

**University of Glasgow**  
**Academic Standards Committee - Friday 29 May 2009**

**Summary Report of the Review Visit to the  
Linked Work Training Trust (Central), Grangemouth**

**Mrs Jackie McCluskey, Senate Office**

**Wednesday, 25 February 2009**

**PANEL MEMBERS**

Dr Jack Aitken, Director of Senate Office  
Professor K Gibb, Head of Department of Urban Studies  
Mr Anthony Gloyne, University Teacher, Department of Economics  
Mrs Jackie McCluskey, Senate Office (Clerk)  
Professor A Nash, Pro-Vice Principal (Convener)

**IN ATTENDANCE ON BEHALF OF LWTT**

Ms Fiona Craig, Director  
Councillor Martin Oliver, Board Member  
Mr Fred Hay, Board Member  
Ms Anne Donoghue, Tutor  
Mr Alex Downie, Lecturer  
Ms Deirdre Elrick, Lecturer

**Students**

Ms Seema Arshad	-	Graduate BME Programme
Mr Robert Bell	-	Year 3 Cohort
Ms Ezme Boyd	-	Graduate BME Programme
Ms Michelle Donoghue	-	Year 3 Cohort
Ms Tracy Gibson	-	Year 3 Cohort
Ms Karen Newbigging	-	Year 3 Cohort and Student Representative on LWTT Board
Ms Emma Nolan	-	Year 3 Cohort

**Workplace Supervisors**

Ms Margaret Stewart, Children's Services, Falkirk Council  
Mr Craig Holden, Clackmannanshire Council for Voluntary Service

**Placement Supervisors**

Ms Sandra Comrie, Voice of Experience Forum, North Lanarkshire  
Mr Frank McChord, Community Planning Falkirk Council

**1. SUMMARY**

The Panel unanimously agreed to **recommend to Academic Standards Committee and Senate** that the partnership between the Linked Work Training Trust (LWTT) and the Department of Urban Studies at the University, should continue. In addition, the staff of

LWTT should be recognised as teachers of the University for the purposes of teaching on courses leading to Degrees and Postgraduate Diplomas of the University.

The Panel made a number of commendations and recommendations which are outlined in Section 2.

## 2. COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### Commendations

- The Director was congratulated for the quality of the documentation provided, both in advance of the visit and on the day, and was thanked for the practical preparations, in particular for organising the groups to meet the Panel; the warm welcome and the excellent hospitality.
- LWTT was commended for its high standards of management and delivery of the BCLD degree programme, and the quality of its students, graduates and staff. The Panel was also pleased to confirm its recommendation to the University's Academic Standards Committee, to formally recognise the Director and the three tutors of LWTT as teachers of the University for the purposes of teaching on courses leading to Degrees and Postgraduate Diplomas of the University.

### Recommendations

The Panel recommended that:

- 1) A Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the University and LWTT should be prepared to clarify the ongoing relationship and, in recognition of the charitable status, income-dependent structure of LWTT's operations, indicate the limits of liability of each party. The MOA should also include reference to the processes for monitoring and review.

**Action: Senate Office; LWTT Director**

- 2) The established relationship with the University's Department of Urban Studies should be strengthened with a view to facilitating increasing two-way co-operation and collaboration in relevant teaching and research, and also student access to University services and social activities.

**Action: LWTT Director; Head of Urban Studies**

- 3) LWTT should consider diversifying its activities both in respect of career destinations of its students –thereby affording new sources of employment opportunities during the training period and beyond – and of degree programmes offered. With regard to the latter, discussion with the Head of Urban Studies about the potential for extension to honours and for LWTT tutors contributing to courses leading to a postgraduate masters programme should be undertaken as well as consideration of the possibility of a research masters degree undertaken at LWTT.

**Action: LWTT Director; Head of Urban Studies**

- 4) Should a BME programme or similar be repeated or under consideration in the future, steps should be taken to ensure that it is not exclusive or in effect positively discriminatory, and thereby limited in scope and student experience.

**Action: LWTT Director**

### **3. INTRODUCTION**

3.1 The LWTT has delivered the University of Glasgow Bachelor of Community Learning and Development (BCLD), formerly Bachelor of Community Education & Community Development (BComEdComDev), as a work-based general degree since 1995. Informal links with the Department of Urban Studies were formalised in 2005 when it became responsible for liaison with LWTT and oversight of the University's oversight of the delivery of the BCLD programme. The BCLD programme was approved through the University's programme approval process in 2005; therefore the purpose of the visit was to formally review the operation at LWTT.

3.2 The role of the Panel was to:

- consider the documentation in detail; and
- following discussions with relevant parties, make recommendations to the Academic Standards Committee and thence to Senate.

