



College of Science and Engineering

College Annual Monitoring Summary

Session 2010-11

Information on the Annual Monitoring process is available in the [Code of Practice on the Annual Monitoring Process](#).

1: Introduction

1.1 Method used to produce this report

(eg School Annual Monitoring Summaries (SAMS), consultations with School Quality Officers (SQOs), sampling of course and programme AMRs, reference to minutes of meetings, College Learning & Teaching Plan and Learning & Teaching Strategy, correlations with internal and external student experience surveys, discussions at relevant committees etc)

This report was compiled from a variety of sources. In addition to School Annual Monitoring Summaries, I met with the school quality officers both collectively and individually. In some instances I read year level Annual Monitoring Reports (AMRs) in addition to the school level report. I prepared the report for the discipline of Electronics and Electrical Engineering to feed into the overall engineering report. During the year two Periodic Subject Reviews (PSRs) were carried out - Electronics and Electrical Engineering and Psychology. In addition to being a member of the Learning and Teaching Committee of the College of Science and Engineering (COSE), I attend EdPSC, ASC and now the Teaching Infrastructure Working Group. Finally, as convenor of the Quality Officers Forum, I played an active role in the induction event for School Officers in February 2012. Feedback from the School Quality Officers (SQOs), at this event will help in formulating strategies to improve the quality process university-wide.

1.2 Contextual factors at the time of reporting

(eg University restructuring, local factors)

The deadline for the SAMs in Science and Engineering was 9th January 2012. However, by this date I had no complete returns. The date had been chosen after consultation with SQOs in order to allow inclusion of the official returns from external examiners and the outcomes of MSc boards of examiners. In retrospect this date was a mistake because more rapid feedback is needed. The SQOs were often the same people who had been badly affected by both the original problems with MyCampus and by the ongoing issues. However, SAMS and AMRs need to be seen as working documents, which are out of date as soon as they are written. As a result, we need to write them earlier to suit the 'UG year'. The PG reports would then have to be an update/addendum.

2: Management of the Student Learning Experience

2.1 Engaging and Supporting Students in their Learning

2.1.1 *Evaluation of the effectiveness of the mechanisms used for obtaining and responding to feedback from students*

(Please refer to the responses to Q.13 of the SAMS)

The official university wide mandatory questionnaire was almost universally disliked. The most common criticisms were :

- too long particularly when students took large numbers of 10-credit classes and
- not setup to gather feedback on the teaching of individual staff who are part of a team teaching a course.

COSE has devised a shorter form more suited to the requirements of our college. A new system, which would allow schools to mix paper and on line completion of course questionnaires, is under consideration by the university.

Students report that they fill in the NSS because they want the University to get a good rating to enhance the perception of their degree. This was stated at subject staff student liaison committees and confirmed by one of the SRC representatives at the College Quality Officers Forum.

Frank Coton presented to EdPSC an analysis of the NSS results, which demonstrated that there was weak correlation between the scores for feedback and the other NSS questions.

2.1.2 *Evaluation of the effectiveness of Staff-Student Liaison Committees (SSLCs) in engaging with matters related to Learning and Teaching*

(This will require sight of the minutes of overarching School-level SSLCs)

From what I have seen these continue to work well. Examples from which I have evidence to support this contention, include :

- Computing Science where the AMRs included specific references to issues raised and fixed,
- Physics and Astronomy where I saw the minutes in preparation for their PSR and
- Electronics and Electrical Engineering where issues for discussion are raised by staff as well as students and where the students do not just complain about problems but report on teaching approaches which they felt have worked particularly well. This turns the SSLC into a two-way communication process.

2.2 Managing the Learning Environment

Summary of the suitability of the teaching spaces and equipment used this year, including a bullet point list of unresolved issues requiring the attention of the College or the University (Please give specific details of room locations, the precise nature of the problem and the remedy that you seek)

(a) College-owned teaching spaces:

In COSE we have attempted to prioritise refurbishment of laboratories and are working with Estates and Buildings to tackle problems as money becomes available.

(b) Centrally-owned teaching spaces:

The essence of the problem with centrally owned lecture theatres can be summed up by the following verbatim comment from the lecturer for Electronic Engineering 1Y :

The lecture theatre (Rankine 408) has recently been refurbished. The data projector failed on about 1 occasion in 4; I had to carry a projector with me. No clock has been provided so I got one installed. The lighting system is controlled by unlabelled buttons; press the wrong one and the room goes dark, which means that you cannot see the buttons to choose another one. The central screen is large but the side screens are uselessly small and one is broken already. The lectern has no room for a laptop or lecture notes. The appearance of this room has been greatly improved but the functionality has been reduced.

