

# UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

## Academic Standards Committee

A meeting of the **Academic Standards Committee** will be held on **Friday 28 January 2022** at **9.30 am** via [Zoom](#).

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

### AGENDA

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

1. **Minutes of the Meeting held on Friday 26 November 2021** [ASC 21/32](#)
2. **Matters Arising**
  - 2.1 *Convener's Business (ASC/2021/14)*
  - 2.2 *Annual Monitoring: Overview (ASC/2021/15.1.5)* [ASC 21/33](#)
3. **Convener's Business**

#### Section A: Items for Discussion

4. **Annual Monitoring**
  - 4.1 *College Annual Monitoring Summaries for 2020-21*
    - 4.1.1 *College of Social Sciences (PG)* [ASC 21/34](#)
    - 4.1.2 *Overview* [ASC 21/35](#)
5. **Periodic Subject Review – Responses to Recommendations**
  - 5.1 *Economic & Social History* [ASC 21/36](#)

#### Section B: Items for Formal Approval

6. **Item Referred from Edinburgh Theological Seminary**
  - 6.1 *Report of the Meeting of the Joint Board of the University of Glasgow and Edinburgh Theological Seminary held on 15 December 2021* [ASC 21/37](#)
7. **Item Referred from The Glasgow School of Art**
  - 7.1 *Early Exit Award from Master of European Design (ASC/2020/57.2)* [ASC 21/38](#)

<b>Section C: Items for Noting or Information</b>
---

**8. Item Referred from The Glasgow School of Art**

8.1 *Periodic Review Report: Innovation School* [ASC 21/39](#)

**9. Periodic Subject Review – Full Review Reports**

9.1 *School of Nursing & Health Care* [ASC 21/40](#)

**10. Any Other Business**

**11. Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Academic Standards Committee will be held on **Friday 25 March 2021** at **9.30am** via Zoom.

**University of Glasgow**  
**Academic Standards Committee**

**Minute of Meeting held on Friday 26 November 2021 at 9:30 AM via Zoom**

**Present:**

Professor Marc Alexander, Dr Donald Ballance, Ms Jane Broad, Ms Helen Butcher, Dr Paul Castro, Dr Robert Doherty, Professor Neil Evans (Convener), Dr Kelum Gamage, Professor Ann Gow, Professor Joe Gray, Ms Sarah Honeychurch, Dr Eamon McCarthy, Professor Niall MacFarlane, Professor Douglas MacGregor, Professor Anna Morgan-Thomas, Ms Anna Phelan, Mr Niall Rogerson.

**In Attendance:**

Ms Ruth Cole, Dr Helen Purchase (for item ASC/2021/15).

**Apologies:**

Mr David Bennion, Ms Mia Clarke, Dr Angus Ferguson, Professor Moira Fischbacher-Smith, Dr Willie Miller, Professor Jill Morrison.

**ASC/2021/12 Minute of the Meeting held on Friday 1 October 2021**

The minutes were approved.

**ASC/2021/13 Matters Arising**

*ASC/2021/13.1 Responses to Issues Raised in the Undergraduate and Postgraduate College Annual Monitoring Summaries 2019-20 - EvaSys (ASC/2020/54.1)*

Dr Lowdon had provided an update on two matters:

- In relation to improving evaluation student response rates, the Senate Office guidance was being updated and would be re-circulated to Schools and RIs via the School Quality & Enhancement Officers, with follow-up meetings where required. In the more medium term a general review was planned given the changed context of course delivery.
- Regarding the issue of inappropriate and personal comments made in course evaluation, a meeting would be arranged with the SRC to discuss what guidance could be incorporated into the Student Rep Training and how best to communicate with students to ensure that they do not leave inappropriate comments in surveys.

**ASC/2021/14 Convener's Business**

Professor Evans drew members' attention to the message from the Clerk of Senate that had been sent to Schools and RIs earlier in the week in relation to the sustainability of University exam diets from spring 2022 and onwards. The message highlighted a number of different factors which were now coming together to create an extremely challenging picture: increases in the number of students, course combinations and end-of-course exams; an increase in the proportion of students declaring a disability that require exam adjustments; and the need to accommodate a combination of on-campus and online exams. The University's Senior Management Group had agreed that these issues should be addressed through a short-life Aurora-type project, to be called the Exam Sustainability Project. This would have the task of establishing what options the University has and what changes need to be made to processes and systems within the time available to permit future exams diets, including resit diets, to take place securely. Ms Broad noted that exam timetabling was the point at which a very large number of individual decisions and actions came together, and the University's current

systems and processes were not robust enough to manage the size and complexity of the demands being placed on them. As an indication of the size of the task, at the winter 2021 diet, there would be 47,000 exam instances taking place over a nine-day period.

It was noted that part of the overall picture was the need to balance the continuing development of online exams with the return to campus-based exams where this was judged to be the appropriate form of assessment. Recent work carried out by the Inclusive Online Assessment Working Group and the Assessment Planning Management Group had led to changes being implemented at the December 2021 diet, such as the replacement of double time with an arrangement where students were expected to spend the designated time on the paper with 30 minutes available for the upload of answers. Disabled students would receive additional time where this had been identified through a needs assessment. Members thanked Ms Broad for the information and it was agreed that it would be useful to circulate further information that had been presented to SMG and had led to the decision to set up the Exams Sustainability Project.

**Action: J Broad**

Dr McCarthy asked whether changes currently being input to PIP reflecting the move to the various online exam formats would be fed into the project. Ms Broad explained that the information in PIP was not used in timetabling, and that the timetabling team were dependent on information being supplied directly by the Schools/RI. ASC expressed its concern that the University's lack of a comprehensive curriculum management system meant that many such inefficiencies were exacerbating the current difficulties.

### **ASC/2021/15 Annual Monitoring**

#### *ASC/2021/15.1 College Annual Monitoring Summaries for 2020-21*

##### *ASC/2021/15.1.1 College of Arts (UG and PG)*

Dr McCarthy introduced the report, highlighting that many positives had been identified in relation to student experience and student performance. The dominant theme in relation to what needed more work was student support, particularly in relation to mental health and facilities such as the Library and IT.

##### *ASC/2021/15.1.2 College of Medical, Veterinary & Life Sciences (UG)*

Mr Rogerson noted that while there were common themes in the MVLS report (e.g. concerns around staff mental health and challenging workloads), the different Schools had very different requirements and this was difficult to reflect in a concise report. There were representations about Schools wishing to have greater autonomy on how to respond to situations arising locally. There was reflection on some cohorts having been better supported than others during the last session, and specific issues arising from the switch to online teaching and assessment: student isolation arising from not being able to attend in-person labs, and different subject areas having different constraints (e.g. imposed by the accrediting bodies in relation to online assessment).

##### *ASC/2021/15.1.3 College of Science & Engineering (UG and PG)*

Dr Purchase also highlighted concerns regarding staff workloads, particularly with the switch to online teaching and assessment, resulting in a negative impact on morale. Staff felt that they were not able to do their jobs properly, and were unable to keep up with changes, the greatest burden tending to land on a small number of staff. The non-standard start dates had led to many unforeseen administrative and structural problems, which added to the already increased workload. Significant concerns had been expressed regarding online exams and there was a strong desire for the option of on-campus exams being made available at future diets. Concerns were highlighted regarding the estate, with the example of the Geographical and Earth Sciences building being in a serious state of disrepair and requests for remedial work over a long period of time not being answered.

#### *ASC/2021/15.1.4 College of Social Sciences (UG)*

Dr Doherty highlighted the exceptional response of staff to the challenges of the year, with a professional approach, adaptability and hard work meaning that academic standards were maintained. Many positive innovations in pedagogy and assessment had been identified. Staff had faced long hours, a high proportion of screen time, the inability to take annual leave, loss of administrative support and extraordinary efforts required to engage students in online learning. The report also reflected the many challenges faced by students e.g. in relation to digital exclusion.

The Convener noted from the report the concern raised at the risk of Accountancy and Finance losing accredited status if there was no return to in-person timed exams. The Adam Smith Business School had been asked to provide further information on this and had now been put in touch with staff on the Exam Sustainability Project. It was noted that the University had already accepted accreditation requirements to be a key criterion in relation to justifying the return to in-person timed exams.

#### *ASC/2021/15.1.5 Overview*

It was noted that the Annual Monitoring reports included an additional section for the 2020-21 session on temporary course changes arising from adjustments in teaching and assessment made in response to the pandemic. ASC agreed that a lot of useful information was included though these were only examples of the changes. There had been a great deal of innovation in the last two sessions, much of which had been very successful and was planned to be used on a permanent basis.

Members discussed the references to the dramatic increase in cases being referred under the Code of Student Conduct for plagiarism, collusion and other breaches associated with online exams. Ms Butcher acknowledged the seriousness of the issue, with the Student Conduct team having been overloaded and cases taking a long time to conclude. This was going to be referred to at the December meeting of Senate through the Senate Assessors' annual report. There were significant concerns around academic integrity as well as in relation to the welfare of students who had to wait a long time for the outcome of referrals, though recently there had been intensive work to reduce the backlog. It was also noted that for the December 2021 diet, 'double time' in timed online exams was no longer being offered: students would be given the designated time for the exam with an additional 30 minutes to upload answers, and disabled students would receive extra time where this had been identified through a needs assessment.

Given the many issues arising from the switch to online teaching and assessment during the pandemic, there was a discussion around the University's preparedness to respond to similar crises in the future. It was noted that important questions around risk and future-proofing were being addressed in the Learning & Teaching Strategy 2021-25.

The Overview prepared by the Senate Office identified themes under the general headings of 'what worked well' and 'themes for University attention', and gave examples of the various issues. Some of the themes featured in both lists as the positives often related to the achievement and endeavour of staff and students in the context of extremely challenging circumstances. Members agreed a number of amendments to the Overview, using the following headings:

What worked well:

- Flexibility and adaptability of staff
- Online engagement and assessment
- IT improvements – interactive technologies
- Student performance

- Student feedback

Themes for University attention:

- Admissions – increased student numbers, and English language requirements
- Staff workloads and welfare
- Staff and student mental health
- IT/Remote delivery and equipment
- Suitability and quality of teaching spaces/timetabling
- Online assessment and exams
- University policy
- University communication
- University systems
- Student Conduct
- Issues raised in previous summaries

The final version of the Overview, including examples of comments, is provided at **Appendix 1**. Responses would be sought after consideration of the Social Sciences PGT College Annual Monitoring Summary at the January 2022 meeting.

The Overview report also referred to ASC's request for work to be undertaken to address the tone of some of the responses to University-wide issues received previously. The Senate Office had initially proposed that the future process for securing responses would be conducted via in-person meetings between the CQ&EOs, representatives from the Senate Office and key individuals from University Services and other relevant areas. However, there were logistical challenges with such an approach. Members discussed an alternative approach which would aim to reduce the 'faceless' aspect of the process, with Senate Office assisting by identifying key people in the services who would be able to have dialogue with the academic areas raising issues. It was acknowledged that there was work to be done on both sides, with the requests for responses to be framed less as complaints and more as constructive feedback, with an understanding that there would always be limitations on what the services were able to do. It was agreed that the four CQ&EOs should meet before ASC to identify the key areas for which responses would be sought and to identify where more contextual information around the issue was needed from the School/College before requesting the response.

**Action: Senate Office**

### **ASC/2021/16 Periodic Subject Review**

#### *ASC/2021/16.1 Reports on PSR to be Received during 2021-22 and Proposed ASC Reviewers*

ASC received the schedule of reviews taking place during 2021-22 and noted the allocation of members to review full reports and recommendations. ASC reviewers would be advised of the relevant timescales in due course.

#### *ASC/2021/16.2 Responses to Recommendations*

##### *ASC/2021/16.2.1 School of Computing Science*

ASC received an update from the review of Computing Science which took place on 4-5 March 2020. This detailed the responses and progress made to date in implementing the 16 recommendations.

Professor Gow and Dr Ferguson had reviewed the responses and found them in the main to be full and constructive. It was agreed that further updates should be requested for the May 2022 ASC meeting for the following:

Recommendation 1: There was reference to subject-based GTA training but it was not clear from the response whether this was being offered as an alternative to the centrally delivered training. ASC's understanding was that the latter was mandatory.

Recommendation 7: The response acknowledged that there had been a delay in taking forward the work on reviewing and developing assessment.

Recommendation 10: Development and recognition of CPD for events taking place in the School had not yet been taken forward.

### *ASC/2021/16.3 Update Reports*

#### *ASC/2021/16.3.1 School of Veterinary Medicine*

ASC received updated responses on two recommendations arising from the review of Veterinary Medicine that took place on 18-19 February 2019. Recommendation 6 concerned difficulties associated with enrolments falling outwith standard semester times and roll-over of timetabling at Garscube. The issue had been referred to the World Changing Glasgow Team but had not yet been taken forward. It was agreed that the Vet School should indicate to WCGT that ASC had asked for the current target date for the work, and that this should be reported to the ASC meeting in March 2022.

### **ASC/2021/17 Annual Report on Undergraduate External Examiners' Reports – Session 2020-21**

ASC received the annual report, noting a slightly lower return rate than in previous sessions. In view of the exceptional pressures of the 2020-21 session this figure was considered satisfactory. A number of common themes were identified from reports and the Appendices included examples of comments on the following themes: online examinations, assessment format, feedback on assessment, and Moodle. ASC noted overlap with some of the themes emerging through Annual Monitoring. Many of the comments on timed online exams were concerns around students receiving 'double time', and, as noted above (ASC/2021/15.1.5), different arrangements would be in place for the December 2021 diet.

### **ASC/2021/18 Update Report from Academic Regulations Sub-Committee on Good Cause**

Professor Alexander introduced an update report on two ARSC meetings held in June 2021 and subsequent discussions. A University-wide consultation on Good Cause in January 2021 had concluded that the requirement for students to provide a reason for claims and some supporting evidence should be retained. ARSC had been asked to consider a number of questions flowing from this including how the definition of evidence could be broadened and how the guidance on a number of features of Good Cause could be improved.

- Requirement for supporting evidence

The difficulty of obtaining supporting evidence (e.g. a letter from a GP) was well known. The view was that students were generally willing and able to speak to someone about their circumstances and the requirement for some third-party evidence made it more likely that the extent of a student's difficulties would become clearer to the University in order for appropriate referrals for support to be made. Also the timely obtaining of such evidence could be helpful in relation to what was required at a later stage for consideration by a progress committee. Should the third-party evidence be tenuous or weak, students could explain in the claim why stronger supporting evidence was not available.

ASC agreed to endorse ARSC's recommendation that Good Cause claims should be supported by third-party evidence. It was noted that expanded guidance would be developed around the forms of evidence that would be acceptable and the circumstances where staff such as Advisors/Advising Teams and Student Support Officers could provide supporting

statements. (It was also noted that during 2021-22, in light of continuing difficulties associated with the pandemic, the expectation was that Good Cause claims did not require, but could be strengthened by, provision of evidence. Students were expected to make reasonable efforts to provide such evidence. The requirement for supporting evidence, as stated in the Code of Assessment, would be reinstated once circumstances allowed.)

- Sensitive circumstances

A key theme in discussions had been the accessibility of the Good Cause process to students who experienced particularly sensitive and/or distressing circumstances. Such students might be concerned about those circumstances being recorded in a central records system and having to describe the events in question could in itself be extremely distressing. The view of ARSC was that in such circumstances it should be acceptable for the student to indicate the nature of the circumstances to a senior member of staff who could then provide a general statement for the Good Cause claim in lieu of a written description of the circumstances. The statement would confirm that the student had made the member of staff aware of adverse circumstances, and that those circumstances were such as to have a likely impact on the particular assessment(s).

ASC agreed to endorse ARSC's proposal, noting that this needed careful guidance as to what circumstances would justify this approach, how the staff involved would manage communications, what would need to be completed within the Good Cause system, and in what circumstances the Exam Board (or sub-group) might request additional information from the advising staff member. The member of staff would at all stages need to ensure that the student was comfortable with the level of detail being disclosed.

- Place of Good Cause within the overall framework of support for students

Throughout the various discussions there were references to the fact that Good Cause claims often alerted the University to difficulties that students were facing, and that such claims might result in a member of staff contacting the student to enquire about their welfare, or information being passed to the student about available support services. ARSC noted that this was not one of the formal functions of the Good Cause process and that relying on Good Cause to carry out this function would put an unreasonable burden on it. In addition, given the timing of assessment, earlier identification of issues through other mechanisms was preferable. ASC supported ARSC's proposal to take forward a piece of work with Student Support & Wellbeing to show more clearly where the Good Cause process fitted within the overall framework of student support in order to help students identify the most appropriate and timely means of addressing their difficulty.

ASC noted a list of actions identified to improve the processes around Good Cause and the understanding of it by students and staff (those advising students as well as those who administer the process).

**Action: ARSC/Senate Office**

ASC acknowledged that Good Cause remained a very challenging area and that the issues would remain under review. The number of claims was continuing to grow, with the associated work and support needs resulting in a very significant burden which tended to fall on a small number of staff, which in itself raised issues of equality, and the position adopted on the requirement for third-party evidence was not ideal. The issues were compounded by the limitations of the system used for lodging and processing claims. ASC noted that this was another area where the lack of a comprehensive curriculum management system was having a significant impact.



## **ASC/2021/19 Programme Approval**

### *ASC/2021/19.1 Audit Report on Programme Approval Undertaken by Colleges*

ASC received the audit report on programme approval activity carried out during 2020-21. Auditing showed that, in the main, approval processes were followed and appropriate information was uploaded to PIP. However, there was some variation in the way that incomplete proposals were handled. In one case there were several issues outstanding at the time of the Board meeting (consultations incomplete) with the Convener left to complete the scrutiny process and confirm approval. The guidance on programme approval was clear that the Board should be presented with the full information. In another case, the Board minute indicated that approval had been given but did not say that this was subject to completion of outstanding actions that had been identified by the Board.

Feedback would be provided to Colleges on the importance of the full trail of the approval process being evident in PIP with:

- the Board considering all relevant information associated with the proposal; and
- approval withheld until all substantial issues had been addressed; and
- confirmation that minor outstanding matters had been approved to the Convener's satisfaction.

## **ASC/2021/20 Periodic Subject Review**

### *ASC/2021/20.1 Full Review Reports*

ASC noted the following full reports for reviews which had taken place in the Spring of 2021:

- School of Geographical & Earth Sciences
- Philosophy.

## **ASC/2021/21 Report on Accreditation by Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies – Session 2020-21**

The Committee noted the summary of accreditation visits and reviews undertaken by professional, statutory or regulatory bodies during session 2020-21.

## **ASC/2021/22 Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Academic Standards Committee will be held on **Friday 28 January 2022** at **9.30am** via Zoom.

## Overview of Issues raised in Annual Monitoring Summaries 2020-21

The College Summaries have been reviewed by the Senate Office to identify any common themes, including what worked well and issues that require further consideration. These are presented below.

Areas that worked well have also been identified in the College Summaries. These have been broken down into themes and will be sent to Student Learning Development for wider dissemination.

### 1. What worked well

There were a number of common themes reported in the What Worked Well section of the College Summaries. These themes, however, also feature in the themes for attention as the positives often relate to the achievement and endeavour of staff and students in the context of extremely challenging circumstances. These areas included the following:

Flexibility and adaptability of staff

Online engagement and assessment

IT improvements – interactive technologies

Student performance

Student satisfaction

#### What worked well

##### Flexibility and adaptability of staff

“All schools reported that staff performance in challenging circumstances was exceptional, with very engaged and committed staff (Psych, GES, ENG, P&A, M&S, Chem, CS), with particular mention of excellent admin and technical support.” (Psych)

“Schools provided some local community building, and support for students with mental health problems (Psych, Chem), with evident goodwill between staff and students.” (M&S)

“The January start for PGT students caused significant academic, administrative and technical problems, with extremely high workloads for lecturing staff teaching large classes over the summer, and consequence staff burn-out (CS, GES). These problems are on-going, with project supervision of large cohorts overlapping with S1 delivery. All staff involved should be commended for their commitment to seeing through this difficult year while continuing to prioritise the delivery of high-quality education.” (CoSE)

“Flexibility for 20-day feedback turnaround was welcomed (Psych), as was the flexibility in the evidence required for Good Cause claims (Psych), and the use of MyC for Good Cause processes.” (Psych)

“Tutorials and additional tutorial(Q&A) support sessions were well received by students (Chem); assessment and feedback calendars continue to work well in Psych.”

“Staff contribution both PSS and academic has been tremendous throughout the last academic year under very challenging circumstances.” (MVLS)

##### Online engagement and assessment

“Overall, the move online worked well and allowed for greater autonomy and flexibility for students around timing and pace of learning. Online anytime lectures encouraged active learning, whilst online live classes led to a greater sense of community.” (College of Arts)

“Improved rates of attendance at online classes were noted.” (College of Arts).

“Blended learning. Online lectures, the mixture of ‘live’ and ‘anytime’ has been received well by the students. Live small group tutorials continue to work well, attendance and interaction has been excellent. Most senior students keep their cameras on fewer in the earlier years.” (MVLS)

“The delivery of online proctored end-of-year examinations using Proctorio was highly successful (BVMS1, BVMS3) and provided an opportunity to streamline post exam administrative processes (BVMS3) while maintaining equivalent assessment content. Support from IT services and the Moodle team were important in implementing the online proctoring system which was required by BVMS accreditors.” (SVM)

“Students adapted very well to online examinations (coursework has been submitted electronically already). Online exams: there is increasing appreciation across staff and students that open-book and less time-restricted assessments are more appropriate for most of the assessments. They are not a panacea, but they work, discriminate, assess more authentically, and drive deep reflection on the design of questions/tasks enhancing the assessment process. Student trust in assessments was undermined by the possibility of their classmates cheating, colluding or otherwise gaining advantage.” (SLS)

“Turnitin: The School’s use (as Pilot and then as spearhead) of Turnitin at point of submission for online exams (via Moodle Assignment) helped assure quality and instill confidence in the minds of students (and staff and External Examiners). Should be used more widely across the University.” (SLS)

### **IT improvements – interactive technologies**

“Move to online delivery led to enhancements in organisation and appearance of Moodle pages and optimising use of ReadingLists.” (College of Arts)

“Opportunities for innovation e.g., Virtual Surgery (VS) adapted for online delivery, the new Virtual Primary Care (VPC) platform created by the Medical Schools Council (MSC) ‘real life video’ consultations, an online alternative to seeing patients face-to-face.” (MVLS)

“Use of OneDrive to collate ILOs. Previously, all ILOs were on different documents across Moodle. This year, a OneDrive document was created where all ILOs could be easily found, this was very useful for staff and students and will continue.” (MVLS)

“Recorded lectures with the opportunity to re-engage and the flexibility resulting from ‘anytime’ sessions evaluate particularly positively. The delivery of ‘live’ teaching sessions and exam revision sessions worked well. Use of Moodle books to organise course contents, help to create an engaging online learning experience”. (BN1)

“Greater opportunities for external speakers.” (College of Arts)

### **Student performance**

“Student achievement compared to previous years vary: similar (Psych, P&A, ENG), on average was better (Chem), noticeably better (CS).”

“A number of subject areas in SMLC, Humanities and CCA reported similar grade-profiles as pre-pandemic and in some courses even a little better. This was confirmed by externals in all four Schools, where practices in marking and feedback were praised. English Lit reported that over 50% of students were awarded a first class degree.” (College of Arts)

“Assessment performance was increased, possibly due to the online nature of the exams, or the pandemic as students had more time to focus on learning. The MCQ component was increased and this had a positive effect on marking load, whilst maintaining assessment reliability and validity.” (MVLS)

“Student performance in assessments was generally very strong; learning happened and to a high standard for the majority who completed the year. Detailed statistical analysis of grading patterns and assessments evidenced a high level of discrimination. However,

although difficult to draw comparisons, the average grade achieved was higher than seen in previous years.” (SLS)

Systems for identifying students requiring remedial assistance noted in more than one report.

### **Student Satisfaction**

“High levels of student satisfaction are reported in all Schools and many examples of community building activities are given in the AMRs. In particular, students praised teaching staff for their frequent and clear communication as they navigated online learning.” (College of Arts)

“Students responded positively to the online teaching innovations, despite being fatigued by the number of online hours. Teaching in 2021-22 session will be a mix of online and on campus.” (MVLS)

“Student feedback was largely positive across the BVMS and BSc/MSc Vet Bioscience programmes and acknowledged the efforts of academic staff for their enthusiasm, their engagement, passion and for supporting students and keeping them informed. Also, administrative staff for their support and help negotiating and managing the complex class rotations.” (SVM)

“Course Evaluations, NSS results, EE reports, SSLCs etc. all indicate that students appreciated the support and the quality of the education they received from staff. The commitment and willingness of staff to support their students and each other, their adaptability, flexibility, and willingness to work above and beyond the call of duty should be acknowledged as key to making things work. However, years like last year cannot be sustained.” (SLS)

“Considering the challenges, the impression is that students and staff think that many of the issues that develop have been successfully navigated.” (SVM)

“Students’ attainment remained equivalent or improved in comparison to previous years and feedback was generally positive. Very good feedback was received from external examiners regarding the work of administration and teaching staff regarding marking and feedback. Student voice through SSLC meetings operated effectively. NSS overall student satisfaction of 85.5% was one of the highest in the Business School. The subject of Economics has climbed from the 4<sup>th</sup> place to the 2<sup>nd</sup> place in the Russell Group and in external benchmarking, overall satisfaction reached place 17.” (SocSci)

“Student satisfaction with the quality of teaching remained high and was reflected in both Staff Student Liaison Committees and in feedback on individual courses. Courses were praised for being intellectually stimulating and well run, and access to online materials was effective. Students appreciated staff availability over the teaching period, including Q&A sessions, office hours, or ad-hoc responses to enquiries.” (SocSci)

## **2. Themes for University attention**

There were a number of common issues reported through the Summaries, a number of which have been recurring themes over previous reports. The issues identified related to the following themes (with recurring themes marked \*):

Admissions – increased student numbers, and English language requirements

\*Staff workloads and welfare

\*Staff and student mental health

\*IT/Remote delivery and equipment

\*Suitability and quality of teaching spaces/timetabling

Online assessment and exams

\*University policy

\*University communication

\*University systems

Student Conduct

Issues raised in previous summaries

## **2.1 Admissions – increased student numbers, and English language requirements**

All four Colleges referred to issues regarding admissions policy and over recruitment with the subsequent impact on staff and students which was significant and will continue for at least four years as cohort passes through the levels of study.

