UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

Academic Standards Committee

A meeting of the **Academic Standards Committee** will be held on **Friday 21 May 2021** at **9.30 am** via Zoom.

<div align="right">

Mrs R Cole
Clerk to Committee
Ruth.Cole@glasgow.ac.uk

</div>

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.   **Minute of the Meeting held on Friday 19 March 2021**   ASC 20/68

2.   **Matters Arising**

2.1   *The Glasgow School of Art: Report from the Periodic Review of the School of Simulation & Visualisation; Re-validation of the MSc Medical Visualisation & Human Anatomy (ASC/2020/41.4)*

3.   **Convener's Business**

Section A: Items for Discussion

---

4.   **Annual Monitoring**

4.1   *Responses to Issues Raised in the Undergraduate and Postgraduate College*   ASC 20/69
     Annual Monitoring Summaries 2019-20

5.   **Annual Report on Postgraduate External Examiners' Reports – Session**   ASC 20/70
     2019-20 (Reserved Business)

6.   **Periodic Subject Review**

6.1   *Responses to Recommendations*

   6.1.1 Sociology   ASC 20/71

   6.1.2 Theology & Religious Studies   ASC 20/72

6.2   *Update Reports*

   6.2.1 Undergraduate Medical School   ASC 20/73

Section B: Items for Formal Approval

---

7.   **Items Referred from The Glasgow School of Art**

7.1   *Report of the Meeting of the Joint Liaison Committee of the University of*   ASC 20/74
     Glasgow and The Glasgow School of Art held on 8 April 2021

8.   Item Referred from Scotland's Rural College

Section C: Items for Noting or Information

---

9.   Dates for Next Session

Friday 1 October 2021

Friday 26 November 2021

Friday 28 January 2022

Friday 25 March 2022

Friday 27 May 2022

10.   Any Other Business

11.   Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Academic Standards Committee will be held on **Friday 1 October 2021** at **9.30am** via Zoom.

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee

Minute of Meeting held on Friday 19 March 2021 at 9:30 AM in the Senate Room

Present:

Professor Marc Alexander, Professor Jim Anderson, Dr Donald Ballance, Ms Jane Broad, Mr Chris Buckland (vice Mr David Bennion), Ms Helen Butcher, Dr Robert Doherty, Professor Neil Evans (Convener), Ms Ann Gow, Professor Joe Gray, Dr Louise Harris, Mr Grigoris Kokkinidis, Dr Eamon McCarthy, Dr Margaret Martin, Professor Jill Morrison, Ms Anna Phelan, Dr Helen Purchase, Dr Scott Ramsay, Mr Niall Rogerson.

In Attendance:

Ms Ruth Cole

Apologies:

Dr Angus Ferguson, Professor Moira Fischbacher-Smith, Professor Niall MacFarlane, Professor Douglas MacGregor, Professor Anna Morgan-Thomas.

ASC/2020/40 Minutes of the Meeting held on Friday 22 January 2021

The minutes were approved.

ASC/2020/41 Matters Arising

ASC/2020/41.1 Proposed Changes to Operation of Discretion by Exam Boards in the Award of Degree Classifications (ASC/2020/32)

At its March 2021 meeting, EdPSC endorsed the changes agreed by ASC, meaning that the operation of 'discretion' in the award of degree classifications would be replaced by the application of firm boundaries and an algorithm to be applied in the borderline zones.

ASC/2020/41.2 Annual Monitoring: PGT College Annual Monitoring Summaries for 2019-20 - College of Social Sciences (ASC/2020/34.1.1)

In follow up to the point noted in the Social Sciences Annual Monitoring Summary regarding the perceived poor quality of IT hardware at the Dumfries campus, it was reported that staff were primarily supported by UWS but this would shortly be changing so that support would in future be provided by Glasgow. All members of staff would be provided with a laptop and would then access Glasgow systems and desktop support directly.

ASC/2020/41.3 Course Approval Process for 2020-21 (ASC/2020/30.2)

It had been confirmed that, in view of the continuing heavy workload for staff, temporary changes to courses made for session 2020-21 in response to the pandemic, which were now intended to continue into future sessions, did not need to be confirmed through the full approval process for 2021-22.

ASC/2020/41.4 The Glasgow School of Art: Report from the Periodic Review of the School of Simulation and Visualisation; Re-validation of the MSc Medical Visualisation and Human Anatomy (ASC/2020/36)

The MSc Medical Visualisation and Human Anatomy was a GSA joint programme with the University of Glasgow, and at its January 2021 meeting ASC had asked for an extra statement to be added to the review report about the scrutiny process before revalidation could be confirmed. That statement was in preparation.

ASC/2020/42 Convener's Business

There was no Convener's business.

ASC/2020/43 Annual Monitoring

ASC/2020/43.1 PGT College Annual Monitoring Summaries for 2019-20

ASC/2020/43.1.1 College of Medical, Veterinary & Life Sciences

Mr Rogerson introduced the Annual Report from MVLS. The report mirrored some of the issues and concerns raised in the other PGT college AMRs. Mr Rogerson highlighted the success of online delivery of teaching and application of the No Detriment policy. One item raised in the report concerned plagiarism in online exams and student misunderstanding of this. It was also noted that, despite such concerns, overall results had been similar to those achieved in previous sessions.

There was a question around whether weekly Covid testing was to be introduced, in order to allow students to return to campus. Professor Morrison advised that this was under review, with in-principle agreement for twice weekly testing, though this would take time to roll out. There was discussion of the concerns around timetabling. Ms Broad noted that the scale of the changes to teaching delivery in the last twelve months had created significant challenges in relation to timetabling and that this was on-going. Central timetabling was also conducting a review of courses that could be withdrawn.

Members noted that there were important issues around the format of teaching delivery for future years, such as whether all lectures should be available for remote as well as in-person attendance, and whether the appropriate technology would always be available to support this, to allow real-time remote participation as well as simply recording sessions. Professor Morrison noted that blended learning was a prominent feature of the Learning & Teaching Strategy but there were various principles around what this meant that needed further discussion.

ASC/2020/43.1.2 Overview

The following were identified as having worked well: response of staff to the challenges of online delivery; online exams processes; No Detriment policy; staff support; use of Zoom for lectures.

The following were identified as themes for the University's attention:

- IT/Remote Delivery: There were many comments pertaining to various aspects of IT provision for staff and students, including in relation to remote and blended-learning as noted in the discussion above.

- Staffing/Staff Workloads: the significant additional workload that the pandemic had created for staff was evident, with concerns around staff wellbeing. While staffing and workload issues were matters for College resourcing, the following comment was noted: 'Adapt PDR expectations for all staff, at all levels, engaged in the teaching process.'

- Timetabling: As noted above there were significant concerns around timetabling where the pandemic had resulted in substantially revised teaching schedules.

- Student Support/Mental Health: while there was acknowledgement of the support and information now being provided by the University, concerns were raised around the time taken for registration with the Disability Service and for mental health support to be obtained. Professor Morrison noted that a review of the Disability

Service had just been published and it was anticipated that the recommendations would lead to some significant improvements in the Service's processes.

- Communication of policy: Concerns had been expressed by students regarding communication about the No Detriment policy (particularly for the MRes programmes).

- Masters programmes without independent work: demand had been expressed for the development of entirely taught Masters degree programmes. ASC agreed that the College should be asked to provide more information on this.

ASC agreed that the above themes were an accurate reflection of the issues raised by the College and that the Senate Office should seek updates and responses from the relevant sources to these University-wide matters.

Action: Senate Office

ASC/2020/44 Periodic Subject Review

ASC/2020/44.1 Responses to Recommendations

ASC/2020/44.1.1 Politics

ASC received updated responses to five recommendations. The committee was satisfied with the responses and agreed that no further updates were required.

ASC/2020/44.1.2 School of Engineering

ASC received updated responses to three recommendations. The committee commended the very comprehensive responses and agreed that no further updates were required. It was noted that important work was being undertaken in relation to the use of GTAs in marking honours assessment, and this should be highlighted to Professor Wendy Anderson who was developing the GTA Code of Practice.

Action: Clerk

ASC/2020/45 Item Referred from Edinburgh Theological Seminary

ASC/2020/45.1 Report from the Meeting of the Joint Board of the University of Glasgow and Edinburgh Theological Seminary held on 1 December 2020

ASC approved:

- The remit and membership of the Joint Board for 2020-21

- The appointment of ETS staff members as Associate University Lecturers.

It was noted that the gender balance of the Board membership continued to be an issue but this was an on-going challenge that the Seminary were aware of and were working to address.

The remainder of the report was noted.

ASC/2020/46 Items Referred from The Glasgow School of Art

ASC/2020/46.1 Programme Proposal: BDes/MDes Design for Health & Wellbeing

ASC agreed to give in-principle approval for the proposed introduction of the BDes/MDes Design for Health & Wellbeing programme at the GSA commencing in September 2022. It was noted that when the final degree title was confirmed, Education Policy and Strategy Committee would be asked for formal approval as this would be the first time that an integrated masters 'MDes' award title had been introduced.

ASC/2020/46.2 Programme Proposal: MDes Design Innovation & Circular Economy

ASC agreed to give in-principle approval for the proposed introduction of the PGT programme MDes Design Innovation & Circular Economy commencing in September 2022. It was noted that clarification on the listed exit awards was required, as there was an indication that a PG Diploma exit would be available with specialisation, and that an MDes Design Innovation would be available, but no detail was given on what the requirements for these awards would be.

ASC/2020/46.3 Programme Proposal: MDes Design Innovation & Future Heritage

ASC agreed to give in-principle approval for the proposed introduction of the PGT programme MDes Design Innovation & Future Heritage commencing in September 2022. The same queries as above arose in relation to the proposed exit awards.

ASC/2020/46.4 Major Programme Amendment Proposal: BDes/MEDes Product Design

ASC agreed to give in-principle approval for the proposed major amendment to the BDes/MEDes Product Design to take effect in September 2022. Clarification was required on the proposed exit award from Year 4 MEDes which was described as 'BDes Hons (unclassified)'. ASC noted that if the requirements for an honours degree were satisfied then the degree should be classified.

ASC/2020/46.5 Major Programme Amendment Proposal: MDes Design Innovation Suite

ASC agreed to give in-principle approval for the proposed major amendment to the PGT MDes Design Innovation suite of programmes to take effect in September 2022. The same queries arose in relation to exit awards as noted at ASC/2020/46.2.

It was also agreed that there should be dialogue between the Academic Collaborations Office and GSA around the documentation that should be presented for ASC's consideration when in-principle approval was being sought. In addition to the Programme Proposal or Major Programme or Course Amendment Proposal, an overview of the structure of the programme and the various exit awards would be particularly valuable.

Action: Clerk/ACO

ASC/2020/47 Items Referred from Scotland's Rural College

ASC/2020/47.1 New Programme Proposal: BSc (Honours) Animal Welfare Science

ASC agreed to give in-principle approval for the introduction of a BSc (Honours) Animal Welfare Science programme by SRUC, commencing in September 2022. It was noted that there appeared to be significant resource issues to be addressed, e.g. in relation to the availability of labs and teaching space which required consultation, and of Library resources which was currently under consultation with Edinburgh University. The business case had identified issues around student numbers required to make the programme viable.

ASC/2020/47.2 New Programme Proposal: BSc (Honours) Equine Science & Management

ASC agreed to give in-principle approval for the introduction of a BSc (Honours) Equine Science & Management programme by SRUC, commencing in September 2022. As above, there were resource issues to be addressed, with additional staff requirements having been identified and the likely need for additional stabling and horses.

ASC/2020/48 Establishment of the Learning & Teaching Enhancement and Change Forum

ASC noted the paper outlining the new Learning & Teaching Enhancement and Change Forum. This development reflected the very significant recent expansion in digital delivery and digital systems. Members highlighted the importance of provision for staff training and

for horizon scanning for future developments. Ms Phelan noted that training was covered in a number of different teams and ensuring some oversight of this would be valuable.

ASC/2020/49 Periodic Subject Review: Key Dates 2020-21

The revised schedule for expected reviewer dates was noted.

ASC/2020/50 Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Academic Standards Committee will be held on **Friday 21 May 2021** at **9.30am** via Zoom.

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 21 May 2021

Responses to Issues Raised in the Undergraduate and Postgraduate College Annual Monitoring Summaries 2019-20 Cover Sheet

Ms Lesley Fielding, Senate Office

Brief Description of the Paper

Following consideration of the College Annual Monitoring Summaries, ASC confirmed and identified themes that they wished to be raised at University level. The Senate Office then contacted relevant services to seek updates and responses to these University-wide matters.

The responses are presented in the attached paper.

Action Requested

Following its consideration of the responses to issues raised in the College Annual Monitoring Summaries, ASC is asked to confirm that they are satisfied with the responses provided and identify any areas that require to be followed up.

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

Senate Office to seek additional responses, if required.

Resource Implications (where appropriate)

As appropriate.

Timescale for Implementation (where appropriate)

As appropriate.

Equality Implications (where appropriate)

As identified in the report.

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 21 May 2021

Responses to Issues Raised in the Undergraduate and Postgraduate College Annual Monitoring Summaries 2019-20

Mrs Lesley Fielding, Senate Office

1. Process

As approved by ASC and EdPSC the Annual Monitoring process was streamlined in terms of reporting requirements in response to the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic. The abridged form aimed to capture a focused and concise evaluation, given the extraordinary events arising from the pandemic during academic session 2019-20. Implementation of the revised Annual Monitoring process that was approved by both ASC and EdPSC has been postponed until the disruption of the pandemic has settled. Colleges submitted the College Annual Monitoring Summary (CAMS) to the Senate Office two weeks in advance of the November meeting of ASC. The Colleges of Arts and Science and Engineering summaries include information that pertains to both undergraduate and postgraduate learning and teaching matters, whereas summaries of postgraduate activity in the Colleges of Social Sciences and MVLS were submitted in January and March 2021. The College Summaries were then reviewed by the Senate Office in order to identify any common themes. Following consideration of the College Annual Monitoring Summaries, ASC confirmed and identified additional themes that they wished to be raised at University level. The Senate Office contacted the relevant services to seek responses to these University-wide matters. The responses are listed below. Please note that the original comments, which have been considered by ASC, are included in **Appendix 1**.

2. Key Themes

The following issues from the Undergraduate and Postgraduate Annual Monitoring Summaries received responses from the relevant University Services:

- IT/Remote Delivery
- Staffing/workloads
- University Policy
- Suitability and quality of teaching spaces
- University systems
- Staff and student Mental Health
- University Communication

3. IT/Remote Delivery

IT/remote delivery: Many concerns had been expressed in relation to the support and equipment required by staff to deliver teaching and assessment remotely. In addition, many questions had been raised about the extent to which students had equal access to computer and online services and whether particular groups were disadvantaged by the move to online teaching and assessment.

A number of these issues had been considered by Learning & Teaching Committee and detailed responses follow:

(i)   Provision of Equipment/support

Central IT resources - Mr Dave Anderson, Director, Business Relationship Management and Engagement

Central IT resource has been made available to **staff**. Laptops, desktops, web-cams, document cameras and external microphones have been provided. Schools and Colleges have also provided equipment in some instances. Support for staff moving to online teaching has been facilitated by a number of measures, including online resources through Glasgow Anywhere, upskilling sessions (live and recorded) and through the university Helpdesk.

(ii)   Student Support - IT

Response from Mr Dave Anderson, Director, Business Relationship Management and Engagement

IT equipment for **students** has been made available, with over 300 laptops distributed to support online learning. In addition, support for students through the helpdesk has moved to an online model to be accessible to students remote from campus, this includes a 24 hour online/telephone helpdesk during each of the exam diets.

Response from Chris Buckland, Student Hardship Fund (Extract from University's response to the Fair Access Commissioner for Scotland in November 2020)

When lockdown was first announced in March, we immediately removed all laptops from our laptop loan lockers in the University Library and repurposed them for longer term lending. Students were able to request a laptop online via the UofG IT Helpdesk and we fulfilled around 100 requests over the April/May exam period. This was open to all students, but WP students were referred and guaranteed this help, if needed.

During the summer, we used £267,000 awarded by the SFC to bridge the digital gap and took the decision to purchase additional laptops instead of replacing machines in our PC clusters on campus, to provide a stock of some 750 laptops for a renewed laptop loan scheme, aimed initially at widening participation students and those facing financial hardship. Again, cross-institutional collaborative work involving Information Services, Registry Financial Aid, Widening Participation and the SRC has led to a system whereby WP students are automatically loaned a laptop for the entire academic year, if they require it. SFC terms dictate that only UK students are eligible for support via this fund; the Hardship Fund remains the support mechanism for EU and International students who require assistance in obtaining IT equipment.

We were able to provide laptops to students who were self-isolating in halls of residence.

Additionally, we have created the Glasgow Anywhere Desktop, which enables all students to access critical software, applications and files from any device remotely. We have now re-opened the Library and additional study space on campus to allow students who may struggle to work effectively in their home environment to have access to safe spaces for study, a particular issue for some of our WP students.

Response from Dr Carol Collins and Andrew Struan (LEADS – Students)

LEADS for Students actively engages with all students across the institution. At the start of the pandemic, the team took to immediately building a new Moodle course for online learning, online assessment and studying/working from home materials. This course covered the core topics of shifting to online study, online assessment and conducting research online. All undergraduate and postgraduate taught students were enrolled onto the course on Moodle, and all students were informed about the existence of the course via multiple communication channels (Moodle announcement, direct email, social media, student communications).

In addition, LEADS for Students took the lead in developing resources for online exams. This included, but was not limited to, synchronous exam preparation classes, online exam guidance and information, and a practice exam submission Moodle. This Moodle was designed to replicate the students' exam submission types, and LEADS for Students staff manned the HelpDesk to respond to student queries and questions around online examinations. As before, all students were enrolled onto this exam Moodle and received communications via a range of channels.

First- and second-year undergraduates were also offered short, optional, for-interest courses throughout the summer. These courses covered a range of topics (from the history of argumentation to creative writing). Attendance was optional and based on sign-up; the courses were exceptionally well attended and very popular. As a result of student demand, we repeated a number of the short courses and expanded the provision offered. All first- and second-year undergraduates were provided with the opportunity to sign up for any of the courses and all were contacted via Moodle announcements.

In addition to these new resources, courses and materials, LEADS for Students continued its usual provision. This included the full range of open classes; these classes are College- and level-specific, and they are open to all students in the relevant College. We immediately shifted all of our classes to online formats, and all students were informed of the relevant classes via Moodle announcements and direct emails. Similarly, we continued to offer confidential one-to-one appointments for all students. These appointments can cover any element of academic work, and we immediately swapped to delivery of online appointment type. All students were informed of the appointment availability via Moodle announcement, direct email and social media. Lastly, our year-round asynchronous provision remained open - and was substantially expanded to meet student demand. This provision is again College- and level-specific, and all relevant students are enrolled on the courses.

The pandemic resulted in an immediate expansion of the work of LEADS for Students. This expansion saw a significant increase in student engagement, student attendance and the positivity of student feedback. LEADS for Students is there for all students at any level of study, and we will continue to expand and enhance both our synchronous and asynchronous provision.

4. Staffing/Staff workloads

ASC commented on Staff workloads. The current situation had created significant additional workloads for staff. Reports referred to the freezing of key posts and the need for additional IT support posts. There were significant concerns around staff well-being both in relation to workloads and to the conditions under which they would be required to return to working on campus.

(i) Staffing and Workload

Response from Professor Frank Coton, Vice Principal, Academic Planning & Technological Innovation

"Controls on staff recruitment were introduced when the first lockdown occurred to mitigate the potential financial risks and uncertainties the University faced at that point. When the size of the student intake and other factors became more definite, this approach was progressively relaxed to the point that staff recruitment practice has returned to normal and Colleges now have resources released for appropriate levels of replacement and investment.

(ii) Staff welfare

Project Aurora:

In response to concerns regarding timetabling and return to campus, at the Principal's request, Project Aurora was established to set up to facilitate and support the planning and identify ways in which the University could ensure the best experience possible for both staff and students, whilst navigating the uncertainties. Latest information is available at:

Link to https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/coronavirus/guides/recoveryroutemap/

5. University Policy

(i) No Detriment Policy

Response from Senate Office:

The No Detriment Policy (NDP) was introduced as an emergency response to the national lockdown and sudden closure of University campuses on 23 March 2020 with the priority of supporting students who were experiencing severe disruption to teaching and assessment in the later stages of Semester 2 while maintaining the standard of our awards. The Policy was developed by a small team in consultation with various groups of the University in accordance with emergency governance arrangements introduced at that time. There was a phased introduction of the NDP with initial publication on 8 April 2020 as it was not feasible to introduce the full, extensive, policy within the very short timeframe between lockdown and the beginning of the Spring assessment diet in 2020. Under these circumstances complete policy information was not available as early as would be ideal, but the development team prioritised policy areas to ensure information was available for each phase of the assessment process.

There were inevitable challenges around the communication of the No Detriment policy across the University, particularly given the time constraints and the phased issuing of information as noted above. The Senate Office set up a dedicated webpage for all Covid related regulatory information and this continues to be in place with a banner link from our front page as well as links from the University's main Coronavirus webpage and the Exams Support webpages which have been set up to provide a comprehensive information set for students. Working with the Student Communications team, emails and social media notices were sent to students when key information was issued, and FAQs and videos were also developed to facilitate explanation of our policies. As some elements of the policy are directed at specific sets of students, some communications have been targeted at certain groups. We accept that the format of the MRes degrees which have a higher balance of project work than the standard PGT structure were not specifically covered in this messaging. This was one of a number of programmes with a relatively small cohort of students, and a distinctive structure, for which the particular rules to be applied were agreed after the main policy information had been published and that were communicated directly to the academic areas concerned. Unfortunately this particular student cohort may therefore have felt overlooked, but this simply reflected the intense time pressure under which the details of the No Detriment policy were being worked out.

As has already been flagged to ASC, the Senate Office has confirmed that the experience of introducing the No Detriment Policy in response to an emergency situation has reinforced the need for some simplification, and standardisation, of academic policy across the University. Development work is therefore planned to review the Code of Assessment and associated policies and this will be taken forward in alignment with activity in areas such as the World Changing Glasgow Assessment and Feedback Project and the Assessment and Feedback Working Group. While some initial scoping work on policy simplification was conducted by the Senate Office towards the end of 2020, the continuing demands associated with the management of immediate policy priorities, particularly in relation to

online assessments and assessment support measures in the current context of the Covid-19 pandemic, have taken resources which would normally be directed at the medium/longer term development activity.

The management of the future of online assessment – from 2021-22 onwards - will be taken forward by a new working group of EdPSC – the Inclusive Online Assessment Working Group which will focus on: i) standardisation of 24-hour online exams where possible across the University; and ii) the use of timed exams where appropriate. It is recognised that designing and developing inclusive approaches to assessment in quantitative disciplines presents particular challenges that require focused attention. The Vice Principal Learning and Teaching will work with the Deans of Learning and Teaching and members of staff in quantitative disciplines to determine how best to resource and progress this work over the next few years. Meanwhile, in planning for online assessment in 2021-22, the working group will focus on the short-term considerations in particular.

(ii)   *Course Changes – Adjustments in Response to the Pandemic*

In addition to the matters noted in the summary, it was agreed that the concern regarding the process and workload associated with making temporary course changes permanent in the coming session should be noted.

Response from Senate Office:

The course approval process was adjusted in response to the pandemic to allow blanket approval at local level for temporary course changes needed in order to move to online delivery in 2020-21. Given the ongoing severity of the pandemic, these temporary arrangements have continued for the preparation and approval of courses to be delivered in 2021-22 allowing continuation of temporary changes in this session along with further temporary adjustments to support delivery in the evolving context of the pandemic. Changes approved in this way are not entered onto PIP and it is recognised that approval of those changes that become permanent will be required in the future. Work will be taken forward to re-design the PIP form in order to streamline course approval wherever possible.