Estates and Buildings and AV Services consulted local staff from the Rankine Building (Civil and Electronic and Electrical Engineering) before refurbishing this lecture room. They (or more precisely AV Services) then ignored nearly all our comments. From the returns for this year and from those of previous years, I believe that most staff would prefer to see

less spent per room in refurbishment,
the actual equipment more in line with what **lecturing** staff want and
more spent on maintenance.

We appreciate that the last point is a shift from capital to recurrent expenditure. Simple examples (not an exhaustive list) are :

cleaning white boards at least annually
a table to put down the paraphernalia carried (especially when lecturing away from home base) and
a hook to hang your jacket.

See also 4.2 (b) and summary at the end of 3.2.1.

Presumably as a result of lobbying on behalf of the Quality Officers Forum I have been asked to attend the Teaching Infrastructure Working Group. For this working group I have been asked to put forward a brief minimum spec per lecture room. Estates and Buildings have suggested that we try to supply them with lists of specific room issues in April/May because summer is their opportunity to tackle problems.

2.3 Equality of opportunity and effective learning for all students

*Please comment on any Equality and Diversity issues identified in Annual Monitoring and how they will be/have been addressed
(See Q. 13 of the SAMS)*

The SAMS suggest that this is not an issue but, through the College Learning and Teaching Committee, one school raised the issue of a disabled member of staff being allocated an unsuitable lecture room. I believe that we need a budget to respond when rooms need modified to accommodate disabled staff or students. The money for this could come from less elaborate AV equipping of rooms during refurbishment (see paragraph 2.2 above). Being able to react when necessary is probably a more sustainable approach.

3: Institution-led monitoring and review of quality standards

3.1 The effectiveness of the Annual Monitoring Process this session

3.1.1 *Evaluation of the standard of SAMS, identifying any areas for improvement*

I was more than happy with the information I received through the SAMS. If there were any minor deficiencies, they can readily be explained by the circumstances - the inevitable disruption caused by the university-wide reorganisation from departments into schools, the number of experienced staff who left under VS and what MyCampus failed to deliver,

Emerging from the Induction event and further discussion at the College Quality Officers Forum there is support for an improvement in the process. Within schools or subjects there are key documents which support our monitoring of quality. They are

AMRs

Staff Student Committee minutes

Summary of student Questionnaires

External examiners reports and dialogue

Statistical summary of results perhaps associated with the exam boards

Audits – PSR, accreditation,

An obvious suggestion is that the SAMS should become more of a commentary on the underlying evidence gathered from these documents. These documents together with the SAMS would then form the 'Quality Return' from each school. These Quality Returns would be useful for PSRs and accreditation visits.

I also believe that it would make sense for us to attempt better 'vertical integration' i.e. to design these three forms, AMR, SAMS and CAMS, together so that information can flow more readily in both directions, from AMRs all the way to CAMS and from CAMS back to next years AMRs.

3.1.2 *SQOs' evaluation of the quality of colleagues' engagement with reflection on good practice*

In some instances this was identified as being less than had previously been normal. In these cases the re-adjustment required after restructuring was the usual reason identified. In addition, two schools, Psychology and Maths and Stats, had also just overhauled their degree programmes and the SQOs alluded to the fact that the reflections by staff had been directed towards these internal review processes rather than being included in the annual monitoring cycle.

3.1.3 Overview of staff comments on the structure and/or content of the AMR form and suggested improvements

Many staff would like to see further simplification of the AMRs. In essence the AMR Forms are intended to find out :

‘What’s wrong and how we can fix it?’ and

‘What’s right and how we can publicise this good practice?’

At its core the necessary sections are therefore

1. Previous issues which are unresolved, subdivided into (a) school and (b) college/university
2. Current problems for fixing, again subdivided into (a) school and (b) college/university
3. Good Practice
4. Comments

3.2 Closing Loops

3.2.1 Progress in addressing key issues from the previous session, including whether staff and students have been informed of the responses to the issues that they raised

After I became the College Officer for Science and Engineering, I looked back at the previous reports for the faculties which had merged. I attempted to pick out themes which encompassed the major issues which were being reported, and I incorporated these into a College Quality Action Plan, which was approved by the Teaching Committee in January 2011. The themes were :

- Efficiency of operation - course statistics should be ‘automatically’ inserted into AMRs. This probably requires a dedicated teaching administrator per school or even per subject with large schools.
- Lecture Rooms and associated equipment not fit for purpose and not maintained. Staff views often ignored when refurbishing lecture rooms.
- Student engagement with the annual monitoring process
- Pressure for lecture notes on Moodle for each course
- Lecture Attendance
- The handling of large classes
- Short First Semester and consequent lack of revision time

These themes could equally have been derived from the list of issues for this year in section 4.2 (b). This is to be expected because these are substantive issues which will not disappear overnight. I suspect that tackling these issues successfully will require persistence over a time span of at least 5 years.

