documentation complete

Course Title	School	Documentation complete and of required standard*	Consultations completed prior to School approval*
21450 – Competition Law Enforcement LAW5195	School of Law	Yes	Student and external consultations missing but comments relating to this "earlier courses from which this content is taken were approved with full consultation."
20576 – Russia, China & International Politics of Eurasia CEES5082	Social & Political Sciences	Yes	Yes
20623 – Housing Policy Contrasts across a devolved UK URBAN5129	Social & Political Sciences	No	Student, Employer and External consultation documents not signed by proposer; and Employer consultation not signed by Employer. Followed up with School with a reminder to ensure all documentation complete.
20671 – Prisons & Beyond: The sociology of total institutions SOCIO4128	Social & Political Sciences	Yes	Yes
20719 – Location Analysis & Modelling URBAN5134	Social & Political Sciences	Yes	Yes
21319 – Tobacco & the Global Economy ESH2065	Social & Political Sciences	Yes	Yes

*'No' responses to these should be given further explanation, and information on how the problem has been resolved.

The following **amend course** proposals for substantive changes were audited:

Course Title	School	Documentation complete and of required standard*	Consultations completed prior to School approval*
20387 – Entrepreneurship MGT2014	Adam Smith Business School	Yes	N/A – correction to timetable
20761 – Business Competition MGT3023	Adam Smith Business School	Yes	N/A – correction to timetable
20765 – Statistical	Adam Smith Business School	Yes	Yes

Analysis & Methods ACCFIN2018			
20821 – Professional Practice 5 MGT5068	Adam Smith Business School	Yes	N/A – correction to no longer allow Erasmus students to take the course
21441 – Export Marketing MGT5027	Adam Smith Business School	Yes	N/A – correction to timetable
21834 – Financial markets, Securities & Derivatives ECON5009	Adam Smith Business School	Yes	N/A - changes in assessment due to the COVID19 situation and the progression to student centered blended L&T
20467 – Education in Practice 2A: Learning through Curriculum EDUC2085P	School of Education	Yes	N/A – correction to no longer allow Erasmus/visiting students to take the course
20678 – Educational Elective 3 EDUC3078P	School of Education	Yes	Yes
21405 – Popular Education: Theory & Practice EDUC2077	School of Education	Yes	N/A – correction to timetable
20394 – Literature 1 DUMF1045	Interdisciplinary Studies	Yes	N/A – correction to Semester of delivery
20728 – Environmental Field Course DUMF4043	Interdisciplinary Studies	Yes	Yes
21293 – Placement DUMF3068	Interdisciplinary Studies	Yes	N/A – correction to allow coursework to count as 'independent work'
20584 – Obligations 1A	School of Law	Yes	N/A – correction to formative assessment
21210 – Criminal Law: Theory & Doctrine LAW4010	School of Law	Yes	N/A – correction to course title
21748 – Public Law LAW5063	School of Law	Yes	N/A – correction to course title
20520 – The Rise & Fall of	Social & Political Sciences	Yes	N/A – correction to course title

Course Title	School	Documentation complete and of required standard*	Consultations completed prior to School approval*
Communism in Central Europe: A socio-economic perspective (1918-1953) CEES4002			
20629 – Sustainable Housing Development URBAN5097	Social & Political Sciences	No	Student, Employer and External consultation documents not signed by proposer; and Employer consultation not signed by Employer. Followed up with School with a reminder to ensure all documentation complete.
20736 – Urban Studies Researching & the Dissertation URBAN5119	Social & Political Sciences	Yes	N/A – corrections to text in short description, timetable, description of summative assessment and formative assessment
21077 – Class & Stratification SOCIO4091	Social & Political Sciences	Yes	N/A – corrections to short course title
21796 – Economic & Social History 3: Studies in Economic & Social History ESH3003	Social & Political Sciences	Yes	N/A – correction to minimum requirements to award of credits.

*'No' responses to these should be given further explanation, and information on how the problem has been resolved.