6.   University Systems

University systems: Comments had been received on ways in which the course evaluation system could be improved. In light of the shift to online assessment, comments had also been made regarding the functionality, capacity and reliability of Moodle.

(i)   EvaSys

Response from Dr Richard Lowden, Academic Policy Manager, Senate Office:

A number of concerns were raised by a couple of Schools in the 2019-20 College Annual Monitoring Summaries in relation to course evaluation. These concerns included: a lack of student engagement with the University's course evaluation surveys; inappropriate comments left by students in surveys; the bureaucracy of the course evaluation process; the number of surveys sent to students; support for off-campus remote use of EvaSys; and the appropriateness of questions included in course evaluation surveys.

Regarding concerns about student engagement and poor response rates in the Adam Smith Business School, I have sent the School a guidance document which includes strategies that have been successfully employed by other Schools to increase response rates for online surveys. I have also contacted the Business School to arrange a meeting to discuss the number of surveys that are being sent to students in the School, which is significantly more than in other Schools in the University. On the issue of personalised comments left by students in the Business School, I have edited the email template which is sent to students inviting them to participate in course evaluation surveys to remind them that any comments

must be related to the content of the course and that personal or inappropriate comments were completely unacceptable and would be disregarded. I will also work with the Business School to develop a School-wide communications strategy to discourage students from leaving inappropriate remarks.

In relation to the concerns raised by Theology and Religious Studies about support for off-campus remote access to EvaSys, it is worth noting that all requests for support should be made via the IT Helpdesk. Once a request has been made, it will be responded to by myself, a member of IT Services, or EvaSys technical support. EvaSys can also be accessed remotely via VPN or Remote Staff Desktop. Regarding concerns raised about the questions included in course evaluation surveys, I should clarify that course evaluation surveys must include a minimum of the five 'core questions' that are listed in the Course Evaluation Policy. Once these questions have been added, Schools and Subjects are permitted to add additional questions from the optional question sets listed in the appendices of the Policy, or include their own questions. The inclusion of these additional questions allows Schools, Subjects and individual courses to tailor questionnaires to meet their specific needs and to invite more reflective feedback from students.

(ii) Moodle/Sharepoint/Mahara

Response from Dave Anderson, IT

Additional capacity has been added to Moodle (the University's Virtual Learning Environment) to support the increased requirement. While there were concerns initially in March/April 2020 the service has proven to be reliable and able to meet the demands of students. Services used before March 2020 have also seen a rapid increase in adoption with additional storage added to Zoom and Echo360 to accommodate demand. One of the key successes in supporting staff and students, particularly through the initial shift to online delivery and assessment, was in pulling the expertise from across the University. The Digital Support Network provided (and continues to provide) a lively discussion forum where technical and pedagogical questions could be raised and addressed in a collegiate and supportive manner. This network assessed the current range of digital tools available to staff and identified additional tools required to deliver online teaching successfully at scale, this included Mentimeter (online polling platform for all UofG staff and students) and lab software in COSE and Life Sciences. This group then led to the creation of the Learning and Teaching Enhancement and Change Forum (LTEC) which is able to review new software requests, assess scope of demand and prepare a business case should funding be required. The LTEC Forum builds on the community of practice and will assist in the evaluation, development and implementation of any new software platform.

Digital Accessibility is a priority for the University, with a working group established to promote best practice and provide guidance on tools available to ensure online content is accessible to all students and staff. Automated transcription and captioning of video content remains a challenge, particularly for technical subjects that frequently deploy a vocabulary that is beyond the limitations of AI transcription. As new tools and technologies emerge these will be assessed for suitability, and in the interim Information Services is able to provide support on how best to use the current tools (including zoom) along with noise cancelling microphones to improve quality and reduce errors.

Planning for returning to campus is underway. It is recognised that a range of delivery options will be required with some staff and students possibly unable to travel to campus for the first part of semester 1. Technical solutions will be required to ensure that staff are not required to double teach (once face to face and again online) and that online students are able to interact with on campus students to benefit from as full a Glasgow experience as possible. Pilot spaces are being created to evaluate some of the technologies available to

deliver this, and to assess ease of use for staff and students. Any new technology or equipment to support this will be rolled out through August and early September 2021

6. Suitability and quality of teaching

(i) Location and quality of teaching spaces/Rooms/Room bookings/Timetabling

Response on behalf of Estates Directorate

Provided by Karen Lee, Director of Strategy, Performance & Transformation.

The response below relates only to centrally-managed teaching space. Locally-managed space (including specialist space) and scheduling of that space remains the responsibility of the owning School.

The annual timetabling process normally commences in February each year (for the following academic year) with the timetable being published in June ahead of student enrolment commencing in August.

The new dataset is normally created from the latest live timetable available (i.e. the 2022/23 dataset will be created from the 2021/22 timetable as it exists in January 2022). Exceptionally for the 2021/22 dataset the decision was made to use an earlier version (March 2020), given the very significant changes made subsequently in light of the Covid-19 response and which would not be replicated, including January starts for PGT programmes.

Room allocations are made in line with specific criteria, starting with the largest size of class and in line with the data submitted, these being:

- Size
- Accessibility requirements
- Features and equipment

At the time of publication there will inevitably be some events (classes) which have not been allocated a teaching room and liaison between the central team and School will continue in order to resolve this.

Events are typically not roomed due to one or a combination of the following factors:

- A mis-match between the preferred size of class and the capacity of teaching rooms.
- Clustering of requested teaching times around mid-week and core hours resulting in too-great a demand for the number of rooms available at particular times (i.e. the full 45 hours of the teaching week are not used).
- The requested features or equipment not being available in the type or size of room requested.

Achieving a resolution for these events prior to enrolment or, at least ahead of the start of teaching, requires Schools to change one of more elements of the request. For example, changing the time/day at which the class is taught, adjusting the size of the class or amending the features and equipment requested. Should this not be possible or undesirable, the only option is to identify solutions on a week-by-week basis in light of cancellations or other changes which may arise and result in rooms being freed up. Options for resolution post-student enrolment are necessarily more limited since it is much more difficult (and undesirable) to change the day/time or to split the class.

Subsequent changes to the timetable or size of class (e.g. when actual enrolments exceed the predicted number) may result in classes being unroomed and requiring alternative accommodation. Where this occurs either the eventual allocation/s may be fragmented (e.g.

multiple rooms across the semester) as it must fit around other scheduled activity or the class needs to be accommodated at one of the less popular times.

Timetabling and room allocation activity is completed in advance of student enrolment, therefore there is very limited scope to take account of distance between different classes during the process. The spread of the campus buildings inevitably necessitates movement across the campus over the course of the day, especially when different sizes and types of space are required for the various classes.

There is an annual programme (paused in the last year due to Covid-19) of both refurbishment and redecoration of teaching spaces which aims to maintain appropriate standards and to reconfigure spaces in line with evolving pedagogy. The overall maintenance schedule should see all teaching spaces fully refurbished on a 10-year cycle, with some mid-term refresh and redecoration.

Specific problems with equipment in teaching rooms or concerns about overall quality should be reported via the Helpdesk in order that they can be reviewed and remedied.

7.   Student Support/Mental Health

Student support and mental health: Concerns were widely noted regarding the numbers of students who were struggling with poor mental health and reporting insufficient support being available. This was noted to be putting additional strain on academic and support staff from whom students often sought support.

Response from Clare Craig, Head of Student Wellbeing & Inclusion:

A new Mental Health and Wellbeing Campaigns Adviser, Suzie Shapiro was recruited at the end of last year. Suzie is a qualified CBT Therapist who also has a comms background. Amongst other things, she has developed, and is currently piloting, workshop content on Procrastination and Perfectionism – two of the most commonly reported issues from students seeking counselling support. She is also working with the comms team to deliver regular content and signposting information via the student newsletter. The focus of this role is to deliver consistent and clear messaging about promoting good mental health and ensuring awareness of the various avenues of support available to students.

As planned, we used some of the additional funding provided by SFC to bolster wellbeing support, allowing counsellors to focus their efforts on those requiring a clinical response. We now have 3 new Wellbeing Officers in place, all of whom have a counselling background and whose key duties include:

- Triage Appointments for those looking to access Counselling.
- Case management post crisis intervention (where support is being provided across a number of internal and external services or where check in appointments are required to stabilise a situation).
- The delivery of psycho-educational workshops.
- Case work – supporting students whose issues are not suitable for counselling or who have completed counselling but need ongoing check in/support.

Sherief Kholeif had suggested that the peer support programme could be expanded to include a trained GUSA peer support team. Peer Support sits within Student Engagement under my colleague Kirsty McConn Palfreyman but my understanding is that this was taken forward and that the GUSA peer support team has completed training.

Further development of the Student Support Officer role in Student Engagement has also been agreed. This role had previously been trialled in the Vet School, the Business School,

the School of Education and Dumfries Campus. It has been well received and a further 15 roles are now planned across colleges and schools.

Work continues to develop and improve our wellbeing support with teams in student services working closely together to ensure student's needs are met.

8. University Communication

A number of School commented on the need for improved communication from the university on issues relating to central communications.

Awaiting response

COMMENTS FROM COLLEGE ANNUAL MONITORING SUMMARIES 2019-20

IT/Remote Delivery

(i) Provision of Equipment/support

"The preparation of new online material to deliver the practical classes in academic session 2020-2021 will require significant resources e.g. recording equipment, software and IT technical assistance" (School of Veterinary Medicine)

"IT infrastructure is boosted sufficiently to only allow seamless online teaching AND any online assessment and functionality on scale, including unlimited availability of Turnitin (including for exam submission), timed online examinations, Moodle quiz functionality, MCQ etc." (School of Life Sciences)

"Additional equipment and consumables and importantly maintenance of equipment, will be essential to meet the demands of simulated practical teaching to replace patient activity during these unprecedented times." (Dental School)

"Continuing support for the increased demands placed on both staff and students by online delivery and assessment, including access to equipment, software, training, IT support and appropriate staffing." (School of Law)

"Reassurance is sought that there will be adequate technology support for remote delivery" (Schools of Mathematics & Statistics, Physics & Astronomy)

"24/7 central IT support would be welcomed -not just for remote delivery (especially international off-campus students), but also for ODL" (School of Engineering)

"Expand investment for additional learning technologists to raise the profile and professional standing of on-line courses. This is a particular concern within Accounting & Finance." (Adam Smith Business School)

"There was a view that great efforts could be made to utilise online technology to improve inclusion of SiS colleagues in wider College and University initiatives." (School of Interdisciplinary Studies)

"To continue to increase the availability of e-learning materials through the library to help support the online teaching was seen as important." (School of Interdisciplinary Studies)

"ICT Support Systems – adequate ICT support for staff required e.g. more and improved computers for staff and more learning technologists." (School of Education)

"Consistent Guidance - having many technological options makes staff spend a lot of time trying different things and gives students a more disparate experience." (School of Education)

"It would be important to invest in video editing software to allow updating of content without having to re-record." (School of Interdisciplinary Studies)

"The University should provide more support for the move to online provision, including significant upgrading of hardware and software capabilities as well as staffing resource including learning technologists and specific practical training/upskilling support on a regular basis." (School of Social & Political Studies)

"Could better transcription software be resourced -Zoom transcripts are incomprehensible and re-doing these is a massive amount of work."

"Resources will be needed to facilitate remote and blended learning that can be flexibly (e.g. some students in the room, some online)"

"The University needs to make sure that laptops/wifi are available for all students to work from home as there are students with a less advantaged background who will struggle. For these students, we cannot simply rely on the provision of University PC clusters as these will probably not be available due to disinfection challenges and also because we cannot force students that live far away to take frequent transport to access these facilities. We need to make sure that these students are supported and that we are inclusive." (School of Life Sciences)

"The University should be attentive to the need to provide equal access to all students to computing and on-line services to enable successful participation in blended learning." (School of Social & Political Sciences)

"There is also a need to ensure that digital provision is not associated with greater inequalities among students. According to research from 2017, disadvantaged students consistently perform worse through online learning than they do in face-to-face classrooms, which increases the likelihood of dropping out." (Adam Smith Business School)

"The pandemic has exposed digital inequalities among students, which need to be addressed by the university." (College of Arts)

"The University should be attentive to the need to provide equal access to all students to computing and on-line services to enable successful participation in blended learning." (Schools of Education and Law)

"The University should be attentive to the need to provide equal access to all students to computing and on-line services to enable successful participation in blended learning." (School of Social & Political Sciences)

"As was thrown starkly into light this academic session, many students have problems at University residences with connectivity and access: the efficiency of these systems should be at the same level as the library." (Adam Smith Business School)

"A mechanism for students to be able to access free software (e.g. InVEST, QGIS) remotely would be useful so that they do not have to download these on to their own computers." (School of Interdisciplinary Studies)

"University to provide students with 1) the necessary resources to effectively take part in online learning (hardware, Wi-Fi etc) and 2) upskilling so that they can make effective use of the resources and software at their disposal. Equitable access to ensure a common experience and remove digital inequalities is important." (School of Social & Political Sciences)

Staffing/Staff workloads

"One school commented that increased university requirements for conducting, monitoring, managing and reporting on teaching activities significantly increases workload for course heads/ programme directors/ year heads etc., with a request that their necessity be reassessed" (School of Chemistry)

"We need some staff positions! Some key strategic and operational positions (including academic positions), to be unfrozen to ensure continued and robust delivery in the short and medium terms and to allow future re-activation of courses that have currently been cancelled due to insufficient staffing and the hiring freeze (e.g. L1 Environmental Biology)". (School of Life Sciences)

"Ensure adequate School staffing to allow delivery of courses requiring high levels of staff input." (School of Veterinary Medicine)

"The continuing understaffing and "churn" within the SVM Undergraduate School has a significant impact on the ability of the School to meet the expectations of accrediting bodies, external examiners and student body in relation to delivery and assessment of the course (BVMS3, BVMS4)." (School of Veterinary Medicine)

"In discussion with the Directors of Learning & Teaching in the seven schools, it was clear that additional targeted administrative and academic staff resources will be needed if the Schools' currently excellent provision is to be sustained and improved" (College of Science & Engineering).

"Challenges in ensuring consistency and quality of life science teaching owing to lack of staff. Life science content is a unique selling point of the programme and year-on-year NSS feedback endorses the value of the science content and its contribution to student satisfaction. An inability to deliver the courses outlined in the programme and course descriptors could potentially impact on student satisfaction and ultimately league table rankings. This situation is being addressed, however requires close monitoring." (NHCS)

"Physically-distanced teaching of practical skills to BVMS1-BVMS4, will impact on staff availability for BVMS5 teaching (and vice versa)." (School of Veterinary Medicine)

"Adoption of blended learning model across the curriculum, requiring staff to upskill in specific TEL areas, whilst meeting ongoing operational demands and increased workload due to the COVID-19 pandemic." (NHCS)

"there was significant increased workload on colleagues at College, School, and Subject level and the work associated with examining was not concluded until the first week of July which placed substantial additional pressure on those colleagues tasked with preparation for teaching in 2020-21." (School of Social & Political Sciences)

"There is a strong concern expressed about staff well-being under such pressure (expressed by two schools, but widely shared by all others)" (Schools of Chemistry and Geographical & Earth Sciences)

"Workload Allocation – needs increased to accommodate extra workload resulting in transition to online provision." (School of Education)

"Staffing – more subject specific support required." (School of Education)

"The University should also address issues related to high workloads which stem from hiring freezes and other staffing issues." (School of Social & Political Sciences)

"Adapt PDR expectations for all staff, at all levels, engaged in the teaching process." (MVLS)

(ii) Staff welfare

"Return to Campus: One subject (TRS) has raised questions regarding the safety of on-campus teaching. TRS also note that once we are back teaching in classrooms, changing rooms for every class might be a real problem and that classes need at the very least to be in the same place every week." (Theology & Religious Studies)

"The requirement for face-to-face teaching during practical classes and rotations carry a significant risk to staff and due to the low numbers of staff, if one member of staff becomes COVID-19 positive, teaching becomes untenable" (School of Veterinary Medicine)

"Issues such as rooms which are overcrowded, poorly maintained, and poorly cleaned will be of particular concern as we move towards a return to campus within social distancing rules. We need to ensure health and safety of staff and students in campus re-opening plans and continue to take a flexible and compassionate approach to those who may be at risk or worried about health risks." (School of Social & Political Sciences)

University Policy

"Application of No Detriment Policy and Processing of Results: This resulted in overly complicated spreadsheets and means of assuring the quality of student grades. Exam boards were delayed as scrutiny groups and administrative teams struggled to apply the guidelines and confirm results in the time available." (Adam Smith Business School)

"Student expectations relating to No Detriment Policy were not managed with sufficient care at University level." (School of Social & Political Sciences)

"**Communication / support:** Colleagues welcomed the policy but would have appreciated some further work on filtering of information and instruction to ensure that school/subject guidance is clear and simple for both staff and students. Staff were grateful for, but nonetheless anxious about, the complexity of the final spreadsheets and formulae for result calculation, which also changed regularly. Some have asked about the possibility of simplification, or that they at least be more clearly explained, for the next round of exams." (College of Arts)

"**Degree classification:** A number of externals in one School (SMLC) stressed the need for a comparative statistical analysis to analyse what impact the No Detriment policy has had on degree classifications, and in the longer term what impact the disruption has had on subsequent cohorts". (School of Modern Languages & Cultures)

"**(PGT):** Two Schools highlighted the difficulties in applying the No Detriment policy to PGT students in general. They also noted the difficulties caused due to a delay in the production of a shared spreadsheet that was suitable to allow the processing of marks for PGT students." (College of Arts)

"Staff have felt supported by the University, although at times firm guidance was understandably a little slow." (School of Veterinary Medicine)

"The emphasis placed on the established course evaluation survey is considered to be counterproductive and far too rigid. Student engagement with the process is highly variable, generating some very poor response rates and unreliable data. There is a feeling among colleagues that we are polling students far too often and that they suffer from "feedback fatigue". In some instances, only the dissatisfied few complete the evaluation, resulting in low participation scores and imbalanced feedback. The feedback itself is often personalised, inappropriately targeting members of teaching staff rather than course delivery. Colleagues would like to see a move away from bureaucratic box ticking to more innovative, responsive and reliable instruments and a more considered approach. A willingness to apply some innovative thinking and devise a more flexible approach would be welcome: possibly with a random selection of one or two courses evaluated for each member of staff per year; or with an annual survey of core classes on a programme and irregular feedback on electives; or spot check evaluations of a certain proportion of the provision per programme. Changes along these lines, or with other options, would be attractive, responsive and generate more useful information for development and planning." (Adam Smith Business School)

"Better support needed for off-campus remote access to EvaSys by staff. One subject) suggest that questions asked also need to invite more reflective feedback from students." (Theology & Religious Studies)

"SMLC notes that the Moodle marking interface is inadequate for intricate marking of scripts. The system is also prone to function slowly and be unresponsive, which increases the scope for error on the part of markers. This will need attention before we return to teaching given

the heavy increase in online marking next session" (School of Modern Languages & Cultures).

"With a massive push as regards online teaching the infrastructure underpinning Moodle needs to be sufficiently robust to support full usage e.g. Moodle Quiz." (School of Veterinary Medicine)

"Moodle is clumsy for online assessment; an improved online assessment tool would make the marking process more efficient for staff." (School of Engineering)

"If future iterations of the summative Degree Examination are to be online; then access to and support for using Moodle Quizzes and/or tailored online assessment software with provision for invigilation would be advantageous." (School of Veterinary Medicine)

"Moodle needs to be sufficiently robust to support full usage – Moodle quiz." (School of Veterinary Medicine)

"Moodle marking interface is inadequate for intricate marking of scripts." (College of Arts)

(iii) Sharepoint

"One School reported significant problems with SharePoint for handling data (and handling of spreadsheets more generally). They frequently encountered the wrong/old version of a spreadsheet being presented/circulated. It's not completely clear where the problem lay, but certainly this needs to be addressed for next year's exams period and further training may be required in this area." (School of Cultural & Creative Arts)

(iv) Mahara

"The absence of access for graduates to their Professional Phase Portfolio post-graduation remains unresolved." (School of Veterinary Medicine)

This issue was also highlighted to EdPSC given the increasing number of subject areas expressing interest in the use of Mahara and the growing importance of preparing students for employment after graduation. In view of the resource implications, the Convener of EdPSC undertook to discuss this with Mr Dave Anderson in Information Services. In addition, the Convenor will flag this with Learning & Teaching Committee given the planned commitment within the forthcoming L&T Strategy to students' skills and professional development and the need for students to demonstrate their achievements after graduation.

Suitability and quality of teaching

(i) Location and quality of teaching spaces

"Consideration of room bookings so that students are not in a different place for the same course each day*, and don't have to traverse long distances between classes* (School of Physics & Astronomy).

"The issues of students having to move significant distances across campus between classes was also raised. In particular, Film & Television noted the lack of suitable teaching space for teaching practical courses." (College of Arts)

"Quality of teaching spaces* (P&A), in particular: Gregory Building* (GES), East Quad (GES), functional lapel microphones* (C). Need for out-of-hours lab access and flexible spaces (School of Geographical & Earth Sciences).

"rooms which are overcrowded, poorly maintained, and poorly cleaned." (School of Social & Political Sciences)

"We continue to have concerns over rooms and room bookings. These include a lack of consistency in provision; chopping and changing across the weeks of a course." (School of Political & Social Sciences)

"All four Schools again reported issues with the suitability of some of the rooms (including equipment in TEAL rooms) on campus and, as before, highlighted difficulties with the timetabling process, including only timetabling classes at short notice (e.g. 24-hours before the class) or not finding a room for a class. (College of Arts)

"Request that the large L&TH lecture theatre be used to prevent duplication of lectures." (School of Psychology).

"The consequences of timetable clashes being overridden due to remote learning will need to be considered when returning to on-campus delivery" (School of Geography & Earth Sciences).

"Electronic timetables do not reflect course information submitted or staff workloads and are difficult to correct." (School of Education)

"Some improvements have been made with CMIS electronic timetabling, however the Dental School continues to be frustrated by the lack of facilitation for our 4th /summer term."

"Inadequate timetabling of large classes continues to be a problem on campus, with apparent low priority for timetabling of premium programmes during working hours. This is untenable if we are to continue attracting high quality students." (Adam Smith Business School)

"Administrative Issues – at the start of the academic session the registration process, room bookings and online timetabling systems need to be improved." (School of Education)

"For LLM classes, which continue to grow, suitable accommodation for teaching remains problematic when face to face teaching resumes post-Covid." (School of Law)

"For PgDip the quality of accommodation in Alexander Stone building is below standard in terms of size of teaching rooms and student networking spaces." (School of Law)

"For PgDip: One student required significant adjustments to transition to online learning and request for additional support from the Disability Service and the wider University." (School of Law)

Student Support/Mental Health

Student support and mental health: Concerns were widely noted regarding the numbers of students who were struggling with poor mental health and reporting insufficient support being available. This was noted to be putting additional strain on academic and support staff from whom students often sought support.

"The University's student mental health provision is still considered inadequate especially in these changed circumstances." (Schools of Geographical & Earth Sciences, Psychology and Computing Science)

"Having a named mental health practitioner associated with each School is suggested." (School of Chemistry)

"We have previously raised concerns about the increasing number of students who have high levels of anxiety, depression, and stress. This is resulting in an increased number of 'good cause' clams and is putting a considerable emotional strain on academic and administrative staff who are often the first port of call for these students. These issues are likely to be exacerbated due to a summer of lockdown and ongoing public health restrictions. We would therefore like to see greater support for the Counselling & Psychological Services

to both help these students and relieve some of the pressure on staff." (School of Social & Political Sciences)

"Mental health remains the largest issue for students; although there is a lot of information provided by the University, could the time taken for students to register with the disability office and/or obtain mental health support be improved."

University Communication

A number of School commented on the need for improved communication from the university on issues relating to central communications.