“All admission applicant groups are becoming more complex in their admissions advice and conversion from offers to places taken. Non-standard applications (outside the ‘normal’ high school or graduate profile) are increasing, as are candidate changes late in the cycle (fee status, response to offer, deferral). These factors make targets difficult to secure. Widening Participation (WP) has significantly grown, with GAP, MD20/40, REACH, SWAP (Scottish Wider Access Programme), Care Leaver and Remote and Rural all now needing to be identified and given different consideration under the WP umbrella.” (MVLS)

“Another area requiring urgent attention is our admissions processes at PGT level. These are extremely difficult for PGT programme conveners to effectively manage and has led to programmes being oversubscribed –with, for example, the MSc in Music Industries having to field a 100% increase in their standard student numbers in the 20/21 academic session. This renders our programmes difficult to deliver and, particularly, to assess with the current staff availability, and much of this could be avoided with more streamlined and communicative admissions processes. We would like to highlight that many individual members of staff within the admissions team are doing an excellent job, but that the team is understaffed, and the mechanisms by which are admissions system functions, particularly regarding anticipated and final student numbers, seem to be inadequate.” (College of Arts)

“The need to improve transparency around admission policies for postgraduate international students, particularly around language requirements. FTV conveners operated under the assumption that all students meet the published IELTS entry requirements and were only informed recently that this was not in fact the case. As a ‘traditional’ academic postgraduate programme, the MLitt in Film and Television Studies requires students to be able to write and communicate at a high level and some international students have really struggled to do so this year, in a much more widespread and noticeable way than in previous years.” (College of Arts)

“Moving the start date of PGT programmes from September to January required enormous staff effort, particularly in delivering S2 in the Summer, and in battling with an university infrastructure that does not recognise the specific nature of this model of delivery.” (SoSE)

“Our first-year intake increased by around 70% in 2020/21 and has increased again in 2021/22. These numbers are becoming unmanageable with the current staffing levels and academic recruitment in our subject area is problematic. Furthermore, the large numbers impact on the student experience. We have a reputation as a small (in relative terms), friendly programme – which is one of our main selling features and what drives NSS results. Students do not want to enter a faceless factory – which is what we are becoming. In terms of student welfare, we have traditionally provided Advisers of Study from within the subject, which greatly enhances the student experience, but it is becoming increasingly difficult to find suitable members of staff for the role. We pride ourselves on high levels of graduate employment, but this will become more difficult with around double the numbers of students, again impacting on our reputation.” (Acc & Fiin)

“We are all very concerned about the large and increasing number of UG students in the ASBS. This can have adverse effects on students experience and have severe implications for the NSS results, especially in assessment and feedback which has become difficult to manage.” (Economics)

“Revising the recruitment policy, to limit the enrolments further, allowing for a better quality of teaching and learning. Also, to have a better balance of GIC and Non-GIC enrolment.” (Management)

“Over-recruitment at the undergraduate and postgraduate level and a lack of forward planning in consultation with the School and Subject is having a negative impact on the student experience. This level of growth is unsustainable and will require a major expansion of our Honours provision to accommodate this number of students. Due to the impact this will have on staff workloads and therefore our ability to respond effectively the issues raised by our NSS results, it is likely that the student experience will be negatively affected for the next few years. We would also ask that due consideration is given to preventing any further growth in either our undergraduate or postgraduate programmes for the next four-year years, while the surge in undergraduate numbers over the past two years of (2020/21 and 2021/22) works its way through the four-year degree.” (Politics)

## **2.2 Staff workloads and welfare**

All College summaries referenced the significant additional workload that the pandemic situation had created for staff. As was evident from the comments in the “What worked well” section, there was an amazing effort by staff, particularly in relation to student support, however, there were concerns that the ongoing pressures were at the cost of staff wellbeing. Staffing and workload issues are matters for College resourcing, however, the following comments were extracted from the ‘For University attention’ section.

“Workload models must recognise the time required for staff to undergo training with new technology associated with blended learning and digital assessment.” (SVM)

“Staff have gone to extraordinary measures to support the students, and this seems to go on without acknowledgement by the University.” (SVM)

“Increased workload due to the pandemic and being too busy to take any annual leave, including the additional days was noted by two different Schools in Arts.” (Humanities and CCA).

“We are all very concerned about students and staff wellbeing which were never more important than now, given the heavier workload as well as the private constraints, e.g. care responsibilities, fear about health and job security etc. We are very concerned about meeting students’ expectations in terms of on-campus experience since most courses in Economics are well above 50. In addition, some academic staff would still feel insecure with on campus teaching amid COVID, calling for a comprehensive guidance on what should be done under such circumstances.” (Economics)

“There is a view that the pandemic has highlighted that a significant amount of development work/innovation will be required in moving forward and this needs to be reflected in workload models.” (Interdisciplinary Studies)

“Workload concerns and expectations: These need to be addressed, particularly for those with caring responsibilities.” (School of Law)

“Since academic staff are required to be much more active in response to online student communications, extension requests etc., and have additional burdens in facilitating online delivery, it must be acknowledged that there is less time for scholarship/research (Psych, Chem) –noting that the additional academic burdens for online delivery have tended to fall on the shoulders of the dedicated few.” (Chem)

“Staff mental health should become more of a priority to the University and there should be more contact points for staff to rely on when they feel overwhelmed or very low/not coping. The conditions we had to work through this year were really tough and the amount of stress sometimes was unmanageable.” (SLS)

“The University has not been proactive in helping to manage the mental health of staff.” (SVM)

“There are some staff vacancies which need to be replaced as soon as possible. Additionally, some provision for cover of staff on long term sick leave is required. Having several permanent staff vacancies is unsustainable and is compromising the student experience.” (Dental School)

### **2.3 Staff and Student Mental Health**

Student mental health was commented on by all four colleges with concerns for the support available to students and the need for staff training to support the students.

“All four Schools raised noted increases in student anxiety and mental health concerns. They note that available resources need to be better signposted to students and that CAPS needs additional resources as all areas reported waiting times that are much longer than is practically helpful. This was a significant feature in all AMRs in Arts.”

“Also, for student mental health. Many students did not make it through last year but would have in a normal year. They are our responsibility.” (SLS)

“The UoG CAPs (Counselling & Psychological Services) is a well-used and much needed resource for students. Further investment to expand the service and reduce waiting times. This was referred to by students in the NSS qualitative comments.” (NHCS)

“The lack of a counsellor at the SVM has caused problems as staff members, with little or no training, spend an enormous amount of time and energy supporting students – often to the detriment of their own mental health.” (SVM)

“Academic staff need guidance on how to deal with student mental health issues, since they are usually the first people that students contact when they have problems.” (CoSE)

“Addressing and supporting the ongoing digital inequalities facing students. Increased reporting of racism as experienced by Chinese students specifically in the pandemic context. Increased reporting of poor to at-risk mental health and the demands (of time but also significant emotional work) placed on all staff to support students the absence of appropriate mental health resources. For example, the kinds of events to support staff on dealing with the secondary stress of supporting students with serious MH issues should be repeated through the academic year and widely advertised among i.e. level convenors and admin staff.” (Sociology)

“The significant levels of support provided to students and staff from Financial Aid, Disabilities and the CRISIS Team should be noted.” (SocSci)

### **2.4 IT/Remote Delivery and Equipment**

There were a substantial number of comments received pertaining to various aspects of IT provision for staff and students and development and use for online teaching methods:

“Many of the challenges posed by the continuation of a blended learning approach are not limited to the SVM, these challenges include (but may not be limited to):

- Work is required as to how students are supported with digital learning to ensure engagement. (SVM)
- Work needs to be done to determine the optimal balance of online and in-person teaching. (SVM)

- Further training and support for staff is needed to enhance the student online learning experience. (SVM)
- Staff struggle to find the time to undergo training with new technology.
- The digital infrastructure across the University must be fit for purpose.
- Appropriate IT support must be made available to staff and students.” (SVM)

“Better on-campus provision needed for staff to record lectures and/or deliver online classes.” (M&S, P&A)

“A university service should be provided for the task of checking the transcriptions for recorded teaching materials.” (CoSE)

“Support for Gathertown would be welcomed, to support remote community building.” (Chem)

“Technical support for mixed sessions (teaching but also committee meetings that are simultaneously online and face-to-face). Current provision is woeful.” (SLS)

“More lecture recording facilities for on-campus sessions.” (SLS)

#### Transcription of videos

“It is noted that the position on correction of video transcripts has changed since the end of the 2020-21 academic year. Whereas in 2020-21 staff were told that there was ‘no legal requirement to correct’ automatic machine transcriptions recent announcements on requirements for digital accessibility for the new 2021-22 academic year say that staff ‘must provide a corrected transcript and/or captioning’. The workload implications of this are of course huge. It is noted that the UofG information (University of Glasgow -MyGlasgow - Digital Accessibility -Video) states that ‘How we will meet the regulations: The University has agreed that we will provide automatic transcripts, i.e. machine-generated transcripts, for all video recorded via services that Information Services provides, primarily Zoom, Echo 360 and Microsoft Stream. The quality of these transcripts is claimed to be between 75 -90% accurate, although strong anecdotal evidence suggests it is less than that. To try to manage student expectations, information on the accuracy of auto transcripts has been provided to students. Improvement of transcripts needs to be addressed locally.’ Therefore, clarity on what ‘improvement of transcripts needs to be addressed locally’ means will be needed. An important point here is that not all teaching uses English as the language of instruction and so not all staff can expect to start with a transcript ‘claimed to be between 75%-90% accurate’. One subject area (Archaeology) has suggested that funding could be provided for functioning voice recognition and transcription software. The current system is not fit for purpose and providing even approximately accurate lecture transcripts results in an entirely unacceptable quantity of additional work for staff. There will be future issues with students with disabilities unless this issue is resolved.” (Humanities)

“Additional spaces to deliver courses over Zoom from campus are needed. The University should consider longer term investing in platforms more specifically designed for teaching delivery that have enhanced features for learning (for example, Adobe Connect).” (Short courses)

“Access to on campus wifi remains a problem. The wifi provision across different parts of the campus varies significantly, and this made it unreliable for staff teaching online from their offices.” (TRS)

“Some staff commented that if we want to have effective on-line teaching (especially for group discussions or tutorials) in the future, we may need to insist that students to turn on their cameras and make sure they are listening.” (SocSci)

“Any continued use of online/blended learning should prioritise the student learning experience over any need to reduce resourcing requirements.” (CoSE)



“There is need to adapt new technology and policies about physical on-campus facilities to deliver a high quality blended and online learning experience for our students.” (MVLS)

## **2.5 Student – IT**

“LEADS should be encouraged to provide student courses in basic digital skills, undergraduate research and dissertation skills, and general ethics, at a university level.” (College of Arts)

“Scot Lit would like to highlight the issue of access to technology as crucial to creating an inclusive learning environment. Staff voiced real concerns about ‘Tech poverty’ and that the support in place for students, such as the laptop loan scheme, are not yet enough.” (College of Arts)

“Students need clarity as to the technical settings (e.g. cookie settings) needed for students seeking to access lecture recordings embedded in Moodle.” (College of Arts)

“Staff in TRS would like guidance on disability accommodation for online learning in relation to accessible readings for people with dyslexia and dyspraxia and the difficulties around note taking when courses are online.” (College of Arts)

“Study space for students on campus that allow them to take part fully in online learning sessions.” (SLS)

“Graduation ceremonies, and celebrations ceased during the pandemic. This is an important rite of passage for the student community. During the crisis, staff were happy to support producing video, relying on the good will of friends/colleagues as a temporary measure. Moving forward, the University should invest in professional IT/digital services to support schools to design and deliver alternative celebrations/events. Written guidance and advice on creating videos was helpful, but this needs to be properly resourced and should not continue to fall to lecturing staff.” (NHCS)

## **2.6 Teaching Spaces and timetabling**

“Three subjects expressed concerns around the ongoing uncertainty around teaching arrangements for 2021-22. The issues related to timeliness of availability of information, timetabling, safety of staff delivering in-person classes, and one subject underscored that access to campus is an irreplaceable part of the student experience.” (College of Arts)

“The requirement to relocate History of Arts classes from Robertson building with an intensively taught practical course during the teaching semester was disruptive for staff and students and added workload and stress to what was an already challenging year managing working during a pandemic. Earlier planning and consideration of the impact of this needs to be considered in future developments. This has had a lasting negative impact on staff workload and moral.” (MPhil Textile Conservation, College of Arts)

“Accessibility to our physical infrastructure remains a significant barrier – none of the buildings on University Gardens, including practice spaces and the in-train new media lab at no. 8, are accessible for students with physical disabilities and the same is true of the recording studios in the Gilbert Scott Buildings. This means, currently, that teaching on courses that require the use of these facilities is often moved to accessible spaces, but these spaces do not have the hardware or software required to teach what is needed. In the absence of a new building, more urgent action on accessibility is required.” (Music, College of Arts)

“Space is needed for students to work independently; request Molema 227, 229 and 306 be removed from central bookings.” (CoSE)

“Timetabling Challenges – the blended approach to come courses where students will be on campus for some classes and online for others is a timetable challenge.” (MEduc)

“Although it is difficult with COVID-19 uncertainty, it will be helpful to have clarity on room bookings/allocations as early as possible to enable effective planning.” (MVLS)

“Improvements have been made with CMIS electronic timetabling simplification this year. There is, however, continued frustration that the ‘fourth term’ (July-September) remains unfacilitated causing confusion for both students and staff.” (Dental School)

“The number of suitable facilities in which to safely carry out AGP treatments remains insufficient as does the required number of supervisory clinical staff. If AGP experience provision is less than required to meet the GDC requirements the School will remain unable to graduate the final year cohort even after an additional year.” (Dental School)

## **2.7 Online Assessment and exams**

There were a substantial number of comments received pertaining to online assessment and examinations.

“There is a need to have a clearer definition of what constitutes a ‘High Stakes Assessment’. On some courses, the move away from such assessments has resulted in an increased number of summative assessments, and correspondingly higher stress levels for students (as reported through the School Staff-Student Liaison Committee) and increased marking workload for teaching staff.” (Interdisciplinary Studies)

“Academic standards / plagiarism –colleagues in Critical Studies, Humanities & SMLC would like greater guidance on marking ‘open book’ exams and would like to see Turnitin or other plagiarism software used as standard in online exams.” (College of Arts)

“One subject (Scottish Literature) is grateful to Senate for their advice and support through exam boards this year. Understanding that these are unusual circumstances, colleagues nevertheless reported feeling disengaged from the exam board process this session and felt that their contribution was diminished. It is hoped that future refinements to exam boards, while promoting fairness, transparency and equality, do not disenfranchise teaching staff and that we instead find ways to engage staff who actually teach on and convene the courses for which results are reported.” (College of Arts)

“Differing views regarding open-book and online (unproctored) exams/assessments: open-book exams are welcomed (Psych); suitable in some areas (GES); online exams appear to be appreciated by students (CS). However, there is an increase the potential for cheating (P&A, M&S, ENG, Chem); it is very difficult to set appropriate exams for open-book online circumstances (CS, ENG); Supervised exam conditions would be an improvement on the current processes (even for quizzes) (M&S). Future decision on online/open-book exams should consider subject-specific requirements.” (CoSE)

“There should be more flexibility around invigilation and timing of examinations across different subjects. In medicine, the exams in early years are partly in preparation for a national licencing exam and in final years, the exams ensure students can practice safely. This makes these exams different to the aims of many other courses and invigilation and time limits would be appropriate for future assessment diets. The External Examiner comments show that they are strongly supportive of this and that the Medical School in Glasgow is currently out of step with other institutions. To meet the needs of the GMC we may also need to explore further, solutions for holding online exams under strict exam conditions with students own devices.” (MVLS)

“Remote proctoring of online assessments is likely to remain a requirement by some accrediting bodies.” (SVM) “The move away from timed, invigilated exams is likely to cause AccFin to lose their accreditations from professional bodies. This will have a huge impact on student recruitment and student satisfaction.” (ASBS)

“Colleagues requested a return to in-person language exams. In the short term, colleagues requested that the University prioritise a 4-hour time window for online timed exams in 2021-22.” (College of Arts)

“The automatic double time for assessments (plus extra for ASN students) was deemed excessive by teaching staff and External Examiners and the RCVS (the SVM was a significant outlier compared to its peer group)”. (SVM)

“Online exams only versus in-hall exams:(staff and students) need a decision/guidance early (before Semester 1 starts) as to which or both will be allowed for the full 2021-22 session.” (SLS)

“Some students answered assessments with verbatim quotes from lectures. Is this acceptable under open-book circumstances? Should students be viewing recorded lectures during their exam? - More guidance needed.” (SLS)

“MCQ exams are not really suitable for open-book conditions, yet they are authentic assessments not only for professional programmes but also for early years (Year 1 and Year 2) of non-professional programmes. They do have a place. A suitable online MCQ assessment system is badly needed. Similarly for short-answer-based exams that, like MCQ exams, legitimately assess breadth of knowledge across a broad curriculum rather than depth per se.” (SLS)

“There was some questioning around the pedagogical purpose of examinations when conducted exclusively online in ‘open-book’ format. There were also some concerns among staff about the increased potential for student misconduct in online examinations.” (Interdisciplinary Studies)

## **2.8 University Policy**

“Less centralised decision making, especially those seeking (and generally failing to find) solutions that suit everyone and every situation. Accept the inevitable truth that ‘guidance’ delivered early would EMPOWER Schools to act in their own initiative and to solve problems early. Schools were successful through the 2020-21 sessions (and despite the centre rather than because of it) and will do so again for 2021-22. The centre should aim to inhibit schools less: trust schools more. A university aiming to be world leading should embrace management practices that are of this millennium and not of the last.” (SLS)

“Code of assessment and support for assessment: upcoming changes are welcome to the code of assessment and the GCAT interim and partial solution. However, these are only the start, and the SLS encourages the University to invest more seriously and urgently in: a) Revising/simplifying the code of assessment b) Streamlining the processing of assessments (grading, aggregation, feedback, programme outcomes etc.). All issues from previous years.” (SLS)

“Students and staff need firmer deadlines and rules regarding extensions and good cause and delayed or deferred assessments. The system used in 2020-21 was not suitable for purpose and caused massive stress and workload problems. Five days extensions are sufficient (to avoid clashing with following assessments and a domino effect).” (SLS)

“Continued use of a 20-day turnaround period for feedback (rather than the 15-day) would ease pressure on staff.” (Psych)

“Extended exam periods prevent discrimination in exam results and exams need to be time-limited to avoid this.” (Chem).

“English Literature request greater University-wide clarity on content advice, which students still understand as a matter of ‘trigger warnings’. Staff also have this problem. The University needs a clearer central statement on the rationale for and limits of content advice. What does it protect against specifically? – students seem to understand such advice as psychological prophylaxis against the ‘triggering of trauma’. Is this really the case, and what

are the implications if so, since some students therefore understand the presence of any upsetting course content as a form of exclusionary pedagogy (courses become inaccessible, like old buildings)? Or, if content advice is not (solely) a preventative against 're-activated' trauma, what positive terms describe what it helps students to do in preparation? This needs to be clear and detailed –not just a phrase or two. To anticipate the diversity of all supposed 'triggers' would require the substitution of an entirely anodyne syllabus. What are the limits of content advice –what can be reasonably foreseen, and what can we say to students who do not feel their 'triggers' have been anticipated? These issues need to be cleared up urgently and very early in student experience – as a matter of induction.” (College of Arts)

“Relatedly, the ‘fitness to study’ process where students with MH issues can be asked to suspend their studies should be reviewed, our experience is that it tends not to be recommended by Disability Services and the Advising team because it ultimately makes things worse for students there must be something seriously wrong with this. Improving understandings of the disability services: what it does, how it supports students and staff in ensuring a student is supported appropriately.” (Sociology)

## **2.9 University Communication**

“University communications to staff have been erratic, late, and sometimes only distributed after the communications to students.” (M&S, GES, Chem)

“University guidance with regard to the pandemic was at times slow to arrive at the School. While this is understandable, given the changing nature of the situation, it did make communicating with SVM students in a timely fashion challenging.” (SVM)

“Communication – If returning to campus in the second semester, ample notice and communication is needed. The speed and clarity around implications could be improved.” (MEduc)

## **2.10 University Systems**

### **2.10.1 EvaSys**

“Critical Studies & CCA noted low levels of student engagement in EvaSys this year.” (College of Arts)

“Colleagues in SMLC observed that the EvaSys questionnaires asks students to comment on the teaching abilities of individual members of staff, which results often in unconstructive feedback. In general, it was thought that the structure of the questionnaires invited students to critique teaching rather than reflect holistically on issues of learning and teaching. Would it be possible to adjust the base questions to elicit more constructive responses?” (College of Arts)

### **2.10.2 MyCampus**

“English Language & Linguistics reports that MyCampus was unable to cope with semester 3 provision (i.e. for Masters students taking a programme with a January start in 2020-21). This caused confusion during the course selection period generally, and also resulted in some students from the ELL and SLS Masters programmes taking semester 3 courses while undertaking dissertation work.” (College of Arts)

“The MyCampus student record does not indicate the array of various WP categories on which the School is asked to report –the admissions team therefore needs to rely on additional spreadsheets/ databases/ separate communications provided by other teams, which introduces delay and potential confusion into the reporting process.” (MVLS)

“To enhance student experience, 'My Campus' needs further development to enable accurate handling of components of assessment and progression criteria across the BN(Hons) programme. The School is keen to work to secure these changes ensuring that 'My Campus' works effectively across the Programme.” (NHCS)

### 2.10.3 Library

“English and Scottish Literature raised the issue of purchase of set texts in formats that can only be used by one student at a time (meaning some could not read the book in time for the seminar, and also that no-one had a copy of the text in front of them during class). Eng Lit also report that some students have struggled to access library materials during lockdown. Even with more electronic resources being made available, candidates have commented on difficulties securing key texts/archives.[NOTE –FTV have also raised the question of access to materials for teaching with College above]”.

### 2.11 Student Conduct

“Plagiarism procedures. Where students have been reported to Student Conduct in the Senate for plagiarism, the process has taken several months to get to interview. It is a focus of concern in the subject among affected students and staff how long the formal plagiarism process takes.”( ESH, SocSci)

“Serious thinking about how to deal with Plagiarism and collusion in online assessments.” (SLS)

“Senate Conduct processes make it hard to prove contract cheating.” (CS)

### 2.12 Issues raised in previous summaries

The following specific issues were raised in previous summaries:

“university insurance is not suitable for field trips” (CoSE)

“student field trip costs should be covered by the university, not the students” (CoSE) – to be followed up with College of Science and Engineering.

“refurbishment of Molema 227” (CoSE).

**University of Glasgow****Academic Standards Committee – Friday 28 January 2022****Annual Monitoring: Overview (ASC/2021/15.1.5)****Lesley Fielding, Senate Office**

As requested at the November meeting of ASC, the College Quality & Enhancement Officers (CQ&EOs) met to discuss the issue of securing responses to the issues identified for University Attention in the College Annual Monitoring Summaries. The CQ&EOs concurred that, while some situations could not be immediately addressed or resolved, it was essential there was clear communication providing background and context to the work that was ongoing in these areas. The following approach was agreed:

- The initial approach to services would be by correspondence, however, for those responses which did not provide a satisfactory response, a meeting with the CQ&EOs and the Senate Office would be arranged.
- To ensure the process was manageable, a quorum would be set for the meetings requiring two CQ&EOs and one member from Senate Office to attend.
- The initial approach to the service would clearly state the intent of the process and a standard statement would be drafted for inclusion which would clarify that the information was sought on behalf of ASC with the intent of following up quality issues with all responses being reported to ASC and Schools/Colleges.
- The Senate Office would draft the text for the correspondence and would be reviewed by the CQ&EOs.
- The importance of identifying the correct recipient(s) was acknowledged to ensure specific issues were directed to individuals with in-depth knowledge of the issue.

It was agreed that the revised format could be piloted in the first instance, however, it would be practical to integrate the additional process into the existing timeline with a link to a standalone document. These details would be outlined in the report to ASC in May for consideration and approval.

University of Glasgow

**Academic Standards Committee – Friday 28 January 2022**

**Postgraduate College Annual Monitoring Summary 2020-21 –  
College of Social Sciences**

**Cover Sheet**

**Dr Robert Doherty, College Quality Officer**

**Brief Description of the Paper**

This paper contains a summary of the Annual Monitoring Reports from the College of Social Sciences.

**Action Requested**

ASC is asked to consider the issues raised in the report covering postgraduate provision in the College of Social Sciences in 2020-21, apart from the Adam Smith Business School, which will be submitted to the March ASC meeting.

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

Actions identified separately.