The following **withdraw course** proposals were audited:

Course Title	School	Documentation complete and of required standard*	Consultations completed prior to School approval*
21243 – Financial Information Management MGT5028	Adam Smith Business School	Yes	N/A – changing of Course Code from MGT to ACCFIN
21458 – Business Start-Up MGT4053	Adam Smith Business School	Yes	N/A – Withdrawal of courses for 2020-21
21681 – Aid & Development ECON5001	Adam Smith Business School	Yes	N/A – Withdrawal of course due to COVID-19
21821 – Innovation &	Adam Smith Business School	Yes	N/A – Withdrawal of course for 2020-21

Participation at Work MGT4033			
21571 – RE (Catholic) Specialism Part 1 EDUC4103	School of Education	Yes	N/A – Withdrawal of course for 2020-21
21673 – Honours Action Research Project II DUMF4045	Interdisciplinary Studies	Yes	N/A - Course code changed to one with a 'P'
21776 – Conflict of Laws LAW2051	School of Law	Yes	N/A – Withdrawal of course for 2020-21
21430 – MSc Chinese Studies T301-5300	Social & Political Sciences	Yes	Yes
21650 – MSc History V100-5300	Social & Political Sciences	Yes	N/A - transfer of the programme management to another College (Arts)
21891 – MSc in Digital Society L318-5300	Social & Political Sciences	Yes	N/A – Withdrawal of course for 2020-21

*'No' responses to these should be given further explanation, and information on how the problem has been resolved.

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee - Friday 2 October 2020

Report on Items Approved under Summer Powers

Mrs Ruth Cole, Clerk to the Committee

1. Periodic Subject Review

1.1 Full Review Reports

The reports of the following Reviews have been approved under Summer Powers subject to some minor comments which have been forwarded to the Panel Convener. The finalised reports will be provided to the November meeting of ASC.

Subject	ASC Reviewers
Sociology	Aileen Bell Louise Harris
Theology & Religious Studies	Margaret Martin Sandy Whitelaw

1.2 Responses to Recommendations

1.2.1 Politics (**Appendix 1**)

The PSR took place on 6 March 2019, since when the subject area had been re-named Politics and International Relations. The response to the recommendations was delayed due to the disruption associated with the Covid-19 pandemic. The full responses were considered under summer powers by the Committee Convener (the Clerk of Senate had acted as PSR Panel Convener and had already considered the responses). The following comments have been forwarded to Politics and International Relations:

Recommendation 1: This recommended the development of a clear strategy, to be agreed by the Subject and School and ratified by the College Management Committee, for the introduction of the new International Relations degree. It was evident from the responses provided that there had been careful consideration to ensure delivery of a high quality IR degree programme, through planning and ongoing monitoring systems. The response, however, referred to potential staffing issues and did not indicate the strategy that would be employed by the Subject and School to ensure that the new and existing programmes were equally supported. This is a point that is further reinforced by the request for such a plan by the Head of College in her response.

Recommendation 3: This recommended the development and implementation of a plan to resolve current administrative difficulties. The response indicated that this would have been covered in a planned review of the School Workload Model but this had been delayed due to the pandemic.

Recommendation 4: This included reference to accessibility issues in the Adam Smith building. It was understood that refurbishment was currently taking place in the building. If this included improvement to accessibility within the building it would be helpful to record information on this in relation to the recommendation.

Recommendation 8: This concerned the provision of peer assessment and feedback for GTAs. The response provided information on practice in this area and listed four points under 'recommended best practice' but it was not clear how this best practice had been developed

and whether it was now being implemented within the subject. For example, under point 1 ('consider making observation by course conveners a formal requirement for GTAs teaching for the first time…') there was no information on who would consider this and take it forward.

Updates and further clarification of responses to recommendations 1, 3, 4 and 8 have been requested for the March 2021 meeting of ASC.