"Acknowledging opportunities for local decision making (e.g exam format and processes (C, GES)), and clarity on Disability provisions. Clarity over what information is sent to whom (and when) (P&A). In particular, information on what we can and can't offer students on-campus is essential for recruitment activities (Schools of Geographical & Earth Sciences and Computing Science).

"Improved communication to PGT students regarding admissions matters (deferrals, deposits etc.), so that they are not sent directly to academic staff "(Schools of Psychology and Computing Science)

"Improved (timely, consistent, unambiguous) communication of regulations and future plans." (Schools of Geographical & Earth Sciences, Mathematics & Statistics, Psychology, Engineering, Computing Science)

"Students felt there could have been clearer communication centrally about the no detriment policy (particularly in relation to MRes students)" (MVLS)

Two Schools commented on the need for improved communication from the university on issues relating to central communications.

"Communication – communication from the centre needs to be timelier and more consistent." (School of Education)

"Students as well as staff have expressed that University communication around issues from Good Cause and no-Detriment and to the requirement for students to be on campus was confusing and caused more anxiety than was necessary." (School of Social & Political Sciences)

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee: Friday 21 May 2021

Periodic Subject Review: Responses to the Recommendations Arising from the Review of Sociology held on 17 February 2020

Cover Sheet

Mrs Lesley Fielding, Clerk to the Review Panel

Brief Description of the Paper

Under Summer Powers 2020, Academic Standards Committee received and approved, the Report of the Periodic Subject Review of Sociology and associated recommendations. The recommendations contained within the report were approved for onward transmission to those identified for action. This report details the responses and the progress made to date in implementing the recommendations. The response has been delayed due to pressures caused by the current pandemic.

The Convener of the Review Panel would like to commend the Subject for the thorough responses and developments undertaken since the Review.

Action Requested

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

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

As identified in the report.

Resource implications

As outlined in the paper.

Timescale for Implementation

As outlined in the paper.

Equality Implications

As identified.

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee: Friday 21 May 2021

Periodic Subject Review: Responses to the Recommendations Arising from the Review of Sociology held on 17 February 2020

The following recommendations have been made to support Sociology 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 1.1

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Subject has representation on the relevant School and College Committees and is consulted on all key strategic planning and appointment processes concerning the Subject. [Paragraph 2.4.3]

For the attention of: The Head of School
Head of College
For information: Head of Subject

Responses:

Head of School:

The Subject now has key representatives on relevant School and College Committees and is consulted on all key planning and appointment processes concerning the Subject via Head of Subject/Head of School liaison.

Head of College:

The School has been under new leadership since November 2019, and considerable advances have been made with regard to Subject participation in School level strategizing and planning. As the Head of School notes in her response, the Subject now has key representatives on relevant School and College committees, and is consulted on all key planning and appointment processes concerning the Subject.

Recommendation 1.2

The Review Panel, while welcoming the recent developments, **recommends** that the College and School continue to ensure that the Subject is consulted and involved at all stages of the course approval process. [Paragraph 5.1.3]

For the attention of: The Head of School
Head of College
For information: Head of Subject

Responses:

Head of School:

The Subject is consulted and involved in all stages of the course approval process through a redesigned Portfolio Review and approvals process.

Head of College:

As the Head of School indicates, the Subject is consulted and involved in all stages of course approvals through a redesigned Portfolio Review and approvals process. Since the Periodic Subject Review in February 2020, the College has appointed a new Dean of Learning & Teaching (this post was void when the PSR was undertaken) and the School has appointed a new Director of Learning & Teaching. Both appointments, together with a restructured College level Student Experience & Enhancement team, have sought to facilitate Subject consultation and involvement in the course approval process.

Recommendation 2

The Review Panel **recommends** that the College and School, as a matter of priority, in consultation with the Subject, review the current postgraduate provision and recruitment, taking into consideration the sustainability and impact on staff and the Student Experience. [Paragraph 3.1.2]

**For the attention of: The Head of School
The Head of College
The Head of Subject**

Responses:

Head of Subject and Head of School:

Since the PSR, PGT convenors have discussed provision and capacity for growth, whilst cognisant of recommended class sizes and subsequent impacts on student experience and sense of community. We have assessed student numbers (current and projected growth) and identified several key issues: maintaining number of courses; increasing number of courses; valuing the range of large and smaller programmes. To address these challenges, we have increased the number of PGT courses on offer for 2021/22 through the development of new courses and the reinstitution of courses to dovetail student interests as well as staff expertise. Whilst this has expanded provision, this also brings into sharp relief the issue of competing needs in the Subject area in relation to growth in numbers and Honours and PG provision. New posts created in the subject area should greatly strengthen our current and future provision. We are also working closely with the School PGT Committee to ensure alignment with School vision for PGT provision. Significantly however, achieving the sustainability of PGT programmes requires that the subject has the ability to determine and advise on the numbers of students recruited to popular programmes. The School and Subject have been liaising more closely with External Relations to manage this more effectively.

Head of College:

As the Head of Subject and Head of School indicate, there have been significant and positive developments in this area. In addition to their responses, I make two further observations. First, it is appreciated that the School and Subjects are coordinating more effectively with regard to selecting and supporting sustainable PGT programme growth – new appointments have been and are being made in the subject which will help bolster Subject-level capacity. Second, across the College there seems to be a disconnect between ER, College, Schools and Subjects with regard to student intake targets. Greater transparency and clarity about the process of setting and achieving intake targets would be beneficial to all and would also help garner academic support and involvement in this process which would in turn assist ER staff. The recent discussions at SMG about data, and the participation of the Deputy Secretary and new Head of PIA in this arena, are very welcome in this regard.

Recommendation 3

The Review Panel **recommends** that the School review the contracts and workloads of early career staff and tutors to ensure parity and to identify possible career pathways. In addition, the School should review the current system for paying tutors and GTAs to ensure that occurrences of non-payment do not occur. This should include the review of best practice in other colleges. [Paragraph 4.4.8]

For the attention of: The Head of School
For information: The Head of Subject

Response:

The School has reviewed the use of fixed term contracts for early career staff and taken steps to minimise these. We have also reviewed the academic career track and sought to develop career opportunities for Tutors coming to the end of their contracts through including entry level G7 research and teaching roles. Workload planning has been improved through the use of a transparent model for allocating workload which is used across the School in one-to-one discussions with all academic staff involved in teaching with their head of subject. The College has recently reviewed and standardised payment rates for GTAs and we will continue to work with College Finance to improve the payment process.

Recommendation 4

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Subject look at the numbers of PGT students any individual should supervise and explore whether it is possible to devise a method of more equitable distribution of projects for supervision. [Paragraph 4.1.5]

For the attention of: The Head of Subject

Response:

In response to the recommendation, with PGT growth there are direct implications for increased PG numbers for dissertation supervision. Several actions have been taken to create a sustainable, equitable distribution, as outlined in the following. In 2019/20 each member of staff was allocated 3 PGT dissertations. In 2020/21, despite the increase in numbers of PGT students, the allocation was maintained, due to staff who do not have PGT supervision in their workload (roles in College /School leadership, research-only contracts etc.) agreeing to supervise students. At the same time, members of staff who are supervising specialised dissertations or practical projects on certain programmes (such as Media, Migrations, Global Health) were allocated a reduced number of dissertation students to supervise. Furthermore, in 2020/21, because a high percentage of PGT Media students have selected the practical project option, the members of staff supervising them will not supervise traditional dissertations at all. In cases where someone is allocated 4 instead of 3 dissertation students, efforts are made to reduce their workload in other areas, such as undergraduate dissertations supervision. To manage project supervision on the Media programme we have recruiting a number of media practitioners to supervise projects, alongside other colleagues and sought to manage their workload by reducing supervision duties for UG and other PGT programmes. We are recruiting further staff in the Media area to further spread this supervision load and we will actively manage the numbers of students who take on project rather than traditional dissertation work.

Regarding early supervision, PGT students are offered a series of Dissertation Training sessions, containing both content-based recordings, and face-to-face interactive workshops in the 1st semester. They are distributed to a supervisor in February, while they still take

their second semester courses, to ensure that, should they start working on the dissertation early, they have the appropriate support.

Recommendation 5.1

In order for students to have sufficient learning support, as outlined in the Accessible and Inclusive Learning Policy and Lecture Recording Policy, the Review Panel **recommends** that the Subject ensure that lecture recording is undertaken, wherever possible, by all staff or alternatives provided, including uploading slides to Moodle. [Paragraph 3.3.9]

For the attention of: The Head of Subject

Recommendation 5.2

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Subject undertake a review of the practice of uploading lecture slides to ensure that students are not disadvantaged and ensure staff are informed on the requirements of the Accessible and Inclusive Learning Policy. [Paragraph 3.4.3]

For the attention of: The Head of Subject

Response to 5.1 and 5.2:

Given the move to online learning and teaching (2020/2021) and in line with university guidance on good practice and supported by information and advice from LEADS and the School Blended Learning Online Group, all courses have been delivered using a combination of pre-recorded and live lectures, with alternatives provided where recording has not been taken place (e.g., a detailed set of lecture notes to accompany slides). Staff have been made fully aware of good practice to ensure compliance with accessibility legislation, and have moved towards ensuring PowerPoint slides, when used, are available before scheduled class times.

Measures taken during this current academic session have been integrated into a wider range of steps taken to comply with the Accessible and Inclusive Learning Policy, including: uploading reading lists via the University Library's @readinglists facility in advance of the start of the course; uploading a complete Course Guide and further teaching materials (like tips on essay writing and data analysis) in electronic format on Moodle before the start of the course; including information on relevant documents, assessment information, deadlines, and indicative marking criteria on the Course Guide; making explicit on the Course Guide, Course Moodles and Level / Programme Moodles that deadline extensions and special assessment considerations are available in case of health or disability issues of different sorts, and according to University regulations (i.e. adapting oral assessment requirements for students whose health can be affected by speaking in public); and ensuring that the Course Moodle page is accessible, in compliance with relevant legislation.

Recommendation 6.1

The Panel **recommends** that the College undertake a review of the current advising system, particularly in relation to the support required for postgraduate students. [Paragraph 3.3.8]

For the attention of: The Head of College
For information: The Head of School
The Head of Subject

Response:

The College Head of Student Experience is currently working on a project proposal for a review of student support across the College (this action was delayed because of the

pandemic). This project will progress through the College's Learning & Teaching Framework, potentially using the Chief Advisers Group in a quasi-academic lead capacity. The Head of Subject has nominated a representative from Sociology to participate in this project. For AY 21/22 we plan to have (i) drafted a summary document for all subjects contributing towards the MA SocSci outlining broad advising arrangements and (ii) provide a briefing session for staff to supplement the Advisers' training module provided by the Senate Office.

Recommendation 6.2

[1]The Review Panel recommends that the School examine the statistics with a view to identifying whether a pattern emerged for those students who received Credit Refused and to research potential strategies to reduce the instances of Credit Refused. [Paragraph 3.1.3]

For the attention of: The Head of Subject

Response:

We have strategies in place to support students (awarded CR for non-attendance/non-submission) throughout their course. Currently, Level Administrators contact students several times throughout their year of study to better understand non-attendance/non-submission and establish if further supports are needed. We also advise the MA Social Sciences Advising Team, as they may be able to offer additional supports.

Looking at the statistics for the period 2015 to 2019 (no record is available for 2019/20 due to CA awarded), we can identify the following patterns: L1 CR rates are both low and steady except for the 2017/18 year; we note a decrease in rates at L2; both L1 and L2 have very small percentage increase in CR rates in Semester 2 (averaging over the 4 academic years at 1.3% at L1 and 1.7% at L2). It is our view that CR rate reflect students who do not progress because of academic plan (e.g. MEDUc students) and students repeating courses (second or third attempt) but still do not attend/submit coursework despite the regular contact and follow-up from Course Administrators as outlined above. We are reassured our retention rates remain generally very good and will keep this under review.

Recommendation 7

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Subject, with the support of the School and College, explore approaches to build a sense of community among the student cohort including further development of the Sociology Café and the Sociology Student Society. [Paragraph 3.3.3]

For the attention of: The Head of Subject
For information: The Head of School
The Head of College

Response:

The subject continues to build on its existing work to develop a wider sense of community. In 2020/21, the Sociology Café continues to thrive with invitations extended to honours and PG students and staff to come along. Colleagues who run the café have set up its own webpages hosting a range of resources and materials related to each of the sessions https://www.uogsociologycafe.net. The Cafe runs joint events with the Sociology Society, and the Glasgow Anthropology Network runs monthly seminars, alongside the Sociology

---

[1] The second item under Recommendation 6 was an additional recommendation requested by Academic Standards Committee which has been agreed by the PSR Panel Convener.

Seminar programme. Staff regularly post notices of School, College and university-wide events (eg The Global Health Film Club, the GRAMNet Seminar and Film Series, Social Theory Seminars, book clubs) as well as those occurring outwith the university on Course / Programme Moodles. It should be noted and emphasised there that this work continues in the current context and is testament to the subject area's commitment to establishing meaningful spaces of encounter and discussion with students.

Recommendation 8

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Subject review the current processes, relating to responding to student feedback, to ensure there is clarity around these issues and to ensure that all responses are unambiguous. The Subject should engage the class reps to provide feedback to students, possibly via social media. [Paragraph 3.4.2]

For the attention of: The Head of Subject

Response:

We have carefully evaluated the processes for student feedback across Levels and Programmes. As standard, feedback is sought at several points across both semesters (via the staff / student committee during semester and then the end of semester online assessment using Evasys). At UG level we adopt a standardised approach: L1 and L2 Convenors provide a detailed convenor response to both sets of feedback addressing issues raised and outlining adjustments to practice as appropriate and this is posted on Moodle. Our Honours Convenor circulates course specific student feedback to Course Convenors plus a template document to teaching staff that is to be completed and returned to students outlining main areas of feedback that elicit a response, and some reflection on how the course may be further improved in coming academic sessions. This completed document is posted on Course Moodles.

At Postgraduate Level, different feedback processes are in place tailored to specific cohort needs and requirements (via class feedback meetings, via Moodle course fora, via Student Reps at the bi-annual Staff/Student Liaison Committees). All appropriate amendments made in response to feedback are communicated to students via Moodle and the various feedback platforms provide a further check and balance for clarity on action when required.

Recommendation 9

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Subject invigorate efforts to revive the Sociology Learning and Teaching Group and to ensure regular meetings to enhance the identification and sharing of good practice across the Subject. The Subject may wish to consult with LEADS for guidance on this issue. [Paragraph 4.1.3]

For the attention of: The Head of Subject

Response:

In response to this recommendation, we emphasise and value the opportunity to discuss a wide range of L&T issues and have identified through different fora a number of areas that will be the focus of the reinstituted L&T group. In the current academic year (2020/21) much of the focus of Subject L&T work has been on the rapid response delivery on online teaching, adjustments to assessment, supporting colleagues with developing and delivering a wider set of pedagogical tools and supporting students to ensure inclusive, accessible, safe and intellectually stimulating learning environments. We anticipate this work to be a continued area of work for the L&T group, but not the sole focus and we are collectively

identifying a range of topics that will inform the L&T Group work moving forward. This work will be led by the newly created role of L&T convenor in the subject area.

Recommendation 10

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Subject take steps to ensure that potential students wishing to undertake SAY are not discouraged or disadvantaged in the choice or support for their dissertation. [Paragraph 4.1.6]

For the attention of: The Head of Subject

Response:

We already have several detailed processes in place to support students that are specifically designed to support their dissertation preparations whilst at their host institution during their SAY.

We have a course code already set up on mycampus (SPS9008) so that students, by dint of enrolling in the class, would then automatically get enrolled onto the Moodle. Our Honours Administrator searches mycampus for students going abroad, and checks via email if they have enrolled on the JH dissertation training. As a precaution, all students (single and joint honours) are enrolled on our training sessions on the dissertation Moodle and can access the material there.

Students may contact the Dissertation Convenor at any time and our Honours Administrator provides support to students regarding access to Moodle. The Dissertation Convenor again contacts SAY students when the dissertation proposal drop-in sessions are being organised to ensure that they have an opportunity to discuss their ideas with a member of staff. Moreover, the provision of online recorded lectures in 2020/21 has made dissertation training more accessible to students abroad and we will retain these online resources in future years for this reason. Drop-in sessions are also online, and it is very likely a similar format will continue in the coming academic year. There has been no indication in previous years that SAY students suffer on the dissertation when it comes to their mark; indeed, the average mark for SAY students' dissertation proposals (often submitted while they are abroad) has either been in line, or above, the average mark for the whole cohort.

Finally, for students interested in SAY, the Study Abroad Convenor will (1) ensure that pre-honours students receive the necessary reassurances that they will be able to access the dissertation Moodle whilst away, and (2) explore with the students the possibility of methods training at the host institution.

Recommendation 11

The Review Panel considered that it was desirable for the work-based learning opportunities to be made more explicit to undergraduate students and therefore **recommends** that the Subject take a more proactive approach to developing work links with the dissertation for undergraduate students. [Paragraph 4.1.7]

For the attention of: The Head of Subject

Response:

At subject level there is already a set of practices and mechanisms in place to promote collaborative dissertations option to UG and PG students. We work closely with colleagues in COSS Employability who present to third year students in the first semester about the options around collaborative dissertations for UG students. A hyperlink to the new Making

your dissertation work for you course and Moodle which contains advice and guidance on making dissertations workplace relevant is embedded on the Dissertation Moodle. This session is usually well attended, and students are encouraged to contact Dickon Copsey and Emma Smith directly (COSS Employability) to discuss their ideas. During these information session students learn about the built-in supports that will be vital to students and supervisors less familiar with this option. In discussion with our COSS Employability colleagues, UG uptake is much lower than PGT reflecting a school-wide pattern, which might be explained by the longer lead into the dissertation at UG Level (proposal in JH, dissertation in SH). Moving forward we will continue working with our Employability colleagues and direct students to the Making your dissertation work for you course and Moodle.

Recommendation 12

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Subject, in conjunction with the current online pilot and in liaison with LEADS, review the current submission process and consider viable alternatives, including the option of submission of assignments in Word document format which would enable feedback to be provided via tracked changes. [Paragraph 4.1.9]

For the attention of: The Head of Subject

Response:

The move to online L&T in response to Covid-19 accelerated the review of current submission practices for course work. Consequently in 2020/21, all pre-honours submissions (Level 1 and Level 2) have moved to online marking and assessment (using Turnitin online marking suite). Honours and PGT assessments use an adapted online marking process using uploaded Word documents. Both processes have proven viable in 2020/21 and provide the option for in-text feedback, at the discretion of the marker.

Recommendation 13

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Subject liaises with the Senate Office and consults the good practice guide on the Senate Office Website to develop a strategy for increasing student response rates for EvaSys course evaluation surveys. [Paragraph 3.4.4]

For the attention of: The Head of School

Response:

The move to online L&T in response to Covid-19 accelerated the use of online course evaluations and this is now embedded practice in the School.

Matters for attention – outside of Subject or School

Recommendation 14

The Review Panel considered that it was important that mental health resources were widely publicised and **recommends** that the Mental Health Working Group should consider how to disseminate information on training and support available to staff such as Mental Health First Aid training and 'Mind Your Mate'. [Paragraph 3.3.6]

For the attention of the Convener of the Mental Health Working Group
For information: The Head of Subject

Response:

We will publicise opportunities for staff and students to take part in a further round of Mental Health First Aid training and, via the SRC, for students to participate in Mind Your Mate training, later this year. This will be done via staff and student newsletters, the University and SRC websites, and social media. In addition, we will regularly remind students of the available means of mental health support, including Together All (available 24 hours a day) and CAPS.

Over the course of the next few months we will be putting in place an intermediary level of support at College level which should assist academic and professional staff in the School in supporting student wellbeing. Further information on this will be disseminated in due course. This will complete the five-level support structure envisaged in the Student Wellbeing Strategy which was recently approved by the Senior Management Group. In relation to this, we will also review the training provided to non-specialist staff.

Recommendation 15.1

The Review Panel **recommends** that the observations regarding the good cause form and online process be forwarded to the Senate Office for consideration. [Paragraph 3.3.5]

For the attention of: The Assistant Director of the Senate Office
For information: The Head of Subject

Recommendation 15.2

At the staff meeting, the Panel was advised that another University operated a centralised system for good cause claims, which ensured consistency of practice across the institution while alleviating the administrative pressure on academic staff. The Review Panel **recommends** that this issue be drawn to the attention of the Senate Office. [Paragraph 3.3.7]

For the attention of: The Assistant Director of the Senate Office
For information: The Head of Subject

Response:

In order to give full context for the response, it is helpful to see the relevant paragraph from the report:

3.3.5 The Panel noted that, while students could apply for good cause on MyCampus, they were unable to apply online for an extension for assignments. The Head of Subject believed that students were deterred by the requirement to submit personal information online. He commented that the previous system required students to complete a physical copy of the form, which encouraged the provision of fuller evidence in support of their application. In view of this observation, the Review Panel **recommends** that the observations regarding the good cause form and online process be forwarded to the Senate Office for consideration.

- The statement about online application for extensions is not completely correct – short extensions of up to five working days are not part of the Good Cause process but requests for extensions of more than five working days are required to be submitted via a Good Cause claim in MyCampus. Students indicate the amount of additional time that they are requesting and when the claim has been considered staff complete the record by indicating whether an extension has been granted and, if so, what the revised deadline is. Shorter extensions which are lighter touch and do not require the submission of evidence are considered by course convener (or the person identified in course documentation as responsible for coursework assessment). The concern surrounding submission of personal information online

is an issue that is well known from the point of view of both student sensitivity and data protection. The procedure already allows for students to provide sensitive information to staff direct rather than submitting it to MyCampus. In addition, as ASC is aware, the Good Cause procedure is under review, and one of the issues under consideration is how to make the system more accessible for students who are dealing with particularly sensitive circumstances – from the point of view of the amount of information that is required and whether supporting documentary evidence must be provided.

3.3.7 In the SER, the Subject outlined the initiatives they had introduced in endeavouring to support students including a 'Who to Speak to' document available through Moodle and aimed at directing students to appropriate forms of support. Additionally, the Subject operated a good cause committee comprised of three staff members. The team operated by splitting the caseload; however, the team were familiar with all cases which assisted continuity, which was of particular importance in relation to complex cases. The Review Panel **commends** the Subject for its proactive stance on this issue. At the staff meeting, the Panel noted that another University operated a centralised system for good cause claims, which ensured consistency of practice while alleviating the administrative pressure on academic staff and ensured consistency of practice across the institution. The Review Panel **recommends** that this practice be drawn to the attention of the Senate Office.

- The Senate Office recognises the use of a Good Cause committee of this nature to be good practice, as decisions should not be made by one member of staff alone, and acknowledges that the work involved in considering claims is considerable. This issue was explored during the recent University-wide consultation on the Good Cause procedure. The Senate Office is in contact with colleagues at a number of HE institutions across Scotland and is aware that various different approaches are in use, each with their own advantages and disadvantages. It is noted that while handling of all Good Cause claims centrally would alleviate administrative pressure on academic staff, there is no capacity available centrally to absorb this pressure.

Recommendation 16

The Review Panel **recommends** that this issue regarding unsuitable teaching accommodation be highlighted to the Director of Estates and Commercial Services. [Paragraph 4.3.2]

For the attention of: The Director of Estates and Commercial Services
For information: The Head of Subject

Response:

SER extract - Learning and Teaching Space

4.3.2 The Review Panel acknowledged the challenges presented by the lack of appropriate teaching spaces, particularly in relation to the growth in student numbers over recent years. This was the case, particularly, with regard to those student and staff with particular issues of accessibility. Based predominantly in the Adam Smith Building, common complaints ranged from the allocation of multiple rooms for courses, the allocation of unsuitable rooms and loss of teaching time travelling between lectures. All students with whom the Panel met echoed these concerns. The Panel acknowledged there was no immediate solution to these issues, however, the Review Panel recommends that this issue regarding unsuitable teaching accommodation should be highlighted to the Director of Estates & Commercial Services.