**Resource Implications (where appropriate)**

As appropriate.

**Timescale for Implementation (where appropriate)**

As appropriate.

**Equality Implications (where appropriate)**

None.

The aim of Annual Monitoring is to maintain quality and improve provision through identifying action that can be taken to improve future student experience. In the context of the COVID-19 pandemic annual monitoring will proceed with a significantly reduced area of focus in terms of reporting requirements.

The streamlined approach adopted for the last annual monitoring round will be continued for the review of provision 2020-21. Schools will therefore again collate feedback on courses based around reflection on two key areas: i) the student experience and ii) student performance.

In addition, information on locally approved blanket course changes will be linked into the annual monitoring process. School Annual Monitoring Summaries (SAMS) will include commentary on temporary course changes introduced in 2020-21 to adjust to the pandemic along with plans for continuation or further development of such changes in the delivery planned for 2021-22. Schools will need to report on their reflection on the impact of these changes on the student experience and opportunities for continuing any identified enhancements in the future design of learning, teaching and assessment.

The commentary on course changes will be collated in the College Annual Monitoring Summaries.

For session 2020-21 this abridged form should be used to record Annual Monitoring Activity. Its purpose is to capture a focused and concise evaluation (or a reflective summary). In undertaking annual monitoring, online meetings should take place to support reflection, reporting and development planning towards enhancement and the maintenance of academic standards.

College	College of Social Science		
Provision covered	Unit of Learning		
Postgraduate Taught	<p>The outcome of annual monitoring across four Schools was reported to College, with the exception of the Adam Smith Business School. Academic and Digital Services has been included with the College for reporting purposes. This report has been informed by the <i>abridged</i> School AMRs provided by the Quality and Enhancement Officers responsible for PGT provision across the Schools that comprise the College. The Adam Smith Business School requested, and was granted, an extended reporting cycle, reporting to College at the end of February 2022.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School of Education: Dr Julie Harvie</li> <li>• School of Interdisciplinary Studies: Dr Alexander Whitelaw</li> <li>• School of Law: Sarah Elliston</li> <li>• School of Social &amp; Political Sciences: Dr Ty Solomon</li> <li>• <i>Academic and Digital Services</i>: Dr Vicki H.M. Dale</li> </ul> <p>Dr Robert Doherty, College Quality Officer.</p>		
Programmes or units not compliant with annual monitoring.	School of Education	Adult Education for Social Change Adult Education, Community Development and Youth Work, MEd Assessment in Education, MSc Educational Doctorate, EdD	
Collaborative Provision covered			



**In the context of the extraordinary circumstances of this academic year, please reflect on Student Experience and Student Performance.** (Please take particular account of course evaluations, data on student performance and the reports of external examiners).

What is working well?

**School of Education**

- Online provision: The transfer of course materials and teaching online has been successful. In some cases, supported by a Learning Technologist, others from having a blended approach already in place.
- External Examiner Comments have been very positive across many programmes.
- Academic Support – Students were well supported by staff to improve the quality of their academic work. Some courses noted this particularly for dissertations e.g. when students had to move to desk-based studies due to the pandemic.
- Student Attainment – Students attaining high standards in their assessments in many courses and dissertation projects.
- Positive Student Feedback – Feedback from students in terms of overall satisfaction indicates high levels of satisfaction in many courses.
- Course content and structure– a good balance between academic, professional and practical experiences provided for students, some of which involve partnership working. Content and materials are intellectually stimulating and promote critical thinking.
- Assessment: formative assessment (used to give students next steps) and summative approaches were well received by students.
- High quality teaching – teaching and learning practices that are challenging, engaging and innovative.

**School of Interdisciplinary Studies**

- Online teaching appears to have been well received and was considered particularly appropriate given the international nature of the student cohort.
- General course satisfaction has been very high and specific areas have been commended – for example, zoom technology has generally worked well.
- Despite the loss of extensive face-to-face contact, the technology facilitated high levels of group engagement and discussion.
- Some fieldtrips and guest lecture inputs were possible in the session.
- Despite the difficult learning circumstances, attainment across programmes was excellent (at least comparable with previous years).

**School of Law**

- Diploma in Legal Practice: Excellent levels of satisfaction were reported by students across all courses on the programme. Praise was given for both the staff, the structure and format of the courses and the materials provided. Accessibility of students to the Course Director and Deputy Director was provided readily through Zoom appointments.
- An early decision was made to run the programme online due to continued concerns over COVID-19 and the unsuitability of rooms in the Sir Alexander Stone building, where all tutorials would take place, for necessary social distancing.
- LLM: Staff were congratulated by students and by external examiners for the work performed over the year. Academic co-operation in collectively pooling expertise to adapt all of the School's LLM courses to online teaching contributed to the successful running of the programme, despite the restrictions imposed by University guidance. Despite the flattening of the grade profile this year, the grades awarded were endorsed by External Examiners and praise was given at the Exam Board for the way in which the examining process had been conducted.

### **School Social & Political Sciences**

- Despite the challenges posed by the pandemic, evidence from course evaluations and staff-student liaison committees showed that the majority of students during AY2020-21 were satisfied with their teaching provision across the School. Student performance was strong overall despite the many challenges faced by students, with many students benefitting from the no-detriment policies.
- While online teaching continued to pose challenges for both staff and students, online provision appeared to become more embedded across most Subjects in AY2020-21, and most students appeared to adapt well to the shift.
- SPS has re-organised its internal structures and committees this past year.
- Despite continued growth in key programmes in the School, staff continued to deliver high-quality provision across programmes as evidenced by continued overall positive student feedback and supportive external examiner comments.
- External Examiners also expressed satisfaction with the performance of different programs (evidenced through EE reports and Exam Boards of Study minutes).
- Staff collegiality in response to the pandemic (across academic and administrative levels) proved to be high and staff responded quickly and beyond expectations to support each other and students.

### **Academic and Digital Development**

- In summary, the knowledge and approachability of staff is welcomed, as is good constructive alignment in terms of formative assessments preparing students for the summatives. Students also value interactions with peers.
- In SSLC, across level 3 courses, the representatives reported that the general atmosphere was very good and tutors were very knowledgeable and approachable. Representatives reported that all masters students were happy with their experience and had found it useful to check in with peers on Phase 4 to check their parity in terms of progress.
- The external examiner, in their report, commented on the well-structured programme with appropriate ILOs, which were constructively aligned with the assessments. It was also noted that the teaching, learning and assessment methods were varied, and staff lead by example. Also noted: good alignment between the feedback on a piece of work and the marking scheme, robust moderation, and marking taking account of the full 22-point scale.

### **What needs work?**

Across an extensive portfolio, units reported common and particular areas for development, including:

- Continue development of online provision. Increase activity on forums.
- Ensure information which is normally provided at face to face sessions is communicated effectively online.
- Pastoral support for students in the online environment.
- Give students access to the range and variety of books needed to fully engage with the children's literature programme and to prepare them for assessment.
- Inclusion of Zoom sessions as a drop in where possible within workload. More 'contact' options for distance students.
- Review of assessment schemes.
- Continuing working on flipping and blended elements to maximise synchronous and/or face to face time; more use of online videos/recording if possible (eg of lessons).
- Registration and enrolment processes as they make students very anxious often at a time when they still don't have knowledge about who or contact with the programme lead and the programme administrator.
- Achieving all courses with online reading lists that students can access prior to starting the courses.
- Mismatch between expectation set centrally of all assignment feedback returned within 15 working days and staff capacity for such a turnaround given competing deadlines and other responsibilities.
- Length of Saturday sessions (particularly for distance learners) and full day sessions for FT students.
- Student confidence with academic writing.
- Feedback collected centrally (PTES/ Evasys): either not collected or not shared with teaching team.

- More administrative support required as capacity of administration staff to support the programmes is strained and under resourced.
- In teacher education, connections between the courses, especially to School Experience & consideration of the role of subject specialists. Logistical issues: timetabling, registration, room bookings and the location of back-to-back classes on campus.

#### **School of Interdisciplinary Studies**

- Students naturally looked forward to a return to face-to-face teaching generally as well as specific PGT experiences like fieldtrips and guest lecture input. This was seen as invaluable in allowing students to understand the relationship between theory and practice.
- There were some technical issues that impacted on the learning experience; on occasions there were difficulties with Zoom-based sessions that led to concerns about the quality of discussion and the level of genuine interaction with students. As such some tutors found it hard to identify students who are struggling and give them extra support.

#### **School of Law**

- Diploma in Legal Practice: Although the need to run the programme online was justified by the need to work within the context of Covid-19, this did cause dissatisfaction for some students and it is not ideal to run a vocational course online which depends on methods of learning such as advocacy. While initially comparisons were drawn by students with other providers who were running in-person classes, this distinction disappeared in 2nd semester.
- The lack of appropriate rooms remains a serious cause of concern and was part of the reason for running the course online, since the available rooms would not have allowed appropriate social distancing. While some improvements to décor have been made, fundamental problems of lack of appropriate teaching space, space for students to study and network and the conditions in rooms (e.g. inadequate temperature control) urgently require solutions. This is a postgraduate course with the consequent fees and the provision for this course compares unfavourably with direct competitors, in addition to impacting on the learning experience of current students. This issue has been reported many times before, but no satisfactory solutions have been offered by the University or College. Some comments were received regarding length and complexity of materials and consistency of marking and feedback, these are being addressed by the course team.
- LLM Grade Profile and Academic Misconduct: The move to online assessment is to be welcomed as a response to the COVID-19 pandemic. However, there has been a flattening of the grade profile which may be due to a combination of the adoption for Covid-19 of a 24 hour return format, and the accessibility of materials online. It also raises concerns about inappropriate collaboration, plagiarism, poor academic referencing, and the potential use of essay/exam mills. In addition, there is no way of knowing for certain who is actually submitting the work, since student id could be shared. The use of this assessment format requires further evaluation, along with additional measures being taken to detect such academic misconduct.

#### **School Social & Political Sciences**

- Despite overall positive student evaluations, rapidly increasing student numbers in some programmes, along with associated knock-on effects across other programmes, is affecting student experience at the PGT level, increases in student numbers are impacting delivery of teaching (under current staffing and resourcing) and well-being.
- Disconnects between central admissions targets and SPS teaching capacity across key programmes continued in AY20-21, significantly impacting resource and teaching planning, including requirement option-only subject courses to absorb additional capacity for large programmes.
- Increases in student numbers also led to significant workload increases for staff with pastoral responsibilities, in addition to professional and administrative staff workloads.
- Continued online delivery and implementation of pandemic specific teaching policy changes continued to necessitate additional time to develop materials and continued to place added pressures on workload and work-life balance and integration. Although staff have delivered on this in a strong a positive manner the knock-on effects linked to mental exhaustion and wider costs to well-being are taking a toll.
- Online Teaching and University Policy: Staff and students have also raised the problem of lack of person-to-person engagement within some teaching elements (both synchronously and a-synchronously

delivered) due to the move online and that this may be related to issues including lack of confidence, IT capabilities etc. As a result, staff often have to engage more time and effort into encouraging participation.

- Although the No-detriment policy proved to be beneficial for students during the pandemic it did prove challenging to understand and apply at PGT level with staff feeling guidance was often slow to be received compounded by a heavy sense of bureaucratic oversight that often was perceived to be unhelpful even if it was undertaken with the best of intention. The ban on research with human subjects, even if they could be contacted online, caused stress and anxiety and dissatisfaction across the board. Travel restrictions created mobility issues and additional problems for International Masters programmes.
- Language Challenges: For AY2020-21, the level of in-class engagement and assessment performance continued to pose challenges both for students and staff. The disconnect between university entry requirements and SPS-specific programme expectations continued to be large amongst international cohorts.

#### **Academic and Digital Development**

- In summary, workload is a recurring theme (our students are academic staff, a number of which have significant teaching commitments). Contributions from peers is noted to be variable; however, this is also a reflection of workload. Another issue is a request for clearer structure/signposting; this perhaps again reflects the circumstances of our time-poor students (and is noted for the future).
- In SSLC, across all phase 1 courses, the student representative raised the issue of student workload (raised as an issue for the attention of the university). For courses 1b and 1c, the student representative communicated some dissatisfaction about the flipped course design.

### **In the context of the extraordinary circumstances of this academic year, and any anticipated requirements and challenges in 2020-21, please reflect on any themes or issues that you wish to report to the responsible level of the University.**

(Check with your School or College Quality Officer if advice is needed on which is the most appropriate level)

School

#### **School of Education**

The dominant themes identified are outlined below and the programmes to which they apply are listed after each.

- Workload – recognition needs to be given in the workload for
  - a. the extra work required of staff in moving to online provision.
  - b. Programme Leaders who are responsible for very large programmes and teaching teams.
  - c. Course leaders who manage and support Associate Tutors.
  - d. Longer dissertations mean supervisors time allocation should be increased.

(MScEd) (TESOL) (ES) (MScPS) (IMCLMC)

- More technical support /Computing Capacity – training for staff and employing more Learning Technologists for example (CLL) (MScPS) (TLL) (MEDEL) ES
- Academic Staffing – more staff required (ESACYC) (EPPE) (MScPS)
- GTA Support – this should be increased (EPPE) (ES) (IMCLMC)
- Administrative Staff – below capacity in terms of new demands being made on them. Increased staffing and support is required as a priority - (ES) (MScPS)(IMCLMC)
- Overwhelming amount of information (CP)
- Additional resources for desk based dissertations (TESOL)
- Staff wellbeing – concern about staff resilience in the face of increased workload and working from home (ES)
- Clearer Guidance – clearer guidance needed about what is expected for online provision to ensure consistency (PGDE)

### **School of Interdisciplinary Studies**

- Given that ‘blended’ models of delivery are likely to continue, there is a need to continue to enhance various aspects of the technology that supports this model (basic IT kit and software).
- There are challenges in transitioning back to more face-to-face teaching and how this relates to the online materials that colleagues have already developed and how best to retain some level of online delivery (without losing the value of the created content, whilst remaining attentive to students’ competing priorities).
- The on-going presence of COVID will continue to place challenges on procedures to mitigate its spread and this will be particularly challenging when moving into winter and Semester 2 when social distancing rules are removed.
- More information on specific issues such as plagiarism will be needed. Students come from a wide variety of backgrounds and often do not necessarily realise what the consequences of plagiarism can be. It would therefore be important to emphasise this early in the academic year and to reiterate it during their semester before they embark on the dissertation. Also, further guidance on referencing is needed for some students.
- More regular information to all students to join DYAW workshops is needed, as well as information about the new project (MGT5020P) option designed by ASBS as an alternative to the dissertation would be needed throughout semester 1 and semester 2.
- A different system of monitoring of attendance for the Social Sciences Research Methods course (DUMF5096) – which introduces students to necessary skills for the implementation of the interdisciplinary work they are increasingly requesting to undertake in tourism dissertations, will be needed for the 2021-2022. For the 2020-2021 academic year, unfortunately very few students followed it as it was offered on audit. In the academic year 2021-2022, students will need to demonstrate they have attended most of the sessions of the course (by completing a week-by-week tick box) before being able to undertake their dissertation.
- Attention to moderation processes requires some scrutiny and further advice from L&T to ensure the EE does not have to raise queries about marking quality.

### **School Social & Political Sciences**

- Subjects expressed appreciation for the School’s efforts to accommodate requests for resources and to find ways to address continued unprecedented growth in student numbers at the PGT level.
- Subjects expressed appreciation with regards to the School’s efforts to streamline administrative processes and looked forward to plans to reshape School L&T committee structures.
- Further work to enhance the digital learning strategy for the School is required especially as the school seeks to make better and enhanced use of online and blended learning as an approach to L&T which is likely to remain post-pandemic.

### **College**

#### **School of Education**

- Workload Capacity – more staff needed with expertise and profiles to match course demands and growing numbers on courses. Making Associate Tutor contracts more secure may help and / or capping student numbers (GLOBED) (MScPS).
- Earlier cut off point for registrations – to allow for adequate course planning (EPPE) (MScPS).
- ICT support systems for staff – although support sessions have been offered, staff have often not been able to attend these due to workload issues. GTAs and learning technologists were appointed late and are stretched. More required (ES) (IMCLMC).
- Staff Wellbeing – concern that issues relating to working from home and converting courses online will affect the wellbeing of academic and administrative staff (ES).
- Administrative Support - Increasing administrative support is a priority, this is a high-risk factor in managing growth in PGT student numbers and in maintaining quality and standards (ES).
- Revisiting Course Entry Requirements – entry requirements may need revisited to address student drop out rates (MScPS).
- College EMJMD “group” guidance - has been very helpful (IMCLMC).

**School Social & Political Sciences**

- Rapid growth in student numbers at the PGT level is by far the dominant concern of the Subjects. The over-recruitment of students creates challenges in many areas. Student experience suffers, as expressed in some staff-student liaison meetings. Allowance of late admissions – often after the teaching semester has begun – makes accurate forward planning impossible and creates challenges across the board to accommodate numbers beyond what have been forecasted by Subjects. Re-allocation of teaching resources at the last minute creates significant knock-on effects for staff and administrative workloads, student experience, and staff and student well-being. While this AMR focuses on PGT, Subjects emphasised that over-recruitment at PGT level is inseparable from over-recruitment and workload issues at the undergraduate level.
- Closer collaboration between Subjects’ self-assessment of teaching capacities and College admissions targets at PGT is necessary going forward.
- Closer collaboration and more transparent information flows between admissions processes and Subjects is necessary going forward.
- Subjects expressed the desire and necessity of a longer-term conversation between College, School, and Subjects about levels of recruitment, disconnect between College targets and Subject capacity, the balancing of recruitment across programmes both within Subjects and across the School, all with a view towards more sustainable and managed admissions.
- Concerns were raised about a time-lag in the appointment of new teaching and administrative staff, such that by the time new staff are in post student targets and admissions have since increased. This leaves students, staff, and administrative staff in the same situation.

University

**School of Education**

- Library Resources – investment needed for online materials to be provided for students and managing copyright regulations (CLL) (TESOL).
- ICT Support Systems – adequate ICT support for staff required e.g. more learning technologists (MScEd) (ES) (MScME).
- Workload Allocation – needs increased to accommodate extra workload resulting in transition to online provision (TESOL).
- Staffing – more subject specific support required (TESOL).
- Consistent Guidance - having many technological options makes staff spend a lot of time trying different things and gives students a more disparate experience (IE).
- Staff Wellbeing – concern about increased workload for staff and issues arising from working from home (ES).
- Communication – communication from the centre needs to be timelier and more consistent (ES).
- Administrative Issues – at the start of the academic session the registration process, room bookings and online timetabling systems need to be improved.

**School of Law**

Accommodation

- Assistance to the PG.Dip team to secure appropriate accommodation. This issue has been reported many times and urgent action is required.

Impact of Online Examinations

- Analysis of the grade impact of the move to online exams would be beneficial. While genuine student achievements over this difficult period are to be welcomed, the increase in cases being referred for suspected plagiarism or collusion is a cause for concern. The general trend of a flattening of grades seen in conjunction with online 24 hour, open book assessments requires further evaluation.

Quality Procedures

- The University requires a better approach for providing the information needed to generate Quality Monitoring information and Reports. The forms available are often located in different systems, the forms themselves are not readily compatible with editing and the procedures are contained in numerous

separate documents, which can lead to confusion and considerable unnecessary time being spent on establishing what the requirements are. The information on the University website on quality monitoring is hard to navigate and would benefit from being amalgamated into a more streamlined set of materials. Additional consideration should be given to the timetabling of procedures for reporting which need to align with when information is available and with when disseminating the outcome of review would be most useful to Schools.

#### **School Social & Political Sciences**

- Concerns were raised about plagiarism procedures. It was noted that several months often pass between when cases are reported to Senate and the interview. Some Subjects stated that they are addressing this at PGT level by increasing the amount of information and research/writing training that students are given, but concerns remain about the formal process.
- The above concerns about rapidly increasing student numbers expressed to College must also be raised at University level.
- Increased reporting of racism experienced by Chinese students within the context of the pandemic.

#### **Academic and Digital Development**

- The issue of staff workload has been raised in a number of courses, and we are aware of this continuing to be an issue at the start of the 2021/22 session. Our students are academic staff, a number of which have significant teaching commitments. While some schools seem supportive of their staff participating in PGCAP, there is an ongoing issue of some managers not recognising the need for participants to study beyond the timetabled contact hours).
- We do not have adequate administrative support to manage EvaSys, i.e. We have only one staff member who is trained in using EvaSys, which creates a bottleneck in the system. This has created problems over the last two academic sessions in that courses ending in semester 2 were not surveyed, as that member of staff had to prioritise other work (in 2019/20) and has been off on long-term sick leave (in 2021/22).
- Some of the Academic and Digital Development Team are using their own personal home computers to work in the absence of an up to date, reasonably spec'd laptop provided by the institution (and office desktop computers are also several years old). Appropriately high-spec laptops are necessary given the flexible working required during a pandemic and to deliver a high-quality experience, especially for live online classes.

**In the context of the extraordinary circumstances of this academic year, please reflect on the impact of the course changes in 2020-21 on the student experience and opportunities for continuing any identified enhancements in the future design of learning, teaching and assessment.**

What is working well?

#### **School of Interdisciplinary Studies**

- Various new 'blended' approaches to teaching have clearly been delivered, generally with great success. There is a broad view that this is particularly welcome and effective at PGT level and that significant aspects of the approach need be retained and accommodated alongside face-to-face interaction.

#### **School of Law**

- The flexibility that may be offered by having blended approaches to learning, though this approach works less well for some courses and programmes than others and can pose significant challenges. 'Double teaching' is to be avoided.

#### **School Social & Political Sciences**

- While most changes in assessment occurred at the undergraduate level, changes and the move to online at PGT appears to have worked similarly well. Many of the most pressing challenges at PGT revolved around the issues discussed above regarding student numbers and language issues.

- Despite some challenges and concerns around digital exclusion issues, most students adapted well to online teaching in AY2020-21.
- After the early and rapid move online at the end of AY2019-20, most staff felt generally positive about teaching online and managed to embed more substantively online teaching materials and resources aimed and aligned with continued ILO fulfilment.
- The school implemented a 'light-touch' approach to request and approval of temporary course assessment changes. This was welcomed by staff as it allowed for a quicker approval process. It also enabled staff to respond quickly to the need to reflect on necessary changes that would enable students to engage and be tested on their learning in ways that were more appropriate to the teaching methods. We anticipate that some of the changes to assessment may have had a positive impact on attainment levels although this needs more careful review and reflection

#### **Academic and Digital Development**

- Staff continue to reflect on their teaching approach, and the structure of their courses in terms of continually ensuring constructively aligned courses which are relevant to practice and underpinned by appropriate up to date literature.

What needs work?

#### **School of Interdisciplinary Studies**

- Further work is needed to ensure the blended approach to learning and teaching is effective and gives students the same opportunities of group-discussion with peers and colleagues that the on-campus classes afford.

#### **School of Law**

- Support for blended learning.
- Appropriate accommodation
- Timely and accessible information on changes required of the School (University policies often being last minute, made without proper consultation and being provided in emails without also updating website materials).

#### **School Social & Political Sciences**

- Some Subjects expressed the need for more technical training for staff with the move to full-time online. While there was much online assistance and materials provided by the University and available elsewhere, teaching online full-time nevertheless proved highly time-consuming. Short workshops for staff were suggested.
- The school recognises the need to focus more attention on the relationship of ILOs and assessment, especially in light of changes to mode of teaching delivery and expectations to respond to high stakes assessment. This may require more focused work with colleagues and improved guidance during the course design and approval process so that lessons learned during this period can be maintained as the school returns to normal working practices'

#### **Academic and Digital Development**

- Students value face-to-face interaction with staff and their peers. During the pandemic, we made the decision to switch from a blended provision to a fully online provision, in order to offer participants more flexibility, and to protect our teaching team, some of whom are clinically vulnerable. With some return to campus, some face-to-face teaching observations have begun, and we will investigate the possibility of moving the object-based learning session in course 2b back into the museum for 2022/23, if circumstances allow.
- We continue to provide clearer assessment guidance including the development of rubrics for all courses.



Form AM2 – College Report of Annual Monitoring Activity - Review of Session 2020-21

Please list all courses that have been approved at local level i.e. temporary course changes to adjust to the Covid-19 pandemic (an appendix is acceptable)

**Additional matters**

Please highlight any additional matters that you wish to raise from this year’s Annual Monitoring cycle

**School of Interdisciplinary Studies**

- Online teaching has generally been successful (for students, teachers and ultimately in relation to standards/ grades).
- Post-Covid, elements from the online version will be maintained across many of the courses and work will be needed in relation to this transition.
- The place of the (non-compulsory) Social Science Research Methods course on Tourism programmes remain a problem (e.g. it seems to have been taken as ‘audit only’ by many, leading to minimal engagement).
- All students on the new End of Life Studies programme have been very positive about experience; though some higher-level issues are evident in relation to its status as a formally designated full online course (e.g. university’s relationship with FutureLearn; the suitability of workload model metrics to online learning and comparative insight as to content/expectations of other F2F and online PGT programs within the SoIS and CoSS).

**School Social & Political Sciences**

- While the move to online was largely effective due to staff diligence and attention, student experience at PGT is directly linked to the above issues over over-recruitment, student numbers in the classroom, and programme/subject teaching and marking capacities.

**University of Glasgow****Academic Standards Committee – Friday 28 January 2022****Overview of College Annual Monitoring Summary 2020-21: College of Social Sciences****Ms Lesley Fielding, Senate Office****1. Introduction**

The report contains information from the College of Social Sciences Postgraduate Annual Monitoring Summary. It should be noted that the School Postgraduate Annual Monitoring Summary for the Adam Smith Business School was not completed in time for inclusion in the CAMS and will be reported separately to the March meeting of ASC. As agreed previously, the College Annual Monitoring Summary for MVLS will be reported to the March meeting of ASC.