Recommendation 9: This concerned missing summary response documents to course evaluation questionnaires. In response, the subject commented on disappointing student response rates when online evaluations were introduced, and raised concerns regarding what they perceived to be systematically biased evaluations.

These comments were passed in full to Dr Richard Lowdon in the Senate Office for consideration and dialogue with the subject area, as appropriate.

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Summer Powers 2020

Periodic Subject Review: Responses to the Recommendations arising from the Review of Politics held on 6 March 2019

Mr Chris Buckland, Clerk to the Review Panel

Politics & International Relations and the School of Social & Political Sciences would like to thank the panel for the supportive review process. This is a particularly challenging time for colleagues in Politics & International Relations (PIR), with the launch of the new International Relations undergraduate programme, a new Erasmus Mundus postgraduate programme and increasing student numbers across postgraduate and undergraduate programmes. PIR supports what has been one of the largest graduating degrees in the University and is now one of the very small number of Subjects responsible for two undergraduate programmes in the MA(SocSci). In light of these factors, PIR especially appreciates the acknowledgement of the hard work colleagues devote to teaching and learning and the commendations in the Periodic Subject Review report.

Below we detail our responses to the Recommendations included in the report. Overall we found these helpful and believe that they provide useful guidance on further developing our teaching programmes and portfolio.

Recommendations

The following recommendations have been made to support the Subject in its reflection and to enhance provision in relation to teaching, learning and assessment. The recommendations have been cross-referenced to the paragraphs in the text of the report to which they refer and are grouped together by the areas for improvement/enhancement and are ranked in order of priority within each section.

Context and Strategy

Recommendation 1

The Panel **recommends** that the Subject and School develop a clear strategy for the introduction of the new IR degree programme and how this will complement the current Politics degree programme, ensuring both are equally supported. The Subject and School should closely monitor the impact the new degree programme may have on current provision and staff morale. This strategy should be developed and agreed in consultation between the Subject and School and ratified by the College Management Committee ensuring all teaching commitments are considered within College forward planning. [Paragraph 4.1.3]

For the attention of: Head of Subject, Head of School, Head of College

---

Joint Response: Head of Subject and Head of School

As the first cohort of the new International Relations (IR) degree programme completes their first year, closely monitoring the implementation and enrolment of the programme is one of the Subject's top priorities. This will be essential for ensuring that adequate staff resources are made available to ensure the success and sustainability of the new programme.

The new IR undergraduate programme is offered as part of the MA Social Science degree with both a single honours pathway and joint honours pathways with other Subjects in the

School and with Q-Step. It draws from the existing Politics Honours pathway but offers students a specialized curriculum in International Relations during the two Honours years. The Politics and IR programmes thus share a common pre-Honours curriculum. The IR pathway will be distinguished from the Politics programme in two key ways:

1. IR students will be required to take an advanced IR core course in their Junior Honours year (unlike Politics students). This required course, provisionally entitled *Contemporary Issues and Theory in International Relations,* covers key foundational concepts in international relations theory and contextualizes them via case studies of contemporary events, cases, and trends.
2. Single Honours IR students will be required to take 80 credits of IR options (40 credits in year 3 and 40 credits in year 4) to graduate. Joint IR Honours students will be required to take 40 IR option credits (20 credits in year 3 and 20 credits in year 4). This differs from the Politics pathway, in which students have more flexibility in the options they choose.

The Subject has established a working group of academic staff who are IR specialists to develop the core course and map the undergraduate curriculum to ensure appropriate depth and breadth of coverage. This group will meet at various stages of the first cohort of IR students' progress through the four years of study (i.e. until at least 2023) to monitor the implementation of the programme. Student feedback on the programme will be regularly sought through the Staff-Student Committee and fed into the working group.