Teaching space across the campus is at a premium and in order to optimise allocations whilst allowing Schools to determine the day and time at which classes are taught all space is allocated on the basis of 'best fit' - matching the capacity, features and equipment of the room with the size of class and requested facilities as far as possible. This may result in rooms being allocated which are a distance from a School's 'home' location.

The aim when producing the first timetable each year is to ensure as much consistency as possible in room allocations. However, changes or additions requested subsequently (e.g. as a result of increases in the size of the cohort) often result in less consistency and a greater spread of locations necessarily being used.

With regards to the Adam Smith building specifically, the size, configuration and accessibility of teaching rooms in the building often leads to classes in large-cohort subjects such as Sociology being roomed elsewhere on the campus rather than adjacent to staff workspace.

There is an annual programme of investment in centrally-managed teaching spaces to ensure their suitability as learning spaces. As part of this investment, teaching rooms are being converted, on an incremental basis, to support active and collaborative learning. However, at the present time there is a mismatch between the demand for active learning space (such as may be required by this subject area) and the availability of such. This can often result in rooms being allocated which are less than ideal for the mode of delivery. Whilst this situation will improve over time, it cannot be fully resolved until a significantly greater proportion of the teaching estate is reconfigured.

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 21 May 2021

Periodic Subject Review: Responses to the Recommendations Arising from the Review of Theology & Religious Studies held on 17 February 2020
Cover Sheet

Mr Chris Buckland, Clerk to the Review Panel

Brief Description of the Paper

Under Summer Powers 2020, Academic Standards Committee received and approved, the Report of the Periodic Subject Review of Theology & Religious Studies and associated recommendations. The recommendations contained within the report were approved for onward transmission to those identified for action. This report details the responses and the progress made to date in implementing the recommendations. The response has been delayed due to pressures caused by the current pandemic.

The Convener of the Review Panel would like to commend the Subject area for the thorough responses and developments undertaken since the Review.

Action Requested

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

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

As identified in the report.

Resource Implications

As outlined in the paper.

Timescale for Implementation

As outlined in the paper.

Equality Implications

As identified.

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 21 May 2021

Periodic Subject Review: Responses to the Recommendations Arising from the Review of Theology & Religious Studies held on 17 February 2020

Mr Chris Buckland, Clerk to the Review Panel

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 consider the academic and financial aspects concomitant with the anticipated tender from the Church of Scotland for Initial Ministerial Education training partners, and that they consult with the School and College where appropriate during the tender process. [Paragraph 4.1.1]

For the attention of: Head of Subject, Head of School, Head of College

---

Joint Response:

We have been in continued conversations with the Church of Scotland in the wake of their suspension of the tendering process. They expressed their intention to continue with open channels of communication before any significant changes are decided upon. At present there are no new plans for a tendering process. If this changes, we will consult with the Heads of School and College about the tendering terms to determine if a Glasgow bid would be viable.

However, we have enhanced our institutional collaborations with the Presbytery of Glasgow (Church of Scotland) part-funding a post filled by Mark Johnston which intends to develop training outwith traditional degree channels. This has resulted in eight new short courses being designed and delivered and another four in the pipeline. The eight courses are:

Semester 1:

Designing and Leading Christian Worship TRS1030E
Managing Difficult Church Change TRS1031E
Reimagining Christian Practice in an Age of Uncertainty TRS1032E

Semester 2:

Creative Writing as Spiritual Reflection: Models, Methods and Practice TRS1034E
Introduction to Biblical Hebrew TRS1033E
Worship and Contemporary Visual Arts TRS1029E

Additional course approved by the Board of Studies:

Engaging the Bible TRS1036
Listening in Mission TRS1037

These 10 credit courses not only built bridges with the Church of Scotland and have the capacity of serving as Access Courses to widen participation and recruitment, they have also

been revenue generating. The courses are £200 and we've had c.85 students enrol across the six courses delivered so far, thus generating £17,000. There have been significant teething problems around registration and matriculation, but the team in SCS (particularly Helen McLaughlin and Maeve Houston and Mark Johnston (the Short Course convener in TRS)) have worked to address the systemic problems, which should make it easier for other Subjects to develop similar Short Course options, which have proved beneficial to TRS in a number of different ways.

Additionally, Trinity College has planned a number of further activities to enhance outreach. Four online panel discussions have been organised during the Covid lockdown: 1) Theological Reflection in a Time of Covid-19; 2) Pastoral Care in a Time of Covid-19; 3) Reimagining Mission during and after Covid-19; and, 4) Breaking New Ground: Church Planting and New Forms of Church (24 March 2021). The first three events have all taken place and had c.150 participants from across the UK, Europe, North America, South Africa and New Zealand. A six week online community of practices ran in the summer of 2020. The topic was 'Distanced Ministry in Disruptive Times'. The course ran with 24 participants due to pedagogical priorities, although over 60 sought to enroll. Across these activities, Trinity College has demonstrated a greatly enhanced and proactive engagement with extending our external partnerships and strengthening our relationship with both the Church of Scotland and the United Reformed Church, in particular. This has been significantly supported by the role of Zanne Domoney-Lyttle as Trinity College administrator, jointly funded by Trinity College and TRS endowments.

Strategic planning for future growth

> **Recommendation 2**
>
> The panel recommends that the Subject work with the School and College to ensure that staff workloads are resilient to the planned future growth in Postgraduate Taught provision, and assess whether the number of UG honours courses offered is sustainable or needs further reduction. [Paragraph 6.1.3]
>
> **For the attention of: Head of Subject, Head of School**

Joint Response:

Out of practical necessity, TRS reduced their offering of Honours courses from c.20 per annum to 12. This has increased the number of students across all of our honours options and reduced workload, while at the same time ensuring a broad range of topics are offered across Theology and Religious Studies. We expect to remain at a similar level of Honours Courses. The School is developing methods for comparing and planning workloads within and across subject areas. In anticipation of this, we have built into the current workload the capacity to deliver the three new PGT programmes that will be coming online: MTh Church History and Theology (Spring 2022),[1] MSc Religion & Global Challenges (Autumn 2023), and MTh Biblical Interpretation (expected Autumn 2023).

> **Recommendation 3**
>
> The Panel notes the strategic outreach plan being developed by the Subject in an attempt to address the lack of growth in undergraduate student numbers. The panel recommends that the Subject consider whether there is a wider market which can be utilised to support Undergraduate recruitment. [Paragraph 5.1.1]
>
> **For the attention of: Head of Subject, Head of School**

---

[1] This was due to begin in January 2021, but the College of Arts Graduate School suspended all PGT programmes starting this year in light of the global pandemic.

Joint Response:

In addition to the widening participation Short Courses noted above, TRS at Glasgow has been part of ongoing discussions within TRSUK about addressing issues of diminished recruitment. Two key themes have emerged: 1) the need to foster better links with teachers and schools; 2) making clearer to potential students the natural progress from Religious, Moral and Philosophical Studies (RMPS) at secondary school to TRS at university. To directly engage with these issues TRS has used endowments to support a part-time, fixed-term position during the academic year 2021–2 for Dr Jonathan Birch, who is a longtime tutor in TRS and also principal examiner in the philosophy of religion and epistemology for A Levels. Dr Birch has organised a number of outreach activities to support exams revision, develop relationships with teachers and students, and ultimately to increase recruitment. These events align to the exams curriculum. Since beginning these activities in the Spring of 2020, we have seen increases in the number of applications to TRS:

UCAS application figures

	2019	2020	2021
TRS Joint	85	71	93
TRS single honours	64	84	73
Total	**149**	**155**	**166***

Three more outreach/CPD events are planned for May 2021.

Additionally, we are working with the Recruitment Office to better articulate on our UCAS and internal webpages that the clearest university pathway from an A-Level or Higher in RMPS is a joint MA in TRS and Philosophy. A number of English universities are considering redesigning their incredibly strictured degrees to attain this aim, whereas we already have this in place, it just needs to be more clearly articulated. Of the 650 UCAS applications for joint MAs including TRS since 2015, 171 have been joint with Philosophy and 76 with History. Dr Birch is taking the lead on this and is working with the SCS Student Recruitment and Academic Events Administrator (Katie Quinn), the UK Student Recruitment Officer (Rhona Gordon), and colleagues at other TRS departments through the aegis of TRSUK to develop our advertising profile in this respect.

Dr Birch is also taking the lead in developing links with NATRE (National Association of Teacher of Religious Education), which principally comprises RE teachers in England. We have contacted them directly to see if we may be of assistance in setting up a Scottish cluster. We are also in discussions with Education Scotland for developing a CPD course for Scottish RE teachers on world religions in their global context. It is anticipated that this will take the form of a micro credential.

Finally, we have brought online a two-year BD pathway based on the recognition of prior learning. This has already resulted in an increased number of applications from Church of Scotland candidates.

---

* The figures for 2021 are not yet complete. While they reflect Home applications as of the UCAS deadline, they do not include all International and EU. In addition, we have at least five additional students who are applying after the deadline to complete training for Church of Scotland ministry through the BD, most will be on the new two year version.

Academic Standards

Recommendation 4

The Panel recommend that appropriate quality assurance mechanisms be developed to ensure that the new Postgraduate Taught programmes are included in the Subject's Quality Enhancement review cycle. [7.1.3]

For the attention of: Head of Subject

Response:

This is happening as the programmes come on stream. The MTh in Ministry, Theology & Practice is already included in the Quality Enhancement review cycle and the MTh in Church History & Theology will as well when it begins in January 2022.

Equality and Diversity

Recommendation 5

The panel recommends that the Subject take measures to ensure that they adhere to the University requirement for course material to be populated on Moodle in advance of lectures, in accordance with the Accessible & Inclusive Learning Policy. [Paragraph 5.3.1]

For the attention of: Head of Subject

Response:

The University has instituted new guidelines as we have moved to fully online teaching during the pandemic, particularly in light of the Accessible & Inclusive Learning Policy (AILP). This has included the necessity of uploading material in advance. TRS has complied with these regulations and this in turn has addressed the previous shortcomings. Additionally, the introduction of a traffic light system for monitoring the accessibility of material has ensured that all Moodles are far more compliant with the AILP.

Technology Enhanced Learning and Teaching

Recommendation 6

The panel recommends that the Subject work with the School of Critical Studies to ensure that online marking is fully utilised, and that Subject staff receive suitable training on relevant systems. [Paragraph 6.1.6]

For the attention of: Head of Subject, Head of School

Joint Response:

All marking in TRS is now being completed online. Additional training has been made available, motivated principally by the demands of teaching online during the pandemic. TRS now has a clear and functional procedure for online marking and recording of grades, working closely with the Subject Administrator.

Graduate Teaching Assistants

Recommendation 7

The Panel **recommends** that the Subject consider the impact on staff workloads of removing the requirement for GTA seminar teaching at Levels 1 and 2, and that efforts be

---

> made to provide any existing or future GTAs with a level of peer assessment and feedback on their teaching performance [6.4.2]
>
> **For the attention of: Head of Subject**

Response:

Whereas the subject area had indicated during the PSR that GTA contributions to teaching might be reduced, this will not be the case. TRS is working to normalise GTA work within the subject area. While GTAs previously have not been involved in marking, this is now changing. Training for new markers and direct feedback after moderation processes is now in place. With regards to supporting GTA teaching, course conveners or other permanent staff will sit in on teaching sessions once a semester and provide the GTA with written feedback, both to ensure the quality of teaching but also to support professional development of our GTAs. This will not necessarily happen for those teaching on Tutor contracts, who have greater teaching experience.

Matters for attention – outside of Subject or School (no response required)

The Panel noted the challenges experienced by Subject staff in signposting students to relevant support services and highlighted the Student Support & Wellbeing project of the World-Changing Glasgow Transformation, whose work intends to increase staff and student awareness of appropriate support that is available. [Paragraph 5.2.3]

For the attention of: Executive Director of Student & Academic Services

Additional Subject response:

There has been a university-wide emphasis on signposting students to relevant support during the last year. This has been particularly important in the College of Arts who produced an excellent Induction Moodle that sets out numerous wellbeing issues and provides clear and accessible information. TRS has embedded links to this material in our Handbooks and Moodles, as well as intentionally drawing students' attention to these resources in class.

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 21 May 2021

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

Cover Sheet

Brief Description of the Paper

At its meeting on 2 October 2020, Academic Standards Committee received the updated responses to the recommendations arising from the Periodic Subject Review of the Undergraduate School of Medicine (copy attached). From the responses that had been received, it was clear that the timescale had been unrealistic and little progress had been made. It was agreed that update responses should be requested in relation to Recommendations 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7 to be submitted to ASC in May 2021.

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 21 May 2021

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 targeting Widening Participation students) we anticipate a further increase in Scottish students in the coming 2 years. This 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 & Learning Centre was hoped for, but the requisition of our Teaching and Learning Centre in the QEUH has prevented this. We are mindful that for Year 3, many of the comments about poor organisation in the NSS reference the organisation within the first semester (Phase 3). Flexibility in room size limits would 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:

In the light of future growth in student numbers, 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 at consistent venues on-campus, preferably in the Wolfson Medical School Building. The WMSB is purpose-built for such teaching, and would be helpful in maintaining the quality of the student experience. The WMSB 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 allocation 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 (external donations and ACT funding) will require that we provide some guarantee (or at the very least a 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.

> **Updated response: May 2021**

The vast majority of students have continued their medical education relatively unaffected by COVID. Clinical teaching has continued and has been greatly enhanced through COVID by initiatives such as "Operation Colleague". The numbers of students contracting COVID as a result of clinical contact has been virtually zero.

1.MBChB Year 1 & 2 (Phase 1 & 2) and Staff Numbers

The student numbers in Year 1&2 have continued on their planned growth. Post COVID experience is expected to be positively impacted by the changes made peri COVID. We have successfully pivoted to online lectures and tutorials (PBL/VS) and the online laboratories have benefitted from the LT platform. The student feedback has improved over this year from this group and we are currently actively considering the shape of the post covid Year 1 & 2 curriculum.

The current L&T staff numbers combined with the extended workforce and GP colleagues has proved sufficient for the altered delivery. This will be kept under review as we move into the next phase of delivery and reintroduce small group F2F teaching.

The timetable is now delivered to students in these years by the App which has improved the student experience. We have the difficulties encountered across the University in planning forward and continue to work with colleagues in CMIS to achieve a good student experience on campus in 21-22. The move of lectures to zoom delivery will help but the need to socially distance for small group teaching brings challenges in finding appropriately equipped rooms around the campus.

We plan to use a blended approach for laboratory teaching in the future. This includes, temporarily, anatomy. We will, however, be moving to in person anatomy labs as soon as COVID circumstances allow.

2. MBChB Year 3 (Phase 3) and Staffing Numbers

The direct entrants to Year 3 from St Andrews, IMU, and Brunei bring the numbers of students in Year 3 - 5 to an average of 375 in each of the years.

We plan to continue with zoom lectures which apart from working well, solve the space problem. The only two spaces that have the potential to accommodate this number are the JMS Building and the TLC on the QEUH site which is currently the Lighthouse Lab so out of

service for L&T activity. It may come back online during 2022.We will need to negotiate access to these spaces for the occasions in the future when we do want to bring these year groups together in person.

We have independently negotiated space on the Golden Jubilee site for clinical teaching and assessments and early experience at the GJNH has been very positive and bodes well for an ongoing partnership.

The teaching in Year 3 is predominantly carried out by clinical colleagues. We have now split the year into four groups instead of three. This allows for additional GP Teaching for which additional GP ACT funding has been allocated. This is in line with the SG agenda to increase GP numbers across Scotland.

3. MBChB Years 4 & 5 (Phase 4 and Preparation for Practice)

The vast majority of teaching takes place in clinical settings, both hospital and GP Practices. We continue to have excellent liaison with the NHS Educational Leads across the West of Scotland in the Health Boards teaching Glasgow students. We work closely together with them in mapping clinical teaching and activity. Increased student numbers are supported by an increase in the ACT resource that follows the teaching.

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 & 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

Response (updated May 2021):

1. In common with other areas the UMS has become very dependent on educational technology through the Covid period. In order to support this we employed a UL with the relevant skill set a year ago on a twelve-month contract which has just been made permanent. She and other colleagues from the UMS are actively engaged with the wider TELT agenda in both SOMDN and the College and this is an area that will continue to be actively developed particularly as we emerge from COVID and have ongoing altered patterns of delivery.

2. We are working with Central IT to enhance the utility of My Campus and move away from VALE. A project to support this has now been delayed twice because of COVID as it is agreed it would be best delivered when the UMS Teams are largely back on Campus. We now hope for it to start in 21/22. This is intended to be a gap analysis between the packages already available centrally that can be utilised and what is missing. The gaps

---

[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.

will be filled by either purchasing or developing specialist software. A coherence between the systems used will also be ensured.

3. The merger of the MVLS IT Team with IS has been a huge positive and has allowed us to have a managed programme of IT developments, a more constructive and functional link to the teams responsible for the IT systems providing student support and much more robust advice on all elements of IT planning going forward and specifically the gradual move away from VALE, the future of the portfolio support options (our preferred option is to move to Mahara or another University provided option) and taking forward bespoke software requirements such as integrating Practique (OSCE software) with the packages already in use.

4. The merger with Central IT has allowed us, in conjunction with other areas in the College, to roll out the new attendance monitoring package which has been very successful and will be of even greater value when the reporting tool is added.

5. We have been discussing with Central IT the dependence on one individual to support VALE. We no longer believe that it is as vulnerable as was once thought so there is time for a planned move through the VALE project (mentioned above). The one point of failure in terms of support is therefore currently our single biggest risk.

6. The roll out of the Honorary Status database across the University which originated from a project in the UMS (Helen Lloyd) and which is now managed centrally provides us potentially with a platform to use for recording the contribution of honorary staff to the MBChB. This is tagged as a future development.

7. Merging the QA information into a single source is also tagged as a future development. This entails merging data held as a part of the ACT feedback requirements (which is extensive) with the more generic data held on systems such as EvaSys to provide comprehensive data across all elements of the MBChB.

> **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.

See Above

Supporting staff

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

---

Updated May 2021

Key senior roles in the UMS PSS Team have changed and the postholders are now successfully embedded and as a result the Team is in a much stronger position. The turnover referred to in the original PSR report was, to an extent, a perception and reflected a period of expected changes due to staff moving to promoted posts, being offered other opportunities within SoMDN to widen their experience, and retirements. This, in the natural course of events, has stabilised.

The new team had planned a major review of the structure and to a degree that is still in place but had to be paused at the COVID outbreak. Nonetheless positive change has been made and there has been much improvement in the way in which the team operates. Delivery of the full vision will require significant resource to be fully delivered to enable the UMS PSS staffing level to be meet the average benchmark of comparable Schools in Scotland. This is one priority against other competing ones for very limited resource in the UMS against a peri Covid environment where increasing the head count is understandably handled with caution in the wider environment.

Overall there have been improvements due to UMS PSS management changes, ongoing improvement and planning with more to follow as we emerge from COVID. This is not unrelated to the IT section as improved IT would free up time of the PSS Team for more value-added activities.

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 (or on alternate weeks during COVID lockdown) 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 have 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.

Update: May 2021

1. The pandemic has facilitated different means of communication and has seen enhanced staff engagement. A key example is the SoMDN Town Hall meetings which pre COVID took place approximately four times each year with an attendance of between 30-45. These now take place much more frequently and have an online attendance of between 70 and 120. T&L matters have high profile at these meetings.

2. The UMS Manager has established an active email circulation tool that goes widely round all contributors ensuring all have access to news, updates, developments and opportunities.

3. Minutes of key UMS L&T meetings are available and there is currently a move to managing Committees via Teams which will make this much easier both to facilitate and to access.

4. The enhanced honorary status database (mentioned above) will allow for greatly enhanced communication with NHS colleagues contributing to the MBChB. There are currently in the region of 800 such contributors covering all areas of the activity of the UMS.

5. Developments will continue as the return to campus progresses but it is clear that engagement with electronic means of communication is now high.

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 May 2021

PBL facilitators' days and the Educators' days proceeded as planned, albeit in an online format. COVID-related pressures have stalled the implementation of a series of sessions for our Honorary Staff members (who are largely clinicians within our partner health boards and

in General Practice) on Training the Trainers. This initiative will help improve the extent and the quality of our teaching provision.

All of our VS tutors receive biannual feedback from their VS group (using Evasys). This feedback is reviewed by the Director of Vocational Studies and peer support is available as indicated by feedback or as requested by tutors. The feedback then feeds into the UoGMS QA processes. In addition to receiving feedback, all VS tutors attend at least 3 peer review, marking calibration and training sessions per year. Furthermore, attendance at the annual TALE (Teaching and Learning Event) conference and free access to University of Glasgow GP CPD events is open to all and encouraged.

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 & 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.

Update May 2021

1. A group led by the Deputy Head of the UMS has been convened to lead on scholarship and a database is being compiled containing all the projects that are currently live. We are also building links between the Clinical Teaching Fellows (NHS ACT funded posts for doctors in training) so that there can be enhanced collaboration across the clinical/non-clinical divide. This will enhance the quality and scope of the scholarship that can be undertaken. This has been slower to get underway than we had had hoped as the CTFs have had an increased clinical workload during Covid.

2. The focus for scholarship currently is with regard to differential attainment across the protected characteristics. This is challenging because of the difficulty of accessing the granular data from the University. Discussion is ongoing between SoMDN and relevant colleagues to try to find a solution to this problem. This is becoming increasingly important as this analysis looks likely to become a requirement from the regulators.

3. Funding has remained in place for scholarship throughout Covid and several L&T staff have been able to attend and participate in online conferences and workshops.

4. The Scholarship Group will develop a relationship with LEADS and their input will be welcomed.

It is hoped to be in a position to action the scholarship agenda more proactively in 2021/22 as the CTFs free up and the data becomes available.

Student support mechanisms

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.

Update May 2021

1. The Library initiatives have unfortunately been delayed because of Covid but will be picked up again as soon as possible and hopefully in 2021/22.

2. The Induction Pack and the Academic Skills Pack were introduced for Year 1 in September 2020 with engagement (which was very high) being monitored via Moodle. Introductory sessions for both PBL and VS are held as well as a Q&A session ahead of

---

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

the students being fully launched into both in Year 1. Wellbeing is key to successful management of independent learning so the Head of MBChB Student Welfare also participates in the introductory sessions.

3. A vertical theme in Clinical Reasoning has been established which threads through the entire MBChB and introduces concepts that promote independent learning such as critical thinking and self-regulated learning. There has been, for example, a pilot of a series of Moodle sessions in a virtual ward that students work through asynchronously with structured feedback. Early outcomes across the MBChB suggest this has been a very useful tool to enhance students' preparedness for independent management of clinical problems in a clinical environment.

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

---

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: May 2021

1. Formative assessments normally take place prior to any new summative assessment type e.g., MBChB1 do a formative MCQ, MEQ, MILE and Coursework and then MBChB2 do a formative OSCE. There is individual feedback provided to students after each of these.

2. There are also sessions provided for each Year group where students are guided through responses to formative MCQ and MEQ papers in advance of the summative assessments to illustrate and highlight the keys to optimal performance.

3. 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.

4. We have harmonised ILO's across our clinical specialties, introducing a clear progression in learning from early to later attachments. This has both attracted positive feedback from students and has also led to the development of better exam questions and, in turn, clearer marking schedules.

5. Following summative exams, students are able to view how they have performed individually in MCQs and MEQs broken down across all topics and blocks/domains. Following clinical exams each student can view their mark and their pass/fail status for each OSCE station.

6. Students who have failed or who are in the Pass-Fail borderline (Grade D) are invited to attend a meeting with the Year Head to review the exam material to help provide formative feedback. The opportunity to do this in later years is more limited by the fact that some of the material necessarily comes from external sources given the Medical Schools' Council Assessment Alliance now provides the common content which allows direct contemporaneous comparison of achievement across all UK Medical Schools.