The Colleges of Arts and Science & Engineering merged their Undergraduate and Postgraduate Summaries into a single reporting point which was submitted to ASC in November 2021.

The College of Social Sciences PGT annual monitoring summary, has been reviewed by the Senate Office to identify any common themes, including what worked well and issues that require further consideration. The themes identified are presented below. Following its consideration of the College Annual Monitoring Summary, ASC is asked to confirm that the themes identified below are an accurate reflection of the issues raised by the College. The Senate Office will then seek updates and responses from the relevant sources to these University-wide matters.

Areas that worked well have also been identified in the College Summary. These have been broken down into themes and will be sent to the Academic & Digital Development (ADD) for wider dissemination.

**2. What worked well**

There were a number of common themes reported in the What Worked Well section of the College Summary. These themes, however, also feature in the themes for attention. These areas included the following:

- Flexibility and adaptability of staff
- Online engagement and assessment
- Student performance
- Student and External Examiner feedback

**2.1 Flexibility and adaptability of staff**

“Despite continued growth in key programmes in the School, staff continued to deliver high-quality provision across programmes as evidenced by continued overall positive student feedback and supportive external examiner comments.” (School of Law)

“LLM: Staff were congratulated by students and by external examiners for the work performed over the year. Academic co-operation in collectively pooling expertise to adapt all of the School’s LLM courses to online teaching contributed to the successful running of the programme, despite the restrictions imposed by University guidance. Despite the flattening

of the grade profile this year, the grades awarded were endorsed by External Examiners and praise was given at the Exam Board for the way in which the examining process had been conducted.” (School of Law)

“Staff collegiality in response to the pandemic (across academic and administrative levels) proved to be high and staff responded quickly and beyond expectations to support each other and students.” (School of Law)

“In summary, the knowledge and approachability of staff is welcomed, as is good constructive alignment in terms of formative assessments preparing students for the summatives. Students also value interactions with peers.” (Academic & Digital Development)

## **2.2 Online Engagement and Assessment:**

“Online provision: The transfer of course materials and teaching online has been successful. In some cases, supported by a Learning Technologist, others from having a blended approach already in place.” (School of Education)

“Assessment: formative assessment (used to give students next steps) and summative approaches were well received by students.” (School of Education)

“Despite the loss of extensive face-to-face contact, the technology facilitated high levels of group engagement and discussion.” (School of Interdisciplinary Studies)

“While online teaching continued to pose challenges for both staff and students, online provision appeared to become more embedded across most Subjects in AY2020-21, and most students appeared to adapt well to the shift.” (School of Law)

## **2.3 Student Performance**

“Student Attainment – Students attaining high standards in their assessments in many courses and dissertation projects.” (School of Education)

“Despite the loss of extensive face-to-face contact, the technology facilitated high levels of group engagement and discussion.” (School of Interdisciplinary Studies)

## **2.4 Student and External Examiner Feedback**

“Positive Student Feedback – Feedback from students in terms of overall satisfaction indicates high levels of satisfaction in many courses.” (School of Education)

“General course satisfaction has been very high and specific areas have been commended – for example, zoom technology has generally worked well.” (School of Interdisciplinary Studies)

“Diploma in Legal Practice: Excellent levels of satisfaction were reported by students across all courses on the programme. Praise was given for both the staff, the structure and format of the courses and the materials provided. Accessibility of students to the Course Director and Deputy Director was provided readily through Zoom appointments.” (School of Law)

“LLM: Staff were congratulated by students and by external examiners for the work performed over the year. Academic co-operation in collectively pooling expertise to adapt all of the School’s LLM courses to online teaching contributed to the successful running of the programme, despite the restrictions imposed by University guidance. Despite the flattening of the grade profile this year, the grades awarded were endorsed by External Examiners and praise was given at the Exam Board for the way in which the examining process had been conducted.” (School of Law)

“External Examiners also expressed satisfaction with the performance of different programs (evidenced through EE reports and Exam Boards of Study minutes).” (School of Law)

“The external examiner, in their report, commented on the well-structured programme with appropriate ILOs, which were constructively aligned with the assessments. It was also noted that the teaching, learning and assessment methods were varied, and staff lead by example. Also noted: good alignment between the feedback on a piece of work and the marking scheme, robust moderation, and marking taking account of the full 22-point scale.” (Academic & Digital Development)

“In SSLC, across level 3 courses, the representatives reported that the general atmosphere was very good and tutors were very knowledgeable and approachable. Representatives reported that all masters students were happy with their experience and had found it useful to check in with peers on Phase 4 to check their parity in terms of progress.” (Academic & Digital Development)

### **3. Themes for University attention**

The issues identified within the main Social Sciences summary had common issues identified in other College summaries. The general issues identified related to the following themes:

- \*Staff Workload and Welfare
- \*Suitability and quality of teaching spaces/timetabling
- \*University systems
- \*University Communication
- Online exams
- \*IT Equipment
- Admissions – increased student numbers
- Student Conduct
- Student Welfare
- Quality Procedures

\*Issues raised in previous summaries

#### **3.1 Staff Workload and Welfare**

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

“Staffing – more subject specific support required (TESOL).” (School of Education)

“The issue of staff workload has been raised in a number of courses, and we are aware of this continuing to be an issue at the start of the 2021/22 session. Our students are academic staff, a number of which have significant teaching commitments. While some schools seem supportive of their staff participating in PGCAP, there is an ongoing issue of some managers not recognising the need for participants to study beyond the timetabled contact hours.” (Academic & Digital Development)

“Staff Wellbeing – concern about increased workload for staff and issues arising from working from home (ES).” (School of Education)

#### **3.2 Suitability of Teaching spaces and timetabling**

“Assistance to the PG.Dip team to secure appropriate accommodation. This issue has been reported many times and urgent action is required.” (School of Law)

“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)

### **3.3 University Systems**

#### **3.3.1 IT Support**

“ICT Support Systems – adequate ICT support for staff required e.g. more learning technologists (MScEd) (ES) (MScME).” (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 (IE).” (School of Education)

#### **3.3.2 EvaSys**

“We do not have adequate administrative support to manage EvaSys, i.e. We have only one staff member who is trained in using EvaSys, which creates a bottleneck in the system. This has created problems over the last two academic sessions in that courses ending in semester 2 were not surveyed, as that member of staff had to prioritise other work (in 2019/20) and has been off on long-term sick leave (in 2021/22).” (Academic & Digital Development)

#### **3.3.3 Library**

“Library Resources – investment needed for online materials to be provided for students and managing copyright regulations (CLL) (TESOL).” (School of Education)

### **3.4 University Communication**

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

### **3.5 Online Exams**

“Analysis of the grade impact of the move to online exams would be beneficial. While genuine student achievements over this difficult period are to be welcomed, the increase in cases being referred for suspected plagiarism or collusion is a cause for concern. The general trend of a flattening of grades seen in conjunction with online 24 hour, open book assessments requires further evaluation.” (School of Law)

### **3.6 IT Equipment**

“Some of the Academic & Digital Development Team are using their own personal home computers to work in the absence of an up to date, reasonably spec'd laptop provided by the institution (and office desktop computers are also several years old). Appropriately high-spec laptops are necessary given the flexible working required during a pandemic and to deliver a high-quality experience, especially for live online classes.” (Academic & Digital Development)

### **3.7 Admissions – increased student numbers**

“The above concerns about rapidly increasing student numbers expressed to College must also be raised at University level.” (School of Social and Political Sciences)

### **3.8 Student Conduct**

“Concerns were raised about plagiarism procedures. It was noted that several months often pass between when cases are reported to Senate and the interview. Some Subjects stated that they are addressing this at PGT level by increasing the amount of information and

research/writing training that students are given, but concerns remain about the formal process.” (School of Social & Political Sciences)

### **3.9 Student Welfare**

“Increased reporting of racism experienced by Chinese students within the context of the pandemic.” (School of Social & Political Sciences)

### **3.10 Quality Procedures**

“The University requires a better approach for providing the information needed to generate Quality Monitoring information and Reports. The forms available are often located in different systems, the forms themselves are not readily compatible with editing and the procedures are contained in numerous separate documents, which can lead to confusion and considerable unnecessary time being spent on establishing what the requirements are. The information on the University website on quality monitoring is hard to navigate and would benefit from being amalgamated into a more streamlined set of materials. Additional consideration should be given to the timetabling of procedures for reporting which need to align with when information is available and with when disseminating the outcome of review would be most useful to Schools.” (School of Law)

## **4. Temporary Course changes**

This element of the CAMS was incomplete, therefore the CQ&EO for Social Sciences will contact the relevant Schools on this issue and provide an update to the March meeting of ASC.

## University of Glasgow

## Academic Standards Committee – Friday 28 January 2022

Periodic Subject Review: Updated Responses to the  
Recommendations 1, 2 and 9 Arising from the Review of Economic  
& Social History held on 6 March 2020

## Cover Sheet

Ms Jane McAllister, Senate Office

**Brief Description of the Paper**

At its meeting on 1 October 2021, ASC received the responses provided to the recommendations arising from the review of Economic & Social History which took place on 6 March 2020. The report detailed the responses and progress made to date in implementing the nine recommendations. Dr Ballance, who had reviewed the original report, advised that the responses were generally satisfactory. It was agreed that further updates would be requested for the January 2022 meeting of ASC in relation to the following recommendations:

**Recommendation 1:** The recommendation had identified a need for clarification of the role of Adviser of Study. The response detailed a review that had taken place of Professional Services 'Advising' but it did not address clarification of the advising role or how academic advising staff should interact with the Professional Services team.

**Recommendation 2:** The recommendation concerned a review of communications within the Subject Area. The response set out a number of actions that had been taken and referred to further review and consultation with students to be undertaken at the Staff-Student Liaison Committee in November 2021. ASC would welcome a further update following that meeting.

**Recommendation 9:** It had been recommended that the Subject Area develop an overarching plan setting out its vision for the future, which would provide a framework for tackling a number of issues highlighted in the review. The response included information about how some of these issues were being addressed but it did not appear that an overarching plan had yet been put in place. ASC requested a further response on this.

**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 28 January 2022

**Periodic Subject Review: Updated Responses to the  
Recommendations 1, 2 and 9 Arising from the Review of Economic  
& Social History held on 6 March 2020**

**Recommendation 1***Adviser of Study*

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

**[For the attention of: Head of the School of Social & Political Sciences]**

**Joint response:**

During AY 20/21 a Professional Services “Advising” review was undertaken, under the College Learning & Teaching Framework, as a means of underpinning the Adviser of Studies role. The Review highlighted inconsistencies in the student experience of across the College and data gaps which prevented detailed analysis of the scale or trends in student demand. In response, the College, as part of broader University initiative, established a new professional services team of 10 FTE including 6 FTE Student Support Officers (4 FTE new posts) during September 2021. Communication to staff and students regarding remit of team and how to access support will be disseminated during semester 1. Advisers of Studies will receive regular updates, initially via Chief Advisers who are providing input to design of new service which is envisaged as an initial point of contact for students of all levels across the College.

**Updated Response: January 2022**

Since summer 2021 – 22, academic staff have been able to access a TEAMS site (MA Soc Advisors of Studies). This includes a range of materials, including a copy of the remit for Advisors of Studies, a copy of the annual induction for new Advisors of Studies, support materials for academic advisors, and links to policies and guidance among other things. The induction materials clarify the role of Professional Services, and ways of contact, as well as the function of Advising. The TEAMS site also provides a forum for communication between the Professional Services team and academic advisors. This site is used by colleagues in Economic & Social History who are academic advisors.

In addition, the College has recently developed a Student Support & Wellbeing Service, the first phase of which was launched in semester 1 of this academic session. This team of 10 professional services staff (6 of which are new investment roles) hold responsibility for supporting effective resolution of the common issues faced by our students as well as providing expertise in key areas of pastoral care, leveraging where required specialist services provided centrally within the Student & Academic Services Directorate led by Robert Partridge.

Academic advising is a key element of the integrated support service for students. Its future shape and cohesion with the support service being provided by the College Student Support



& Wellbeing team will be led by the Associate Dean of Student Engagement & Pathways, a role to which the College is currently recruiting with an expectation that this work will have made key progress by the end of this academic session.

## **Recommendation 2**

### *Communications*

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

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

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

**[For the attention of: Head of Subject]**

### **Response:**

Communications amongst staff in ESH were updated with the use of Microsoft Teams organised in relevant channels. There has also been an increased use of Teams for information sharing at School Level amongst staff, including use of Teams for documents relating to School Meetings, Staff Induction and Information, and Support for Line Managers. For student-facing communications, Moodle remained the main forum for announcements and student discussion forums, as student feedback suggested that multiple platforms were not helpful. Given the pandemic situation in 2020-21, students were more immediately concerned in SSLC meetings with issues around online engagement, particularly in break-out rooms in class, and the need for more informal spaces for interaction outside class. Staff ran drop-in sessions for students to attend informally and ask questions as well as scheduling additional OnlineLive meetings within courses for students to interact with peers and ask questions. Students were also encouraged and supported to revive the Economic & Social History Student Society.

Further review of communications and consultation with students will be undertaken at the Staff-Student Liaison Committee in November 2021 as students shift back to on campus learning.

### **Updated Response: January 2022**

Students were consulted at the Staff-Student Liaison Committee meeting on 11 November 2021 about communications from the subject area, with the background given to the reasons for asking. Students noted that the return of in-person tutorials following the pandemic had made a significant improvement to communications and accessibility. Students noted that clear information on the Moodles helped them understand what was required of them for assignments. No other issues regarding staff-student communications were brought forward, and students were invited to email the head of subject, Dr Elliot, with any further comments.

In addition, the SSLC convenor and ESH Learning & Teaching lead, Dr Jeff Meek, is reviewing the processes of the SSLC in line with best practice in the School and University. Following subsequent discussion with specific reps, we believe that there are improvements we can make with the SSLC, for example, further encouraging students to table agenda items in advance of the Committee meetings; staff following up with reps after the meetings to ensure that all discussion points have been fully aired; and ensuring that students are

aware of the ways in which various forms of student feedback is used and how they can contribute.

At School level, subjects will be asked to deposit minutes of their staff-student liaison meetings and action lists with the School Learning & Teaching Committee. This will support preparation of annual monitoring review reports, but also contribute to a community of good practice and information sharing.

### **Recommendation 9**

#### *Strategic Planning*

The Panel observed that several issues had been highlighted during the PSR that were considered to be under review/development or of concern, but regarding which, no specific recommendation had been made.

In order to promote further Subject engagement with such matters, the Panel **recommends** that Economic & Social History develops an overarching plan, which as well as setting out its vision and overall plan for the future of the Subject Area, shows how it intends to address areas of concern highlighted in the report but that were not the subject of a specific recommendation. This would include, but not be limited to, issues around student mental health; the management of fluctuations in PGT student recruitment; and the alignment of assessments with Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs). This plan should be agreed with the Head of School to ensure alignment with other areas of the School and should contribute to the strategic planning process within the School. **[Paragraph 3.2.2, 3.1.4, 4.1.5]**

**[For the attention of: Head of Subject].**

**[For information: Head of the School of Social & Political Sciences]**

#### **Response:**

Strategic planning takes place at the level of the School and College with input to this process from ESH via the School Executive, Research and L&T committees. Subject members on these committees actively contribute to School, College and University planning through including via highlighted areas of concern and potential solutions as part of dialogue in the planning process. For example, the Subject has raised concerns about the need to enhance student mental health support during Covid19 and helped to provide staff with updated guidance on how to support students to access these services. Similarly, the Subject has flagged concerns around recruitment and are working with School and College leads to address issues with respect to language competency and increased staffing to cater for growing numbers, as well as addressing issues around capacity. This has been taken up in College and School plans with a range of new appointments to Global Economy roles recently confirmed, working across PIR and ESH. The School's staffing strategy has also been developed in consultation with colleagues in the Subject and this has involved G7 and G8 staff in ESH moving on to open-ended contracts. The School Portfolio Review process has also recently been improved to include more active consideration of alignment with ILOs and assessment procedures, supported by School and College strategies to streamline and improve L&T governance and oversight.

The Head of Subject and Head of School also meet regularly at the School Executive and in one-to-one meetings to set and review shared strategic objectives, ensuring alignment with the School Strategic Plan and Subject leadership, including with respect to staffing, programme innovation, enhancing the student experience and developing a leading role for ESH in the School plans to play a leading role in decolonising the curriculum.

## **Updated Response: January 2022**

The ESH periodic subject review took place before the pandemic and the demands of Subject leadership have intensified over this period, with significant additional responsibilities accruing to Subject leads who have played a central part in the School management team's efforts to navigate the pandemic. The ESH subject area works within the School of Social and Political Sciences strategy to ensure coherence and effective use of management time. Many of the issues the PSR asks us to address are not unique to the subject and are being addressed across the School through the School L&T strategy (attached). This strategy has been developed since the PSR in March 2020 by the Deputy Head of School Learning & Teaching, Dr Eamonn Butler-MacIntosh in post from January 2021, in consultation with the School Executive Committee. The subject area is engaging with this strategy as an on-going process, in a way which is collective and collegiate and includes new colleagues. The subject area itself has also had a change of leadership. Professor Ray Stokes finished his period as head of subject in December 2020 and the position was looked after by Professor Jim Phillips until April 2021, when the current head of subject, Dr Rosemary Elliot, took on the role.

Looking at the PSR again, we have provided some information below about changes since March 2020 and future plans in line with the School strategy which relate to points raised.

### **Staffing and sustainability**

Since March 2020, there have been a number of appointments in ESH to ensure the sustainability and development of the subject. These include two senior lectureships focusing on imperial and post-colonial history and Asian history to align with the decolonisation agenda of the School, to further integrate global history within the subject area at both UG and PG, and enhance research and teaching leadership [2.4.3 *Curriculum Development*]. This is in addition to the appointment of a lecturer specialising in US banking and finance. The School has also appointed two additional tutors (1.5FTE) for the Global Economy programme. Two members of staff who were on time-limited contracts have been moved onto open-ended contracts, while another two had their contracts extended with the intention to move to open-ended this summer. Future appointments planned include a senior SL/Professor post with expertise in quantitative methods, which is a key gap in the subject area. In addition, the subject area now has three lecturer posts joint with the Politics subject area, which allow for a greater integration of expertise within the School, including the creation of courses which can be offered across programmes.

The growth of PGT numbers has continued (2021 – 2, we have 161 on the MSc Global Economy and 76 on the GLocal Erasmus Mundus International Master) [3.1.4 *Postgraduate Taught Provision*]. This has continued to put pressure on staff, particularly given the pandemic circumstances. However, the additional posts mean that the subject can now offer an enhanced range of options to students and expand the staffing involved in leading the PGT programmes. Additional tutor support has provided enhanced support for students through extending writing and research workshops and additional seminar groups to support hybrid learning and the delivery of the programmes.

The School also has a new Head of Professional Services, Michael Murray (from May 2021). Michael Murray and Eamonn Butler-MacIntosh are working with External Relations to better manage future intake from 2022 – 23, including the introduction of deposits on specific programmes and capacity limits on PGT admissions into the subject. From January 2022, the subject will be provided with monthly admissions updates which will allow for better planning for and control of anticipated student numbers. This stability is necessary to provide space to review the balance of UG and PGT provision within the subject and the subject's contribution to PGT provision within and across the School in line with the School Learning & Teaching policies and future plans, detailed below. In addition, the subject is establishing

annual Away Days, which will consider research and teaching development [2.4.3 *Approach to Curriculum Development*].

### **Portfolio review**

The School will commence its new Portfolio Review from January 2022. This will include different levels of review ranging from size and breath of the overall programme portfolio that is operational within the school to more specific reflections on ILOS and Assessment needs. Furthermore, it will include a subject-by-subject review of courses mapped against programmes. This will ensure that programmes will only use courses that help students meet programme ILOs. These courses will be mapped against programme plans on MyCampus and along with improved advising mechanisms this will ensure that students are provided the most appropriate guidance when making course selections. ILOs of courses (UG and PGT) will be reviewed as part of the annual course approval process with all courses required to be reapproved once every three years (on a rolling basis from the point of their last approved change) to ensure that course assessments continue to reflect ILOs and student needs, as well as developments in pedagogical thinking. We will be creating a database to help keep track and can if required request a specific review of a course. This will also allow us to double check resource needs and build requests into forward planning. All programmes will be required to undergo a full review (business planning, marketing assessment, ILOs review, stakeholder and student engagement) every five years. This will ensure that programmes remain fit-for-purpose and resourcing needs are properly accounted for.

### **Learning and Teaching**

The issues around technology enhanced learning and teaching have been superceded by the pandemic and ESH staff have engaged fully with the upskilling and opportunities offered [4.1.6 *Technology-Enhanced Learning and Teaching*]. In some ways, indeed, the pandemic circumstances allowed greater innovation in classroom teaching, for example, by using the Virtual Classroom in the archives and by hosting guest speakers for specific courses, as well as an opportunity to re-consider assessments in line with the shift towards low stakes assessment. The use of TEAMS has been integral to improving communication and for on-going support for staff with teaching and learning, and also with Advising [4.4.1 *On-going Support and Development*]. There are a number of School level initiatives to improve learning and teaching and engage and support staff, including around blended-learning, equality and diversity and decolonisation, the latter including students.

ESH and the School note the Panel's comment whether the subject area could do more to highlight specific strengths in its approach to curriculum design and, in particular, how it incorporated innovation in its provision [4.1.3 *Curriculum Design and Development*]. The School has a policy to invite subjects to the School Learning & Teaching Committee (LTC) to talk through their good practice. In December 2021, Dr Hannah-Louise Clark from ESH spoke to the LTC about decolonisation of the curriculum in pre-honours and associated anti-racism training for GTAs to support facilitation skills in the classroom. A proposal to expand this and develop it as training for all GTAs in the school as a means to support trust building, dialogue enhancement and coping with difficult conversations is to be developed as a result of this excellent ESH initiative. However, the subject area can do more to disseminate our excellent practice and as the circumstances of the pandemic hopefully ease, we will be able to do more in this regard.

There was also a point raised in the PSR about PGT dissertation support [3.3.2 *Induction and Support*]. Dissertation support is being reviewed for the current cohort and beyond, by Dr Sean Vanatta in conjunction with the programme convenors, including the timing of proposals and allocation of supervisors as well as improved guidance for supervision sessions and on Moodle to ensure consistency.

## **Community Building and Student welfare**

This was indirectly raised in the points about student mental health [3.3.2 *Good Cause*]. Within ESH, the Student Society has been re-established with the support of Dr Jeff Meek. There have also been a number of initiatives to support students through the pandemic, for example, drop-in session and study skills workshops. The School runs a schoolwide student support network and a separate Peer Assisted Learning (PAL) programme. The PAL programme operates at subject level and connects honours students with pre-honours students. This was established in the Academic year 2021/22. A similar programme connecting PHD students with Masters students is in planning and will be proposed to the LTC in the new year. The use of TEAMS by the Advising Service and Advisors of Studies has created a greater community of support for staff to respond quickly to student queries and difficulties.

---

***School of Social & Political Sciences: Learning & Teaching Strategy  
2021-2023***

---

### *Introduction*

The School of Social & Political Sciences (SSPS) is a broad-based, interdisciplinary teaching school that brings together a range of disciplines from across the social sciences. This includes Area Studies, Criminology, Economic & Social History, Media & Communication Studies, Politics & International Relations, Social & Public Policy, Sociology, and Urban Studies. QAA subject Level Benchmark Statements are available for these disciplines<sup>1</sup> which are coordinated across five distinct subject groups.

SSPS has an international reputation for high valued teaching and performs well in many of the teaching quality indicators and indices, although opportunity for improvement does exist. The school has grown significantly over the past ten years and now ranks as the third largest teaching school in the University by full-time student headcount and second by FTE (full-time). The student community in SSPS is varied with a balance of international and domestic students. The wide range of study programmes offered by SSPS spans not only the school's own range of disciplines but connects students more broadly across the arts, humanities, information technology and applied public health and social wellbeing.

The school seeks to provide an inclusive environment where students can work together and with staff to reach their academic potential through engagement with and creation of knowledge, growth of inter-cultural competency and opportunity to participate in graduate leadership opportunities. In doing so we aim to align with the University's stated purpose to develop and support our students so they may "contribute in the fullest way possible to culture, society and the economy locally and globally".

This strategy is underpinned by a commitment to strong values on inclusive learning and teaching practices, academic integrity, professionalism and respect.

### *Aims*

The overarching aims of this strategy document are to:

- provide a clear roadmap for development and implementation of key projects that will strengthen the delivery of learning and teaching across the school;
- consolidate and stabilise recent growth to support the efficiency and financial sustainability of the school;
- enable the school to positively respond to strategic initiatives and goals within the University's high-level Learning and Teaching Strategy 2021-2025, including digital learning and student-centred active learning approaches;
- further grow and enhance the school's international reputation as a centre of excellence for the study of social science;
- engage in transformation of the curricula and assessment to respond and reflect student interests, skill needs and awarding gaps.
- create a learning environment that embraces and celebrates culture and diversity through active listening and respectful actions.

---

<sup>1</sup> Economic & Social History – lists as History. Urban Studies lists as Town & Country Planning. All other subjects listed have their own QAA subject benchmark statements

## *Strategy*

The SPSS learning and teaching strategy aims operates in conjunction with the SPSS research strategy. SPSS notes that research-informed and research-led teaching are integral to equipping students with the knowledge and critical skills to be active and creative citizens. The strategy will help to promote more flexible use of academic and administrative workloads to maximise opportunities for balancing teaching with research and scholarship, while at the same time strengthening the pedagogical approaches that promote active and collaborative learning.