Monitoring of student numbers is being coordinated between level convenors and Deputy Head of Subject, in full consultation with the College admissions office and School Student Advising Service. As the largest Subject area in the School, staffing, administrative capacity, and staff/student ratios remain a key area of concern for the Subject. In addition to the IR undergraduate programme, the Subject also significantly contributes teaching resources to other 'IR' taught postgraduate programmes within the School, most of which recruit high numbers of international students:

- MSc/MRes International Relations
- MSc/MRes Human Rights & International Politics
- MSc/MRes Global Security
- International Masters in Security, Intelligence & Strategic Studies
- Nankai Joint Graduate School

While recognising that the College has invested in recruiting IR scholars over the past several years, several IR colleagues have left the university in the last several years. And several have not been replaced (in part due to the current hiring freeze following the COVID-19 lockdown). At present just under a third of academic staff in the Subject are IR specialists. The demands on their time are likely to increase if, as expected, there are increasing student numbers on the IR undergraduate and postgraduate programmes. The Subject and School will address this by developing an appropriate staffing strategy. This includes a number of planned posts currently frozen due to the coronavirus response as well as the development of business cases for additional investment in staffing based on growth and strategic priorities through a collaborative approach to annual school planning via the School Executive.

We are also working to ensure manageable workloads. The School has also transitioned colleagues early from LKAS fellowships to lectureships to bring in additional teaching capacity. We are developing processes for accurately accounting for and reducing high workloads - clear and transparent discussions with colleagues, clarity around allocations, reviewing admin roles and allowances for some roles, developing a sustainable study leave strategy for the Subject, and sharing capacity across Subjects.

Response: Head of College

Although the PSR was conducted last year, with a previous HoC and HoS in post, the commendations and recommendations are still relevant. I welcome the PSR report and the joint response from the Head of Subject and Head of School. Now that the IR degree is well underway, I would welcome a clear strategic plan regarding the complementarity and fit between the IR and Politics degree programmes and the support required. This plan should also include the impact on teaching loads and staff morale. Notably, it has come to my attention that over the past three years the growth in the number of courses offered across the College has outstripped growth in student FTEs, inevitably increasing staff workloads. Since the Covid lockdown, the College has encouraged HoS to review their course portfolio, leading to a 10% reduction in the number of courses offered (either suspended or deleted) in SSPS. I anticipate that greater efficiencies in course provision and team teaching may alleviate some of the pressures facing staff within the subject. I also anticipate that, once student numbers in AY 2020/21 become more certain staffing requests will be released. I look forward to discussing and ratifying the IR strategy at a future College Management Group.

Strategic planning for future growth

Recommendation 2

The Panel **recommends** that the School reviews communication, engagement and inclusion of all staff to ensure all Subject staff are given an opportunity to contribute to strategy and teaching developments in an open and transparent environment. [Paragraph 4.1.4]

For the attention of: Head of School
For information: Head of Subject

Joint Response: Head of School and Head of Subject

The College, School and Subject leadership have developed processes and modes of engagement including a range of consultative forums and opportunities for staff to feed into strategy development and raise concerns and requests for support. The College and School is also working to incentivise innovation in teaching and broader strategic developments and to streamline the approvals process for curriculum development. This includes involving subject representatives in Portfolio meetings, clearly communicating and establishing minimum requirements for teaching and assessment, developing FAQs, working with colleagues in the College/University to develop fast track approvals processes and supporting innovation as per the L&T framework for the College. We are developing a number of online forum, a development committee and a fast track approvals process in response to the Covid19 epidemic and following the period of implementation of blended learning for 20/21 the School Executive will review what we have learned about improvements to communication, approvals and development processes for strategy and teaching during this period with a view to further improving engagement and inclusion of all staff.

Supporting staff

Recommendation 3

The Panel **recommends** that the Head of Subject should, in consultation with the Head of School and Head of School Professional Services, continue to review the administrative provision and develop and implement a plan to resolve current administrative difficulties in a manner that is resilient to the planned future growth. [Paragraph 6.3.4]

Joint response:

The Politics & IR subject services the largest number of Honours students in the School. Given the very large number of Honours students (one of the largest graduating degrees in the university) and the increasing number of PGT students, the pressure on administrative staff has consistently grown over several years, owing, in part, to the static level of staffing.