7. Coursework and MILE assessment. In Year 1, students submit a mock formative MILE which is marked and students receive individual written comments on their work which specifically highlights areas for improvement that they can use to inform subsequent summative coursework. All summative coursework feeds forward with students receiving individualised written feedback as well as generic cohort observations.

8. MCQ Exam. Ahead of the first MCQ summative exam in Year 1, students have a marked formative MCQ exam. Following the outcomes being available there is a plenary session where the most challenging questions are discussed and explained.

   In relation to the pre-exam MCQ practice:

   a) MB3 have a practice paper on Moodle with feedback for each item.
   b) MB4 have a practice paper based on the Medical Schools' Council Assessment Alliance (MSCAA) material.
   c) MB5 have 2 sessions of MCQ practice. An initial one from UoG and one with the 50 item MSCAA practice paper. This runs as a mock exam followed by individual item feedback at the end of the session.

9. MEQ exam. There are exemplar papers and answers supported in plenary sessions in each year. All students are able to view an individualised breakdown of their results across all topics and blocks/domains for their MEQs following each summative assessment. These types of questions are used at the end of each year and so this provides further feedback for preparation for future exams.

10. OSCE/Clinical Exams. In advance of clinical exams (OSCEs) exemplar stations are shared on Moodle to give students an example of the format of the full station. This includes making available all documentation including the candidate/examiner/actor instructions to the marking schedules. The Clinical Teaching Fellows are responsible for the provision of individual teaching, assessment of clinical examinations and provision of feedback while students are on placement to ensure adequate preparation for the summative OSCE in Years 3, 4 and 5.

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 21 May 2021

Report of the Meeting of the Joint Liaison Committee of the University of Glasgow and The Glasgow School of Art held on 8 April 2021
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 The Glasgow School of Art (GSA) held on 8 April 2021.

Action requested

Academic Standards Committee (ASC) is asked to:

- **approve** the Remit, Composition and Membership of the Joint Liaison Committee for session 2021-22 **(Appendix 1)**;

- **endorse** the GSA Code of Assessment – Exceptional Circumstances Addendum (attached); and

- **note** the list of staff recognised by GSA as Associate University Lecturers (AULs) **(Appendix 2)** and the remainder of the report.

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

As outlined in the report.

Resource Implications

No resource implications for the University have been identified.

Timescale for Implementation

As outlined 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 21 May 2021

Report of the Meeting of the Joint Liaison Committee of the University of Glasgow and The Glasgow School of Art held on 8 April 2021

Robbie Mulholland, Academic Collaborations Office

1. Remit, Composition and Membership, Session 2021-22

The committee **agreed to recommend** the remit, composition and membership of the Joint Liaison Committee of the University of Glasgow (UoG) and The Glasgow School of Art (GSA) (2021-22) to Academic Standards Committee (ASC) for approval, as detailed in **Appendix 1.**

2. Proposal to Establish Joint Liaison Committee Sub-group

The Deputy Head of the UoG Academic Collaborations Office (ACO) introduced a proposal setting out a revised timetable for the annual meeting of the JLC and also the introduction of a JLC sub-group. She explained that the proposal had arisen following recent discussions between UoG Academic Collaborations Office (ACO) and GSA Academic Quality Office (AQO) staff aimed at accommodating certain operational requirements relating to the production of GSA statistical information. The timing of the availability of Higher Education Statistical Agency (HESA) statistics and the necessary alignment of this data with GSA's annual HESA Return impacted the GSA Programme Monitoring and Annual Reporting (PMAR) process. This, in turn, affected the timeline associated with consideration of the JLC Annual Report through GSA's committee structure.

She advised members that ACO and AQO staff had agreed that by moving the annual meeting of the JLC from its current place in the calendar (usually February) to April, this would accommodate the above reporting requirements. It was recognised, however, that April was rather late in the year for the JLC to be considering business relating to the previous academic session. With this in mind, ACO and AQO staff had agreed to seek JLC approval to establish a sub-group which would meet in the first semester (October/November) of each academic session and report to the JLC. A meeting at this point would provide the added benefit of allowing an opportunity for its members to discuss any matters which might require to be included, or expanded upon, in the Annual Report.

She advised that the sub-group would operate along the lines of the Senior Officers meetings which had been held between representatives of the ACO and AQO in the past. The meeting would replace one of the operational meetings which currently took place between staff of the two offices.

Following discussion, members **agreed** that the annual meeting of the JLC be moved to the month of April, and a JLC sub-group be established in the terms described above with the membership below.

Membership of JLC Sub-Group:

UoG:

Clerk of Senate (Convener of the JLC)

Deputy Head, ACO

Academic Collaborations Manager, ACO

Deputy Director (Academic)

Academic Registrar

Senior Policy Officer

3. Reporting of Minutes of Joint Boards

Following the last meeting, the Clerk had investigated what the reporting routes at UoG were with regard to the onward reporting of minutes from UoG-GSA Joint Programme Boards. He noted that there appeared to be no consistent practice in this regard and minutes from Joint Programme Boards were not submitted to other groups/committees within the University as a matter of course. Following discussion, the JLC **agreed** that UoG College Learning and Teaching Deans should be contacted to seek their views on onward reporting routes in respect of Joint Programme Board minutes.

4. Periodic Review – Composition of Panels

Discussion had taken place at the last meeting of the JLC regarding the desirability that a member of UoG academic staff should sit on GSA Periodic Review Panels. The GSA Academic Registrar confirmed that, following discussion with relevant members of staff at GSA, it had been been agreed that there should be UoG academic staff representation on all future GSA Periodic Review Panels.

5. Responses to External Examiner Reports

The External Examiner Report Response table provided by the Senate Office (for inclusion with the GSA Annual Report in respect of sessions 2018/19 and 2019/20) had not yet been received by GSA. There was some uncertainty regarding the completeness of GSA External Examiner report information held at UoG and this had been compounded by factors linked to the pandemic.

AQO and ACO staff had recently discussed the effectiveness of the current procedures for the exchange of external examiner information between the two institutions. These staff had agreed to meet to review the arrangements going forward as a matter of urgency. The outcome of these deliberations would be conveyed to the new JLC sub-group in due course. In the meantime, AQO would arrange to provide ACO with all the external examiner reports which they held in respect of sessions 2018/19 and 2019/20 with a view to GSA being provided with the External Examiner Report Response table for both sessions at an early opportunity.

6. Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) - Suite of Agreements

The committee was advised that the suite of Agreements relating to the Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) between UoG and GSA had been finalised and signed-off. The suite of Agreements was the collection of documents which set out the terms and conditions of the Agreements which existed between UoG and GSA.

7. Annual Report from The Glasgow School of Art (2019-20)

7.1 Overview of the Year

The GSA Deputy Director (Academic) thanked GSA colleagues for their outstanding commitment over the course of the last year. Staff had had to adapt to very different working environments and practices following the onset of the Covid-19 pandemic and the rapid pivot to new learning, teaching and assessment methods. They had helped navigate GSA through a series of unprecedented challenges at a time when the institution was already trying to work through disruption brought about by several other factors, including post-fire re-organisation and industrial action. He thanked the Heads of the School of Innovation, and of Learning and

Teaching in particular, for assuming additional senior responsibilities at a time when absences and staff turn-over had impacted considerably on the work of GSA's senior leadership team.

He also thanked the Executive Director of Student & Academic Services and other staff at UoG for the support they had provided to GSA students on a range of matters over the course of the last year. He highlighted in particular the invaluable support which had been provided by the University in respect of Covid-19 testing for GSA students.

7.2 GSA Response to Covid-19

With the onset of the pandemic and subsequent national lockdown in March 2020, GSA had moved quickly to reevaluate its approach to learning and teaching in compliance with government public health measures. The GSA Deputy Director (Academic) described the arrangements that GSA had put in place to ensure that academic progression and completion remained possible for all students. The approach had drawn on the experience gained from the teaching intelligence model put in place after the second Mackintosh Building fire when a sudden loss of access to many on-campus facilities had occurred. The Academic Continuity Group (ACG) was formed to oversee all teaching developments and decisions to adjust provision were guided by the three principles of safety, legality and educational viability.

Going forward into academic session 2020/21, GSA was adopting a Hybrid-Flexi academic model - one specifically designed to support the reconceptualisation of the teaching of studio. The Hybrid-Flexi model was devised in response to an anticipated reduction in studio access and the increased use of digital technology which was similar to approaches to art and design practices being adopted elsewhere in the sector. PGT Stage 3 had been delivered entirely online in session 2019-20 and this had allowed GSA to pilot several elements of the Hybrid-Flexi model as a combination of remote online learning, and limited in-person learning.

GSA was aware of the challenges this academic model posed in terms of digital capacity/expertise and a group had been formed to oversee investment in support of remote learning. The institution was making a significant investment in its infrastructure to support remote learning and teaching and this included an investment of £321K for laptops, connectivity and IT support for students experiencing digital exclusion.

7.3 Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR) Outcome Report

The Deputy Director (Academic) advised the committee that the GSA ELIR had taken place, following several postponements, in 2020. The initial visit took place in March and the main review event in October. The final QAA report would be published on 9 April 2021 - the day following the meeting of the JLC.

He advised that Academic Council was overseeing the development of a detailed action plan addressing matters highlighted by the report and that this plan would form the basis of a submission to QAA Scotland in May 2021. GSA would work closely with senior colleagues at the University on this matter. A series of GSA staff briefings on the report would take place shortly and ahead of publication.

[*Clerk's post-meeting note*]:

The QAA report's threshold judgement on the GSA ELIR was:

*'Glasgow School of Art (GSA) has arrangements for managing academic standards and the student learning experience which are **limited** effectiveness'.*

The report (which can be accessed via the link below) includes 6 commendations and 16 recommendations, summarised as follows:

Commendations:

Widening Access
Support for articulating students
Student support services
Decolonisation of the curriculum
Technology support
Digital inclusion strategy

Recommendations:

Institutional leadership, strategy and direction
Student representation
Partnership with students
Communication and consultation
Studio space and workshop provision
Support for additional programme costs
Institutional progress with equality and diversity
Assessment and feedback
Assessment design
Assessment policy
Academic standards
Using data to enhance the student experience
Review of student-facing professional support services
Responding to student feedback
Independence in student-facing processes
Awarding body oversight and approval

https://www.qaa.ac.uk/docs/qaa/reports/glasgow-school-of-art-elir-outcome-20.pdf?sfvrsn=3984d581_4

7.4 QAA Scotland Cause for Concern Reports

The GSA Deputy Director (Academic) advised the committee that QAA Scotland had taken forward two Cause for Concern Investigations in 2020 – one being an investigation into a concern raised by undergraduates at GSA, and the other being an investigation into a concern raised by postgraduates at GSA. The Cause for Concern reports (see link below) had been published on 19 February 2021 and GSA was currently in liaison with QAA Scotland regarding the reports' recommendations.

https://www.qaa.ac.uk/reviewing-higher-education/quality-assurance-reports/Glasgow-School-of-Art

7.5 Assessment and Feedback

The committee heard that work regarding the GSA Academic Framework and the institution's approach to assessment and feedback which had been paused at the onset of the pandemic had now been resumed. The Deputy Director (Academic) considered that some of the difficulties experienced by GSA during the course of the pandemic could be attributed, in part, to the different programme structures and approaches to formative and summative assessment in place across the institution. Some feedback from students suggested that they did not fully understand how assessment was arrived at and they would welcome more clarity regarding this and also greater consistency across GSA with regard to programme and assessment design.

He advised that the review of the Academic Framework would include:

- A review of the GSA Code of Assessment, including the Addendum approved in February 2021;

- Completion of the Academic Framework project to achieve greater consistency in programme and assessment design; and
- A review of staff/student induction with regard to assessment.

He anticipated that assessment and feedback were two matters which the QAA ELIR report would suggest that GSA review going forward.

7.6 GSA Strategic Plan

The GSA Strategic Plan was currently under development with work on this being led by the Director of GSA. Plans for this had been endorsed by the Board of Governors in June 2020 and it would sit alongside an operational plan for session 2020-21. The planning process would be stakeholder driven and include wide consultation, including with the University of Glasgow. It was proposed that the Strategic Plan would be presented to the Board of Governors in October/November 2021.

7.7 Campus Developments

A new GSA Director of Estates had been appointed in December 2020 who would lead on the development and implementation of a new Estates Strategy. The Strategy would include redevelopment plans for the Mackintosh Building and a review of physical access on the GSA estate.

The Stow Building had opened to students in September 2019 and the Head of the School of Fine Art was leading on a post occupancy evaluation with regard to this building. A significant number of complaints had been received during the year regarding studio provision across GSA and a considerable number related to the Stow Building.

7.8 Partnership with Students

The committee heard that results from student surveys and other Student Voice sources consistently suggested that closer dialogue between GSA and students as part of student partnering initiatives would be beneficial to the student experience. GSA was therefore putting in place several initiatives aimed at addressing this. This included drawing up a partnership Agreement with Glasgow School of Art Students' Association (GSASA) which could be used as the basis for taking forward matters of mutual interest.

7.9 Periodic Review of The School of Simulation and Visualisation

The Periodic Review of the School of Simulation and Visualisation had taken place remotely on 28-29 July 2020. The Review Panel had made five recommendations and seven commendations. There were no substantive concerns identified by the Panel.

The Periodic Review also included the revalidation of the following programmes:

- MDes Sound for the Moving Image
- MSc Heritage Visualisation
- MSc Medical Visualisation and Human Anatomy (joint programme with UoG)
- MSc Serious Games and Virtual Reality
- BDes (Hons) Sound for the Moving Image
- BSc Immersive System Design

The University's Academic Standards Committee, at its January 2021 meeting, considered the Review Panel's recommendation that the MSc Medical Visualisation and Human Anatomy programme (a joint programme between the University and GSA) be revalidated. The Committee noted that while no concerns had been raised, the report did not specifically refer to the scrutiny process and requested that that be included in order that revalidation could be confirmed. (That has now been done and revalidation confirmed out of Committee.) The same meeting of ASC also noted the Review Panel's decision to revalidate the other 5 programmes

(GSA having delegated authority from the University to revalidate these programmes, as non-joint programmes). In both cases, the revalidation commenced in September 2021 for a period of six years.

The GSA Deputy Director (Academic) conveyed his thanks to the UoG representatives at GSA review events for the valuable contributions they had made. He also thanked the University's representative at GSA's Programme Monitoring and Annual Reporting (PMAR) event for her attendance and input.

7.10 The Royal Institute of British Architects and Architects Registration Board

The committee was advised that the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) Validation Visit to the Mackintosh School of Architecture (MSA) had taken place in November 2018. MSA was granted unconditional approval for the relevant programmes by the RIBA Visiting Board for a period of five years. The MSA was commended on the manner in which it had supported students following the June 2018 fire.

7.11 GSA Singapore Annual Report to the University of Glasgow (2019-20)

The Acting Head of the School of Design introduced the GSA Singapore Annual Report for session 2019-20.

He noted that the partnership between GSA and the Singapore Institute of Technology (SIT) would end in 2021 with no new intake of students. The closure of the partnership was being managed through monthly meetings involving the GSA Acting Head of the School of Design and relevant staff in Singapore. He pointed out that the GSA quality assurance regime would continue to apply to the programmes and collaboration during the teach-out phase and the relevant external examiners would remain in post during this period

Matters of note in session 2019-20 included:

- The collaboration produced its seventh graduating cohort during the session.
- Students graduated in absentia in June 2020 due to Covid-19 restrictions.
- Final year students exhibited their work as part of a very successful online showcase developed by GSA.
- Various staff visits took place between the two institutions with the aim of maintaining dialogue on a range of issues, and
- The Overseas Immersion Programme (OIP) was cancelled in semester 2 due to the pandemic. Online student support initiatives were introduced instead.

He advised members that GSA was very conscious of the important legacy that the Singapore partnership had left behind and a lot of work would be undertaken to ensure that this was preserved and relevant items archived correctly. Cross-institutional discussions would continue, supported by graduates and alumni, with a view to celebrating the many successes of the partnership.

7.12 New Members of Academic Staff Approved by GSA as Associate University Lecturers (AULs)

The committee **received** and **noted** a list (attached as **Appendix 2**) of new members of GSA academic staff approved as Associate University Lecturers (AULs).

[Clerk's post-meeting note]:

GSA Code of Assessment - Exceptional Circumstances Addendum

The GSA Code of Assessment – Exceptional Circumstances Addendum was approved by GSA Academic Council in February 2021 and is enclosed with this report.

The Addendum 'sets out the processes and mechanisms GSA will apply in the light of unforeseen and/ or exceptional events which are outside GSA's control and may significantly

impact teaching, learning and assessment activity and normal access to GSA facilities (physical and digital)'.

The Addendum was inadvertently not considered at the meeting of the Joint Liaison Committee, but it has been considered by senior University staff and discussed with GSA. All the University's suggested amendments have been incorporated. Given the length of time until the next JLC meeting (April 2022), the Convener has taken Chair's Action to ask Academic Standards Committee to **endorse** the GSA Code of Assessment - Exceptional Circumstances Addendum.

8. Student Business

No report was received from the GSA Students' Association.

9. Convener's Business

The Convener observed that the last year had been a very challenging time for both learning and teaching and society as a whole, and she acknowledged the efforts of staff at both institutions in coping with the exceptional circumstances. She noted that the University aimed to take the positives from the experience and didn't want to lose the many valuable innovations that had been achieved. However, many challenges remained, particularly those related to the moving of assessment online. She thanked the University SRC for the excellent support it continued to offer the University in addressing the issues arising from the pandemic and asked the SRC representative to convey her appreciation to his colleagues.

She reported that the new University Strategy, *World Changers Together: World Changing Glasgow 2025* had just been launched. The Strategy was based around the three themes of community, connectivity and challenges. Also, the University had recently launched its Learning and Teaching Strategy in February 2021 – this centred on three pillars: namely, evolving approach to student-centred active learning; transforming curricula and assessment; and students' professional and skills development.

10. Visas and Immigration

The GSA Academic Registrar provided the following update regarding matters relating to visas and immigration at GSA:

- GSA's UKVI Tier 4 Sponsor Licence had been renewed until December 2024;
- An internal audit had found that GSA's visa arrangements were satisfactory and no further work was required at this time;
- The current means of confirming Tier 4 students' presence in class by attendance *monitoring* would be replaced by a system of attendance *engagement*; and
- Further details were awaited regarding the UK Government's *new graduate* Immigration Route due to be launched in summer 2021. This route would allow new graduates to apply for a visa to remain in the UK for two years after completion of their studies to look for work, or 3 years if they had completed a PhD.

11. Data Transfer

The GSA Academic Registrar was pleased to advise the committee that the arrangements in place at the UoG and GSA Registries for data transfer between the two institutions were working very satisfactorily.

12. Covid-19 Testing for GSA Students

The GSA Academic Registrar expressed her thanks to the University for offering Covid-19 testing provision to GSA students.

University of Glasgow and The Glasgow School of Art

Remit, Composition and Membership of the Joint Liaison Committee 2021-22

Remit

The Joint Liaison Committee (JLC) is a sub-committee of the University's Academic Standards Committee and Senate. The JLC will meet annually to consider a report provided by the Glasgow School of Art (GSA) on the performance of all programmes leading to awards of the University delivered wholly or jointly by GSA. It will:

- monitor and approve academic standards, quality assurance procedures and enhancement of quality processes;
- monitor and approve the quality of the learning opportunities for students;
- monitor the quality of the management and enhancement of the student experience;
- promote dialogue on areas in which quality might be enhanced;
- encourage and support critical reflection on practice;
- identify good practice for dissemination as appropriate; and
- report to Senate through Academic Standards Committee.

Composition and Membership

University of Glasgow

Clerk of Senate and Vice Principal (Convener)	Professor Jill Morrison
Head of College of Arts nominee	Professor Nick Pearce
SRC President (or nominee)	Mr Liam Brady
Head of School of Culture & Creative Arts (or nominee)	Professor Kate Oakley
Head of School of Engineering (or nominee)	Professor David Cumming
UoG representative on GSA Academic Council	Professor Elizabeth Moignard
UoG Representative on GSA Programme Monitoring and Annual Reporting	Professor Clare Willsdon
Head of Academic Collaborations Office (or nominee)	Mrs Jackie McCluskey

The Glasgow School of Art

Deputy Director, Academic (Vice-Convener)	Mr Allan Atlee
Academic Registrar	Mrs Janet Allison
President of the Students' Association (or nominee)	Mr Alessandro Marini
Head of School of Fine Art	Dr Gina Wall (Acting)
Head of School of Design	Mr Patrick Macklin (Acting)
Head of Mackintosh School of Architecture	Professor Sally Stewart
Head of School of Simulation and Visualisation	Professor Paul Chapman
Head of Learning and Teaching	Professor Vicky Gunn
Head of The Innovation School	Professor Gordon Hush

In attendance

Mr Robbie Mulholland, Clerk, **(UoG)**

Ms Jill Brown **(GSA)**

New Members of Academic Staff that GSA approved to be recognised as Associate University Lecturers (AULs)

NAME	POST	DEPT.	FTE	DATE OF APPOINTMENT	QUALIFICATIONS	BRIEF CV
Charles Hammond	Lecturer Painting and Printmaking	School of Fine Art	0.5	26/11/2019	BA Honours painting and drawing Diploma – Fine Art	Tutor at University of Edinburgh, college of Art
Dr Nalini Paul	Lecturer in Fine Art Critical Studies	School of Fine Art	0.2	5/11/2019	MA – Philosophy and English Lit MLitt – Creative Writing PHD – English Literature	Creative Writing and English Literature Tutor – Strathclyde University Associate Lecturer – Open University Tutor and Lecturer – Edinburgh Napier University
Dr Elizabeth A Hodson	Lecturer in Fine Art Critical Studies	School of Fine Art	0.2	5/11/2019	BA (Hons) Fine art PHD – Social Anthropology	Teaching Fellow in Art History – Newcastle University
Robert McCaffrey	Lecturer in Design-led Entrepreneurship (Product Design)	Innovation School	0.6	18/11/2019	BA(Hons) Product Design	Lecturer in Product Design
Sara Barker	Lecturer in Painting and Printmaking	School of Fine Art	0.2	2/12/2019	BA (Hons), Fine Art (Painting) Equivalent MA Fine Art (De Ateleirs, Netherlands)	Lecturer, Leeds and Aberdeen University Tutor, GSA & University of Edinburgh, School of Fine Art
Anne Marie Copestake	Lecturer in Fine Art Photography	School of Fine Art	0.4	7/1/2020	MA Fine Art	Self Employed artist and filmmaker. Researcher for Cooper Gallery, Dundee previous Lecturer roles at GSA
Gabriele Rossi	Design Technologist, Digital Health & Care Institute (DHI)	Innovation School	1.0	23/3/20	MSc IT, BA(Hons) Philosophy	Employed UX Designer at Visit Scotland & in Hong Kong.

| Lizete Druka | Lecturer in Design Innovation, Environmental and Ecological Design | Innovation School | 1.0 | 26/5/2020 | Postgraduate Cert – Sustainable Value Chains MA – Textile Designs | Senior CMF Designer, Advanced Design |

NB - From November 2019, GSA assumed responsibility for the approval of AUL status, as agreed at the Academic Standards Committee meeting of 22 November 2019.

Code of Assessment – Exceptional Circumstances Addendum

1 Introduction

1.1 This addendum to GSA's Code of Assessment sets out the processes and mechanisms GSA will apply in the light of unforeseen and/ or exceptional events which are outside GSA's control and may significantly impact teaching, learning and assessment activity and normal access to GSA facilities (physical and digital).

1.2 This addendum supports the principle that GSA will fully and appropriately take into account the impact of periods of significant disruption to normal circumstances and endeavour to avoid or at worst minimise any detrimental impact on student outcomes while maintaining academic standards set out in the overarching Code of Assessment.