3.3 The timetable for the visit is appended.

### **4. PRIVATE MEETING OF THE PANEL**

Following a tour of the facilities, the Panel identified the following areas for exploration:

- Strength of the partnership between LWTT and the University
- Financial stability and limitation of liability
- Student recruitment
- Assessment and the use of the University's Code of Assessment
- Impact of CeVe on assessment
- Workplace and placement arrangements including conflict management
- Quality assurance and enhancement procedures
- The student experience
- MOA

### **5. MEETING WITH THE DIRECTOR**

The Director, Ms Fiona Craig, was accompanied by Mr Fred Hay, a member of the LWTT Board.

5.1 When asked about the strength of the partnership between LWTT and the University of Glasgow, both Ms Craig and Mr Hay were of the opinion that the relationship was a strong one. It was acknowledged however that this was largely on account of the individuals involved. Mr Hay advised that, historically, the relationship had been at a Faculty level, but recent changes to the Faculty structure had necessitated a direct relationship with the Department of Urban Studies. The Director welcomed the

formal link with Urban Studies and agreed that the next step should be to formalise the relationship further with an MOA.

- 5.2 The Panel was keen to explore the issue of limitation of liability in the event of future funding difficulties. It was noted that in the documentation provided LWTT had clarified that, in the funding context in which they operated, it was only possible for them to guarantee one year's training on a year-on-year basis, rather than commit to the full three year degree. In the event of students being unable to proceed early exit qualifications would be awarded as appropriate. The Panel was keen to ensure that the University was in a similar position and that this should be reflected in the MOA.
- 5.3 The Panel highlighted the need for the MOA to also reflect the mechanics of the link with the Urban Studies Department, particularly, how it operated in relation to the quality and maintenance of academic standards.
- 5.4 The Director clarified the role of the Community Education, Validation and Endorsing Committee (CeVe), the professional endorsing CLD body in Scotland. The Panel was advised that CeVe validates LWTT's provision on the basis of 6 competencies - a recent review in September 2008 had resulted in 2 minor conditions. The Director confirmed that she is currently involved on behalf of the newly formed Standards Council, in a review of these competencies as they were now considered to be less relevant given the more varied range of current settings for CLD work. She confirmed that LWTT were always mindful of the need to satisfy both the requirements of the CeVe and the University. The Panel advised that it was important to monitor the potential impact of a change in the competencies on the programme and suggested that the Director should liaise closely with the Urban Studies Department on this at the appropriate time.
- 5.5 The Panel was keen to explore LWTT's recruitment processes. The Director confirmed that they adopted a two stage approach. The first stage involved meeting local employers with a view to identifying potential employment opportunities. Parallel to this, they try to identify potential sources of funding to support the programme. Once confirmed, the positions are advertised locally, and, following an initial screening process, applicants are considered by a joint panel of employer and LWTT representatives. The representatives from LWTT normally consist of the Director and a tutor who would consider the academic potential of the applicant on behalf of the University. Following further investigation, the Panel was assured that the students were being treated equitably and that no compromises were being made on academic potential.
- 5.6 The Panel concluded by commending LWTT on their very high retention rates and outcomes.

## **6. MEETING WITH KEY STAFF**

The Panel met with a group of three full-time tutors.

- 6.1 The Convener confirmed the background and purpose of the review. He explained that although the relationship between the University and LWTT had been successful and long-standing, this had been, in the main, due to the people concerned. As a result, a need to further formalise the relationship had been identified.

- 6.2 When asked about their views on the nature of the relationship between LWTT and the University, the staff confirmed that it continued to be a positive one. They had found the link to the University facilities invaluable and reported that to date, they had made use of the Library, and also the Student Disability Service for dyslexia screening. They also confirmed that they welcomed input from experienced GU staff in both teaching and research. The Panel encouraged the staff to contact the Urban Studies Department directly on any requirements and the staff in Urban Studies would liaise with the relevant University staff on their behalf.
- 6.3 The Convener confirmed that part of the role of the review was to consider LWTT staff as potential approved teachers of the University. Subject to approval, they would be eligible to access the University's Staff Development opportunities at the University and teach on Urban Studies courses if called upon to do so.
- 6.4 When asked about the student recruitment process, the staff confirmed that they were directly involved taking it in turns to accompany the Director on recruitment panels. In addition, they organised associated recruitment road shows.
- 6.5 The Panel was keen to explore whether or not they had experienced any additional difficulties associated with a body of mainly mature students. The staff acknowledged that there were often initial difficulties associated with skills such as essay writing, however, these were normally quickly addressed in the first 10 week unit which essentially served as an induction to learning. The staff assured the Panel that the students were highly motivated and very passionate about their subject - a view confirmed during the Panel's discussions with the students. The staff acknowledged that there was a need to balance academic and pastoral care to avoid any conflict. To do this, they had adopted a shared separation of responsibilities for students which helped avoid the dangers of becoming too involved. They also identified a need to refer students more quickly to experienced support services staff at the University when the occasion demanded such action.
- 6.6 The Panel was pleased to hear about the level of contact between the staff and the workplace and placement supervisors and was encouraged by LWTT's requirement that supervisors had the appropriate level of qualifications and/or experience. The staff confirmed that regular monthly meetings are held with the workplace and placement supervisors separately as well as an annual 3 way meeting allowing for discussion on any particular areas of difficulty. In cases of conflict between LWTT staff and the supervisors, LWTT staff monitor the supervision and identify possible solutions.
- 6.7 The Panel was keen to explore the formal processes in place for gathering feedback from students. The staff reported on the use of pop quizzes which helped to identify any learning gaps and inform on the quality of the teaching. In addition, a formal evaluation is undertaken at the end of each unit. The LWTT Board, which includes a student representative, considers a summary report from each formal evaluation exercise. The staff felt that, given the level of one-to-one communication with each student, it was not necessary to establish a formal Staff Student Consultative Committee.