With the establishment of the International Relations undergraduate programme, the administrative pressures on staff (both academic and administrative) will increase. The School and Subject will accommodate the additional administrative load resulting from creation of the IR undergraduate programme (within the Subject and within the administrative team) within the School Workload Model. This will form part of a wider review of the model, planned for 2020 but delayed due to the pandemic. The Subject does not believe that the entire administrative structure of 'a Subject' needs to be replicated to manage the IR undergraduate programme. However, additional allocations in terms of Honours convening and, potentially, assessment coordination may be needed to successfully manage the additional workload associated with a single Subject providing for two undergraduate pathways in the MA SocSci. These discussions must also recognise that as the number of PG and UG students on programmes related to International Relations increases, staffing must keep pace with collective workload increases within the Subject.

As the PSR report notes, that there have been inconsistencies across the Subjects in the School around how they manage their teaching and this is being addressed through a revised workload allocation process which is currently being piloted by the School Executive. We are also working with College to ensure MPS workloads are sustainable and staff in these roles are properly supported as programmes grow.

Accommodation

Recommendation 4

The Panel recommends that the subject work with the School, College and Estates & Buildings to address accessibility issues in the Adam Smith Building, and to work with the Space Management & Timetabling Team to factor in distance between buildings when scheduling consecutive lectures. [Paragraph 6.3.2]

For the attention of: Head of School, Head of Subject, Director of Estates & Buildings, Space Management & Timetabling Team
For information: Head of College

Joint Response: Head of School and Head of Subject

The accessibility issues associated with the Adam Smith Building (ASB) are a regular feature in PSRs for subjects located within the ASB. As a subject we fully recognise the challenges in the building and try to schedule classes as appropriate for a building with areas of limited access. In addition we try, as best we are able, to recognise and make appropriate adjustments for the fact that some students and colleagues with mobility limitations will have a difficult (if not impossible) time of reaching all staff offices and/or teaching/meeting rooms. The space pressures across the University and difficulties in booking rooms, however, does mean that on occasion meetings must be held in buildings some substantial distance from the

ASB or within rooms with limited access. The Subject welcomes the PSR report's recognition of the challenges with the ASB's layout.

The issue of timetabling and room booking has been raised in multiple student complaints. The School administrative team is working with Timetabling/Central Room Bookings to resolve the issues. The Subject would note that it suffers in student evaluations (both undergraduate and postgraduate) for poor room allocation practices.

Response: Estates & Commercial Services

Room allocations for all teaching events are made in May of each year for the following academic year. Where information on the lecturers teaching event is recorded this can be taken into account when validating the room allocations. However this is typically only recorded in less than 50% of cases and may be subject to further change.

In relation to distances for students, as the room allocation is made some months ahead of students enrolling on courses it is not usually known which courses and classes a student will choose to enrol on in order to have minimised travel time/distance as part of the timetabling and room allocation process.

In both cases the central team has to rely on Schools or Advisors notifying of any issues as soon as possible in order that options to relocate classes can be explored.

Enhancement in learning and teaching

Recommendation 5

The Panel **recommends** that the Subjects work with the Learning Enhancement & Academic Development Service to share University best practice on the use of online assessment & marking, and that the technical issues with Moodle software be raised with University IT Services to identify what steps can be taken to address these. [Paragraph 6.1.7]

For the attention of: Head of Subject
For information: Head of School, Director of LEADS, Director of IT Services

---

Response: Subject

The Subject recognises the need to ensure that best practices are adhered on the use of online assessment and marking. We are currently awaiting the results of the School pilot project on online assessments, which should be very helpful in identifying practices that can disseminated within the Subject.

The situation has evolved somewhat since the Panel issued its recommendations. Due to the COVID-19 outbreak, academic staff within the Subject have rapidly moved their teaching online and will be marking outstanding coursework and exams online. We fully expect that this will filter into our practice in subsequent years. To support this, we would like to request that training opportunities in using Moodle and Turnitin for marking and providing feedback to students are made available by appropriate services within the University.