The strategy will inform commitment to a collaborative work environment that acknowledges the school as a single community made up of students, academics, GTAs, tutors and professional service staff. Working together across the School will create the capacity and flexibility required to deliver on our agendas in research-led teaching, internationalisation, and employability skills and attributes.

The strategy will be led and developed by the school's learning and teaching leadership team coordinated via the learning and teaching committee. It is the responsibility of all staff to support implementation of the key projects and policies informed by the strategy's end goals.

The strategy requires the school will carefully monitor and invest in staffing resource needs to ensure matched growth with student population to prevent expansion of staff-student ratios in such a way that it undermines student experience.

We will adopt policies and workload practices that will provide staff with the opportunities to develop scholarship and share best practice on learning and teaching. This will include the provision of appropriate teaching development skills for all staff, as well as opportunities to apply for scholarship focused research leave, and scholarship research financial support. We are keen to grow engagement of all staff but particularly LTS staff in university and externally awarded learning and teaching development fund schemes and conferences.

### *School measurable strategic objectives*

1. Improve NSS and PTES Scores year-on-year between 2022 and 2025.
2. Reduce the number of SPS courses in the bottom 10% of student FTE across College
3. Improve retainment from pre-honours to honours
4. Introduce key projects to lessen the awarding gap
5. Increase the number of SPS staff applying for LTDF funds
6. Improve balance of SSRs across subjects in the school and strengthen staffing resources to better balance L&T related workload demands
7. Enhance opportunities for subjects to benefit from existing and new internationalisation schemes
8. Improve staff satisfaction with regard to digital learning and engagement
9. Expand number of staff-led internship projects for students
10. Completion of initial portfolio review and implementation of rolling reapproval process to ensure programmes and courses remain fit-for-purpose.

Draft – 10 January 2022  
Eamonn Butler McIntosh

**University of Glasgow**

**Academic Standards Committee – Friday 28 January 2022**

**Report of the Meeting of the Joint Board of the University of  
Glasgow and Edinburgh Theological Seminary held on 15  
December 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 Board of the University of Glasgow and Edinburgh Theological Seminary (ETS) held on 15 December 2021.

**Action Requested**

Academic Standards Committee (ASC) is asked to:

- **Approve** the Remit, Composition and Membership of the Joint Board for session 2021-22 (**Appendix 1**).
- **Approve** the list of ETS staff recommended as Associate University Lecturers (AULs) (**Appendix 2**).
- **Note** 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 28 January 2022

## Report of the Meeting of the Joint Board of the University of Glasgow and Edinburgh Theological Seminary held on 15 December 2021

Robbie Mulholland, Academic Collaborations Office

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

The Board **agreed to recommend** the remit, composition and membership of the Joint Board of the University of Glasgow and Edinburgh Theological Seminary (session 2021-22) to the University of Glasgow Academic Standards Committee (ASC) as detailed in **Appendix 1**.

### 2. Joint Supervision of Research Students

The matter of extending collaborative activity between the two institutions in respect of joint supervision of research students had previously been discussed at Joint Board meetings. The College of Arts Graduate School Manager having consulted with the College of Arts Graduate Dean, now introduced an outline proposal regarding joint supervision between the two institutions. She pointed out that joint supervision was already provided for in the Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) between the two institutions, however this outline proposal was intended to expand on and further clarify details of the arrangements - in particular, operational considerations. She drew members' attention to several aspects of the proposal, as follows:

#### Postgraduate Research (PGR) Students

- Agreement could be reached by both institutions for ETS to undertake joint supervision of any UoG PGR student as Secondary Supervisor.
- The suggested Supervisory percentage splits that would be available, and the associated percentage of the fees paid by students to the University, which would subsequently be reimbursed to ETS. This percentage would reflect the level of supervision undertaken by each institution and the fact that the role of Primary Supervisor would be undertaken by a relevant member of University of Glasgow staff; and
- A need for agreement as to whether the fee split should apply to the International fee rate as well as the Home/UK rate, and to establish who should be responsible for ensuring the transfer of fees between the two institutions. On this latter point, the expectation was that this would be done by the Operations Team in the School of Critical Studies.

The Board welcomed the outline proposal and agreed that it should be developed in more detail with a view to making appropriate amendments to the relevant Appendix of the MoA. The Board agreed that, in the first instance, relevant members of the Board should meet early in 2022 to take the proposal forward, ahead of its consideration by the Head of School of Critical Studies, the ETS Board and the UoG-ETS Joint Board.

### 3. Annual Report from ETS (2020-21)

Introducing the ETS Annual Report for session 2020-21, the ETS Principal reflected on a period dominated by the Covid-19 pandemic. The pandemic had necessitated an urgent reorganisation of normal teaching, learning and assessment structures at ETS and all classes

and assessments had been conducted online for the whole of session 2020-21. ETS had taken its lead from the University of Glasgow in terms of its response to the pandemic, and the health and safety of staff and students had been the top priority during this period.

In terms of learning and teaching, the pandemic had prompted a lot of discussion at ETS regarding the benefits and disadvantages of online provision as against in-person learning. The Seminary, like most HEIs, was working through how the experience of the previous eighteen months could best be harnessed to improve the student (and staff) experience going forward.

ETS valued very highly the strong collegiate and supportive learning environment within which its in-person learning normally took place. The Principal observed that apart from this aspect of the student experience, online provision in session 2020-21 had offered a full and comprehensive learning experience in every regard. He noted that ETS was a small institution and this had helped it to maintain close contact with its students during the period of lockdown. He paid tribute to the ETS student body and SRC in particular for the manner in which they had responded, and adapted, to the exceptional challenges of the pandemic.

In-person classes had resumed at ETS in session 2021-22, and early indications suggested that there was an appetite among the student body to continue a significant level of online engagement. In some cases, the majority of students accessed a class online rather than in-person. The Principal noted that it was too early to tell if this was a trend which would continue, but ETS anticipated an increased level of hybrid delivery going forward.

He noted that the experience gained by the introduction of the BTh Distance Learning option in session 2017-18 had provided a real advantage when the Seminary had been forced to move entirely to online delivery. He thanked the ETS Vice-Principal for overseeing the installation of the IT facilities when the distance learning platform was first introduced.

The Principal highlighted several key developments which had taken place at ETS during the period of the Report:

- A series of postgraduate seminars organised by the Postgraduate coordinator and delivered via Zoom had proved very successful. These seminars, which featured input from University of Glasgow staff, enabled research and PGT students to meet regularly and exchange ideas and information on a wide range of topics;
- As previously reported to the Joint Board, a quinquennial review had been set up by the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland in May 2018 - one of the outcomes of which had been a number of recommendations regarding ETS.

Changes which had been implemented at ETS in session 2019-20 as a result of these recommendations had really started to make an impact in session 2020-21. This included the restructuring of the ETS Senate into sub-groups – this with a view to providing an even sharper focus on various aspects of quality assurance and enhancement. The various changes had also enabled greater input from the student body in committee participation and this was considered to be of great value to ETS. Strategic discussion at ETS had also considered the possibility of increased modular flexibility in the curriculum – this being an issue which would be returned to as the revalidation event approached in 2024.

- Following approval by the Board of Trustees, appointments had been made to the posts of Course Organiser for the Church History Department, and Course Organiser and Lecturer in Greek and New Testament.

Members welcomed the Principal's report and reflected on several areas where they considered there was opportunity to build on areas of mutual interest between the two institutions. It was suggested that consideration be given to introducing an annual set-piece event where representatives of the two institutions could come together to discuss issues of mutual interest. The Board welcomed this suggestion and agreed which members should take the matter forward.

A member pointed out that the programme of ETS postgraduate seminars which took place via Zoom was another area for potential development between the two institutions. He thanked the University members of the Board who had spoken at the seminars and considered that the online nature of the presentations provided opportunities for academic staff from both institutions to participate further. The MTh programmes had several international students and the online delivery had fostered a real sense of community which it was hoped would provide the basis for a strong research hub at the Seminary going forward. It was noted that student numbers on the MTh Missiology were stable and interest in the programme had been buoyed by the diverse range of research interests of new staff.

One member noted that although on-line delivery had brought with it a range of new opportunities, members were very aware that students were very keen to get back on campus again and engage with in-person learning. The Convener endorsed this observation noting that it was very important to get the balance of on-line learning and in-person learning right.

#### **4. Report from ETS Student Representative**

The ETS Student President introduced the ETS SRC report for session 2020-21.

He noted that most ETS students welcomed the move back to in-person teaching for session 2021-22, although some students preferred to continue to engage on-line. He stressed that the quality of on-line learning was very high but most students welcomed the chance to return to the class-room, albeit with appropriate Covid restrictions still in place.

During session 2020-21, students had tried to foster the traditional ETS sense of collegiality by arranging various on-line peer group activities and this had proved to be of great value. He noted that students managed to maximise the opportunities provided by online learning and ETS students were particularly grateful for the access to electronic resources available via the University of Glasgow Library.

#### **5. Appointment of New Members of ETS Staff as Associate University Lecturers (AULs)**

The Board **agreed to recommend** to Academic Standards Committee, new members of ETS staff for appointment as Associate University Lecturer (AULs) as detailed in **Appendix 2**.

#### **6. Credit Transfer**

The Board was advised that ETS had received two applications for credit transfer on the basis of Approved Prior Learning (APL) The applications would be brought to the next meeting of the Board for consideration/approval.

#### **7. Convener's Business**

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

- The effects of the Covid pandemic continued to have a huge impact as the new year approached and she was disappointed that the start of the next semester might unfortunately bring even more new challenges for HEIs. The University was not, at this stage, planning to change the current arrangement for delivering learning in the new

year and very large lectures would continue online, with as many small classes as possible taking place in-person.

- The campus development programme was proceeding well. In particular, the site of the former Western Infirmary had been transformed with the construction of several new University buildings well underway.
- The 2021 United Nations Climate Change Conference (COP26) had taken place in Glasgow in the first half of November and the University had been closely involved with it. This included organising and hosting many events and presentations.
- Approximately 6,000 students had graduated over a two-week period in late November/early December in Covid compliant graduation ceremonies. The Convener had officiated at eight of the ceremonies and there had been approximately 250,000 views of the ceremonies online. Given the circumstances of the last 20 months, the ceremonies had been occasions of great celebration for students, their families, and staff. The University planned to hold extra graduation ceremonies in April, for which planning was already underway.

## **8. ETS Bachelor of Theology (BTh) Programme**

The ETS Principal reported that ETS had started discussions with a view to incorporating modular flexibility into the BTh programme as and when revalidation took place in 2024. The Board would be kept informed regarding this matter.

**University of Glasgow and Edinburgh Theological Seminary**

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

**Remit:**

1. To oversee the following programmes (taught or by research):
  - (a) Bachelor of Theology
  - (b) Master of Theology (by research)
  - (c) Master of Theology in Scottish Church History and Theology
  - (d) Master of Theology in Missiology
2. To make recommendations to the Senate of the University and to the Senate of the Seminary in respect of the validation of the above programmes.
3. To conduct periodic reviews of the above programmes, and make recommendations to the Senate of the University of Glasgow on the basis of their outcomes.
4. To make such recommendations as are appropriate to the Senate of the Seminary.
5. To consider, for transmission to the Senate of the University of Glasgow for its approval, all nominations of external examiners to the University Court for the programmes listed in item 1 above.
6. To consider annually:
  - a) the recommendations of, and comments contained within, the reports of external examiners and the response of the Seminary to the reports;
  - b) a report on the numbers and qualifications of students admitted to the validated programmes, and on the progress of students within the programmes;
  - c) the nomination of members of the Seminary for recognition as teachers of the University;
  - d) the nomination of members of the Joint Appeals Committee;
  - e) to monitor and ensure that the terms and conditions and expectations that were originally approved have been, and continue to be, met;
  - f) ongoing risk management and maintenance of a risk register.
7. To receive annual reports on, and keep under continuing review, the operation of the Seminary's quality assurance procedures for all programmes overseen by the Joint Board.
8. To foster mutual understanding and co-operation and to encourage and review collaboration between the Seminary and the University in areas of common interest.

**Quorum:**

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

**Joint Board of the University of Glasgow and  
Edinburgh Theological Seminary**

**Membership 2021-22**

*University of Glasgow*

Clerk of Senate (Convener)

Professor Jill Morrison

Head of College of Arts (or nominee)

Professor Bryony Randall

Representative from the School of Critical Studies

Professor Charlotte Methuen

Representative from the School of Critical Studies

Professor Mark Elliott

Representative from the College of Arts

Professor Bryony Randall

SRC President (or nominee)

Tiegan Meadows

Head of Academic Collaborations Office (or nominee)

Mr Robbie Mulholland

*Edinburgh Theological Seminary*

Principal of the Seminary (Vice Convener)

Reverend Iver Martin

Vice-Principal of the Seminary

Professor John A MacLeod

A Representative of the Teaching Staff

Dr Alistair Wilson

President of the ETS SRC

Matty Guy

**New Members of ETS Staff for Approval as Associate University Lecturers:**

**Rev. Martin Haldane Paterson**

**MTh (Research) – Submitted**

Edinburgh Theological Seminary: 2019-2021

*Biblical theology of the city in the book of Revelation*

*Supervisor – Rev Dr Alistair I Wilson*

**BA Theology**

Highland Theological College: 2011-2014

*Biblical theology of mission*

*New Testament Greek*

*Project: Evaluation of Christopher J.H. Wright's paradigms of salvation*

**BA Social Sciences (Hons) (Sociology & Politics)**

University of the West of Scotland: 2006-2010

*Political Islam*

*Sociology of Art*

*Dissertation: Evaluation of Michel Foucault's understanding of history*

**Iain Charles Hepburn**

**PhD**

University of Aberdeen: 2006-2011

*Doctorate on the nature of the Torah as used by Ezra-Nehemiah*

**MTh**

University of Aberdeen: 2005-2006

*Masters in Theology (Biblical Interpretation) with a dissertation on the Torah Psalms*

**BA**

International Christian College, Glasgow: 2002-2005

*Bachelor degree in Theology with Old and New Testament specialisms (with languages)*

**Diploma**

Morris College of Journalism: August 1998-November 1998

*Diploma of Professional Children's Writing (Merit)*

**BEd (Hons)**

Northern College of Education, Aberdeen: 1996-2000

*Bachelor of Education at Honours level*

**University of Glasgow****Academic Standards Committee – Friday 28 January 2022****Early Exit Award from Master of European Design (ASC/2020/57.2)****Ruth Cole, Senate Office**

The integrated masters Master of European Design is a programme where students complete years 1 and 2 at GSA then spend one year at each of two European partner institutions, returning to complete their studies at GSA in year 5. In the course of considering proposed programme amendments during 2020-21, it was noted that the position for students who exited after four years needed to be regularised. There is no formal exit point at the end of year 4 as students are required to complete the final year of the degree at GSA. There has been a very small number of students who have exited at the end of year 4 as, due to circumstances beyond their control, they have not been in a position to return to Glasgow. They have been awarded an unclassified honours degree. As the Code of Assessment does not provide for this degree being made as an early exit award, an alternative needs to be agreed.

An early exit at the end of year 4 is problematic as by that stage students have completed only years 1 and 2 in Glasgow. There is no precedent for awarding a Glasgow classified honours degree where none of the honours programme has been completed at Glasgow. Discussions between Glasgow and GSA have been taking place, exploring the options:

Option 1: The student would be required to complete a piece of work, as set by GSA, relating to the learning and assessment completed by the student at the partner institution in year 4, which would allow GSA to carry out its own assessment process. Either on its own, or in combination with some results reported by the exchange institution, this would determine an honours classification. It has been agreed that this would not be appropriate as it would involve additional work for the student who had already completed 480 credits and, by definition, was likely to be in a position of some difficulty (e.g. ill health). It would also be difficult to determine how much additional work by the student would be sufficient to enable GSA to make a meaningful assessment of that work rather than of what had already been completed/assessed at the partner institution.

Option 2: The student would be awarded an ordinary degree. There is precedent in relation to the rare cases of students who complete junior honours abroad and are unable to return to Glasgow for senior honours. In that case the degree is awarded on the basis of the first two years completed at Glasgow and the one year spent at the partner institution. It was felt, however, that this would be inappropriate as an ordinary degree would be insufficient recognition for the 480 credits completed by the student.

Option 3: The student would be awarded a classified honours degree on the strength of the 480 credits completed even though none of the 240 credits of the honours programme had been completed at or assessed by GSA. This was considered to be the best course of action as it would be the fairest outcome for the student. It would be important to emphasise that this would not be offered as a regular pathway on the programme but as an exceptional response to unforeseen difficulties encountered by the student. The context was the close collaborative relationship between the network partners that has been in existence on this programme for more than 20 years. The faculty at the various institutions work closely together, teaching collaboratively at the Spring Workshop each year and undertaking teaching events at partner institutions regularly. GSA also has substantial experience of conversion of grades from students on other programmes undertaking study abroad at these institutions.

ASC is invited to give in-principle approval to the proposal that Option 3 be adopted.



## University of Glasgow

## Academic Standards Committee – Friday 28 January 2022

The Glasgow School of Art: Periodic Review Report of the  
Innovation School held on 18, 25 and 26 February 2021

## Cover Sheet

Robbie Mulholland, Academic Collaborations Office

**Brief Description of the Paper**

The attached paper is the report from The Glasgow School of Art (GSA) on the Periodic Review of the Innovation School held on 18, 25 and 26 February 2021, by video-conference.

**Action Requested**

\*ASC is asked to **note**:

- GSA's Academic Council approval of the revalidation of the Innovation School programmes (below) for a period of six years from September 2022 (section 8.2 of the report).

BDes (Hons) Product Design

MEDes Product Design

MDes Design Innovation and Citizenship

MDes Design Innovation and Collaborative Creativity

MDes Design Innovation and Environmental Design

MDes Design Innovation and Interaction Design

MDes Design Innovation and Service Design

MDes Design Innovation and Transformation Design

Master of Research

- The eight recommendations and six commendations identified in the review (section 7); and
- The remainder of the report.

\*ASC is asked to note that under the revision to the programme approval (validation) process for GSA programmes (approved by ASC at its meeting in October 2018), with the exception of programmes run jointly by the University and GSA, ASC approval is not required for the revalidation of GSA programmes agreed as part of the GSA Periodic Review process. GSA is required, however, to provide ASC with a summary of the programmes which have been revalidated (and this has been provided above).

The report notes (section 8.3) that:

'The Review Panel considered the student experience of the MSc International Management and Design Innovation programme (delivered jointly with the University of Glasgow) as part of the Periodic Review process, and met with staff and students on the programme to discuss the collaboration. As the programme is administered by the University, the Review Panel did not consider the programme for revalidation purposes.'

**Recommended Person/s Responsible for Taking actions Forward**

Relevant staff at The Glasgow School of Art.

**Resource Implications**

No specific resource implications for the University have been identified.

**Timescale for Implementation**

The revalidation of the above programmes will take effect from September 2022.

**Equality Implications**

GSA does not undertake Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) as part of the Periodic Review process.

**GLASGOW SCHOOL OF ART**  
**PERIODIC REVIEW REPORT: INNOVATION SCHOOL**  
**SESSION 2020/21**

**Review Panel**

Allan Atlee (Convenor), Janet Allison Julie Grant Professor Clive Grinyer	Deputy Director Academic Academic Registrar Head of Student Support and Development External Subject Specialist, Head of Programme, Service Design, Royal College of Art
Dr Daniel Livingstone	Head of Academic Programmes, School of Simulation and Visualisation
Alessandro Marini Professor Elizabeth Moignard Professor Nick Pearce Professor Vicky Gunn	President of the GSA Students' Association University of Glasgow Senate Representative University of Glasgow Senate Representative Head of Learning and Teaching

**Secretaries**

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

**The Review Event was held on Thursday 18, Thursday 25 and Friday 26 February 2021 by Video Conference.**

**1. INTRODUCTION*****Background Information***

- 1.1 This was the first Periodic Review event for the Innovation School, having formed as a standalone School in August 2017. In the self-evaluation report, the Head of the Innovation School described the School as emerging, *"from the synthesis of various elements of the School of Design, specifically, the Institute of Design Innovation, the Undergraduate Product Design department, and the Masters portfolio of Design Innovation (which was then 6 interlinked programmes)"* (self-evaluation report, page 6).
- 1.2 All programmes in the Innovation School were previously reviewed and considered for revalidation under the School of Design Periodic Review process - which was last undertaken in academic session 2015/16 - with the exception of three new programmes (MDes Design Innovation and Collaborative Creativity, MDes Design Innovation and Transformation Design and MDes Design Innovation and Interaction Design) which were added as pathways to the MDes Design Innovation suite of programmes in academic session 2015-16.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The School of Design Periodic Review Report, and revalidation of programmes, was considered and approved at the University of Glasgow Academic Standards Committee in May 2016. The three new pathways were approved for validation at the University of Glasgow Academic Standards Committee meeting in April 2016.

- 1.3 The self-evaluation report provided detail on the estate occupied by the Innovation School across the Glasgow and Highlands and Islands campuses. Plans to reimagine and enhance the Haldane Building (Glasgow Campus) had been stalled as a result of the Mackintosh Building fire in June 2018, and smaller interventions made to the estate, with intention to expediently improve the student experience, were detailed in the self-evaluation report. The report also provided detail on the Highlands and Islands campus development, and plans to improve the ‘partnering’ of the two campuses, which was explored during the Periodic Review event (see section 3.1 – 3.6).
- 1.4 The self-evaluation report set-out the Innovation School’s curriculum development planning, which sought to expand the portfolio with the introduction of a BDes Health and Wellbeing programme (Glasgow campus) and by adding two pathways to the MDes Design Innovation Suite: MDes Design Innovation and Circular Economy and MDes Design Innovation and Future Heritage (both Highlands and Islands Campus).
- 1.5 Major amendments to the BDes/MEDes Product Design programme were in development at the time of review. In the self-evaluation report the Innovation School reported that there was ‘growing discontent’ with the BDes/MEDes Product Design intended learning outcomes (ILOs), and summarised that, *“the curriculum had advanced the student experience of practice beyond that captured and described by the intended learning outcomes”* and that the major amendment, *“provides a platform for aligning Programme ILOs within a wider strategic ambition based around the academic portfolio of the School, which underpins student progression from Bachelor to Masters, or Masters to Doctoral study”* (self-evaluation report, page 69).
- 1.6 The proposals for the new provision and major amendments, as detailed in sections 1.4 and 1.5, would be considered by the University of Glasgow’s Academic Standards Committee in March 2021. Subsequent to approval of the proposals, the new provision and major amendment would be considered for validation purposes at a GSA Programme Approval event academic session 2021/22, with intention for implementation in September 2022.

### ***Periodic Review***

- 1.7 Appendix A to this report provides a list of the provision offered and overseen as part of the Periodic Review.
- 1.8 Preparation of the self-evaluation report was led by the Head of the Innovation School. Drafting of the report was predominantly staff-led, with student input sought at the point of reviewing the draft report (see sections 2.1 – 2.5)
- 1.9 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:
  - Identity, ethos and vision of the School;
  - The Innovation School structure including the link with the Highlands and Islands campus, workload planning and cross-GSA collaborative working;
  - Portfolio development, including planned development detailed in the self-evaluation report, postgraduate research development, and the joint programme with University of Glasgow;
  - Sustainability in the curriculum;
  - The future of studio post-Covid;
  - Professional development opportunities;

- Equality, diversity and inclusion, including managing the skills gap for direct entry students, disability underrepresentation, the gender split in the School, and staff recruitment strategies;
- Assessment, including the number of formative and summative assessment points and the appropriate utilisation of assessment periods;
- Quality assurance mechanisms, including the Innovation School's approach to surveys, and the effectiveness of student voice mechanisms.

1.10 During the event on 25 and 26 February 2021, the Review Panel met with the following staff and student groups:

- Head of the Innovation School
- Undergraduate Students
- Postgraduate Students
- Programme Leaders and Heads of Departments
- Course Tutors, Visiting Lecturers, Technicians, and Staff from the University of Glasgow

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

1.11 Owing to the Covid-19 pandemic resulting in the Periodic Review event being held remotely, the Review Panel were unable to undertake a tour of the facilities. In lieu of the tour of facilities, the Review Panel: reviewed a short video showing the Highlands and Islands campus; were provided with a virtual tour of the School's website and Canvas provision; and staff and students were asked for feedback on their learning environment throughout the event.

## 2. OVERALL AIMS OF THE INNOVATION SCHOOL PROVISION

### *Periodic Review Process and Self-Evaluation Report*

2.1 Within the self-evaluation report, the Innovation School reflected on: the inception of the School since its origin in 2017; the School's philosophy and vision; graduate destinations and the impact of students from the Innovation School; composition and trends in the undergraduate and postgraduate space; plans for growth; feedback structures and mechanisms; plans to develop the physical space; and the School's broad range of collaborative activity. The self-evaluation report frequently drew upon the Innovation School's Collaborative Curriculum Review of undergraduate provision, which was described as a sustained, in-depth and collaboratively generated project undertaken in 2018/19 and 2019/20. The Head of School reported that it had been helpful to synthesise the Collaborative Curriculum Review with the production of the self-evaluation report as working collaboratively on the Periodic Review preparation had proven challenging as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic.