- 6.8 It became apparent through discussion that the staff were not fully aware of quality enhancement issues, and it was agreed that the Urban Studies Department should ensure that they circulate any relevant information to LWTT in future.
- 6.9 The staff welcomed the introduction of the University's Code of Assessment which they agreed had been a very useful tool. They explained that every assignment is double marked and in situations of disagreement they would ensure that the assignment is third marked.
- 6.10 When invited to comment further, the staff raised the issue of research. They welcomed the opportunities for research afforded by LWTT, although it was acknowledged that they had to maintain a delicate balancing act between time available for research and teaching.

## **7. MEETING WITH STUDENTS**

The Panel met with a group of 7 students including 2 graduates of the BME programme and 5 current Level 3 students.

- 7.1 The Panel was assured to see the level of enthusiasm and commitment displayed by the students and explored their reasons for undertaking the programme. The students confirmed that they had chosen to study the programme at LWTT to enhance their professional development - a number had been recruited to the programme and the associated posts, others had opted to complete the programme independently. The programme had been recommended to all and they were very content with the provision at LWTT. They also confirmed that the programme had provided them with an opportunity to undertake University level study which would otherwise not have been available to them.
- 7.2 The Panel was keen to explore whether the course was delivering what it had promised. The students unanimously praised the structure and delivery of the programme, particularly the practice-based approach, which they felt better afforded them the ability of fulfilling employers' expectations of fully functioning professionals from the outset. Their biggest challenge was the pressures of study given their home commitments. The BME students confirmed that they would have preferred a greater mix of students as the programme lacked a balance of experiences. It was agreed that the constitution of the programme had likely been dictated by the available funding.
- 7.3 When asked about their exposure to the University and its facilities, the BME students confirmed that their programme had been taught by LWTT staff mostly on campus, specifically, in the Adam Smith building. The students had enjoyed this experience citing the University as an "inspiring" place, however, they advised that due to the extensive timetable which involved all day lectures, they had not been able to engage with the facilities at the University in the same way as other University students. The Level 3 students did not currently attend the University for classes nor, as a result of time restraints, were they in the habit of visiting the University. They confirmed, however, that they had not felt in any way disadvantaged as they had access to the University through internet accounts and in addition, University student services staff had visited LWTT to inform them of the facilities available, some of which they had used. The students agreed however, that in future

it would be helpful if LWTT could identify one or two days in the timetable to attend the University as a group.

- 7.5 The Convener asked the students about their relationship with the tutors. They all agreed that the tutors were very supportive and that they were able to effectively negotiate with the workplace and placement supervisors.
- 7.6 When asked about their relationship with the workplace and placement supervisors, only one student reported slight difficulties with his placement supervisor, however, these concerns were addressed very quickly with the identification of an employment mentor and the establishment of regular monthly meetings. The students reported slight difficulties with the level of some of the employers' awareness of CLD, which was still a relatively new concept.
- 7.9 The students reported that they had discussed their programme with peers from other Universities and they had been reassured in their view that the provision from LWTT and the University was of a very high standard. Amongst other things, their peers had complained of no real sense of community, which they all agreed was a positive aspect of the programme at LWTT.

## **8. MEETING WITH PLACEMENT AND WORKPLACE SUPERVISORS**

The Panel met with a group of two Placement Supervisors and two Workplace Supervisors.