Academic Standards

Recommendation 6

The Panel **recommends** that the Subject work with the School and College to provide clarity on what constitutes a minor or major change to an existing course or programme to ensure that the approval process is timely, and that Subject staff receive adequate feedback on

---

> changes which have been assessed by the College Board and School Oversight committees. [Paragraph 7.1.3]
>
> **For the attention of: Head of Subject and Dean for Learning & Teaching**
> **For information: Head of School**

Joint Response: Head of School and Head of Subject

The Subject welcomes the Panel's recommendation to clarify the process of course approvals both within the School and the College. Our experience of this process in recent years is that it is a time-consuming process that places substantial burdens on staff and stifles innovation. The current process requires staff to begin working on new courses and course changes between 12 and 16 months before a course is due to run. The School has sought to speed this up and to improve oversight processes. Subject representatives are now involved in School teaching portfolio committees; FAQs and guidance on changes required prior to approval have been improved in an effort to incentivise staff be innovative in the use of modes of assessment, intended learning outcomes and teaching formats. The School is also developing processes so that the Subject (and School more broadly) is better able to rapidly develop courses that respond to contemporary political issues.

This includes some indications that 'summer powers' to change courses may be used more liberally during the ongoing COVID-19 outbreak. While recognising that this is an exceptional response to the current challenging circumstances, the Subject would like to request that the College consider making some of these changes more permanent, particularly by devolving greater responsibilities for course approvals to the School and radically shortening the timelines.

Response: Dean of Learning & Teaching

Course approval processes do sit largely with Schools at the moment. There are some inconsistencies across the College in how these are implemented, and it is clear that they are sometimes seen as acting as a gatekeeper rather than facilitating timely and appropriate changes. The College will continue to work with the School committees to support consistent and helpful guidance and advice.

Supporting staff

> **Recommendation 7**
>
> The Panel recommends that the Subject work in partnership with the College and Human Resources to build upon existing provision and ensure that staff are clear on the criteria for Academic Promotion, and that they are suitably supported through the promotion application process. [Paragraph 6.4.2]
>
> **For the attention of: Head of College Human Resources, Head of College**
> **For information: Head of School**

Response: Subject

The Subject welcomes this recommendation and will seek to liaise with the College to ensure clarity in promotion criteria. This will likely be especially important over the next several years as the substantial changes to work patterns and School/College/University expectations around academic workload due to the COVID-19 pandemic raise a large number of issues on the interpretation and application of promotion criteria. The Subject will look for clarification on how the promotion criteria will be applied in light of the directives around the prioritisation of teaching and recognition of, in some cases, substantial caring responsibilities many colleagues unexpectedly assumed.

As noted elsewhere in responses, the change in College and School leadership marks a clear opportunity to further clarify the interpretation and application of policies and criteria.

Response: Human Resources

The College HR team has initiated annual Academic Promotion briefing sessions which are delivered in the Schools including the School of Social & Political Sciences which all staff are invited to attend. These sessions are led by the Head of School and the Head of HR. During these sessions staff are encouraged to contact the HR team directly if they would like further guidance. In addition staff can discuss the promotion process and their readiness for promotion with their line manager, mentor and/or their P&DR reviewer.

Response: Head of College

As the Head of Subject and College HR team responses outline, we will make efforts to ensure that promotion criteria are clear and, moreover, that the uneven impact of Covid-19 is taken into account. I am reassured by the approach taken by the People First working group, of which the Head of School is a member. Across the College, the HR team will work with School management teams to ensure clarity of promotion criteria – especially given the adverse circumstances staff have faced as a consequence of the pandemic.