2.2 The self-evaluation report was authored predominantly by the Head of School, drawing from Senior Management Team meetings and the Collaborative Curriculum Review (see section 2.1). The self-evaluation report includes that, *"The Head of School has authored the text, in an attempt to provide a coherent narrative voice and tone, albeit with the incorporation of suggestions by colleagues across the Innovation School and students through the CCR [Collaborative Curriculum Review] and membership of Board of Studies"* (self-evaluation report, page 4).

- 2.3 The self-evaluation report detailed that the Head of School's original plans for undertaking reflection in preparation for Periodic Review was to utilise a monthly working group which would include staff and students. This plan was not realised as a result of: the Covid-19 pandemic; the Head of School taking on duties of the vacant Deputy Director Academic post; and staff departure. The Review Panel were in agreement, however, that the self-evaluation report does articulate that the reflection for Periodic Review remained a collaborative and collegiate process, and this was reflected at the staff panel meetings.
- 2.4 At both undergraduate and postgraduate student panel meetings the Review Panel were assured that students were aware of the Periodic Review process and event. It was not evident that students had been consulted during the process of compiling the self-evaluation report, however it was clear that students are consistently consulted with through informal feedback mechanisms in the School, and that feedback is acted upon quickly and effectively.
- 2.5 The Review Panel reflected that, though the self-evaluation report was not developed in the way that the School had envisaged, it evidenced a collegiate approach, collaborative review and, from feedback at both the staff and student meetings, the Review Panel were assured that it reflected the experience of the School.

#### ***Glasgow School of Art Selection***

- 2.6 The Review Panel were keen to explore what attracted students to study at GSA. Undergraduate students advised that the Product Design programme focus on service and experience design was a key factor, and that the programme presented as diverse and internationally focused. Undergraduate students expressed that the shift in focus from product design to experience design (notably a focus on human experience rather than physical objects) is a positive development in the Product Design programme as that remains in line with industry developments and expected skills development, but welcomed that a focus on product is still supported. Though the availability of ethnography was not as expected, students expressed that the BDes Product Design programme met expectations.
- 2.7 Postgraduate students also expressed that the focus on service design was a key factor in their decision to study at GSA, and that the service design principles, the theoretical framework, and the opportunity to explore theory and design as a practice created an exciting programme offer. Having the ability 'to shape your area of study depending on your interests' was also noted as a particularly appealing prospect.

#### ***Strategic Vision of the School***

- 2.8 The Review Panel noted that the self-evaluation report presented as a manifesto, which predominantly expressed how the Innovation School differed from the School of Design, rather than clearly expressing its own identity and direction. The Review Panel were also in agreement that the articulation of the School's ethos, identity and ambition in the documentation submitted for review was inaccessible and lacked clarity.
- 2.9 At the meeting with the Head of School, it became apparent to the Review Panel that expressing how the Innovation School differed from the School of Design had been used as a vehicle to reflect on the formation of the School, rather than as an explicit articulation of its future vision. The vision of the School became clearer through discussions with the Head of School and the meetings with staff, but it remained challenging to capture it succinctly and to articulate it in a way that was accessible to multiple audiences.

- 2.10 During the staff panel meetings, it was evident to the Review Panel that staff had a collective understanding and shared vision of the direction and ethos of the School. Staff panels expressed that they would like to clarify and more clearly articulate the social impact of the Innovation School through its vision statements and marketing strategy. Staff also expressed that they want to ensure that students are able to articulate clearly the skillset developed through study.
- 2.11 The Review Panel were assured that the staff and student body shared a common ethos and mission, with recognition that the identity and vision of the school had not been clearly articulated in the self-evaluation report or in a single vision statement. The clear shared ethic and mission between staff and students in the Innovation School was commended, and the School approach to a human centred ethos of design - evidenced through the self-evaluation report, the review event panel meetings and work undertaken with public sector bodies - was commended (**Commendation 1**).
- 2.12 The Review Panel recommended that, as the Innovation School had been in its current form since 2017, the School should use the Periodic Review process to reflect on, develop and articulate a clear vision and strategy, ensuring that it is accessible to multiple audiences - including potential undergraduate students, postgraduate students and external collaborators - and that it supports the School's future ambitions. Further, the legacy of the School should be taken into consideration to ensure that it is supporting, and not stifling, the clarity of vision (**Recommendation 2a**).

#### ***Management and Operation of the School***

- 2.13 The Review Panel were keen to explore the staff structure of the School, and how it supports the operation and future vision of the Innovation School, in particular as it presents quite differently to the other Schools within GSA.
- 2.14 The Head of School detailed that the School was undertaking a convergence project, to merge historic role titles, transferred from the School of Design, to new roles evolving within the Innovation School. The Head of School recognised that the School structure was unconventional, but was confident that it supported the School in its current context and future vision, as it supports the ubiquitous nature of its provision.
- 2.15 During the Head of School and staff meetings, it was clear to the Review Panel that managing the applications to postgraduate taught programmes puts significant pressure on staff workloads owing to the large volume received, and during the student panel meetings comment was made that staff do, at times, seem extremely busy. The Review Panel were advised that this is an ongoing issue, and that a decision on the size of cohorts and appropriate resourcing was required.
- 2.16 The complexities of operating across two campuses was discussed, which included recognition of the additional non-academic related demands of the Director of Operations in addition to the Academic Support Manager responsibilities, and the requirement for staff to support two major research projects ongoing in the Innovation School.
- 2.17 The Review Panel recommended that, with reflection on the School's complexities and ambition, the School structures, including cohort size and resourcing, should be reviewed to ensure they support the School's plans for growth and development (**Recommendation 2b**).

### ***Supporting Equality, Diversity and Inclusion***

- 2.18 The Review Panel were keen to explore the School's mechanisms for supporting equality, diversity and inclusion in the School.
- 2.19 The Head of School advised that there is a broad understanding in the School of the GSA mechanisms to support equality, diversity and inclusion, including the Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) processes, but that the understanding of how these processes could support broader impact could be strengthened. The Head of School advised that the EIA process is well established at programme-level, and that the School aspires to develop a School-level approach. Staff panels fed-back that they understand the EIA process, but feel that the process does not have the required or intended impact.
- 2.20 The Head of School recognised that there is good practice taking place in discreet parts of the curriculum to support the School's equality, diversity and inclusion ambitions, but that the School hasn't yet developed an appropriate mechanism for implementing areas of good practice more widely. The Head of School advised that it is a School priority to understand the barriers to this and to better implement the sharing of good practices.
- 2.21 During meetings with staff panels, examples of good practice in supporting equality, diversity and inclusion in the School were provided. During meetings with students it became apparent to the Review Panel, however, that students were not aware of the good practice, and that it was not being well communicated in the School.
- 2.22 During the event, students reflected positively about the diverse range of societies available in the School and GSA, and expressed that women were well-represented in the Innovation School, but that there was a lack of diversity across all levels. Students expressed desire for more voices from varied backgrounds to be heard, in particular as the programmes in the Innovation School are focused on the social side of design, though it was recognised that this is an industry-wide issue. Students expressed that diversity of the staff and student body was of concern, but that there is equality in point-of-view, that all topics are open for discussion in an open and honest way, and that there is appetite in the School for these discussions to take place. Students expressed that there is a strong ethics policy in the School, and that they feel supported when working in sensitive environments. There was frequent reference to the strong ethics culture in the School throughout the Periodic Review process, and the Review Panel commended the School's engagement with ethics throughout the curriculum, in particular in the undergraduate space (***Commendation 3***).
- 2.23 Students raised that there are not specific set readings on matters of equality, diversity and inclusion, and that reading lists could be more diverse. In general, students felt that diversity could be better supported, i.e. through a more diverse reading list, but that it is clearly a value of the School. Staff panels supported this view and recognised that there is good practice in place (for example, the Winter School 2020 was specifically focused on biases and the impact of bias) but that resources could be diversified. Additionally, staff advised that there are active steps being taken to diversify the cohort.



- 2.24 The Review Panel summarised that there was evidence of good practice taking place to support equality, diversity and inclusion, but that the Innovation School should move beyond the good practice of individuals, and embed this across the School to create an inclusive environment for all. The Review Panel recommended that the newly established School-led Equalities Working Group should be used to: lead and mainstream ongoing good practice across the School; measure and evaluate the impact; and that all staff and students should be encouraged to participate (**Recommendation 7**).

### ***Sustainability***

- 2.25 The Review Panel received feedback that sustainability, future focused projects, and environmental discussions take place within the Innovation School, but through scrutiny of the documentation and discussion with staff and students it was evident to the Review Panel that it's not a clearly articulated part of the curriculum. The Review Panel recommended that the School give consideration to the explicit articulation of how learning for sustainable development and practices is embedded in the curriculum documentation (**Recommendation 8**).

## **3. EVALUATION OF THE QUALITY OF THE PROVISION UNDER REVIEW**

### ***Highlands and Islands Campus***

- 3.1 The Head of School expressed that having a non-metropolitan component of the GSA offer in the Highlands and Islands campus was important to the identity of the Innovation School, and that it was a unique attribute, providing a desirable, nuanced aspect of the portfolio. The self-evaluation report detailed that the location of delivery of two of the Design Innovation Suite programmes had switched in 2019/20 with the aim being to improve the student experience in both the Highlands and Islands and the Glasgow campuses and to make the portfolio more appropriate to location: the MDes Design Innovation and Environmental Design was moved to the Highlands and Islands campus, to utilise the space and environment, and the MDes Design Innovation and Collaborative Creativity was moved to the Glasgow campus to allow collaboration with a more diverse group of organisations.
- 3.2 The Review Panel were keen to explore the staff and student experience in the Highlands and Islands, and the future vision for the campus. The Head of School highlighted that students at the Highlands and Islands campus had expressed that they didn't feel like students of GSA, but that their link to the Innovation School had improved following developments with the digital offer, in particular the investment in Miro and Zoom. With intention to increase the student voice at the Altyre campus, a Highlands and Islands student representative was introduced to better support students arriving at the Highlands and Islands campus and to improve the connection with the Glasgow campus.
- 3.3 It was raised that for some students, the particularly remote location of the Highlands and Islands campus was an attraction for study, and for others it was a concern, and that the experience of studying in a very remote location must be made explicit to applicants. Though a Classroom Assistant (an Innovation School graduate from the previous year) had been appointed to support the transition to study at the Highlands and Islands campus, it was evident to the Review Panel, from staff and student feedback received during the Periodic Review event, that there was some weakness in support available at the campus, and that the student experience was of concern. Staff panels advised that increasing and improving the support available at the Highlands and Islands campus had been requested, but that staff and students were referred to the Glasgow campus for support. Students at the Highlands and Islands campus had reported feelings of isolation (in part owing to the Covid-19 pandemic), and concern was raised about the availability

of studio space and accommodation in the Highlands and Islands campus, particularly with the rise in student numbers on the programmes delivered there.

- 3.4 Postgraduate students advised that opportunities to collaborate between the two campuses were lacking, and that there were no formal mechanisms in place to support collaboration. Staff panels advised that there is pressure on students to help develop this collaboration, and agreed that there could be more formal mechanisms in place to support it.
- 3.5 In recognition of the concerns raised during the Periodic Review event, the Review Panel recommended that an Innovation School-led review of the provision at the Highlands and Islands campus should be undertaken, and to ensure the full range of GSA support and services can be delivered to students based at that campus. **(Recommendation 1)**

### ***Assessment and Feedback***

- 3.6 The experience of assessment and feedback from the student panels was varied. For some, it was reported that they had regular communication with tutors, with good contact points throughout the year, and that mid-year reviews were supportive and constructive, having tangible impact on subsequent projects. For others, it was reported that feedback was received too late to allow meaningful reflection before assessment, and that rubrics were unclear and assessment ambiguous. Students fed-back that they understood how their grades related to their intended learning outcomes, but that more information about how projects sit in the grading structure would be welcomed.
- 3.7 Staff panels advised that it can be challenging to assess innovation, as innovation requires trying new things with potential of failure, and that comments provided in feedback on assessment reflect the ambiguity of the discipline rather than the instruction. Staff articulated that having ongoing dialogue about reflective practice, and providing verbal feedback rather than written feedback, assists in avoiding ambiguities, and that providing written feedback for a large number of students can be challenging. Through discussion it was evident to the Review Panel that there was a large emphasis and reliance on verbal feedback. The Review Panel raised concern about the reliance on verbal feedback, in particular for neurodiverse students or students with English as a second language, and for parity of experience.
- 3.8 The Review Panel recommended that the School should develop a shared culture around assessment and feedback, with clarity and consistency on turnaround time, with clear expectations for verbal/written feedback requirements, sharing good practice where established. **(Recommendations 3a and b).**

### ***The Future of Studio***

- 3.9 Through meetings with the Head of School, staff and students, it was clear that there was a common understanding and desire that studio should remain central to the Innovation School's practices and provision. Students expressed that studio was of the utmost importance as a space to build community and exchange ideas, and that the lack of opportunity to exchange ideas in a collaborative space during the national lockdowns as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic was extremely challenging. Staff supported the value of studio for socialising, conversing and collaborating between planned curriculum activities, while recognising that use of digital provision would be more present in future.

- 3.10 Staff and student panels expressed that the move online as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic had gone well, but that a hub for reflection, critiquing, and socialising was a vital to connect with the wider institution and to avoid being siloed in a discipline. All expressed concern about losing the tangible nature of studio, expressing that it is a fundamental part of the GSA offer.

#### ***Cross-School Provision***

- 3.11 The Review Panel invited discussion about the cross-School provision available for Innovation School students, which included Co-Lab courses (the first year experience), Design, History and Theory (DHT) courses, and postgraduate taught stage two electives. Some students fed-back that the DHT courses and electives do not fit particularly well with their programmes, articulating that the electives align better with Fine Art and Design programmes, and that the DHT provision does not align with the future thinking practices within the Innovation School.
- 3.12 Students advised that the Co-Lab courses provided a good opportunity to collaborate and meet people from other disciplines, and that they encouraged a more abstract expression. Students expressed that the second iteration of the Co-lab courses were well integrated, but that it was challenging to find a group identity when working remotely as a result of Covid-19 restrictions. Students also expressed that the range of electives felt dominated by art school traditions, and that it would be helpful to have broader range available. It was, however, expressed that moving electives online was a positive development, as it had allowed a better range to be available and a broader scope of cross-elective working.
- 3.13 The Review Panel recommended that the Innovation School should work with the Design, History and Theory team to review and identify challenges in terms of curriculum requirements, and to consider the appropriateness of the curriculum in supporting the Innovation School portfolio (***Recommendation 5***).

#### ***Joint provision with the University of Glasgow***

- 3.14 The Review Panel considered the student experience on the MSc International Management and Design Innovation programme – a programme delivered jointly with the University of Glasgow - as part of the Innovation School provision as a whole, but did not consider the programme for revalidation purposes (see section 8.3). Through exploration of the MSc International Management and Design Innovation programme there arose disparity in how the two institutions approach the partnership, with consensus that it has the potential to be a very positive collaboration. There was appetite from both institutions to better blend the boundaries, while recognising the challenges with this in terms of time and resource available, and the difference in the institutional language and approach. The Review Panel were in agreement that there was a recognisable impact on the student experience as a result of this disparity, with students expressing that there was a lack of connection across institutions, where projects are undertaken separately.
- 3.15 There was positive feedback from students on their experience of the joint programme, who valued the opportunity to work across two institutions and campuses, gaining two different perspectives. It was noted by the Review Panel that the programme had grown exponentially since inception, but that conversations between the two institutions are not happening regularly enough to support further development.

- 3.16 The Review Panel summarised that the Innovation School should work with colleagues at the University of Glasgow to review the joint programme to: reflect on the collaboration to ensure it is working effectively for both parties, supporting and fostering a positive student experience; ensure the programme aims, intended learning outcomes and expectations are clear across the programme; and to create further opportunity for reflection, with regular Joint Management Board meetings (**Recommendation 4**).

#### **4. ASSURING THE STANDARDS OF AWARDS AND QUALITY OF PROVISION**

##### ***External Examiners and Programme Monitoring and Annual Reporting***

- 4.1 The Review Panel were satisfied that effective quality assurance measures were in place, and that the School consults with External Examiners and students effectively. The self-evaluation report detailed that Programme Monitoring and Annual Reporting (PMAR) is embedded in the School review cycle, and it was evident that student and external input is requested, discussed and utilised in the monitoring process.

##### ***NSS Outcomes, Student Feedback and Feedback Mechanisms***

- 4.2 The Review Panel sought to explore the very low response rates to student surveys in the Innovation School, as seen in the supporting documentation for the Periodic Review event. The Head of School and staff expressed that it may be a result of the effective student voice mechanism in the School, which allows an ongoing cycle of feedback and response, but that it could also be survey fatigue, in particular as the Innovation School was running the Collaborative Curriculum Review around the same time as the Student Experience Survey.
- 4.3 The Head of School and staff panels accepted that engagement with formal mechanisms should be improved, but that they would also seek to retain the culture of approachability and constant cycle of feedback in the School. The Review Panel recognised that this approach was effective given the current size of the School, but that formal feedback mechanisms would need to be better utilised should cohort sizes increase.
- 4.4 During meetings with students, it was evident that the class and lead representative structure was embedded in the School and was working well. Students advised that the informal mechanisms for providing feedback are effective, and that engagement with more formal mechanisms of feedback and surveys may be low as the impact of those mechanisms was not evident to students. The Review Panel recognised that collegiate, informal feedback mechanisms in the School were well-established and working well and commended the School on their approach (**Commendation 4**).
- 4.5 The Review Panel were assured that informal student voice mechanisms in the School were robust, but there was concern about the utilisation of formal mechanisms and the over-reliance on lead and class representatives for dissemination of information. The Review Panel summarised that the Innovation School should establish and mainstream consistent use of informal and formal student voice mechanisms and ensure that there is commitment across the School in making best use of established, formal student voice mechanisms, including the Student Experience Survey (**Recommendations 6b and 6c**).

## 5. ENHANCEMENT IN LEARNING AND TEACHING

- 5.1 The Review Panel were advised that, as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic, the Winter School in 2020 was delivered digitally, providing a new model and lessons learned for future years. The Head of School advised that the move to digital delivery reduced cost and logistical issues, and allowed the Winter School to expand to a more international audience.
- 5.2 The Review Panel commended the digital learning techniques developed by the Innovation School, in particular those used in the Winter School, and the School was encouraged to reflect on the successes in this area, and to mainstream the good practice across the School (**Commendation 5**).

### *Knowledge Exchange, External Partnerships and Research*

- 5.3 Common to the whole review event was evidence that the School has a strong knowledge exchange focus of research. The Review Panel commended the Innovation School for: the extensive network that the School has developed with external partners; the breadth, range and depth of collaborative working; and the rich range of curriculum projects (**Commendation 2**).

## 6. ASSURING AND ENHANCING THE QUALITY OF THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE

### *Skills Versus Competencies*

- 6.1 The Review Panel were keen to explore the self-evaluation report references to 'skills versus competencies' and, "[how] the skills required by Innovation School students and the competencies displayed intersect [self-evaluation report, page 11]". The Review Panel considered the nature of specific skill-sets developed in the Innovation School, and explored a more abstract understanding of those skills in capturing experience design, and how this is articulated to support students moving into industry.
- 6.2 Staff panels fed-back that skills versus competencies was part of the long term vision of the School, but that it had been challenging to develop this discussion through continued periods of disruption. Staff were keen to maintain maker aspects as well as theoretical, competency-based aspects of the curriculum, recognising that skills can be developed beyond graduation. There was concern raised that there may be an over-reliance on competencies over skills, with recognition that there needs to be a clear balance in place. In-line with the discussion on assessment and feedback (see sections 3.6 - 3.8) the Review Panel recommended that the articulation of skills and competencies, and the culture and practice of assessment and feedback, should be consistent across the School (**Recommendation 3**).

### *Personal Tutor System*

- 6.3 It was evident from all panel discussions that the GSA Personal Tutor System was embedded, consistently used and working well, but it was highlighted that the system is not being utilised for students on the joint programme. The Review Panel recommended that the use of the Personal Tutor System is consistent and embedded across all programmes in the Innovation School (**recommendation 6a**).

## ***Industry, Employability and Employment***

- 6.4 The impact of Innovation School students, both on collaborative project work and graduate destinations, was evident throughout the Periodic Review event and was commended by the Review Panel. The Review Panel recommended that this should be celebrated and the School was encouraged to find clear ways of articulating this to prospective and current students (**Commendation 6**).

## **7. SUMMARY OF PERCEIVED STRENGTHS AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

### **Recommendations**

- 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 Innovation School to each Board of Studies, Education Committee and Academic Council within the period December 2021 – December 2022.
- 7.2 **Recommendation 1 – Highlands and Islands Campus**  
A School-led review of the provision at the Highlands and Islands campus should be undertaken, to ensure the full range of GSA support and services can be delivered to students based at that campus.
- 7.3 **Recommendation 2 - School Vision and Organisation and Management**  
As the Innovation School had been in its current form since 2017, the School should use this opportunity to reflect on, develop and articulate a clear vision and strategy, ensuring that it is accessible to multiple audiences - including potential undergraduate students, postgraduate students and external collaborators - and that it supports the School's future ambitions:
- a) The legacy of the School should be taken into consideration to ensure that it is supporting, and not stifling, the clarity of vision;
  - b) With reflection on the School's complexities and ambition, the School structures should be reviewed to ensure they support the School's plans for growth and development.
- 7.4 **Recommendation 3 - Skills and Competencies**  
The articulation of skills and competencies, and the culture and practice of assessment and feedback, should be consistent across the School:
- a) The School should develop a shared culture around assessment and feedback, with clarity and consistency on turnaround time, and expectations for verbal/written feedback requirements;
  - b) Ensure good practice in this area in the School is mainstreamed across the portfolio.
- 7.5 **Recommendation 4 - Joint Programme with the University of Glasgow**  
The Innovation School should work with colleagues at the University of Glasgow to review the joint programme, as follows:
- a) Review the collaboration to ensure it is working effectively for both parties, supporting and fostering a positive student experience;
  - b) Ensure the programme aims, intended learning outcomes and expectations are clear across the programme;
  - c) Create opportunity for reflection, with regular Joint Management Board meetings.

**7.6 Recommendation 5 – Design, History and Theory (DHT)**

The Innovation School should work with the Design, History and Theory team to identify continuing and outstanding challenges around curriculum requirements and establish solutions:

- a) Working with the Design, History and Theory team, the Innovation School should review and identify challenges in terms of curriculum requirements, and consider the appropriateness of the curriculum in supporting the Innovation School portfolio.

**7.7 Recommendation 6 – Student Voice Mechanisms**

The Innovation School should establish and mainstream consistent use of formal and informal student voice mechanisms across the School:

- a) Embed consistent use of the Personal Tutor System across all programmes;
- b) Ensure that formal student voice mechanisms, including the Student Experience Survey, are working effectively to support the well-established informal mechanisms;
- c) Ensure there is commitment across the School in making best use of established student survey mechanisms.

**7.8 Recommendation 7 – Equality, Diversity and Inclusion**

The Innovation School should move beyond the good equality, diversity and inclusion work being undertaken by individuals, and embed this across the School to create an inclusive environment for all:

- a) The newly established School-led Equalities Working Group should be used to: lead and mainstream ongoing good practice across the School; measure and evaluate the impact; and encourage all staff and students to participate.

**7.9 Recommendation 8 - Sustainability**

The Review Panel recommended that the School give consideration to the explicit articulation of how learning for sustainable development and practices is embedded in the curriculum documentation.

**Commendations**

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

**7.11 Commendation 1 – Shared Ethic and Mission Between Staff and Students**

The Review Panel identified and commended that there was a clear shared ethic and mission, between staff and students, in the Innovation School:

- a) The School approach to human centred ethos of design, evidenced through the self-evaluation report and meetings with both staff and students - and work undertaken with public sector bodies - was commended.

**7.12 Commendation 2 – Collaborative Working**

The strong knowledge exchange focus of research, and the extensive network that the School has developed with external partners, was commended:

- a) The breadth, range and depth of collaborative working, the rich range of curriculum projects, and the School's developing network was commended by the Review Panel.

**7.13 Commendation 3 – Ethics**

The Review Panel commended the School's engagement with ethics throughout the curriculum, in particular in the undergraduate space.

**7.14 Commendation 4 – Informal Feedback Mechanisms**

The well-established, collegiate and effective informal feedback mechanisms in the School were commended.

**7.15 Commendation 5 – Innovation with Digital Learning**

Digital Learning techniques, in particular in the Winter School, were commended:

- a) The School was encouraged to reflect on the successes in this area, and to mainstream the good practice across the School.

**7.16 Commendation 6 – Impact of Student and Graduates from the Innovation School**

The impact of Innovation School students, both on collaborative project work and graduate destinations, was commended and should be celebrated:

- a) The School was encouraged to find clear ways of articulating this to prospective and current students.

**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 2022:

BDes (Hons) Product Design  
MEDes Product Design  
MDes Design Innovation and Citizenship  
MDes Design Innovation and Collaborative Creativity  
MDes Design Innovation and Environmental Design  
MDes Design Innovation and Interaction Design  
MDes Design Innovation and Service Design  
MDes Design Innovation and Transformation Design  
Master of Research

8.3 The Review Panel considered the student experience of the MSc International Management and Design Innovation programme (delivered jointly with the University of Glasgow) as part of the Periodic Review process, and met with staff and students on the programme to discuss the collaboration. As the programme is administered by the University, the Review Panel did not consider the programme for revalidation purposes.