1.3. Academic Council, or a delegated subgroup thereof, will be responsible for the activation of this addendum in the event of exceptional circumstances and for oversight of its operation.

2 Principles

2.1 The principles which underpin this addendum are:

2.1.1 The health, safety and well-being of students, staff and community is a priority in the event of an unexpected interruption to normal operating conditions;

2.1.2 We will maintain the high academic standards of our awards.

2.1.3 Opportunities for students to progress to the next stage of their programme and complete their degree within suitably amended timescales are supported.

2.1.4 Modes of remote programme delivery and academic student support can be implemented as necessary to ensure continuity of teaching, learning and assessment.

2.2 Underneath these principles are the following assumptions:

2.2.1 This Exceptional Circumstances Addendum applies to all GSA undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes. It can be applied by cohort, programme, department, academic school or institution level.

2.2.2 Assessment arrangements for any joint programmes delivered in partnership with another institution will be agreed in consultation between GSA and the partner institution.

2.2.3   GSA maintains the principles of assessment as summarised in the <u>Code of Assessment, section 2.1 a-g</u>, with the emphasis remaining that each candidate's performance will be assessed against the stated learning outcomes as relevant at course and programme level. However, in the case of an interruption to normal circumstances, GSA can, where necessary, provide flexibility to support students via application of this Exceptional Circumstances Addendum and can expand the Good Cause process for individuals to include a collective good cause approach (see 4 below).

2.3   As a result, this addendum works alongside GSA's Good Cause policy (Code of Assessment: Good Cause, section 9) adding an addendum to Good Cause: Exceptional Circumstances Addendum: Collective Good Cause.

3   Definitions

3.1   An interruption to GSA's normal operational conditions results in the need to deploy an extraordinary institutional process. These interruptions are defined as unforeseeable or unpreventable situations and events that are likely to have a material impact at a cohort, programme, department, academic school, or institution level on a student's ability to progress and/or complete their studies.

3.2   Expanding the assessment regime established in the Code of Assessment (Section 13) means that in exceptional circumstances GSA will use a broader range of assessment evidence than in normal circumstances to come to academic judgements about a student's attainment of the relevant intended learning outcomes.

3.3   This portfolio of assessment evidence may include, but not be limited to:

3.3.1   Work submitted by students for formative assessment and all formative assessment outcomes including indicative grades and other qualitative feedback within the given academic session.

3.3.2   Preliminary and developmental work including drafts of written work, prototypes and other 2, 3 and 4D studies

3.3.3   Descriptions of work unable to be fully realised in its technical execution

3.3.4   Reflective writing, including individual circumstance statements explaining the restrictions to normal working experienced in the preparation for assessment

3.3.5   All summative assessment outcomes within the given academic session at the point of interruption.

4   Concluding assessment for progression and completion (When normal operating conditions are not possible)

Viability of Assessment

4.1   In the event of this Exceptional Circumstances Addendum being implemented, GSA will evaluate whether or not further assessment is a viable option. Where future assessment is not viable, exam boards must determine in order to progress students and/or confer awards, whether a student has achieved a minimum proportion of completed assessment via the work they have already completed and has already been assessed. We will consider in any given circumstances, whether it would be appropriate to lower the required volume of completed work and assessment to progress students or confer awards.

4.2   For students who have not completed sufficient work and assessment prior to the interruption to meet the viability threshold, options to undertake alternative forms of the missing assessments will, normally, be offered.

Professional Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs)

4.3   This minimum may not be applicable on some degree programmes where there are professional validation or prescription requirements (in some cases this will apply to the full degree programme, in others there may be individual courses that must be completed). *Students on such programmes will be advised of the special arrangements applying for some or all courses on their programme that have been agreed with the relevant PSRB.*

5   Changing assessment mechanisms

5.1   In the event that normal operating conditions are interrupted, but where continuing with assessment is viable, assessment mechanisms within each programme may be expanded and adapted. This will normally involve:

5.1.1   An expansion of assessment methods used by staff to support effective academic judgement regarding a student's achievement of individual learning outcomes;

5.1.2   An adaptation of a programme's assessment regime to enable the introduction of alternative methods of assessment that enable progression and completion.

5.2   Introduction of alternative assessment methods: the following process for introducing alternative assessment methods will be implemented:

   i.   Academic School identifies appropriate alternative assessment methods and requirements

  ii.   Academic School submits an extenuating circumstances *change to assessment type* (in a course specifications addendum) which outlines proposed revised assessment procedures and confirms course level intended learning outcomes that are being used.

 iii.   External Examiners are to be consulted by Programme Leader:
  a.   When the Exceptional Circumstances Addendum is implemented and for feedback on proposed amendments to assessment types and/or timings, and;
  b.   To confirm approved amendments.

6.   Collective Good Cause

6.1   Additional mitigations to those outlined above can be undertaken using Collective Good Cause. This allows GSA to impose flexible responses to a situation in which a number of students (collective) are affected simultaneously. This is different to GSA's normal good cause procedures which focuses on an individual student's context.

6.2   Collective Good Cause can be used throughout a given interruption to normal conditions and when this Addendum is in use.

6.3   Collective Good Cause is characterised by:

6.3.1 An assumption that the impact of the adverse circumstances has affected a specific group of students;

6.3.2 For collective good cause we may not require the same level of evidence as that which is expected in individual good cause circumstances.

6.4   Individual student Good Cause remains in place as defined in the CoA9 where individual extenuating circumstances have impaired a student's performance over and above those relating to the collective good cause.

February 2021

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 21 May 2021

Additional Information Relating to Programme Proposals from The Glasgow School of Art considered at March 2021 Meeting of ASC

Ruth Cole, Clerk to the Committee

At the March 2021 meeting, ASC gave in-principle approval to various proposals received from The Glasgow School of Art, noting that clarification on some issues was required. ASC is asked to note the following additional information that has been provided:

New programme proposal: BDes/MDes Design for Health & Wellbeing (UG)

GSA has confirmed that the integrated masters degree title will be Master in Design for Health & Well-Being. This will now be forwarded to EdPSC for approval as it is the first integrated masters (UG) MDes degree to be introduced.

For the following two new programme proposals, clarification was sought on the exit degrees to be available. The full list of awards has now been confirmed as follows:

MDes Design Innovation & Circular Economy (PGT)

PG Cert Design Innovation
PG Dip Design Innovation & Circular Economy
MDes Design Innovation & Circular Economy

MDes Design Innovation & Future Heritage (PGT)

PG Cert Design Innovation
PG Dip Design Innovation & Future Heritage
MDes Design Innovation & Future Heritage

Proposed programme amendment BDes/MEDes Product Design (UG)

Students on the five-year MEDes stream complete two one-year placements at European partner institutions (years 3 and 4 of the programme). The programme documentation indicated that an unclassified Honours degree would be awarded where a student exited after four years rather than returning to GSA for the fifth year. Discussions are on-going with GSA on this matter.

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 21 May 2021

Report from the Periodic Review of the Mackintosh School of Architecture held on 11-12 February 2021 at The Glasgow School of Art

Cover Sheet

Robbie Mulholland, Clerk, Joint Liaison Committee of the University of Glasgow and The Glasgow School of Art

Brief Description of the Paper

The attached paper is the report from the Periodic Review of the Mackintosh School of Architecture held in February 2021 at The Glasgow School of Art (GSA), by video conference.

The report, which has been approved by GSA Academic Council, includes details of the programmes which GSA has revalidated - for a period of six years, with effect from September 2021.

The report also outlines the 4 recommendations and 4 commendations identified in the review.

Action requested

ASC is asked to **Note:**

1. GSA's revalidation of the following programmes, from September 2021 for a period of six years:

   Bachelor of Architecture with Honours
   Diploma In Architecture
   Master of Architecture by Conversion
   Master of Architectural Studies

2. The 4 recommendations and 4 commendations identified in the review (section 7); and

3. The remainder of the report.

Recommended Persons Responsible for Taking the Action(s) Forward

Relevant staff at The Glasgow School of Art.

Resource Implications

No resource implications for the University have been identified.

Timescale for Implementation

The revalidation of the above programmes will take effect from September 2021.

Equality Implications

Equality Impact Assessment Summary Reports for all revalidated programmes were considered as part of the Periodic Review process.

GLASGOW SCHOOL OF ART

PERIODIC REVIEW REPORT: MACKINTOSH SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE

SESSION 2020/21

Review Panel

Allan Atlee (Convenor)	Deputy Director Academic and Convenor
Janet Allison	Academic Registrar
Dr Marianne Greated	Programme Leader, BA Fine Art: Painting and Printmaking, School of Fine Art
Professor Vicky Gunn	Head of Learning and Teaching
Neil Lamb	External Subject Specialist, Senior Lecturer, Robert Gordon University
Alessandro Marini	President of the GSA Students' Association
Professor Elizabeth Moignard	University of Glasgow Senate Representative
Kathy Molloy	Head of Library Services

Secretaries	Jill Brown, Senior Policy Officer, Academic Quality Office
	Tricia Combs, Policy Officer, Academic Quality Office

The Review Event was held on Thursday 11 February 2021 and Friday 12 February 2021 by Video Conference. The Panel held a pre-meeting on Thursday 4 February 2021.

1. **INTRODUCTION**

    Background Information

1.1   The Mackintosh School of Architecture Periodic Review took place as scheduled in session 2021. Owing to the COVID-19 pandemic and resulting social distancing requirements, the entire event was held remotely.

1.2   Within the Self-Evaluation Report, the Mackintosh School of Architecture reflected upon the impact of and response to two unexpected events, the Mackintosh Building fire of June 2018 and the COVID-19 pandemic, which occurred since the last Periodic Review in session 2014/15. Despite the period of disruption, the focus on studio as the core of the educational experience remained central to the identity of the School.

1.3   Since the last Periodic Review, the School has undergone multiple reviews of its learning and teaching approaches with PSRBs (Architects Registration Board (ARB) prescription and Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) validation), resulting in a continuous cycle of review and reflection on the relationship of the School's provision with the future needs of the profession.

1.4   The Mackintosh School of Architecture was based in the Bourdon Building throughout the review period, except from June 2018 to November 2018, as a result of the Mackintosh Building fire. The School was given access to teaching space in the McLellan Galleries during this time. The Self-Evaluation Report noted that the School's community were relieved to return to the building, however, the condition of its learning and teaching spaces and facilities require improvements, linked with a GSA estates strategy.

1.5   Since the Mackintosh School of Architecture Periodic Review of 2014/15, the School introduced the MSc Environmental Architecture in session 2016/17, however, it was not possible to achieve viable enrolments to the programme, and it was discontinued from session 2020/21 onwards.

Periodic Review

1.6   Appendix A to this report provides a list of the provision offered and overseen as part of the Periodic Review.

1.7   The School approached the development of the Self-Evaluation Report as the end of a series of quality and review assurance processes, including PSRB validation and professional prescription and internal Programme Monitoring Annual Reporting (PMAR). As a result of the staff and student consultation during the preparation and development of the submissions for these processes, the Head of School was able to prepare the Self-Evaluation Report with reference to the wide range of materials developed since the last Periodic Review. The completed Self-Evaluation Report received student feedback following circulation to Class Representatives and at an extraordinary meeting of the School Forum with Lead Representatives. The School Board of Studies approved the Self-Evaluation Report via correspondence.

1.8   Having scrutinised the Self-Evaluation Report, and supporting documentation, the Review Panel identified themes and topics for further exploration during the review event. These included, but were not limited to:

- Equality, diversity and inclusion in the staff and student body
- Strategic vision and planning
- Learning and teaching enhancement
- Portfolio development and research in the staff body and research activity in the School
- Effectiveness of the student feedback mechanisms
- Organisation and management of the School
- Internal cross-School and cross-GSA collaboration and external collaboration with employers and industry

1.9   During the event on 11 and 12 February 2021, the Review Panel met with the following staff and student groups:

- Head of the Mackintosh School of Architecture
- Undergraduate Students
- Postgraduate Students
- Programmes Leaders and Heads of Departments
- Stage Leaders, Subject Leaders, Studio Tutors and Professional Support Services, including staff on fractional contracts

A list of all staff and student groups who met with the Review Panel is provided in Annex B.

1.10   Owing to the COVID-19 pandemic resulting in the Periodic Review event being held remotely, the Review Panel were unable to have a tour of the facilities. The Review Panel asked the staff and student groups to give feedback on the learning environment, and their responses are incorporated into the report.

2.   OVERALL AIMS OF THE MACKINTOSH SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE PROVISION

Periodic Review Process and Self-Evaluation Report

2.1   The Self-Evaluation Report reflected on the distinctive history of the School, the diversity of its student body, the centrality of studio and learning through practice, the structure of its programmes, the international opportunities for staff and students, and its vision of itself as a supportive community of designers and researchers. That Self-Evaluation Report describes MSA as '*built on creative exploration and critical thinking, providing an innovative and engaged architectural education, not purely one defined by or limited to a preparation for practice.*'

2.2   The Review Panel felt that the Self-Evaluation Report did not provide detail of collaborative input from staff and students. The panel agreed that although the extent of staff and student consultation during the process of compiling the Self-Evaluation Report was not evident, the Review Panel were assured that effective student feedback mechanisms were in place and that a culture of strong staff and student relationships and open and effective communication existed.

2.3   The Review Panel noted the challenge to the School's development plans which can result from the timing of validation events, including Periodic Review and Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) validation. Through the student and staff panel meetings, it was evident that the Self-Evaluation Report was an accurate reflection of the School.

Strategic Vision of the School

2.4   Initially, the Review Panel wished to explore how the School's strategic vision could be better articulated, encompassing a shared understanding of the School's identity and unique strengths and its future ambitions, as this was not clear in the Self-Evaluation Report. Through discussion with the staff panels, it became apparent how a period of continuous disruption had impacted staff capacity for strategic development and the articulation of future planning. It was evident that there was a strong ambition to move beyond a reactive approach to a more proactive one, which had been frustrated by the need to respond to operational demands. A call for an increased role for staff voice, time and space for creative forward-thinking and discussion, and staffing structures which support the capacity and skill to develop and deliver the School vision were raised.

2.5   The Review Panel recommended that the strategic vision of the School should be developed collaboratively, articulating MSA's unique and current strengths, its approach to addressing challenges and opportunities and to supporting future ambitions. ***(Recommendation 1)***

The Review Panel further recommended that the School:

a. Review staffing structures in relation to capacities and skills to support delivery of the School vision;
b. Develop a consistent approach to team meetings in the School to capture the collective staff voice and ensure that staff at all levels have the opportunity to contribute to planning and decision making; Ensure this is also evidenced through established quality mechanisms;
c. Dedicate and schedule time for staff to create this vision and provide mentoring for teams and individuals as necessary through the process of change;
d. Consolidate and develop plans for postgraduate taught provision, postgraduate research provision and research activity; and
e. Link with Estates to ensure any developing strategic vision for the School, including the future of studio, is recognised as part of the GSA Estates Strategy.

Staff Voice, Organisation and Management of the School

2.6   The Review Panel were keen to explore what was seen as a horizontal staffing structure within the School, with the Head of School supported by a Senior Management Team consisting of the Undergraduate Programme Leader, Postgraduate Programme Leader, Head of Architecture Technology, Academic Support Manager and Technical Support Officer. The Senior Management Team had successfully steered the School through recent disruptions, however, the Review Panel felt there was opportunity to develop mechanisms for capturing the staff voice and incorporate input from the teaching teams into planning at the senior level. The Review Panel recommended that the School review staffing structures in relation to capacities and skills to support delivery of the School vision. *(Recommendation 1.a)*

2.7   Discussion with staff panels connected the School's staffing structure with the schedule of meetings, the impact on workload and the challenge of incorporating the feedback of staff on fractional contracts into future planning. The Review Panel recommended that a consistent approach to team meetings in the School should be developed to capture the collective staff voice and ensure that staff at all levels have the opportunity to contribute to planning and decision making. The School should ensure this is also evidenced through established quality mechanisms. *(Recommendation 1.b)* The Review Panel further recommended that the School dedicate and schedule time for staff to create this vision and provide mentoring for teams and individuals as necessary through the process of change. *(Recommendation 1.c)*

2.8   Connected to the articulation of a shared vision, the Review Panel encouraged the School to pursue strategic development of their ambitions for postgraduate taught provision, postgraduate research provision and research activity. Staff panels considered the role of the summer planning sessions in cross-School discussion of curriculum development and enhancement. Discussion with student panels reflected a student body keen to engage with issues at the forefront of the discipline and to follow a curriculum which embraced these challenges, including equality, diversity and inclusion; sustainability and the Climate Emergency. The Review Panel recommended that the School consolidate and develop plans for postgraduate taught provision, postgraduate research provision and research activity. *(Recommendation 1.d)*

The Learning Environment

2.9   The Self-Evaluation Report reflected on the importance of estate improvements in supporting the future vision of the School and to maintaining the studio culture core to the identity of the School. Furthermore, it noted that "*the condition of learning and teaching spaces within the Bourdon Building remain a constant cause for concern for staff and students, and these continue to be raised on a regular basis within SSCC's, Boards of Studies and at the MSA Class Reps forum and at School Forums*".

2.10   The Head of School noted that the most important factor in studio is the social exchange and working exchange, and the needs of what a contemporary studio needs to be were beginning to be discussed with Estates. These needs were commented upon by the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) during their recent validation visit. Additionally, the July 2019 Architects Registration Board (ARB) prescription of the Bachelor of Architecture and Diploma in Architecture programmes were subject to the following condition: "*In light of the fire in the Mackintosh Building and its impact upon the intended space resourcing of the prescribed qualifications, within its annual monitoring submissions for this period of prescription the School must provide the Board with an update on progress against the strategy/action plan to address resourcing of the prescribed qualifications and demonstrate that these are adequate to ensure that the relevant ARB Criteria will be met by all students for the period of prescription.*"

2.11   Discussion with student panels reaffirmed the importance of the key role of studio as a place for informal social and collaborative interactions. However, concerns were raised about the quality of the building and how it was affecting students' ability to work comfortably within the studio environment. The Review Panel recommended that the School should link with Estates to ensure any developing strategic vision for the School, including the future of studio, is recognised as part of the GSA Estates Strategy. ***(Recommendation 1.e)***

Equality, Diversity and Inclusion

2.12   The Review Panel were keen to explore the School's approach towards equality, diversity and inclusion. The undergraduate students valued the School-led emphasis on accessibility and diversity during the First Year Experience (Bachelor of Architecture Co-Lab 1 and 2) and symposiums, and postgraduate students appreciated the opportunities for student involvement, collaboration and discussion, including the Equality and Diversity Working Group. The Panel were pleased to note the continuing good work to address equality, diversity and inclusion in collaboration with engaged students and saw an opportunity for wider student participation, not just those actively seeking it.

2.13   The staff panel discussion revealed how MSA's approach to equality, diversity and inclusion had resulted in integrating related topics into briefs and tutorials with ambition to further embed these approaches into the curriculum. Staff panels expanded how student-led activity had informed their approach, including the Equality and Diversity staff planning workshop which highlighted how ILOs could better reflect teaching on these topics; the student-led Equality and Diversity Working Group which was used to explore how best to address equality, diversity and inclusion through the curriculum; and the Missing in Architecture (MIA) research group which offered opportunity to interrogate the curriculum and approaches to teaching.

2.14   The Review Panel were pleased to note the positive development and good practice regarding equality, diversity and inclusion. These efforts should be synthesized across the School, as well as collated and evidenced, so it could be communicated to students. The Review Panel commended the approach, initiative, and ethos to embed Equality, Diversity and Inclusion in the School, including the Student-Led Working Groups and other co-creation platform which fostered inclusivity. In addition, the Review Panel recommended the best practices are mainstreamed across the School. *(Commendation 1)*

3.   EVALUATION OF THE QUALITY OF THE PROVISION UNDER REVIEW

Curriculum and Ethics, Climate and Sustainability

3.1   The School undertook a Climate Audit which mapped existing sustainability teaching across all courses within the Bachelor of Architecture, Diploma in Architecture and Master of Architectural Studies, including the Masters by Conversion, in order to provide a secure basis for discussion on curriculum relevance and currency in relation to the current Climate Emergency. This was described by the Head of School as helpful for demonstrating how climate and sustainability ran throughout the curriculum, noting that the challenge was not in adding more but in integrating and making these issues more explicit.

3.2   During panel discussions with students regarding the presence of the Climate Emergency in the curriculum, students felt that the issues were underlying in their courses and that the intention was present. However, they valued more explicit criteria and targets in the curriculum and raised that climate issues and consideration of sustainability could be factored more in how tutors considered work; addressed more in tutorials; and prompted more in assignments. Some students noted how the emphasis on climate was variable across years of study and welcomed more explicit incorporation into the curriculum. The third year focus of the Bachelor of Architecture on carbon neutrality and the INTERACT project with engineering students were valued for allowing students to engage in real-world and cross-disciplinary experiences.

3.3   Staff panels revealed an overarching ambition to foreground issues of climate and sustainability more explicitly in the curriculum. The summer planning sessions and assessment workshops were described as opportunities for reflecting on this and how to better articulate this ambition in the curriculum. Staff panels recognised that the issues were not well represented in the ILOs and the programme and course documentation, and that MSA staff should reassess the emphasis in some teaching. Staff valued the role of the student voice calling for the issues to be more ingrained in the course.

3.4   The Review Panel recommended that the School should undertake a review of and make necessary changes to programme documentation, including the ILOs, to ensure that they reflect the full richness of the curriculum being taught. This should include articulating more clearly the ways in which ethics, climate and sustainability are approached, and the positive teaching and learning developments made in response to COVID-19. *(Recommendation 2)*

The Review Panel further recommended that the School:

a. Reflect and consolidate on the good work achieved through COVID-19 – especially in relation to teaching, learning and assessment approaches, organisation and management and student liaison; and
b. In light of these reflections, update the programme documentation, including the ILOs, to ensure that they fully reflect the richness of the curriculum that is being taught.

Online Delivery and Lessons Learned from COVID-19

3.5   The undergraduate student panel reflected positively on the overall experience of online delivery in response to COVID, noting that the transition had been smooth, the year felt very organised with clear expectations set from the start, and that they appreciated the pairing with tutors as mentors enabling them to know exactly who to contact. They described a sense of togetherness with everyone trying to adjust and improve, and that staff were supportive and receptive to feedback. When asked about the positive elements of learning and teaching, students pointed to being able to access recorded lectures, meaning they had the opportunity to absorb the material. Postgraduate student panels appreciated the online learning events for the Master of Architectural Studies which allowed for group work and the weekly Stage Leaders Surgeries. However, discussions regarding the Professional Practice Year Out (PPYO) of the Bachelor of Architecture led to the Review Panel wishing to interrogate further the experience had by those students and their need for greater support, as detailed in sections 5.12-5.14.

3.6   Staff panels noted that one of the main challenges arising from COVID-19 had been upskilling staff for online delivery, but they were excited by the digital possibilities now available, including but not limited to, Canvas, Padlet, Planet e-stream, Otter.ai, Wander session, Miro and drawing tablets. Digitalisation was linked to more opportunities for collaboration with industry, increased engagement with alumni, opening lectures to a wider audience and an enhanced global reach for the School. Transition to online had made learning and teaching and administrative practices more visible and thus enabled sharing within the staff body. Challenges remained as to how to support greater involvement of part-time staff.

3.7   The Review Panel recommended that the School reflect and consolidate on the good work achieved through COVID-19 – especially in relation to teaching, learning and assessment approaches, organisation and management and student liaison. In light of these reflections, the School should update the programme documentation, including the ILOs, to ensure that they fully reflect the richness of the curriculum that's being taught. ***(Recommendation 2.a)***

Future of Studio

3.8   In discussions regarding the transition to online delivery, student panels expressed that they missed studio access, noting the strength of the School in fostering a strong studio culture of collaboration among students and with tutors. Postgraduate students raised the limitations of digital organisation in fostering the same social networks and informal collaboration as in-person studio access would provide. Studio was described as one of the most important parts of their education, and students expressed concern about designing in isolation and its effect on their confidence.