Recommendation 8

The Panel **recommends** that efforts be made to provide GTAs with a level of peer assessment and feedback on their teaching performance, with the GTA committee being consulted on potential requirements. [Paragraph 6.4.3]

For the attention of: Head of Subject
For information: Head of School

Response: Subject

Current Practice: PIR has over years worked to establish a culture of care and support for GTAs, through regular informal coffee/pub meetings, as well as through sharing of resources, good practice and ideas. Within the School it has also led on establishing the practice of GTA observation and has offered to share its practice with others via the School GTA committee. Two of the PIR course convenors as well as PIR GTA representatives sit on the GTA committee; it has yet to be convened in the 2019-20 academic year.

Most GTAs are currently being observed by course convenors in their first year of teaching on that course. Thomas Lundberg (1A convenor) has developed an observation review form that is widely used across the Subject, usually in conjunction with a personal session to discuss strengths, suggestions and any questions or concerns that the GTA may have. There is some variability among course convenors in how strongly they encourage GTAs to take up the observation and take up varies across the courses. In addition, some convenors have suggested an informal mentor relationship with more experienced Tutors, which could include mutual observation, building an exchange of teaching practice. Direct feedback from students has been limited to a course-wide set of questions in the overall pre-honours course evaluations regarding 'my tutor'; these are most often very positive, though with little specific information about individual GTAs. Further, course evaluation has moved online in the last year and the responses have been somewhat more limited.

*Recommended Best Practice***:**

1. Consider making observation by course convenors a formal requirement for GTAs teaching for the first time on individual pre-honours courses in PIR. *(this has implications for course convenor time).*
2. Explore the viability of establishing the practice of mutual peer observation on courses, similar to the practice among PIR staff, as an option for GTAs *(Voluntary unless payment can be approved*).
3. PIR can - as it has in the past - offer to present and discuss its approach to GTA observation at the School GTA committee.
4. PIR can explore whether and how course evaluations can be modified to increase student feedback to GTAs.

*Post-COVID***:**

The Politics & International Relations Subject believes that the issues around GTA contracts highlighted during planning for AY20-21 necessitate a root and branch review of GTA contracts.

Assessment and feedback

Recommendation 9

The Panel **recommends** that the Subject provides summary response documents to course evaluation questionnaires and that these are placed on course Moodle pages as well as provided to SSLCs. [Paragraph 6.2.5]

For the attention of: Head of Subject

Response: Subject

This is indeed the agreed policy within the Subject. As far as we are aware (through discussion at Subject meetings and a review of course Moodle pages) most course conveners do indeed upload their responses to course Moodle pages.

That said, there are gaps and not all colleagues have followed through on this policy. We will:

- Use subject meetings and communications to remind colleagues of the agreed policy and ask them to ensure that student evaluation responses are uploaded to course Moodle pages.
- Ensure new staff are informed of this practice.
- Ensure annual reminders are sent when staff receive student evaluations.

The Subject would note two points, however:

- The pilot of online student evaluations would seem to have been less than entirely successful, with a substantially diminished number of student evaluations submitted. This has distinct implications for summary measures derived from these evaluations as it is highly likely that the 'reasonably pleased' and satisfied students will be less likely to respond, whilst the dissatisfied students will represent a larger percentage of respondents. Social science research in survey methods would flag this as an unrepresentative and likely unreliable sample.
- It is well established in the literature that there are distinct gendered and racial components to student class evaluations, with female and/or BAME course lecturers— ceteris paribus—receiving lower evaluations then (British white) male course lecturers. We therefore find the reliance on student evaluations problematic and would ask the Senate Office what mitigating steps are being taken to ensure that female and BAME colleagues are not harmed or negatively impacted by systematically biased evaluations.