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

The Review Panel considered the following provision offered by the Innovation School (including student numbers for 2019/20):

Programme		Student FTE in 2019/20*
MDes Design Innovation and Citizenship	<i>A one year programme</i>	4
MDes Design Innovation and Collaborative Creativity	<i>A one year programme</i>	3
MDes Design Innovation and Environmental Design	<i>A one year programme</i>	13
MDes Design Innovation and Interaction Design	<i>A one year programme</i>	21
MDes Design Innovation and Service Design	<i>A one year programme</i>	38
MDes Design Innovation and Transformation Design	<i>A one year programme</i>	0
Master of Research	<i>A one year programme</i>	3**
<b>Total</b>		<b>82</b>
BEDes/MEDes Product Design	<i>A four/five year programme</i>	30
<b>Total</b>		<b>30</b>
<b>OVERALL TOTAL</b>		<b>112</b>

\* total Student FTE to complete with a Degree in 2019/20

\*\* two full-time students, one part-time student.

## ANNEX B: INNOVATION SCHOOL PERIODIC REVIEW - STUDENT AND STAFF MEETINGS

### 1. Meeting with group of Undergraduate Students: Thursday 25 February 2021, 13:15 –14:15

Year	Programme	Lead/Class Rep?
1	BDes (Hons) Product Design	Y
2	BDes (Hons) Product Design	Y
2	BDes (Hons) Product Design	N
3 (Direct Entry)	BDes (Hons) Product Design	N
3	BDes (Hons) Product Design	N
3	BDes (Hons) Product Design	Y
3	BDes (Hons) Product Design	Y (Lead Rep)
4	BDes (Hons) Product Design	Y
4	BDes (Hons) Product Design	N
5	BDes (Hons) Product Design	N
5	BDes (Hons) Product Design	Y

### 2. Meeting with group of Postgraduate Students: Thursday 25 February 2021 14:30 – 15:30

Programme	Lead/Class Rep?
MDes Design Innovation and Citizenship	Y
MDes Design Innovation and Environmental Design	Y
MDes Design Innovation and Environmental Design (2019) now Alumni	N
MDes Design Innovation and Interaction Design	Y (H&I Campus)
MDes Design Innovation and Interaction Design	N
MDes Design Innovation and Service Design	Y (Lead Rep)
MDes Design Innovation and Service Design	Y
MSc International Management and Design Innovation (joint programme with UoG)	Y
Master of Research	Y
Master of Research	N
PhD	N
PhD	N

## ANNEX B: INNOVATION SCHOOL PERIODIC REVIEW - STUDENT AND STAFF MEETINGS

### 3. Meeting with Programme Leaders/Heads of Department: Wednesday 26 February 2021, 10:30 – 12:00

- Head of Strategy
- Operations Director
- Programme Leader, BDes/MEDes Product Design
- Programme Leader, MDes Design Innovation Suite
- Programme Leader, Master of Research

### 4. Meeting with Course Tutors/Technicians/VLs: Friday 26 February 2021, 13:15 – 14:45

- Alumni and Visiting Lecturer
- BDes (Hons) Product Design Lecturer - 2nd Year Lead (P/T)
- BDes (Hons) Product Design Lecturer (P/T)
- BDes (Hons) Product Design Lecturer (P/T)
- BDes (Hons) Product Design Lecturer - 4th and 5th Year Lead
- Lecturer - MDes and MSc
- MDes Design Innovation Suite – Lecturer, Environmental Design
- MDes Design Innovation Suite – Lecturer (P/T)
- MDes Design Innovation Suite – Lecturer
- MDes Design Innovation Suite – Lecturer, Interaction Design
- MRes – Research Fellow
- MRes – Research Fellow
- University of Glasgow – Programme Convenor, MSc International Management and Design Innovation
- University of Glasgow – Programmes Officer
- Visiting Lecturer

University of Glasgow

**Academic Standards Committee – Friday 28 January 2022**

**Periodic Subject Review: Review of the School of Nursing & Health  
Care held on 16 – 17 June 2021**

**Cover Sheet**

**Robbie Mulholland, Clerk to the Review Panel**

**Brief Description of the Paper**

Report of the Periodic Subject Review of the School of Nursing & Health Care held on 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> June 2021.

In line with sector best practice the University continues to review its Periodic Subject Review (PSR) process to ensure it remains relevant and continues to demonstrate a more explicit focus on enhancement. Due to the significant impact of the COVID pandemic and the move to remote working, the PSR was managed in an online format.

**Action Requested**

Academic Standards Committee is invited to receive the report and **note** the nine recommendations contained therein for onward transmission to those identified for action. (The draft report was reviewed by two members of ASC and the Convener, in accordance with the revised process agreed in session 2019-20.)

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

As identified in the Action Plan section of the report.

**Resource Implications (where appropriate)**

Not applicable.

**Timescale for Implementation (where appropriate)**

An update to the recommendations will be provided to ASC in six months.

**Equality Implications (where appropriate)**

As identified in the report.

**University of Glasgow**

**Academic Standards Committee – Friday 28 January 2022**

**Periodic Subject Review: Review of the School of Nursing & Health  
Care held on 16 – 17 June 2021**

**Cover Sheet**

**Robbie Mulholland, Clerk to the Review Panel**

**Review Panel:**

Convener	Professor Moira Fischbacher-Smith
External Subject Specialist, University of Edinburgh	Dr Elaine Haycock-Stuart
Student Representative Council (SRC)	Ms Stephanie Mason
Cognate Member	Ms Samantha Fontaine
Elected Member from the University Court	Professor Nick Hill
Learning Enhancement & Academic Development	Dr Kim Wilder-Davis
Service	
Clerk	Mr Robbie Mulholland, Senate Office

**1. OUTCOME**

- 1.1 The Panel **confirmed** there were no concerns regarding the academic standards of programmes delivered by the School of Nursing & Health Care (N&HC) and recommended the validation of all programmes for a further six years.
- 1.2 The Panel **confirmed** that nothing was raised as a concern during the Periodic Subject Review (PSR) that had not already been identified by the School.
- 1.3 The Panel **confirmed** the School had a transparent and academic governance and quality assurance structure which aligns to the University regulatory framework.

**2. SUMMARY AND CONTEXT**

- 2.1 The Nursing & Health Care School along with the Undergraduate Medical School; the Dental School; and Forensic Medicine and Science comprises the School of Medicine, Dentistry & Nursing, within the College of Medical, Veterinary & Life Sciences. The previous Periodic Subject Review (PSR) was undertaken in December 2013. The Convener confirmed that she was satisfied with the actions which N&HC had taken against the recommendations from the last PSR, the details of which had been submitted to Academic Standards Committee (ASC) at its April and November 2015 meetings. The Convener confirmed that the information provided by the School in advance of the current review was satisfactory and the Panel was assured regarding the academic standards of programmes delivered by the School. The focus of the current review was therefore on enhancement.
- 2.2 The Convener noted that resource allocation fell out with the remit of PSR, however there was an expectation that actions required against recommendations which necessitated additional resources would be taken forward in collaboration with relevant University central support services as required.
- 2.3 The Reflective Analysis (RA) confirmed that the original date set for the N&HC PSR (March 2020) had coincided with the Nursing & Midwifery Council (NMC) programme approval process and this had resulted in the postponement of the PSR. The impact of the Covid-19 pandemic had resulted in a further postponement. The on-going

pandemic meant that the PSR was taking place at a time when teaching delivery had moved online and most students and staff were working remotely.

The Convener acknowledged that the Bachelor of Nursing (BN) was a professional programme which involved students undertaking clinical placements in hospital and community settings from Year 1. She noted that, owing to the pandemic, students had undertaken clinical placements in what were often highly challenging and unprecedented circumstances. She paid tribute to the professional manner in which students had responded and also acknowledged the commendable efforts of academic and clinical staff in supporting students through such a demanding time.

### ***Range of Provision Under Review***

2.4 The RA confirmed that the range of provision under review was as below:

- Undergraduate pre-registration programme;
- Bachelor of Nursing Honours Degree (BN (Hons): full time over 4 years (exit possible at end of Year 3 with a BN Ordinary degree);
- Trans-National Education (TNE): Joint Singapore Institute of Technology (SIT) /University of Glasgow BSc Honours in Nursing: full time over 2 years – students enter the programme with a Diploma in Nursing and are already registered as a nurse with the Singapore Nursing Board

Undergraduate Post-registration programmes:

- Graduate Diploma in Specialist Lymphoedema Management: part time over two years with possible exit awards of Graduate Certificate in Lymphoedema Management or Specialist Lymphoedema Management - each over one year;
- Graduate Certificate: Burns & Plastics Surgery Care for Adults and Paediatrics: part-time over one year.

### ***Staff, Student and External Participation***

2.5 The staff the Panel met with included the Acting Head of the School of N&HC; the BN Programme Lead; those staff in key academic roles (including those from SIT Singapore), Early Career staff and professional and support staff. The Panel also met with several Service Users and Service Representatives.

2.6 The Panel met with undergraduate students from Years 1, 2, 3, and 4 from the BN programme and four students from SIT/UofG Singapore. From comments made throughout the day, the Panel formed the impression that the culture within the School was highly collegiate and supportive and benefitted from a hard-working and highly committed staff. The students the Panel met with felt highly valued as individual learners and student nurses.

### ***School Preparation for PSR***

2.7 The Reflective Analysis (RA) was written by the Head of Nursing & Health Care with input from departmental academic and administrative staff, including the N & H C Deputy Head and the BN (Honours) Programme Director. Other staff assisted with the provision of data and programme-specific information.

### ***Student and Staff Numbers and Profile***

2.8 The RA confirmed that the BN student numbers by year of programme (i.e. students enrolled on courses at year end) were as follows:

	Term			
Course Level	2017	2018	2019	2020
Level 1	40	40	59	58
Level 2	47	38	36	58
Level 3	42	44	37	36
Level 4	36	24	30	27
<b>Grand Total</b>	165	146	162	179

- 2.9 The Panel noted that the School of Nursing & Health Care had 19 members of academic staff and one vacancy - this being the equivalent to 15 WTEs. Two academic staff were University of Glasgow staff based in Singapore and two additional staff were research-only staff. This was an approximate increase of three academic members of staff (2.6WTE) since the last PSR.
- 2.10 The Panel noted the reference in the RA (P.14) that 'the percentage of male nursing students in Scotland is between 8-10% and this figure has been stable over the last 10 years. The BN (Honours) programme has, in the main, met or exceeded this figure in admissions over the past five years and efforts continue to promote nursing as an attractive career option for men'. The Panel noted that staff members from the BN (Honours) programme participated in national activities to address the gender gap. The Panel was advised that the School's attempts to increase male entrants to the programme aligned with the aims of the University's Equality & Diversity Strategy.
- 2.11 The Panel noted from the RA (P.46) that progression rates on the BN programme were generally good at all levels and academic failure rates were low. The main point at which students were likely to withdraw was in the period when students moved from Year 1 to Year 2. The School had identified a number of possible factors as to why attrition might be most prevalent at this point, but it continued to monitor the matter with a view to establishing a more comprehensive analysis.

### 3. OVERVIEW

#### Strategy for Development

- 3.1 The Panel noted that N&HC was an independent School within a larger tripartite School. The Acting Head of School considered that its location structurally brought benefits for the School in that it could access certain additional funding and resources which were available to the bigger School; share resources and skill sets; and also influence strategic direction through committee participation (i.e. the College of MVLS group formed to develop the College Learning & Teaching Strategy).
- 3.2 The Panel acknowledged the School's ability to maintain managed growth in the face of increased student numbers and challenges around staff capacity.
- 3.3 The Panel **commends** the School for its highly collegiate and supportive learning environment.
- The Panel **commends** the School for its excellent staff survey results which evidenced a shared team ethos and collective sense of ownership of learning and teaching, and of the student experience more broadly.
- 3.4 In discussion with the Acting Head of School and key staff, the Panel acknowledged that there was clear evidence of a strong collegiate ethos within the School. However, in discussion around matters such as the balance between academic leadership and administration, and opportunities to streamline and better coordinate existing School activities, it formed the impression that there was some scope for the development of enhanced strategic leadership and organisational oversight. The Panel **strongly**

**recommends** that the School of Nursing & Health Care reviews its existing arrangements regarding strategic leadership and organisational oversight. This with a view to providing greater clarity, awareness and sustainability around issues such as academic leadership, staff roles and responsibilities, decision making, succession planning and configuration of administrative support. This should extend to include arrangements for SIT programme leadership where appropriate.

### **Strategy and Resources**

- 3.5 The Panel noted the various steps the School had taken to try to ensure that the necessary resources and supporting measures were in place to support strategic goals. This included, for instance, attempts to balance staff workload at the beginning of each academic session in matters such as the distribution of PhD supervision, and deriving information and support from the PGT clusters on planning matters. In this regard, the Panel identified Nursing's adoption of a Forward Planning Day as a forum for the sharing and exchange of information with regard to strategic and operational matters as an example of **good practice**.
- 3.6 The Panel acknowledged that there were some areas of strategic oversight regarding which the School had no authority e.g., undergraduate admissions targets. However, the Panel was of the opinion that there were several other matters within the gift of the School which would benefit from greater strategic input. This included how service teaching provision from other academic units was secured and coordinated; and how management information (i.e. the Qlikview information dashboard) could be used to inform strategic decision-making. The Convener undertook to discuss this latter point with the Acting Head of School outside of the review. The Panel **strongly recommends** that the School, in partnership with the leadership team of the School of Medicine and Dentistry, reviews current practice with regard to how service teaching provision from other academic units is secured and coordinated. This with a view to putting in place a more systematic and sustainable model for engaging these services going forward, and one which ensures that future teaching delivery continues to align with strategic academic goals and professional body requirements concerning curricula.
- 3.7 The Panel noted that several staff held multiple roles. The Panel formed the impression from comments made during the course of the review, that, in some instances, the specific responsibilities of some staff roles appeared to be somewhat unclear. The Panel considered it important that the nature and boundaries of individual roles be very clear. The Panel **recommends** that the School clarifies and defines the roles and responsibilities of its key staff such as, but not limited to, Programme Leads, Year Leads and Course Leads. This being with a view to tightening boundaries around specific roles, setting expectations with regard to the division of labour in areas of shared responsibility and where possible, reducing the coordination costs associated with individuals holding multiple roles.
- 3.8 The Panel was advised that the clinical skills facility which the School used at the Queen Elizabeth University Hospital (QEUH) had been requisitioned for use as laboratory space as part of the response to the Covid-19 pandemic. The Panel was assured that the School had obtained access to adequate alternative clinical facilities, including at the Wolfson Building and at the Louisa Jordan facility, although this was not used. The Panel was advised that the many challenges posed by the pandemic had the effect of helping to develop students' awareness of Inter Professional Learning (IPL).
- 3.9 The NMC had introduced revised nursing standards in 2018 and the Chief Nurse for Scotland had adopted a 'Once for Scotland' approach to their implementation. The 'Once for Scotland' approach refers to collaborative practices, adopted by the Chief Nurse for Scotland and which took place between HEIs and NHS boards, to



standardise processes and documentation where possible e.g., practice placement assessment documents (PADs), practice supervision and practice assessment arrangements. Following the introduction of the revised NMC standards, the University's BN programme was the only pre-registration nursing programme in Scotland to be re-validated by the NMC (in July 2020) with no conditions attached. The Panel identified Nursing and Health Care's willingness to engage with national agendas around strategic matters in the health care system in the context of the NHS Scotland 'Once for Scotland' initiative as an example of **good practice**.

#### **Early Career Academic Staff**

- 3.10 All new staff undertook an induction programme on taking up post and were assigned a member of Nursing staff to mentor them. Staff on the Early Career Development Programme (ECDP) also had a mentor from elsewhere in the College while participating in the programme. The Panel heard from several early career staff who felt well supported by the School and several confirmed that the chance to benefit from the opportunities available to early career staff had been part of their motivation to move to the School. The Panel noted that staff on the ECDP were not provided with ring-fenced time for key activities (such as research or scholarship). The Panel considered that it was important that all staff and academic leadership were able to manage and quantify workload. The Panel **recommends** that the School considers the introduction of a workload model to help quantify and manage staff workload, and also the allocation of protected time for early career staff undertaking the PgCAP qualification. [See also section 3.5]. In proposing this, the Panel notes that a workload model is not a solution to workload challenges and can at times become over-complicated. Examples of practice elsewhere in the University should be considered before anything is introduced within the School. The Panel noted that there were no Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) in N&HC.

#### **4. LEARNING, TEACHING AND ENHANCEMENT**

- 4.1 From comments expressed by students and staff throughout the Review, the Panel concluded that the teaching and learning environment within N&HC was very supportive, student-centred and one which made students feel highly valued as learners. Staff were hard-working, passionate about their subject and gave of their time generously to students and colleagues. The Panel noted the School's continuing high league table rankings in 2021. Although some metrics in the National Student Survey went down, overall satisfaction with respect to the School increased by 0.7% to 90.3% and the Panel noted the very high regard in which the School is held by students.
- 4.2 The Panel was of the opinion that several key aspects of the approach to learning and teaching on the BN programme helped to set it apart from other nursing programmes in the sector. This included the extent to which the School embedded clinical placements in the BN curriculum (50%); used subject experts from other academic areas of the University to teach right across the range of the BN curriculum; and included a strong scientific element at the core of the curriculum. The Panel **commends** the School's use of external speakers which brought a valuable source of externality to the School's learning environment and provided students with access to professional role models. The Panel invited the School to ensure that the content of material presented by external speakers was not replicated elsewhere in the curriculum, and also that it mapped clearly to ILOs, and where appropriate at Programme level, to NMC proficiencies.
- 4.3 The Panel reflected positively on the Schools willingness to draw on, and share, best practice in learning and teaching from other areas in the University. Cross-fertilisation of ideas regarding learning, teaching and innovation were encouraged through a range

of College and School committees, and academic cross-over took place in mentoring and the PDR process. Close academic collaboration took place with School of Life Sciences colleagues and liaison with service representatives and other stakeholders was a feature of learning in clinical settings.

The Panel heard from several members of staff and students that the School's adoption of a greater range of IT platforms such as Teams and the Cloud following the onset of the pandemic had greatly helped the School to innovate and consider new learning and teaching delivery options. This had particularly helped to support collaborative working between N&HC and Life Sciences colleagues and was an area that Nursing intended to build on in the future. SIT had also moved all delivery online during the pandemic and their introduction of Zoom technology had helped bring the two institutions closer together to collaborate meaningfully in many aspects of learning and teaching. The Panel **commends** the School for the manner in which it has expanded its use of online technology to facilitate communication and the sharing of best practice with colleagues at SIT.

- 4.4 The RA (P.27) states that 'the nature of nursing programmes/courses means that active learning approaches are integral as the skills, procedures and proficiencies that are required to be demonstrated take practice'. The School used real-life learning and teaching scenarios extensively and encouraged group-work and collaborative learning. The Panel noted that the BN Nursing curriculum comprised 50% clinical practice and 50% classroom-based learning. All the students and staff the panel met with considered that this was one of the main strengths of the programme and they welcomed the many opportunities for self-directed and reflective learning which it presented. Students based in both Glasgow and Singapore spoke highly of the value of learning about the professional career journeys undertaken by external speakers and service representatives, something which encouraged students to reflect on their own future career paths.

The Panel **recommends** that the School work closely with students to review and address the following specific areas that arose during the review in relation to teaching and/or programme design: time creep of online classes; effective design of pre-recorded lectures; effectiveness and visibility of communications around closing the feedback loop (such as the 'We Said, You Did' communications); diversity of case studies used in skills/clinical sessions.

### ***Strategic Development of Learning and Teaching***

- 4.5 The Panel noted that the strategic development of learning and teaching in Nursing had to take account of several different factors, which included: University requirements; professional requirements of the NMC; developments in clinical nursing practice, and a range of professional stakeholder interests. The Panel acknowledged the many challenges that this process of continual scrutiny presented, and it congratulated Nursing on managing to balance these competing interests so effectively.
- 4.6 The BN (Honours) Programme was approved by the Nursing & Midwifery Council (NMC) in session 2019-20 following an approval process that extended over 18 months. The Panel noted that, at University level, developments in learning and teaching in Nursing would draw on the principles of the new University Learning & Teaching Strategy. The RA (P.20) notes that 'Nursing lack(s) a clear strategic plan which is cognisant of both teaching and learning and research activity' and it would refresh its current strategic objectives in the light of the College Learning & Teaching Strategy which was under development. The Panel welcomes this development and suggests the School takes account of relevant observations in this report in shaping the strategy going forward.

## ***Curriculum Review and Development***

- 4.7 The Panel noted that the NMC re-approval exercise of the BN programme involved a substantial curriculum review and development process. The RA (P.23) notes that 'a separate Curriculum Development Group was formed with representation from students, practice learning staff, service-users and carers and professional nursing leaders'. The Panel congratulates the School on the collaborative manner in which this review was undertaken. The Panel was pleased to note that the School took account of students' views in developing the curriculum, for example the creation of a mental health clinical placement, in response to student demand. The Panel agreed with the views of most of the students and staff they met with that the 50:50 split in the curriculum between clinical learning environment and classroom-based learning was one of the most valuable features of the BN programme. Although the 50:50 balance of theory and practice is a requirement of the NMC, the Panel **commends** the School for being one of a few institutions to have managed that balance in practice and in a way that students recognise.

The Panel was also pleased to note the range of different styles of teaching which Nursing employed depending on the subject in question and teaching approach required. The Panel also acknowledged the School's efforts to create a research-informed curriculum. The Panel **commends** the School for the manner in which it has drawn on the skills and expertise of the following to support curriculum development and delivery: individual subject experts who teach across the curriculum; service users and service representatives; clinical placement staff; and external speakers.

- 4.8 The Panel was not entirely clear if students were aware of how what they were learning linked to graduate attributes but the Panel was satisfied that it could see where graduate attributes were demonstrated in the curriculum. The Panel **encourages** the School to be more explicit about graduate attributes and how they are being achieved across the programme by strengthening reference to them in handbooks and in Moodle.

## ***Enhanced Technology and Working Remotely***

- 4.9 The Panel noted that one of the outputs from the curriculum review process which had taken place as part of the NMC re-approval exercise was the development of the Technology Enhanced and Simulation-based Learning Policy. This set out how technology and simulation were utilised in Nursing and was the main policy context within which developments in learning technology in Nursing took place. The Panel was advised that the level of digital literacy amongst staff and students in the School was variable and the School was taking advantage of several opportunities to upskill, particularly in the light of the increased use of hybrid learning during the pandemic. The School had prepared for the transition to online learning by participating in digital development sessions run by the College's Digital Education Team and also building digital training into student induction sessions. The Panel was pleased to note the School's enhanced use of platforms such as Teams, Zoom, NES Turas online, and QMPLE (which is the national placement platform). The Panel **commends** the School for the manner in which it has expanded its use of online technology to facilitate communication and the sharing of best practice with colleagues at SIT.
- 4.10 The Panel noted that students had benefitted from activities such as podcasts; short pre-recorded lectures; workbooks linked to Zoom presentations; videos from service users; and the use of the Moodle common-room. Several students reported that these and other developments had helped to prevent social isolation of students working remotely during lockdown. Most students the Panel met with looked forward to the time when face-to-face teaching could resume. The Panel noted the considerable efforts which the School had made to support the move to online learning but noted comments from several members of staff welcoming more support for developing

learning technology skills. The Panel **encourages** the School to review its move to online learning to ascertain which aspects of enhanced technology that had emerged in the pandemic it would wish to take forward with a view to supporting greater curriculum innovation and flexibility.

### ***Internationalisation and Study Abroad***

#### ***University of Glasgow-Singapore Institute of Technology (SIT) Joint BSc Programme:***

- 4.11 The Panel noted that the Joint SIT-University of Glasgow BSc (Honours) in Nursing programme was in its fifth year of delivery and it had been successfully re-accredited by the Singapore Nursing Board (SNB) in January 2020, for a further 5 years. The Panel acknowledged the difficulties of establishing a joint programme across different countries - and managing it in the face of a global pandemic. The Panel noted that some instances had occurred where different expectations had emerged across the 2 institutions with regard to academic regulations and maintenance of academic standards, but the University had been able to manage these successfully to date. Another challenge concerned the Partner's wish that teaching on the programme be delivered by fly-in/fly-out UoG staff or UoG staff based in Singapore rather than using online delivery. However, the general expansion of online delivery during the pandemic had shown that new models of delivery were possible. Noting that the current Singapore-based UoG Programme Director was due to retire in under two years, the Panel **encourages** the School to give early and close consideration to the role and responsibilities of this post, related matters around succession planning going forward and the related need for continuity of oversight and development of the educational approach.
- 4.12 Both the SIT staff and students the Panel met with expressed great enthusiasm for their studies and the partnership with the University. Students and staff talked highly of one another and pointed to the shared sense of collegiality and purpose within the SIT community and the rich cultural diversity which existed in Singapore. They also considered the Overseas Immersion Programme (OIP) in Glasgow (which was cancelled in 2020) as being one of the highlights of their learning journey. The Panel **commends** the School on its positive engagement with the Joint SIT-UoG BSc (Honours) Nursing Overseas Immersion Programme (OIP). The Panel **commends** the School on the importance it attaches to induction and transition activities for the joint SIT-UoG BSc (Honours) Nursing programme.
- 4.13 The Panel was pleased to hear students report on the extent to which research-informed teaching was incorporated in the curriculum and also that students found virtually no difference between the teaching styles of Glasgow-based staff and Singapore-based staff. Several students and staff the Panel met with observed that despite the restrictions occasioned by the pandemic, one outcome of the enhanced online communication between SIT and the University had been the development of an enhanced sense of togetherness between staff and students of both institutions. It was hoped that this could lead to further shared learning opportunities between the two institutions in future. The Panel **recommends** that the School investigates how to maximise the benefits of the existing SIT partnership in relation to internationalisation, specifically but not exclusively in the area of virtual mobility. Possibilities include opportunities for developing joint student projects/group-work, joint work in keeping with the University's COIL initiative and forms of student exchange. The Panel **commends** the School on the success of the TNE initiative with SIT.