3.9   Staff panels noted how COVID-19 had forced them to rethink all aspects of delivery, however, the limitations of digital forms for peer exchange highlighted how the informal social interaction which took place in studio could not be replaced. Studio remained critical to students' education. Staff pointed to students' concerns regarding isolation, motivation and apprehension about where they were in their design process. In addition to losing the opportunities for interaction, staff raised the issue of the lack of making space for students. Given the importance for physical engagement with material and space, and as teaching could move increasingly online, staff noted that teaching space could be reduced to allow expansion in making spaces.

3.10   The Self-Evaluation Report reflected on how the studio experience was underpinned by peer learning and supported by workshops which "*provide the opportunity to turn simulation and speculation into reality, to experiment, prototype and to improvise, and where technical staff are crucial partners in guiding students in realising design ambitions*." The Self-Evaluation Report described how the School responded to the shift to online learning, including investment in digital drawing tablets to enable "*comment and collaborative exploration to take place in real time*" within studio and technology tutorials. Additionally, a new studio technician post became part of the MSA Technical Support Department team which "*proved invaluable in meeting the added capacity required to plan and re-organise studios to dealing with social distancing in session 20/21, prepare extended inductions and support the transition to digital making.*" The Head of School noted that a good working space for students and staff was crucial to cultivating studio culture, and the School will need to explore the relationship of making in the post-COVID period.

4.   ASSURING THE STANDARDS OF AWARDS AND QUALITY OF PROVISION

Turbulent Period for the School

4.1   Since the last Periodic Review, the School has undergone a turbulent period, particularly in regards to the Mackintosh Building fire of June 2018 and the COVID-19 pandemic. Despite the challenges caused by these years of disruption, the Review Panel were pleased to note the continued success of the School. The Review Panel commended the Head of School for steering the School through particularly turbulent events *(Commendation 2)*

Student Feedback Mechanisms

4.2   Discussions with the undergraduate student panel revealed robust student feedback mechanisms, in particular, the proactive response to issues resulting from COVID-19 and a shared sense of community with students and staff going through the challenges together. Staff were seen as supportive and open to discussions and compromise, and one-to-ones with Stage Leaders and Co-Pilots were identified as effective points of contact which resulted in quick action. As a result, the students' reflection on online delivery was overall positive, though it should be noted that the Review Panel felt that the Professional Practice Year Out (PPYO) experience required additional support, as detailed in sections 5.12-5.14. It was also noted that the change to a two Class Rep arrangement had been beneficial, allowing for more informal interactions in addition to formal meetings. The student voice mechanisms were described as working well, and issues were addressed locally within the School, potentially as a result of the frequency of monthly meetings where actions were tracked and progressed.

4.3   The postgraduate student panel, however, raised more concerns regarding the student feedback mechanisms and the effectiveness of the student voice. Students noted that weekly Stage Leader surgeries and reaching out to individual staff for meetings were helpful, but that it was unclear how issues raised through formal mechanisms were being actioned. The Review Panel felt more could be done to close the feedback loop and communicate to all students, not just those serving as Class Reps.

4.4   The Review Panel commended the School for its response to COVID-19, and the agility and willingness of staff to respond to student feedback during this period, were commended with recommendation that best practices are mainstreamed across MSA and could be evidenced. *(Commendation 3)*

        In addition, the Review Panel:

        a. Commended the School for successfully acting on student feedback, specifically through the COVID-19 period; and
        b. Recommended that the School ensure that formal feedback mechanisms are as effective as informal practices and could be evidenced.

External Examiners

4.5   The Self-Evaluation Report reflected on the School's use of external examiner feedback, including consideration by Senior Management Team, SSCCs, Programme Monitoring and Annual Reporting and Quality Enhancement Action Plans, and for mitigation actions taken in response to the Mackintosh Building fire and COVID-19. External examiners were consulted on the School's revised teaching delivery plans put in place as a result of both emergencies, providing the necessary quality assurance of the School's response. Reports from external examiners, and the School's programme-level responses, also fed into the annual reporting cycle for Architects Registration Board (ARB) prescription and the documentation for Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA)full visiting boards.

4.6   Through discussions with the Head of School and staff panels, the Review Panel were informed of the School's approach to external examiner recruitment as an opportunity for increasing the diversity of voices in the School and of the School's ambition to encourage their own staff to act as external examiners at other institutions.

Programme Monitoring and Annual Reporting (PMAR)

4.7   The Self-Evaluation Report detailed how Programme Monitoring and Annual Reporting (PMAR) was followed within the School, involving preparation by programme leaders and discussions at SSCCs and the Board of Studies. The actions identified in the resulting Quality Enhancement Action Plans (QEAPs) were tracked at SSCCs. Staff panels raised that PMAR reports were produced mainly by programme leaders, and that it was challenging for Stage Leaders to input given the timing of reporting deadlines. Challenges regarding how to close the feedback loop regarding the QEAPs and how to inform students of the progress in response were also raised.

Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs)

4.8   PMAR documentation feeds into the School's PSRB validation and prescription cycles. Since the last Periodic Review, the Bachelor of Architecture and the Diploma in Architecture programmes were awarded continued validation from the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) and continued prescription from the Architects Registration Board (ARB).

4.9   Staff panels discussed how the reviews acted as triggers for reflection. Specifically, RIBA revalidation was cited as helpful in allowing them to think through how to future-proof the curriculum, engage with practice and support students on Professional Practice Year Out (PPYO). As a result, the focus had shifted towards consideration of the nature of the architects they are educating and what skills make a good architect.

4.10   The Self-Evaluation Report described the School's engagement with these review processes "*as a continuous evolutionary process, tying into longer term strategy plans such as the MSA Learning and Teaching Enhancement Strategy 2018/21, MSA Internationalisation strategy 2018/21 and the MSA Strategic Plan, as well as responding to the immediate context within programmes in the institution as a whole and in the outside world.*" The Review Panel were satisfied with the School's approach, though improvements regarding a collaboratively articulated strategy for the School should be undertaken, as recommended in section 2.5.

5.   ENHANCEMENT IN LEARNING AND TEACHING

Curriculum Design and Development

5.1   The Review Panel were keen to explore the School's process for curriculum design and development and how teaching staff were able to feed into the process. Through discussions with staff and student panels, the Review Panel were pleased to learn about the student involvement in pushing for embedding the climate and sustainability agenda, and the Review Panel recommended a review of the curriculum to embed these issues and the developments made in response to COVID-19, as detailed in section 3.4.

5.2   The Head of School noted that the School was exploring undergraduate portfolio expansion and how to link that with encouraging students to think of the subject as dynamic and evolving. Regarding the Diploma in Architecture, there was a move to underpin research in the studio practice for 4th and 5th year students to better equip students to rigorously test their own ideas. This has led to more students undertaking the Masters by Conversion and supporting students to see the route into PhD. Regarding the Masters in Architectural Studies, the Head of School noted that they were exploring staff succession planning in order to continue running the range of pathways and to support staff to be pathway leaders and contribute to curriculum design. Staff panels also raised that specialties within their teams could be harnessed to enhance the postgraduate taught provision.

5.3   Staff panels discussed the curriculum development process via the summer planning sessions. Following assessment in June, the School interrogated what had happened and what their future ambitions were. School workshops were held, including workshops on equality, diversity and inclusion and the Climate Emergency, and these workshops highlighted how to embed those elements into the curriculum. Staff noted that many of the themes regarding the future of the discipline had emerged from the students. Stage Leaders and Co Pilots were given time for curriculum development, and the School returned in

August to discuss the developments for September. The Missing in Architecture research group was also an asset as a space for conversations around the curriculum.

5.4 Given the need to respond to disruptions caused by the Mackintosh Building fire and COVID-19, staff raised the challenges in balancing core business with strategic curriculum development. Staff also pointed to their enthusiasm for adding to the curriculum, but were reticent to remove elements. The June planning sessions were described as the only time for School-wide conversations, as the MSA Learning and Teaching Committee was more administratively-focused. The Review Panel's recommendations, as detailed in section 2.7, aimed to help support staff in contributing to all levels of planning and decision making.

Research/Teaching Linkages

5.5 The Review Panel were keen to explore how research fed into the curriculum and the student experience. Following discussion with the postgraduate student panel, it was clear they were familiar with the work of the Mackintosh Environmental Architectural Research Unit (MEARU) and the Missing in Architecture research group. The Review Panel noted how the MSc Environmental Architecture which ran from session 2017/18 to 2019/20 had been a way to link research and taught strategy. It was discontinued as a result of low recruitment, which was described in the Self-Evaluation Report as "*particularly disappointing given the relation of its curriculum to MEARU's research expertise and the input to it by the MEARU team*." The related postgraduate taught elective courses continue to be offered to Masters in Architectural Studies students.

5.6 Staff panels noted that although direct connections between teaching and research were not evidenced, the indirect relationship between staff research activity and discussions with students was valuable. Some staff described themselves as generalists, so it was challenging to embed research interests into the teaching as the curriculum was not constructed in that way. There was more possibility to bring their research into studio, but not as a course. Staff raised the importance of developing specialisms for increasing capacity for postgraduate research recruitment.

Staff Research Activity

5.7 The Review Panel were keen to explore research active staff's relation to the School and how to build staff capacity for research. Staff panels discussed the limitations when it came to sufficient time for staff to develop their research and scholarship. The Review Panel noted that research is an opportunity for staff development and encouraged the School to develop plans for postgraduate research provision and review staffing structures to support delivery of these plans, as detailed in section 2.6.

Employability and Skills

5.8 Regarding professional studies and employability, the Self-Evaluation Report noted that "*while recognised elements of architectural professional practice are embedded within stage 3, 4 and 5 of the Bachelor of Architecture and Diploma in Architecture programmes, there are opportunities to extend and build on forms of practice, entrepreneurship and creative collaboration through greater engagement with the development of these graduate attributes across GSA, and recognition that professional practices also form part of design and technology.*"

5.9   When prompted on their motivations for coming to the GSA, postgraduate students referred to the emphasis on artistic and conceptual approaches. Artistic skills were seen as more challenging to teach compared to technical skills, though there was a concern that the approach could leave students underprepared for professional practice. In reflecting on their preparedness for seeking employment, students recognised that they had developed professional skills, but that the lack of studio interaction and working in isolation as a result of COVID-19 had affected their confidence in those skills. They also raised that they would be entering a completely different industry than what existed before COVID-19. When asked about career trajectories, students noted that although the programmes were oriented towards becoming an architect, GSA Career Services was a helpful resource when considering alternatives.

5.10   In discussing skills with undergraduate students, they described a progression within the Bachelor of Architecture from being more hands-on in first year towards digital creation in second year, which was noted as better preparation for developing into practice. The third year INTERACT project involving collaboration with engineering and surveying students from the University of Glasgow was acknowledged as delivering a real world experience. Students expressed interest in learning more about professional studies earlier on in the programme and more about the support in place for the Professional Practice Year Out (PPYO).

5.11   Staff noted a move towards improving support and engagement with PPYO students. Consideration was continuing regarding how to bring practice into the School and how to manage the switch into the PPYO year better. The move to online delivery also provided opportunities for digital collaboration with industry and engagement with a wider audience, for example: the "Practice makes Perfect" workshop for Stage 4 Professional Studies of the Bachelor and Diploma; the online Thesis Forum for Stage 5 of the Diploma; the "Into Practice" event on architects' varied routes into the profession; and the online Graduate Showcase.

Support for Professional Practice Year-Out (PPYO)

5.12   During staff and student panel discussions about the transition to online delivery, concerns were raised regarding the student experience for the Bachelor of Architecture PPYO students. Students cited a lack of support and direction, and that many were unable to find employment. Requests were made for additional support for the transition and more contact with tutors. The PPYO Forum was a welcome addition, however, it would have been more valuable earlier in the session. Students also welcomed the opportunity to meet with current PPYO students before undergoing it themselves.

5.13   In response to the challenges PPYO students were facing as result of COVID-19, the Head of School noted that the School was exploring how to help students use this time by providing a range of events through the monthly PPYO forum, including practitioner lectures, young practitioner lecture, in-practice staff lecture, and CV writing workshops. More targeted effort was being made to get students' feedback and provide the support needed. Staff panels also discussed how the School was shifting towards more involvement with PPYO students, prompted by student feedback and in part by a change in personnel. Work continues on how to bring practice into the School and better support the transition into the PPYO year.

5.14   The Review Panel recommended that the School should review and strengthen support for preparation and transition into PPYO, and review and strengthen the support for students moving into the professional environment. ***(Recommendation 3)***

6.   ASSURING AND ENHANCING THE QUALITY OF THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE

Workload and Assessment

6.1   Overall, undergraduate student panels felt that the workload and balance of assessment was manageable. Although certain points of the year were noted as particularly demanding, such as when multiple assessments were due at the same time, students felt that staff were responsive to their concerns. Students valued knowing deadlines in advance, having essay workshops earlier in the course and having the opportunity for feedback, such as on drafts or essay plans, before an assignment's deadline.

6.2   Postgraduate students appreciated the multiple Stage Surgeries for the Master of Architectural Studies and noted that they were able to question and discuss the timetables, giving them a better sense of the logic behind them. They also felt their concerns would be heard by staff, noting a recent extension to a Stage 5 submission in response to feedback. Students also valued staff's consideration of a student's situation, and how the wider context, like COVID-19 or BREXIT, could put extra pressure on them.

Articulating the Student Journey

6.3   Regarding their experience of online delivery, the undergraduate student panel reflected positively on how the year felt very organised with clear expectations set from the start of the session. Staff panels also reflected on how the shift to digitalisation, especially in regards to Canvas, enabled them to revaluate how to provide more clarity in feedback and assessment.

6.4   The Head of School described how as a result of the Climate Audit, the School developed a spreadsheet showing how all years of the Bachelor of Architecture, Diploma in Architecture and the Masters in Architecture Studies fit together. Staff could now access a full map of the MSA provision, and the School was interested in making this visible for students as well.

6.5   The Review Panel were pleased to note how the approach to the Climate Emergency revealed the connections between years and encouraged the School to reflect on how to provide greater clarity on the student journey. The Review Panel recommended that the School should articulate and communicate a clear journey for students through study in MSA, ensuring consistency across all platforms. The Review Panel further recommended that the School ensure Canvas, programme handbooks, programme specifications, timetables etc. are in alignment and consistently articulate the student journey through each programme. ***(Recommendation 4)***

Personal Tutor Scheme

6.6   The undergraduate student panel reflected a positive view of the Personal Tutor Scheme, noting it was reassuring to have a named contact, especially someone who was not involved in their assessment. Although some of the students had not needed to contact their Personal Tutors, they were aware of others who had and who gave positive feedback on the experience. The postgraduate student panel also noted the benefits of having someone

unaffiliated with their project as a contact. The students expressed a view of Personal Tutors as being very open and willing to discuss issues. Given the lack of informal interactions as a result of COVID-19 and how it impacted confidence in work and mental health and wellbeing, students noted how helpful it was to know they could contact someone who would understand.

6.7   The Review Panel were pleased to note the positive feedback from students about the Personal Tutor Scheme and their tutors and staff in general, especially given the period of disruption. The Review Panel commended the School for its successful implementation of the Personal Tutor Scheme. *(Commendation 4.b)*

Strength of Staff and Student Relationships

6.8   The Review Panel were pleased to note the positive affinity that students had for the School, which has been detailed throughout the report and evidenced by student engagement in the School's enhancement activities. For example, students collaborated with the School's equality, diversity and inclusion initiatives through the Equality and Diversity Working Group (section 2.12-2.13); engaged with curriculum design through calls for ingraining Climate and Sustainability into their courses (section 3.2-3.3); made use of student feedback mechanism while calling for more detail on how issues were being addressed (section 4.2-4.3); expressed interest in staff's research activities (section 5.5); and valued the role of the Personal Tutor Scheme (section 6.6).

6.9   Most notable was the relationship students had with studio which they described as one of the most important parts of their education. This importance of studio was made more evident by its absence as a result of COVID-19, especially given the strong culture of collaboration among students and tutors fostered by the School (section 3.8). Despite the challenges raised by COVID-19, students remained connected with the School and staff, expressing a sense of togetherness with everyone trying to adjust and improve (section 3.5). In turn, staff felt more connected to students and valued the role of the student voice in responding to the equality, diversity and inclusion (section 2.13), the Climate Emergency (section 3.3), and curriculum design (section 5.3), while expressing concern about how the loss of studio was impacting students (section 3.9).

6.10   The Review Panel commended the collegiate culture and strength of the staff and student relationships in the School for creating an engaged student body with a strong affinity to the School. *(Commendation 4)*

In addition, the Review Panel commended the:

   a.   Strong staff and student relationships;
   b.   Successful implementation of the Personal Tutor Scheme; and
   c.   Articulate and engaged student body who have a strong affinity with the School.

7.   SUMMARY OF PERCEIVED STRENGTHS AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

<u>**Recommendations**</u>

7.1   The Review Panel made a number of recommendations, as set out below. All recommendations must be completed within 12 months and be formally reported by the Head of the Mackintosh School of Architecture to each Board of Studies, Undergraduate and Postgraduate Committee and Academic Council within the 12-month period.

7.2   **Recommendation 1 – MSA Strategic Vision**

The strategic vision of the School should be developed collaboratively, articulating MSA's unique and current strengths, its approach to addressing challenges and opportunities and to supporting future ambitions.

The Review Panel further recommended that the School:

a.   Review staffing structures in relation to capacities and skills to support delivery of the School vision;
b.   Develop a consistent approach to team meetings in the school to capture the collective staff voice and ensure that staff at all levels have the opportunity to contribute to planning and decision making; Ensure this is also evidenced through established quality mechanisms;
c.   Dedicate and schedule time for staff to create this vision and provide mentoring for teams and individuals as necessary through the process of change;
d.   Consolidate and develop plans for postgraduate taught provision, postgraduate research provision and research activity; and
e.   Link with Estates to ensure any developing strategic vision for the School, including the future of studio, is recognised as part of the GSA Estates Strategy.

7.3   **Recommendation 2 – Review the Curriculum**

The School should undertake a review of and make necessary changes to programme documentation including the ILOs to ensure that they reflect the full richness of the curriculum being taught. This should include articulating more clearly the ways in which ethics, climate and sustainability are approached, and the positive teaching and learning developments made in response to COVID-19.

The Review Panel further recommended that the School:

a.   Reflect and consolidate on the good work achieved through COVID-19 – especially in relation to teaching, learning and assessment approaches, organisation and management and student liaison; and
b.   In light of these reflections, update the programme documentation, including the ILOs, to ensure that they fully reflect the richness of the curriculum that is being taught.

7.4   **Recommendation 3 – Preparation and transition into Professional Practice Year Out (PPYO) and the professional environment**

The School should review and strengthen support for preparation and transition into Professional Practice Year Out (PPYO), and review and strengthen the support for students moving into the professional environment.

7.5   **Recommendation 4 – The Student Journey**

The School should articulate and communicate a clear journey for students through study in MSA, ensuring consistency across all platforms. The Review Panel further recommended that the School ensure Canvas, programme handbooks, programme specifications, timetables etc. are in alignment and consistently articulate the student journey through each programme.

<u>Commendations</u>

7.6   The Review Panel commended the Mackintosh School of Architecture on the following, and identified that these were areas of good practice for dissemination across the GSA:

7.7   **Commendation 1 – Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Approaches**

The approach, initiative, and ethos to embed equality, diversity, and inclusion in the School was commended, with recommendation that best practices are mainstreamed across MSA.

In addition, the Review Panel:

a. Commended the initiatives, practices, and ethos of embedding equality, diversity and inclusion, including the Student-Led Working Groups and other co-creation platforms which fostered inclusivity; and
b. Recommended that best practices to be mainstreamed across the School.

7.8   **Commendation 2 – Leadership of the Head of the School**

The Head of School was commended for steering the School through particularly turbulent events, in particular the Mackintosh Building fire and the COVID-19 pandemic.

7.9   **Commendation 3 – The COVID response from the School**

The School response to COVID-19, and the agility and willingness of staff to respond to student feedback during this period, were commended with recommendation that best practices are mainstreamed across MSA.

In addition, the Review Panel:

a. Commended the School for successfully acting on student feedback, specifically through the COVID-19 period; and
b. Recommended that the School ensure that formal feedback mechanisms are as effective as informal practices and could be evidenced.

7.10 **Commendation 4 – Collegiate culture and strength of staff and student relationships**
The collegiate culture and strength of the staff and student relationships in MSA was commended for creating an engaged student body with a strong infinity to the School.

In addition, the Review Panel commended the:

a. Strong staff and student relationships;
b. Successful implementation of the Personal Tutor Scheme; and
c. Articulate and engaged student body who have a strong affinity with the School.

8. REVALIDATION OF PROGRAMME PROVISION

8.1 As an integral part of the Periodic Review process the Review Panel considered the revalidation of individual programmes. The Self-Evaluation report explicitly and frequently referenced individual programme provision, and the Review Panel considered the student experience and individual programme provision throughout the process.

8.2 The University of Glasgow's Academic Standards Committee is requested to note that GSA's Academic Council approved the revalidation of the following degree programmes for a period of six years from September 2021:

Bachelor of Architecture with Honours
Diploma In Architecture
Master of Architecture by Conversion
Master of Architectural Studies

The next Periodic Review event will be scheduled within a six-year period from 2020/21, being the year in which the Periodic Review event was held.

9. GENERAL REFLECTIONS OF THE PERIODIC REVIEW PANEL

9.1 As a general reflection of the Periodic Review event, the Review Panel were assured of the quality of the student experience and of the provision delivered by the Mackintosh School of Architecture. The Review Panel were satisfied that sufficient discussion took place with School staff and students regarding the quality of the provision under review, assurance of the standards of awards, the School's approach to enhancing learning and teaching, the quality of the student experience and the School's strengths and areas for improvements.

9.2 The Periodic Review event was conducted remotely owing to the COVID-19 pandemic. The Review Panel were in agreement that it worked well and had no further feedback.

ANNEX A: PROGRAMME PROVISION CONSIDERED AS PART OF THE PERIODIC REVIEW

The Review Panel considered the following provision offered by the Mackintosh School of Architecture (including student numbers for 2020/21):

Programme		**Student FTE in 2020/21***
Bachelor of Architecture with Honours	*A four year programme*	78.5
Diploma In Architecture	*A one year programme full-time, or two years part-time*	48
	Undergraduate Total	126.5
Master of Architecture by Conversion	*A one year programme full-time, or two years part-time*	9
Master of Architectural Studies	*A one year programme*	9
	Postgraduate Total	18
	MSA Total	144.5

* total Student FTE to complete with a Degree in 2020/21

ANNEX B: MACKINTOSH SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE PERIODIC REVIEW – STAFF AND STUDENT MEETINGS

1. **Meeting with group of Undergraduate Students: Thursday 11 February 2021, 13:15 – 14:15**

Name	Stage
Student A	Stage 1 Representative
Student B	Stage 2 Representative
Student C	Undergraduate Lead Representative
Student D	Stage 3 Student
Student E	Professional Practice Year Out (PPYO)

2. **Meeting with group of Postgraduate Students: Thursday 11 February 2021, 14:30 – 15:30**

Name	Stage
Student A	Postgraduate Lead Representative
Student B	Masters Class Representative
Student C	Master of Architectural Studies Student
Student D	Stage 4 Student
Student E	Stage 4 Student
Student F	Stage 4 Student
Student G	Stage 5 Student
Student H	Stage 5 Student

3. **Meeting with Programme Leaders and Heads of Departments: Friday 12 February 2021, 10:30 – 12:00**

Name	Programme
Ms Isabel Deakin	Programme Leader - Diploma In Architecture, Master of Architecture by Conversion and Master of Architectural Studies
Mr Alan Hooper	Programme Leader - Bachelor of Architecture with Honours

4. **Meeting with Stage Leaders, Subject Leaders, Studio Tutors and Professional Services Support: Friday 12 February 2021, 13:15 – 14:45**

Name	Title
Kathy Li	Stage 1 Leader
Luca Brunelli	Stage 2 Leader
Tilo Einert	Stage 3 Leader
Robert Mantho	Stage 4 Leader
Miranda Webster	Stage 5 Leader
Florian Urban	Subject Leader, History of Architecture and Urban Studies (HAUS)
Virginia Rammou	Subject Leader, Architectural Technology (AT) and Professional Studies
Craig Laurie	Technical Support Officer
Pauline O'Neill	Academic Support Manager
Kirsty Lees	Stage 3 Co Pilot, Studio Tutor and Admissions Coordinator
Neil Mochrie	Stage 2 Co Pilot and Studio Tutor

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 21 May 2021

Report of the Meeting of the Joint Liaison Committee of the University of Glasgow and Scotland's Rural College (SRUC) held on 10 December 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 Liaison Committee of the University of Glasgow and Scotland's Rural College (SRUC) held on 10 December 2020.