- 8.1 The Panel was interested to hear from the workplace supervisors about the level of mentoring and academic supervision they provided. One of the supervisors worked for the Council of Voluntary Service (CVS). A 12 month work plan would be agreed with all parties, which would normally align with the CVS national business plan. He confirmed that he provided ongoing day to day support and line management supervision. He holds monthly meetings with the students which are subject to a reporting process within the organisation. The discussions are also reported to LWTT staff through regular progress meetings with the tutors. The second supervisor present advised that she did not act as line manager to the students but adopted a more strategic role; nevertheless she maintained close contact with LWTT throughout the placement.
- 8.2 When asked for their view of LWTT and its students, one of the workplace supervisors reported that she had been very impressed with the response she had received from LWTT regarding her previous concerns with a few students. She felt that LWTT had dealt with the problems efficiently and professionally. Both placement supervisors reported a confidence in the abilities of the LWTT students, noting they were very easy to supervise. They felt that there was an impression in the sector that LWTT students were taking over. The supervisors did not see this as a problem, rather they agreed that the LWTT students, although challenging, brought a unique set of skills with them.
- .8.3 The Panel was advised that the students had the ability to identify their own placements, however it was acknowledged that resourcing and funding issues could potentially present problems for future placements.

- 8.4 The Panel was keen to explore the range of supporting material provided by LWTT in advance of the placements. The supervisors advised that they had been content with the level of material provided which consisted of student profiles and information on their aspirations as well as detailed placement packs.
- 8.5 The supervisors confirmed to the Panel that there was no conflict between their assessment of the students and those of the LWTT tutors due to the regular discussion between the student and tutor throughout the placement. They were content with the level of contact they had with all parties and their ability to contact the tutors at any time. The Panel suggested the introduction of collective meetings with all parties concerned; however, the supervisors were in agreement that they would not benefit from collective meetings, nor did they feel they were appropriate, given the need to maintain confidentiality.

## **9. FEEDBACK**

The Panel was joined by the Director and two Board members; Mr Fred Hay and Councillor Martin Oliver.

- 9.1 The Panel reported that they had been impressed with the operation at LWTT and noted that the abilities and energies of Ms Fiona Craig played an integral part. The Convener advised that the Panel had no major criticisms but it would be making a number of recommendations in a formal report. The recommendations would focus on the need for a formal MOA highlighting, amongst other things, the monitoring and review process – specifically how LWTT would link into the University’s Annual Course Monitoring, opportunities for student feedback, and committee reporting procedures. The Director of LWTT would be sent the draft report to confirm factual accuracy.
- 9.2 The Convener advised that the feedback from the students had been particularly positive, however, it was noted that the different student groups had differing experiences of the University. The BME programme had recruited nationally and as a result, students had been mostly taught by LWTT staff on the Glasgow campus, whereas, the other students had remained in Grangemouth. Although, the students were satisfied with this, it was felt that the students would benefit from more direct contact with the University and its services. It was agreed that this would be discussed further by the Director and Head of Urban Studies.
- 9.3 In light of concerns about a potential lack of balance in the BME programme, the Convener queried its future. The Director confirmed that due to the difficulties in securing initial funding for the programme, it was unlikely that it would be replicated in the future and that the policy developments mainstreaming equalities agenda would not make a student cohort like this as appropriate.
- 9.4 The Panel queried LWTT’s short term future in the current financial climate. The Director confirmed that the Scottish Parliament’s empowering agenda – delegating funding decisions to local authorities – had resulted in a change in regeneration funding. Funding now focused on thematic/interest groups and was no longer issued geographically. As a result, LWTT was exploring different funding avenues such as “Not in Education, Employment or Training” (NEET) and the Council for Voluntary Services (CVS), which had recently received lottery funding. In addition, she advised



that LWTT had become less reliant on grants and more on income generation through research and consultancy work. It was argued that in the current economic climate there was likely to be an increased need for LWTT's provision.

- 9.6 The Director confirmed LWTT's willingness to consider taught Masters or PhD provision in the future. However, due to time and resource issues, it was likely, that in the short term this would be through the provision of teaching on programmes within the Department of Urban Studies.
- 9.7 The possibility of extending the current three-year BCLD programme to honours was discussed. The Director highlighted a possible market for it, however, there was a need to discuss it with a range of stakeholders. There is some debate in Scotland with regard to the three year degree remaining the post qualification which is the Director's view.

**APPENDIX 1**

**Timetable for the Review Meeting**  
**Linked Work and Training Trust (Central) (LWTT), Grangemouth**

**Wednesday, 25<sup>th</sup> February 2009**

<b>0830</b>	<b>Depart University of Glasgow</b>
<b>0930</b>	<b>Arrive LWTT (Tea/Coffee)</b> <b>Tour of Facilities</b>
<b>0945</b>	<b>Meeting with Ms Fiona Craig and Mr Fred Hay</b>
<b>1015</b>	<b>Meeting with Key Staff</b>
<b>1100</b>	<b>Meeting with Students</b>
<b>1145</b>	<b>Meeting with Workplace and Placement Supervisors</b>
<b>1215</b>	<b>Private Meeting of Panel (Lunch)</b>
<b>1300</b>	<b>Meeting with Ms Fiona Craig, Mr Fred Hay and Councillor Martin Oliver</b> - to provide feedback
<b>1330</b>	<b>Depart LWTT</b>