### ***Assessment and Feedback***

- 4.14 Some students the Panel met with commented on their workload and one student described it as 'sometimes overwhelming', their view being endorsed by others. Many noted that they had to balance online lectures, clinical placements (the timetabling of

which was subject to regular change), their jobs, private study and sometimes caring responsibilities. Many students the Panel met with expressed the view that the challenge of managing their time was exacerbated by what they perceived to be, at times, inconsistencies in approaches to marking and turn-around times for the return of assessed work, and bunching of assessments particularly when on placement. External Examiners had also commented on the matter of consistency of marking and feedback. Many of the students that the Panel met with considered that these factors made it difficult for them to feed-forward as efficiently as they would like into future assignments and also felt it negatively impacted their general work/life balance. The staff the Panel met with acknowledged the demanding nature of the programme but considered that staff feedback was good and the 15 working days turn-around time was generally met. The Panel noted that the RA (P.21) referred to 'managing student expectations concerning assessment and feedback timescales' as a challenge.

The Panel considered that there appeared to be a mis-match between student and staff expectations around assessment and feedback. The Panel **recommends** that the School, assisted by advice from colleagues in Academic and Digital Development, initiates a dialogue between relevant staff and students to address a mismatch in expectations around the following areas of assessment and feedback:

- Consistency in approaches to marking and turn-around times for the return of assessed work;
- Bunching of assessments and consequent impact on students' work/life balance particularly when on placement; and
- Mapping of assessment to ILOs.

### ***External Engagement***

- 4.15 The Panel met with a group of Service Representatives (SRs) and a group of Service Users (SUs). SRs were NHS Practice Education Facilitators who support BN (Honours) students in practice learning environments, and SUs were people who supported N&HC admissions activities and who used NHS services, or who were family carers, or who represented patient advocacy groups. The SRs the Panel met with reported on a very positive relationship with both the School and students on the BN programme. Some SRs did occasional lecturing with BN students and assisted with undergraduate admissions interviews and training. Most of the SRs had transitioned from a Mentor role within the clinical setting to a Supervisor/Assessor role. Workshops had been provided for students to assist with their understanding of the changed role of the SR. The SRs welcomed the School's openness to suggestions regarding clinical placements and other aspects of the programme, and as previously mentioned in the report, arrangements for a placement in mental health had been arranged in response to student demand. The SRs considered that, in general, the students performed very well in a clinical practice setting. The students were considered to be very well prepared for clinical placements and previous graduates from the programme had progressed to professional nursing roles very successfully.
- 4.16 The Service Users (SUs) the Panel met with commented on the high quality of the BN students they engaged with and also the excellent learning experience that the School provided. The SUs considered the students to be mature, highly committed learners and they very much appreciated the opportunity to lend their experience in support of the students and such a successful programme. Some SUs were involved in undergraduate admissions interviews for the programme and others supported the programme in other ways, i.e. in producing videos and participating in training sessions. Several students commented that they benefitted hugely from hearing about SUs' reflections on their professional life experience. The Panel **invites the School** to note a comment from one SU that the School might consider more diverse admissions

panels for the BN degree because they are currently often white, British, all-female panels.

- 4.17 The Panel agreed that the input and support provided by SRs and SUs provided a richly contextual element to the programme and served to set it apart from many other similar nursing programmes. The Panel **commends** the School on its innovative use of Service Representatives and Service Users as a means of enhancing the overall learning experience, and, in particular, the clinical skills development of BN students.
- 4.18 The Panel was pleased to note the reference in the RA (P.36) which described how, in response to an initiative by the Scottish Government, staff in N & HC were able to share 'examples of good practice concerning changes made to teaching, learning, assessment, and student support during the pandemic' with the Council of Deans of Health (CoDH) Scotland. The CoDH had then shared them with the Cabinet Secretary for Health.

### ***Professional Accreditation***

- 4.19 As noted above (para. 4.6), the BN (Honours) Programme was approved by the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) in session 2019-20 in accordance with new NMC standards. The Joint SIT-UoG BSc (Honours) in Nursing programme is accredited by the Singapore Nursing Board (SNB). According to the RA (P.7), the need for the programme 'was originally identified in 2015 by the Ministry of Education in Singapore who announced that a new degree programme for nurses would be offered by SIT to cater for post-registration diploma holders to respond to the industry need articulated within the MOH's Healthcare Industry Transformation Plan'.

### ***Staff Development and Support***

- 4.20 The Panel was pleased to note the excellent results from the staff survey which showed that staff felt generally very well supported and able to draw on good opportunities for professional development. Staff took advantage of the School's location structurally to collaborate on developmental opportunities with staff from the larger School (of Medicine, Dentistry and Nursing) and the College. Staff cross-over took place in University Performance Development Review and, to some degree, in mentoring. School staff attended CPD activities, conferences and courses and benefitted from information and advice available from the Learning Enhancement & Academic Development Service (LEADS), Teaching & Learning Committees, University Good Practice guides and the Library. Whilst welcoming this, the Panel **invited the School to reflect** on the recommendation above (Para.3.4) regarding staff roles/responsibilities and strategic oversight, and how greater clarity around these matters might help to better contextualise personal development goals.
- 4.21 The Panel identified a need for N&HC to develop scholarship of learning and teaching activity – this was acknowledged by the staff the Panel met with and also in the RA (P. 48). Work had commenced on a School Scholarship Strategy but this had stalled temporarily with the onset of the Covid pandemic. The Panel **recommends** that the School progresses and implements its planned strategy for scholarship of learning and teaching at an early opportunity, with a view to further supporting staff developmental goals and to support progression on the LTS career track.

## **5. THE STUDENT VOICE**

### ***Responding to Student Feedback***

- 5.1 The Panel noted that the School used a range of mechanisms to obtain student feedback. This included input from student representatives at Undergraduate Teaching Committee meetings; NSS outcomes; Staff Student Liaison Committees (SSLCs) meetings; end-of-course evaluations and clinical placement reflection sessions. The

School's response to feedback was communicated in several ways, including posting minutes of meetings which involved students on the Moodle Common Room, and attaching information to a physical 'You Said, We Did' notice board inside the main entrance to the Nursing building. The Panel was pleased to note that the School responded very positively to student feedback and was, for example, prepared to review/amend aspects of the curriculum, i.e., introduce a Mental Health clinical placement to take account of it. However, from discussions with students and staff, the Panel considered that there seemed to be uncertainty among students about where to locate feedback and also whether all feedback loops, say, as recorded in committee minutes on Moodle, had been closed.

### **Staff-Student Partnerships**

- 5.2 The Panel was pleased to note that N&HC placed considerable importance on the value of staff-student partnerships beyond the normal formal channels, i.e. Staff Student Liaison Committees. It considered that staff-student partnerships brought learning communities together with a greater shared purpose - something which was particularly important in the context of the on-going pandemic. The Panel noted from the RA (P.39) that examples of this type of partnership within the School included; writing retreats; engagement with the University Nursing Society; supporting students with social and cultural events; development of a fund to support students applications for funding for various matters; and the annual McGirr lecture. Several students the Panel met with commented very positively on the activities of the University Nursing Society. The Panel **encourages** the School to consider cultivating closer ties with the University Nursing Society as a means of strengthening informal links between students and staff.

## **6. SUPPORTING STUDENT WELLBEING**

- 6.1 The Panel was pleased to note the range of resources that were in place in the School to support student wellbeing. One student the Panel met with likened the learning environment and support network within the School to that of 'a little family', a characterisation echoed by others. Several students made particular mention of the excellent support they had received from Year Leads during the pandemic. Small class sizes were highlighted by several students as one reason why they felt so well supported by staff and fellow students. The Panel noted that the role of Adviser of Studies for the BN Nursing was mainly a pastoral one as there were no optional courses in the curriculum.
- 6.2 The Panel notes that the School had already undertaken some work around resilience building in the student body. The Panel **encourages** the School to progress this work and consider inviting the University Nursing Society to collaborate with it on this.
- 6.3 The Panel formed the impression from discussion that most students saw their main support network as being available from within the School and relied limitedly on the wider University provision. The Panel **encourages** the School to give more prominence, via enhanced sign-posting, to wellbeing resources located elsewhere (i.e., outside of Nursing and Health Care) in the University.

### **Student Transition**

- 6.4 The Panel was satisfied with student transition arrangements which the School has in place. New students undertook an induction period on the commencement of the programme during which they were introduced to key staff. Students were provided with wide-ranging information and advice on School and University facilities, resources and support networks. Students entering the BN programme had a diverse range of academic backgrounds and induction materials were designed to reflect that. A 'Welcome Back' session was provided at the beginning of each academic year and

each semester, and a preparatory session was held in advance of all clinical placements.

- 6.5 The Panel was pleased to note the success of the Joint SIT-UoG BSc (Honours) in Nursing programme Overseas Immersion Project (OIP). The OIP enabled 'SIT students to travel to Glasgow for a four-week learning and cultural experience where they undertake an observational clinical placement within NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde' (RA P.8). The students and staff the Panel met with spoke very highly of the OIP and considered it to be one of the unique selling points of the programme. The Panel **commends** the School's engagement with the Overseas Immersion Project (OIP).

### ***Student Communication***

- 6.6 The Panel was generally satisfied with the effectiveness of student communication in the School. However, the Panel invited the School to give consideration to some aspects of the guidance provided for students in relation to clinical placements. Students pointed out that flexibility around working patterns in clinical placements and who should be contacted to resolve issues around shifts were matters they would like more clarity on. The Panel noted that the new Quality Management of the Practice Learning Environment (QMPLE) web-based system was a useful audit tool in relation to clinical placements but it could not provide real-time information regarding working patterns and related information in relation to individual care settings. The Panel **recommends** that the School reviews its current guidance for students in relation to clinical placements in order to better manage student expectations concerning flexibility in working patterns when on placement and signposting key contacts should alternative arrangements be required.

### ***Student Learning support***

- 6.7 The Panel was pleased to note that the School had well established links with the range of University services and that information and advice related to this was presented and organised well. However, the Panel highlighted a few areas where it saw scope to enhance how some material was presented in handbooks and other support materials. The School is asked to consider making web-links more visible in certain areas – e.g. course handbooks mention that students need to register with Disability Services, but a link to the webpage would also be helpful. The Panel also considered that handbooks would benefit from more explicit information regarding University graduate attributes.

## **7. GOOD PRACTICE**

- 7.1 The adoption of a Forward Planning Day as a forum for the sharing and exchange of information with regard to strategic and operational matters.
- 7.2 The reporting of Evasys data at the annual Forward Planning Days. This helps to inform the evidence base on which planning assumptions are made.
- 7.3 Nursing & Health Care's willingness to engage with national agendas around strategic matters in the health care system in the context of the NHS Scotland 'Once for Scotland' initiative.
- 7.4 Encouragement of a strong student voice across the N&HC community.
- 7.5 The use of a Dissertation presentation as part of formative assessment in Year 4 – this being an opportunity to further develop graduate attributes.
- 7.6 The use of a peer teaching element to prepare students for becoming Practice Supervisors in the workplace. This helps to develop collaborative learning skills and the promotion of graduate attributes.



7.7 The promotion of interdisciplinary working with subject specialists from Science and Social Science disciplines.

## 8. COMMENDATIONS

8.1 The Panel **commends** the School for its highly collegiate and supportive learning environment.

8.2 The Panel **commends** the School for its excellent staff survey results which evidenced a shared team ethos and collective sense of ownership of learning and teaching, and of the student experience more broadly.

8.3 The Panel **commends** the School on the collaborative manner in which this PSR review was undertaken.

8.4 Although the 50:50 balance of theory and practice is a requirement of the NMC, the Panel **commends** the School for being one of a few institutions to have managed that balance in practice and in a way that students recognise.

8.5 The Panel **commends** the School for the manner in which it has drawn on the skills and expertise of the following to support curriculum development and delivery: individual subject experts who teach across the curriculum; service users and service representatives; clinical placement staff; and external speakers.

8.6 The Panel **commends** the School for the manner in which it has expanded its use of online technology to facilitate communication and the sharing of best practice with colleagues at SIT.

8.7 The Panel **commends** the School on its innovative use of Service Representatives and Service Users as a means of enhancing the overall learning experience, and, in particular, the clinical skills development of BN students

8.8 The Panel **commends** the School on its positive engagement with the joint SIT-UoG BSc (Honours) Nursing Overseas Immersion Programme (OIP).

8.9 The Panel **commends** the School on the success of the TNE initiative with SIT.

8.10 The Panel **commends** the School on the importance it attaches to induction and transition activities for the joint SIT-UoG BSc (Honours) Nursing programme.

## 9. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER ENHANCEMENT

9.1 The Panel **noted** the ambition to enhance the student experience embedded in the culture of the School. The recommendations from the Panel builds on work already undertaken by the School.

9.2 The Panel **strongly recommends** that the School should maximise the support available to them from key University central professional support services and looks for opportunities at College and University level to promote, share and learn from best practice.

9.3 The recommendations for enhancement detailed in the table are aligned to the four key thematic sections of the Reflective Analysis as follows with the recommendations listed in order of priority within each section.

- Strategy for Development
- Learning Teaching and Enhancement
- The Student Voice
- Supporting Student Wellbeing

The enhancement activities associated with each theme are presented either as: strong recommendations; recommendations; or encouragements.

In the case of strong recommendations, there may be more urgency required in addressing the issue. Updates on actions arising from recommendations and strong recommendations will be formally presented to the Academic Standards Committee, and commentary on responses to encouragements will also be presented if the Subject Area/School submits this information to the Senate Office although there is no requirement for them to do so.

Members of staff assigned responsibility in the report for enhancement activity are welcome to contact the Panel, through the Clerk, if they wish further information and advice regarding a specific item/s referred to them.

	<b>Thematic Activity (Section 3, Strategy for Development)</b>	<b>Shared Enhancement Benefits</b>	<b>For the Attention of the School</b>	<b>For the Attention of University Support Service</b>
1	<p><b>Strategic Leadership and Organisational Oversight:</b></p> <p>The Panel <b>strongly recommends</b> that the School of Nursing &amp; Health Care reviews its existing arrangements regarding strategic leadership and organisational oversight. This with a view to providing greater clarity, awareness and sustainability around issues such as academic leadership, staff roles and responsibilities, decision making, management of succession planning and configuration of administrative support. This should extend to include arrangements for SIT programme leadership where appropriate.</p> <p>Ref: Section 3, Para. 3.4</p>	<p>This will help to articulate more clearly the strategic vision and direction of the School. It will also allow the School the opportunity to review how it wishes to position itself strategically in respect of the wider ambitions of the bigger School, College and University.</p>	<p>For Attention of (FAO): Head of School of Nursing &amp; Health Care (N&amp;HC)</p> <p>For Information (FI): Dean of Learning &amp; Teaching, College of MVLS</p>	
2	<p><b>Service Teaching Provision:</b></p> <p>The Panel <b>strongly recommends</b> that the School, in partnership with the leadership team of the School of Medicine and Dentistry, reviews current practice with regard to how service teaching provision from other academic units is secured and coordinated. This with a view to putting in place a more systematic and sustainable model for engaging these services going forward, and one</p>	<p>This will help the School to deliver on several key matters including: providing certainty around the provision of core aspects of the curriculum; earlier identification of timetabling and resource requirements; and planning of staff workload.</p>	<p>FAO: Head of School of Medicine, Dentistry &amp; Nursing</p> <p>FAO: Head of School of N&amp;HC</p>	

	<p>which ensures that future teaching delivery continues to align with strategic academic goals and professional body requirements concerning curricula.</p> <p>Ref: Section 3, Para. 3.6</p>			
3	<p><b>Roles and Responsibilities:</b></p> <p>The Panel <b>recommends</b> that the School clarifies and defines the roles and responsibilities of its key staff such as, but not limited to, Programme Leads, Year Leads and Course Leads. This being with a view to tightening boundaries around specific roles, setting expectations with regard to the division of labour in areas of shared responsibility and where possible, reducing the coordination costs associated with individuals holding multiple roles.</p> <p>Ref: Section 3, Para. 3.7</p>	<p>This will help to clarify expectations and improve efficiency with regard to key roles and how these contribute to the School's activities. It will also help to reduce overlap, or gaps, in activity and help new staff to more quickly understand the requirements of their job and that of colleagues.</p>	<p>FAO: Head of School of N&amp;HC</p> <p>FI: Dean of Learning &amp; Teaching, College of MVLS</p>	
4	<p><b>Introduction of Workload Model:</b></p> <p>The Panel <b>recommends</b> that the School considers the introduction of a workload model to help quantify and manage staff workload, and also the allocation of protected time for early career staff undertaking the PGCap qualification. In proposing this, the Panel notes that a workload model is not a solution to workload challenges and can at times become over-complicated. Examples of practice</p>	<p>The introduction of a workload model and the allocation of protected time for early career staff will help staff assess and plan workloads better with a view to ensuring that time for key activities is built into staff timetables.</p>	<p>FAO: Head of School of N&amp;HC</p> <p>FI: Dean of Learning &amp; Teaching, MVLS.</p>	<p>PGCap Adviser, Learning Enhancement &amp; Academic Development Service (LEADS)</p>

	<p>elsewhere in the University should be considered before anything is introduced within the School.</p> <p>Ref: Section 3, Para. 3.10</p>			
5	<p><b>Scholarship of Learning &amp; Teaching:</b></p> <p>The Panel <b>recommends</b> that the School progresses and implements its planned strategy for scholarship of learning and teaching at an early opportunity, with a view to further supporting staff developmental goals and to support progression on the LTS career track.</p> <p>Ref: Section 4, Para. 4.21</p>	<p>This will help the School to build on the preparatory work which it has already undertaken in Scholarship of Learning &amp; Teaching, but which was stalled by the onset of the Covid pandemic.</p>	<p>FAO: Head of School of N&amp;HC</p> <p>FI: Dean of Learning &amp; Teaching, MVLS.</p>	
6	<p><b>University of Glasgow-Singapore Institute of Technology: Joint BSc Programme Management:</b></p> <p>Noting that the current Singapore-based UoG Programme Director was due to retire in under two years, the Panel <b>encourages</b> the School to give early and close consideration to the role and responsibilities of this post, related matters around succession planning going forward and the related need for continuity of oversight and development of the educational approach.</p> <p>Ref: Section 4, Para. 4.11</p>	<p>This recognises the key role that the post of Singapore-based UoG Programme Director plays in the Joint Programme and the particular challenges that are likely to arise in appointing a successor to the current post-holder.</p>	<p>FAO: Head of School of N&amp;HC</p> <p>FI: UoG Programme Director, Joint UoG-SIT BSc Programme</p> <p>FI: SIT Programme Director. Joint UoG-SIT BN Programme</p>	

	<b>Thematic Activity (Section 4, Learning, Teaching and Enhancement)</b>	<b>Shared Enhancement Benefits</b>	<b>For the Attention of the School</b>	<b>For The Attention of University Support Service</b>
7	<p><b>Assessment and Feedback:</b></p> <p>The Panel considered that there appeared to be a mis-match between student and staff expectations around assessment and feedback. The Panel <b>recommends</b> that the School, assisted by advice from colleagues in Academic &amp; Digital Development, initiates a dialogue between relevant staff and students to address a mismatch in expectations around the following areas of assessment and feedback: -</p> <p>Consistency in approaches to marking and turn-around times for the return of assessed work;</p> <p>Bunching of assessments and consequent impact on students' work/life balance particularly when on placement; and mapping of assessment to ILOs</p> <p>Ref: Section 4, Para. 4.14</p>	<p>This will help both students and staff to establish greater clarity and transparency around issues linked to the quality, consistency and timeliness of feedback to students.</p>	<p>FAO: Head of School of N&amp;HC</p> <p>FAO: Bachelor of Nursing (BN) Programme Director</p>	<p>Academic &amp; Digital Development Adviser, Learning Enhancement &amp; Development Service (LEADS)</p>
8	<p><b>Programme Organisation:</b></p> <p>The Panel <b>recommends</b> that the School work closely with students to review and address the following specific areas that arose during the review in relation to teaching and/or programme design:</p>	<p>This will help both students and staff to establish a dialogue around issues highlighted by students linked to teaching and/or programme design.</p>	<p>FAO: Head of School of N&amp;HC</p> <p>FAO: Bachelor of Nursing (BN) Programme Director</p>	

	<p>time creep of online classes; effective design of pre-recorded lectures; effectiveness and</p> <p>visibility of communications around closing the feedback loop (such as the 'We Said, You Did' communications);</p> <p>diversity of case studies used in skills/clinical sessions.</p> <p>Ref: Section 4, Para. 4.4</p>			
9	<p><b>University of Glasgow-Singapore Institute of Technology, Joint BSc Programme: – Internationalisation:</b></p> <p>The Panel <b>recommends</b> that the School investigates how to maximise the benefits of the existing SIT partnership in relation to internationalisation, specifically but not exclusively in the area of virtual mobility. Possibilities include opportunities for developing joint student projects/group-work, joint work in keeping with the University's COIL initiative and forms of student exchange.</p> <p>Ref: Section 4, Para. 4.13</p>	<p>This will help to further integrate internationalisation in the curriculum and build on the clear enthusiasm that exists at both institutions for joint working with one another.</p>	<p>FAO: Head of School of N&amp;HC</p> <p>FAO: UoG Programme Director, Joint UoG-SIT BSc Programme;</p> <p>FAO: SIT Programme Director, Joint UoG-SIT BSc Programme</p>	
10	<p><b>Graduate Attributes:</b></p> <p>The Panel <b>encourages</b> the School to be more explicit about graduate attributes and how they are being achieved across the programme by strengthening reference to them in handbooks and in Moodle.</p>	<p>This will help students to access information more readily about how the BN programme helps to develop the personal qualities and transferable skills necessary for a career in nursing.</p>	<p>FAO: BN Programme Director</p> <p>FAO: Head of School of N&amp;HC</p>	<p>FI: Academic &amp; Digital Development Adviser, Learning Enhancement &amp; Academic Development Service (LEADS)</p>

	Ref: Section 4, Para. 4.8			
11	<p><b>Enhanced Technology and Working Remotely:</b> The Panel <b>encourages</b> the School to review its move to online learning to ascertain which aspects of enhanced technology that had emerged in the pandemic it would wish to take forward with a view to supporting greater curriculum innovation and flexibility.</p> <p>Ref: Section 4, Para. 4.10</p>	This will help the School to reflect on its experience during the pandemic and evaluate its future technological requirements with regard to learning and teaching.	<p>FAO: Head of School of N&amp;HC;</p> <p>FAO: BN Programme Director</p> <p>FI: UoG-SIT Joint Programme Director (UoG);</p> <p>FI: UoG-SIT Joint Programme Director (SIT)</p>	
	<b>Thematic Activity (Section 5, The Student Voice)</b>	<b>Shared Enhancement Benefits</b>	<b>For the Attention of the School</b>	<b>For the Attention of University Service</b>
12	<p><b>Staff-Student Partnerships:</b> The Panel <b>encourages</b> the School to consider cultivating closer ties with the Nursing Society as a means of strengthening informal links between students and staff.</p> <p>Ref: Section 5, Para. 5.2</p>	This will help to further develop the already very strong collegiate learning environment in Nursing and HC. During the course of the pandemic, the opportunities for different year groups to meet informally with one another, and with staff, has been restricted and this would help to promote informal networking and shared experience.	<p>FAO: Head of School of N&amp;HC</p> <p>FAO: BN Programme Director</p>	



	<b>Thematic Activity (Section 6, Supporting Student Wellbeing)</b>	<b>Shared Enhancement Benefits</b>	<b>For the Attention of the School</b>	<b>For the Attention of University Support Service</b>
13	<p><b>Student Communication:</b></p> <p>The Panel <b>recommends</b> that the School reviews its current guidance for students in relation to clinical placements in order to better manage student expectations concerning flexibility in working patterns when on placement and signposting key contacts should alternative arrangements be desired.</p> <p>Ref: Section 6, Para. 6.6</p>	<p>This will provide more clarity for students regarding the timetabling and day to day management of clinical placements, and allow them to maximise their learning experience in these settings.</p>	<p>FAO: Head of School of N&amp;HC</p> <p>FAO: BN Programme Director</p> <p>FI: BN Clinical Placement Administrator</p>	
14	<p><b>Supporting Student Wellbeing:</b></p> <p>The Panel <b>encourages</b> the School to progress work around resilience building in the student body and consider inviting the University Nursing Society to collaborate with it on this.</p> <p>Ref: Section 6, Para. 6.2</p>	<p>The pandemic has brought with it unprecedented challenges for those working and studying in the caring professions. This suggestion will help develop enhanced personal awareness amongst nursing students in the context of a peer-shared learning experience.</p>	<p>FAO: Head of School of N&amp;HC</p> <p>FAO: BN Programme Director</p>	
15	<p><b>Supporting Student Wellbeing:</b></p> <p>The Panel <b>encourages</b> the School to give more prominence, via enhanced sign-posting, to wellbeing resources located elsewhere (i.e., outside of Nursing &amp; Health Care) in the University.</p> <p>Ref: Section 6, Para. 6.3</p>	<p>This will encourage students to take advantage of the full range of student services available throughout the University.</p>	<p>FAO: Head of School of N&amp;HC</p> <p>FAO: BN Programme Director</p>	