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), 2020-21, 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 21 May 2021

Report from the Meeting of the Joint Liaison Committee of the University of Glasgow and Scotland's Rural College (SRUC) held on 10 December 2020

Robbie Mulholland, Academic Collaborations Office

1.   Joint Liaison Committee (JLC) Remit and Membership 2020-21

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) (2020-21), as circulated, to Academic Standards Committee (ASC) for approval as detailed in **Appendix 1**.

2.   Associate University Lecturers (AULs) – Removal of Records

The Board recalled that the Clerk had previously started to make arrangements for the removal from the University IT system of the records of former SRUC employees listed as Associate University Lecturers (AULs). The Clerk informed members that this work had been paused because of the difficulty of accessing online records via remote devices whilst staff were working from home.

3.   SRUC Annual Report (2019-20)

The SRUC Quality Assurance Lead introduced the SRUC Annual Report (2019-20).

3.1   Overview

Members were reminded that SRUC had previously launched its Strategic Plan (2018-22) with outcomes linked to five key drivers: integration; innovation for impact; industry-facing; international and inspiring. The onset of the Covid-19 pandemic in 2020, whilst having had a very significant impact on SRUC, had also allowed the institution to re-visit its strategy and this exercise had been shared with stakeholders via the Unified campaign. The Unified campaign set out a mission for SRUC which placed a strong emphasis on the natural economy and the means by which SRUC could influence developments in this area, particularly through its networks with Government and business.

3.2   Application for Degree-Awarding Powers

The committee was advised that SRUC remained committed to achieving degree-awarding powers. The intention was to progress this in a phased manner, with an application, in the first instance, for *taught* degree awarding powers (TDAP). The preparatory work for application for taught degree-awarding powers would build on supporting outcomes from ELIR 4, internal developmental work and the input of external consultants.

A proposal to take forward an application for TDAP had been considered by the SRUC Academic Board in March 2020 and subsequently endorsed by the SRUC Board. SRUC was now in the process of bringing forward a draft reflective analysis document and this was the focus of several related work-streams. The current expectation was that the application for TDAP would be drafted during the Winter of session 2020-21 with a submission date of April 2021.

The availability of a letter from University senior management endorsing SRUC's application for degree-awarding powers would likely be pivotal to a successful outcome. The Convener

advised that the University would be happy to help in any way it could in this regard and invited the SRUC Registrar to contact her further on this matter outside of committee, at the appropriate time.

3.3   ELIR 4

As noted in last year's SRUC report to the committee, SRUC had undergone ELIR 4 during the Spring of 2019.

Action against the seven recommendations arising from ELIR had been taken forward under the direction of the SRUC Academic Board, convened by the Academic Director. This activity had been supported by action planning involving the Academic Leadership Team, the Learning & Teaching Committee and staff and students. It was noted that the Covid-19 pandemic had brought about a mass switch to online learning and assessment, and it was against this very challenging background that SRUC had moved forward with its responses to the ELIR recommendations (as below):

- *Effective use of academic committee structures*

  SRUC had operated revised Academic Governance Committees fully for session 2019-20 with a view to establishing their effectiveness. A proposal detailing further refinements would be submitted to the Academic Board.

- *Distance Learning student experience*

  SRUC was implementing a project to improve the distance learning experience for staff and students.

- *Preparation for teaching*

  Prior to engaging in teaching, all staff and/or students undertaking teaching and/or assessment responsibilities would be required to undertake New to Teaching academic development. This would include completion of a relevant teaching qualification.

- *Responding to student views*

  Improved channels for the communication of how SRUC responds to student views and maximises impact from student feedback were being put in place. Two new posts had been created with the Student Voice included in their remit, and during lockdown, the SRUC Communications team had become more involved with communications to students.

- *Feedback to students on assessed work*

  A multi-strand approach had been adopted to address this recommendation. One strand would be implemented through internal monitoring, and another through staff development. In addition, a root and branch review of assessment and feedback policy and practice was underway*.*

- *Using data to enhance the student experience*

  Steps taken to address this recommendation included a restructuring exercise to form the Registry and the development of a SRUC data hub to support the availability of live data reports.

- *Careers advice*

  SRUC's response included the future appointment of Careers Advisers and the development of a SRUC-specific approach to careers guidance, information and advice.

3.4   Learning, Teaching and Assessment

It was noted that the new SRUC Learning & Teaching Enhancement Strategy 2020-25 comprised two pillars and ten principles to which all new and existing programmes would align.

The underlying philosophy of the Strategy drew on the idea that "All learning, teaching and assessment at SRUC will enable learning for change and learning for all'. It encompassed the following areas:

- Working with learners as partners
- Designing realistic learning
- Embedding global challenges
- Designing research-informed curricula
- Encouraging critical and creative thinking
- Building learning communities
- Providing flexible learner journeys
- Designing inclusive learning
- Designing active blended learning
- Enabling independent learning.

3.5   Digital Technologies in the Curriculum

The SRUC Registrar pointed out that SRUC had been aware of the educational benefits of active blended-learning – i.e. the combination of hands-on, experiential learning with digital approaches to teaching and learning for some time. This approach had been given added impetus however with the onset of the pandemic. The many benefits of digitisation had become clear during the pandemic and SRUC had taken forward a range of activities associated with digital technologies including:

- the establishment of a Digital Learning team within the Centre for the Enhancement of Learning & Teaching to focus on staff development; and
- the development of a digital learning staff development programme, which included the introduction of a "Getting the Best out of Moodle" toolkit.

3.6   Admissions and Admissions Procedures

The numbers of applications to SRUC degree and associated HN programmes and the number of offers accepted had declined during the previous two years. In 2020 overall applications had increased slightly when compared to the same data set for the previous year but accepted offers had increased considerably.

SRUC had undertaken a review of Admissions during 2019-20 which had resulted in several changes being implemented in 2020-21. It had updated its overarching admissions policy and contextualised admissions policy, and had decided to move to a centralised on-line Admissions system for FE programmes. SRUC was also moving all progression applications (HNC to HND, and HN to degree) to an online system.

3.7   Validation/Revalidation and Institution-led Review

Members noted that Academic Standards Committee had previously approved a proposal from SRUC to separate their Institution-led Review (ILR) process from their programme revalidation process. SRUC considered that the separation of the two processes allowed the ILR process to be used more effectively as an opportunity to reflect on the current programme independently, before feeding forward into the revalidation process. This separation also fitted well with internal restructuring developments, to the extent that the two processes were led by different teams – ILR by the Centre for Enhancement of Learning & Teaching, and validation/revalidation by Registry.

Members were advised that no new programmes had been validated in session 2019-20. A previous issue around the accreditation of the BSc (Honours) Veterinary Nursing programme accredited by the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons (RCVS) had been resolved, and SRUC had received confirmation that both the BSc Veterinary Nursing and the BSc (Honours) Veterinary Nursing awards were accredited by the RCVS.

The Engineering, Science and Technology suite of programmes (below) had been due for review and revalidation in session 2018-19, however SRUC had made a request (later approved by ASC) that this be delayed to allow further strategic development. Institution-led review of the subject area took place in session 2018-19, and revalidation took place in December 2019.

- BSc Agricultural Bioscience
- BSc Applied Animal Science
- BSc Renewables and Environmental Technology

The final report from the revalidation event, along with action plans addressing the conditions and recommendations were submitted to the March meeting of the Academic Standards Committee. Revalidation of the BSc Sustainable Food Production & Land Use (formerly BSc Agricultural Bioscience), BSc Applied Bioscience and the BSc Agricultural Technology (formerly BSc Renewables & Environmental Technology) programmes was approved.

Revalidation of the Environment and Countryside programmes took place in early March 2020. The programmes included were:

- MSc Countryside Management
- BSc Countryside Management
- BSc Environmental Resource Management (validated by the University of Edinburgh)

The Environment and Countryside programmes underwent institution-led review and revalidation at the same time. The final integrated report and action plans were submitted to the May Academic Standards Committee and, again, approval for the revalidated MSc Wildlife and Conservation Management and BSc Wildlife and Conservation Management programmes was granted.

3.8 Future Planned Validations and Revalidations

SRUC's Central Faculty was in the process of developing a business case for the following 2 proposed programmes: BSc Animal Welfare Science and BSc Equine Science and Management. Once these proposals had been approved internally, ASC approval would be sought for their introduction.

3.9 External Examiner System

Most of the fourteen External Examiners who reported during session 2019-20 expressed general satisfaction with academic standards and most aspects of the assessment process. Programme-specific issues noted by External Examiners were taken forward during the annual monitoring process with proposed action by Programme Leaders reported in writing to External Examiners.

Themes identified during this process included:

- Positive learning experience and high levels of support and engagement from staff.
- Staff response to COVID-19 and application of "Help not Hinder" policy highlighted as being very good in a number of reports.
- Preparation for, and conduct of, remote exam boards (including access to materials via Moodle) was highlighted in most instances as being well organised and effective.
- Prolonged feedback time had recurred in a few programmes.

- Consistency in marking approaches both online and across sites was in some instances variable.
- The number of forms for the External Examiner to complete, having an impact on the time available to actually sample evidence.
- Staffing as being a potential threat to programme quality.

3.10 Teaching Excellence Framework

SRUC had decided not to enter the Teaching Excellence and Student Outcomes Framework. It would re-visit this decision in the light of the Pearce Review.

3.11 Student Support Mechanisms

Following the creation of new Faculty offices in session 2019-20, SRUC student support activities were now managed locally by Academic Liaison Managers with a full range of support mechanisms in each Faculty. SRUC continued to work closely with the SRUC Students' Association (SRUCSA) on a number of initiatives including the Healthy Learning & Wellbeing Strategy designed to support staff and students' physical and mental health, and the SRUC/SRUCSA/SANE Black Dog campaign.

3.12 Student Feedback Mechanisms: SRUC Students' Association and the Student Partnership Agreement:

SRUC and SRUCSA formally signed the Student Partnership Agreement in October 2019. The Covid-19 pandemic had prompted a shift in priorities for SRUCSA and this had led to the introduction of 'Speak Week – Covid-19 Edition' – this being an initiative designed to allow students to express how they felt about their studies in lockdown This had resulted in 273 students participating in the activity. SRUCSA had analysed the findings and made recommendations, based on this information to the Executive Leadership Team.

The committee was advised that SRUCSA Sabbatical Officers had played a very important role in lockdown and were involved in consultation on amendments to various policies and procedures. Also, in session 2020-21, the SRUCSA executive was reorganised to better reflect the Faculty structure of SRUC.

3.13 Equality and Diversity

SRUC's Equality, Human Rights & Inclusion Committee (EHRIC) had been revised during session 2019-20 and subsequently renamed the Equality, Diversity & Inclusion Committee (EDIC), under the Convenership of the Director of Professional Services. The revised membership meant that all areas of SRUC's operations were represented. Support for disabilities, including mental health has been a significant focus within SRUC, and this had been recognised in ELIR outcomes.

SRUC had revised its British Sign Language (BSL) Plan and for the first time SRUC's July 2019 Graduation Ceremony had been signed, as were key induction videos.

3.14 Widening Participation and Gender Imbalance

The committee was advised that a new SRUC Equality & Diversity Lead would be starting in the following month. Other resources were also being put in place to address issues around widening participation and gender imbalance. SRUC had been one of three HE institutions to participate in the SFC-funded pilot of the training developed to set out the Principles of Good Transitions run by the Association for Real Change Scotland (ARC Scotland).

Gender imbalance within SRUC's governance structure had also been a focus – SRUC's Board now consisted of 42% female non-executive directors (this had been 20% in November 2016). The Executive leadership team had increased from 0% female representation in March 2018, to 29% at the current time. The Senior Leadership team currently had 53% female

representation. SRUC was currently working towards an institutional bronze Athena SWAN award, with the aim of submitting an application for Spring 2021.

A new Transgender Policy was co-developed with SRUCSA during the 2019/20 academic year.

3.15 Student Feedback

SRUC used a range of student feedback mechanisms at a range of levels including at module, subject, cohort and campus level. Feedback from students was gathered via a range of mechanisms: at the module level via end of module questionnaires, at the subject level via Student Liaison Groups, and at the campus level via the annual Speak Week (run by SRUCSA).

Staff also undertook informal feedback with students through dialogue. At the end of May 2020, the Students' Association was asked to run a bespoke Speak Week for reflection on the pivot to online learning and to enable staff to plan for 2020-21 in line with the Student Voice.

During the recent round of annual dialogue meetings with the Boards of Studies, it was evident that engagement with the range of approaches was variable, and some subject areas were tasked with reviewing their approaches to student feedback and their subsequent responses to that feedback. At institutional level, the recently appointed Student Journey Officer has been tasked with conducting a root and branch review of SRUC's Student Voice activities. This would take place again in 2020/21.

3.16 National Student Survey

Owing to eligibility criteria, only fourth year degree and some second year HND students were able to participate in the NSS Survey.

For the NSS proper, SRUC saw a slight reduction in responses (71% - down from 75% in 2019); this was still above the Scottish average (70%). Overall satisfaction remained at 72%. However, there was a reduction in satisfaction, to varying degrees, against every metric. Areas highlighted by the NSS, and mirrored in other student feedback as particularly problematic were:

- assessment and feedback, particularly around feedback timeliness;
- organisation and management, particularly around the programme running smoothly;
- Student Voice, particularly around how students' feedback was acted upon.

To address these issues, a range of activities were being put in place. For assessment and feedback, programme teams had been tasked with submitting feedback timetables for 2020-21 which would be monitored by Heads of Department, with areas of concern reported to the Executive Leadership Team. To address the underlying factors causing poor assessment and feedback satisfaction, a root and branch review of policy and practice will take place in 2020-21.

Programme teams have also been tasked with reporting on how they would address their NSS returns, including with regard to organisation and management. This was a core agenda item for discussion at the annual quality dialogues, on which Boards of Studies were expected to monitor progress.

3.17 Annual Monitoring Process

Members were advised that all programmes were required to conduct an annual review and from that develop an annual programme monitoring report including a quality enhancement plan.

In session 2019/20 the programme annual monitoring reports had been streamlined to reduce colleague workload due to the impact of COVID-19 at a key point in the academic year. Programme Teams were asked to undertake a SWOT analysis and write a brief report (including an enhancement plan) covering key aspects required for external reporting. The subsequent process of collating these into Board of Study reports for the annual dialogue meetings was also revised based on feedback received last year.

The annual monitoring process was the subject of a student intern project, the outputs of which would be used to inform a further review of the process.

The annual monitoring process had confirmed some key strengths including the level of staff commitment that was required to manage the move to online delivery; the Help not Hinder policy and the maximising of the effectiveness of digital team working. Colleagues were also commended for the level of support offered to students and also to External Examiners attending Exam Boards remotely. In spite of the many challenges facing students, there were very few complaints and appeals.

The common overarching issues arising from the programme annual monitoring reports and annual dialogue meetings, are outlined below. The Academic Leadership Team had taken steps to address these matters which would be taken forward at the Academic Board in November 2020:

- Staffing
- Facilities
- Assessment and Feedback
- Timetabling
- Programme Management
- Learning and Teaching
- Programme Development
- Student Feedback
- Recruitment and Marketing

3.18 Appeals, Academic Misconduct and Academic-Related Complaints Appeals

SRUC had received no formal appeals relating to University of Glasgow programmes.

Academic misconduct

There were nine cases of academic misconduct during the year. Two cases were escalated to major misconduct with both resulting in the students being made to retake the units in the following academic year. In one case the student was withdrawn from further studies during the current year, but they were given the option to return and retake the unit and complete their studies. All other incidents were treated as minor misconduct.

Academic related complaints

From June 2019 to May 2020 there were a total of twenty complaints. Of these, fourteen were frontline complaints, the outcomes of which were: five upheld, two partially upheld and seven not upheld. The remaining six were Stage Two complaints with one upheld, two partially upheld and 3 not upheld. The complaints covered a range of issues across the campuses and programmes with no discernible trends apparent.

One of the members thought it would be useful for future reports if the section on appeals, complaints and misconduct could include an expanded narrative to give added context. The SRUC Registrar agreed to consider this for the next meeting.

4.   BSc (Honours) Veterinary Nursing Programme Report, 2019-20

Session 2019-20 saw the BSc (Honours) Veterinary Nursing programme deliver to its second cohort, with 33 students successfully recruited. Although a good number of students were recruited, the programme continued to recruit into Clearing which indicated that the degree market was more restricted than the HN market. High success rates were achieved by both years despite the challenges of lockdown.

Following lockdown, all exams had been postponed in order to investigate, approve and set up online examinations. The Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons' (RCVS) requirement for secure unseen exams resulted in a proctoring system for online exams being developed and successfully implemented. This system would be continued for session 2020-21.

Members were also advised that teaching delivery of the programme had been extended to the North Faculty in Aberdeen.

5.   Consideration of SRUC New Teaching Staff as Associate University Lecturers (AULs)

The Committee received the CVs of new SRUC academic staff and **agreed to recommend** their appointment as Associate University Lecturers (AULs) to ASC for approval as detailed in **Appendix 2.**

6.   Report from SRUC Student Association (SRUCSA) Sabbatical Officer

The President of SRUC's Student Association (SRUCSA) gave a verbal report of the activities of the Association in session 2019-20 and highlighted the following matters:

- Students had reported that they were very grateful for the level of support they had received from SRUC during the pandemic – including regular email updates from the Principal regarding important safety announcements.
- Students had been reassured by the Help not Hinder Policy and welcomed the opportunity they had been given to input to it and other policy and procedures where appropriate.
- The Speak Easy initiative had been welcomed by students who had welcomed the sense of online community it had created.
- SRUCSA continued to emphasise its commitment to mental health initiatives and was very appreciative of the efforts that SRUC was making in this area.
- SRUCSA appreciated the benefits that the revised Faculty structure within SRUC could bring and SRUCSA was trying to mirror these developments in its own organisational structure.
- The issue of digital poverty had been highlighted by the impact of the pandemic and SRUCSA was looking to keep this matter at the forefront of their activity.

The Convener thanked the SRUCSA President for an excellent report.

7.   Visas and Immigration (standing item)

There were no items regarding visas and immigration.

8.   Publications (standing item)

The Convener thanked SRUC 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.

9. Convener's Business

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

- One of the many challenges for the University arising out of the pandemic was to maintain the many gains that had been made. In some cases of online delivery where it was clear that the new ways of working were better than those used before, then it was very likely that there would not be a return to previous practices.
- The pandemic had also showed the agility and adaptability which staff possessed when business processes which, in the past, would have taken a long time to revise could be implemented in a matter of days/weeks - for example the No Detriment Policy.
- The University had received the Times Higher Education (THE) University of the Year (2020) award. The University had received the award in recognition of the way it had addressed the legacy of its ties to the slave trade. The Convener noted that the University was examining ways by which it could build on the success of the THE award in other areas of activity.
- The McCune Smith Building was scheduled to open in January 2021.

University of Glasgow

Joint Liaison Committee for the University of Glasgow and SRUC

Remit and Membership

2020-21

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 the 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	
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 & Life Sciences) or SRUC Member of SRUC's Education Board (or its successor)	Professor Jim Anderson (nominee for Professor Maureen Bain, Dean of Learning & 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)	Sharlotte Jenell Green
Scotland's Rural College	
Principal (or nominee) [Vice Convener][1]	Professor Jamie Newbold, Academic Director
Registrar	Dr Kyrsten Black
Head of Learning and Teaching	Dr Pauline Hanesworth
Quality Manager	Karen Martyniuk
Student Representative (SRUC Students Association)	Amy McLuckie
In Attendance	
Teaching Group Managers and/or Programme Leaders, as and if required	
Academic Collaborations Manager, UoG	Robbie Mulholland

---

[1] Vice Principal Research attending as and when required.

SRUC New Teaching Staff Recruited 2019/20 (University of Glasgow validated programmes)

Name	Qualifications	Job Title	Division	Subject Group/External Organisation	Campus Location	Primary Programme
Alexander Pirie	BSc Hons Agriculture Countryside Management HNC	Consultant	Consulting	Agriculture and Business Management	Aberdeen	Agriculture
Spiridoula Athanasiadou	Doctor of Veterinary Medicine (DVM), Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece, 1996. PhD The role of condensed tannins towards gastrointestinal nematodes in sheep. University of Edinburgh (UoE), 2001.	Research Scientist	Academic	Agriculture and Business Management	Ayr	Applied Poultry Science
Ewan Johnston	BSc Agri (Hons) General Agriculture MSc Organic Farming BASIS, FACTS, FBAASS	Senior Consultant and Area Manager	Consulting	Agriculture and Business Management	Aberdeen	Organic Farming
Lindsay Whistance	2003-2007 PhD – 'Eliminative behaviour of dairy cows and the potential for adjustment to improve welfare', Harper Adams University. 2001-2003 BSc (Hons) Animal Science (Behaviour) *First Class,* School of Agriculture, Riseholme, University of Lincoln. 1999-2001 **HND** Animal Science and Behaviour Studies De Montfort University, Caythorpe.	Lecturer	Academic	Agriculture and Business Management	Aberdeen	Organic Farming
Jenny McMillan	MSc Applied Economics (Part-time 2016-2018), University of Strathclyde, 'Merit' with Distinction awarded for dissertation on subject of natural capital in Scotland. BSc (Honours) Rural Resource Management (2007-2011) Grade	Agricultural Economist	Academic	Environment and Countryside	Edinburgh	Environmental Resource Management

	2:1, Scottish Agricultural College and University of Edinburgh					
Simon Gibson-Poole	University of Edinburgh: PhD, UAS Technology, 2014-2019 University of Edinburgh: BSc (honours) 1st, Environmental Protection, 2009-2013	Postdoctural (Technology and Information Systems)	Academic	Environment and Countryside	Edinburgh	Environmental Resource Management
Scott Denholm	2009 - 2013 PhD., Applied Mathematics. University of Stirling, Stirling, Scotland 2004 - 2008 BSc. (First Class Honours), Mathematics. Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, Scotland	Researcher	Academic	Veterinary and Animal Sciences	Edinburgh	Applied Animal Science
Sarah Hall	BSc (Hons) Zoology – University of Edinburgh (2006) PhD – University of Edinburgh (2011) Postgraduate certificate (with distinction) in Tertiary and Higher Education – University of Highlands & Islands (2020) Fellow (FHEA) – Advance HE (2020)	Laboratory Manager	Academic	Veterinary and Animal Sciences	Edinburgh	Applied Animal Science
Abbie Barnes	RVN/FdSc Veterinary Nursing Advanced Treadmill Therapy Diploma Introduction to The Aquatic Treadmill Diploma Level 3 Certificate in Hydrotherapy for Small Animals Clinical Coach	Lecturer	Academic	Veterinary and Animal Sciences	Barony	Vet Nursing