Enhancing the student experience

Recommendation 10

The Panel **recommends** that the subject take steps to address the perceived lack of awareness amongst UG students of the Student-Staff Liaison Committee, including the methods of communication used to make students aware of the process, and how contact details of class representatives are advertised. [Paragraph 5.4]

For the attention of: Head of Subject

Response – Subject:

The pre-honours and honours conveners invite the student representatives to meet with them twice a semester, regularly check-in via email throughout the year, and encourage them to get in touch with any concerns that arise. The conveners also encourage the student representatives to develop frequent and consistent methods of communication with their fellow students such as emails and surveys to try to isolate key areas of concern. However, we have faced some issues in recent years with a minority of student representatives not carrying out their appointed duties. The quality and frequency of communication between the representatives and their student colleagues also varies from year to year. We are currently considering a range of strategies to try and address these issues and to increase the visibility of the Student-Staff Liaison Committee:

- Establishing a process to deselect and reappoint non-performing representatives;
- Providing potential representatives with a clearer outline of the minimum expectations of the role;
- More effective and frequent communication about upcoming Student-Staff Liaison Committee meetings to all students in order to encourage broader input into the process;
- Raising these issues with the SRC to discuss additional emphasis in students representative training.

More broadly, the Subject is making other significant efforts to build staff and student collegiality, and avenues for dialogue in more informal channels. Over the last few years, the honours conveners have run an 'Honours Fair' for level two students, that allows students to meet with staff to discuss and ask questions about courses on offer, prior to their entry to Junior Honours. The Subject has also instigated various social events including a start of year drinks party and a dissertation submission party for the senior honours students. The engagement work has also been extended into developing field trips for the Honours students with groups visiting the Scottish Parliament and the EU institutions in Edinburgh. This work has been supported by the appointment of an engagement intern who has assisted with the organisation and has brought fresh ideas to the strategies developed. PIR hopes the role will be reappointed in future years and these initiatives can be extended further.

The COVID-19 pandemic does make some of these efforts to create informal channels of engagement more challenging. As a result, the Subject has decided to run a series of online events over the summer that are open to all Politics and International Relations students. These events range from online lectures and seminars by PIR staff on current political issues to a virtual pub quiz. We plan to run these events up to the start of semester one of the next academic year.

Equality and Diversity

Recommendation 11

The Panel **recommends** that the subject consider their "trigger warning" process, by which students are notified of potentially sensitive material which will be discussed in a lecture, to ensure that students are given suitable advanced warning to allow them to assess whether they are comfortable in attending. This may include providing details in course handbooks, and reconsideration given to the use of sensitive material in data sets. [Paragraph 5.3]

For the attention of: Head of Subject
For information: Equality and Diversity Unit

Response – Subject:

The Subject welcomes the positive acknowledgement in paragraph 5.3 that the Subject already makes use of trigger warnings:

5.3 The UG students who met with the Panel reported that the subject utilises the "trigger warning" process, whereby students are notified of content within the curriculum which could cause potential upset or concern. This was acknowledged as positive by the students, but it was felt that more could be done to provide further advanced warning to allow them to assess whether they are comfortable in attending. The Panel **recommends** that the subject consider this process to ensure that adequate context is provided, which may include providing details in course handbooks, and reconsideration given to the use of sensitive material in data sets.

The use of trigger warnings has been discussed within Politics & International Relations on multiple occasions, both within subject meetings and through extensive email consultation and discussion. We have noted that student representatives have not raised trigger warnings as an issue in Student/Staff Committee meetings. The Head of Subject will raise this as a point of discussion in the next meeting. (Our meeting that was to be held before the end of the academic year was postponed first due to the lockdown and has not been rescheduled as too many areas of uncertainty remain around planning for the next academic year. Once we have clarity on what we will be teaching in AY20-21 and how we will be delivering teaching, we will look to arrange a virtual meeting with class representatives.)

PIR colleagues are committed to open, inclusive and supportive classrooms and encourage student participation. Currently we have an agreement within the Subject that when potentially distressing images/materials/topics are included in class lectures/seminars/formal activities, a general warning should be given. Additionally, colleagues are encouraged to include a general note in course guides that controversial and emotive topics may be discussed in class. At the same time, it must be acknowledged that topics in Politics and International Relations can be particularly emotive and we are not able to anticipate all student contributions.