3.2.2 Strategy for communicating responses to issues raised in this year’s Annual Monitoring Reports to staff and students

To communicate with staff, a dual approach will be used - through the School Quality Officers and through the College Learning and Teaching Committee. For students, the mechanism will be via the SQOs to the SSLCs.

4: Strategic Approach to quality enhancement

4.1 Good practice identified for dissemination via the Senate Office website

(Bullet points will suffice; please note the name of the School and the name of the staff member who can be contacted to provide further information)

GES

- Feedback is typically provided quickly, in part this is achieved by reducing the scale of individual elements of continuous assessment but also students are informed if there are unexpected delays in providing feedback (Dr Tim Dempster)
- Students appreciate the availability of staff who generally operate an open door policy (Dr Tim Dempster).
- Continuing to utilise Moodle for communication, numerical exercises, and assessment (tests) (Dr Derek Fabel)
- Much effort has been put into using Turnitin for essay feedback and developing writing skills (Dr Fiona Meade). This work has been presented to the Learning and Teaching centre as an invited talk and has been requested as an example for the university assessment case studies.
- In 2010-11 we introduced an induction to teaching on level one for all PGTAs involved in Level One and set up a workshop session where PGTAs get specific advice on marking. This has helped ensure that PGTAs involved in the course feel part of the team and also has helped to ensure that their marking of assignments is in line with the grade related criteria. (for further details speak to either Dr David Featherstone, Dr Cheryl McGeachan, Isla Forsyth or Will Hasty).
- We introduced feedback sessions for essays outside tutorials where students could get detailed feedback on assignments. This has been useful in developing students experience of feedback on the course (for further details speak to Dr Cheryl McGeachan).
- Introduction on a trial basis of video-recording of student seminar presentations (Dr Jim Hansom).

Engineering

Examples of good practice have been identified across the discipline areas. Specifically highlighted areas include:

- In EEE the External Examiner found the summary statistics sheets of great value when conducting annual monitoring, making it easy to identify areas of concern (Karen McIlvaney). The flexibility in the degree programmes was also highlighted, enabling students to transfer between specific programmes, even up to the final year (Scott Roy or Martin Macauley). The unique features of the Electronics with Music course was seen as a very good collaboration (Nick Bailey), and the course in Careers Skills was identified as contributing to enhanced graduate attributes (Nigel Johnson).
- In Aerospace the continuing involvement of industrial partners in the MEng design and industrial projects has a positive impact on graduate employment prospects
- Appropriate use of technology to provide feedback to students on assessed work is currently being considered by Civil Engineering with the assistance of the Learning and Teaching Centre
- The new programme in Biomedical Engineering provides students with the opportunity to spend a day at the Royal College of Surgeons and Physicians of Glasgow, and the Queen Elizabeth Spinal Injuries Unit. In addition, interest in the discipline is bolstered through a series of lectures on applications of Biomedical Engineering, and through research seminars (Liz Tanner)

Psychology

Within the Designated degree the Career Service was asked to provide targeted help for the students on this course. This was in response to students' requests. Archie Roy from the careers service provided an excellent session tailored entirely to the need of student graduating with a non-Honours degree. This proved very popular with the students and has been repeated this year.

Physics and Astronomy

Astronomy 1: Students appreciate the continued use of podcasts for some lecture courses and PRS handsets at tutorials. Enrichment activities are well appreciated and supported by the class. The class also strongly supports the undergraduate astronomical society in hosting observing sessions at the Observatory and lectures on popular astronomy topics.

4.2 Key themes identified in Annual Monitoring, including any correlations with the findings of internal and external student experience surveys

(Bullet point lists with the School(s) identified in brackets; please subdivide the lists to indicate whether identified by students, staff or External Examiners)

(a) Positive messages and how they have been disseminated:

The excellent quality of many of the AMR forms was very noticeable. They gave an impression of competent staff, who were well acquainted with their cohorts of students and the staff teaching them and who were therefore in a position to comment knowledgeably on problems and issues. The current structure of the SAMS, part commentary and part compilation of lists of issues/good practice, gave the School Quality Officers a more difficult task to produce a coherent report. Despite this, I was also more than satisfied with the school-level report within the constraints imposed on the SQOs. I will feed back these positive comments through the SQOs.

(b) Matters identified for attention:

Chemistry

Chemistry would benefit from an effective teaching administrator as much of the administration of teaching is done by academic staff. This comment echoes through the AMRs. An administrator could help with e.g. collating and formatting exam papers, inputting information into MyCampus, monitoring class lists etc. Freeing up time for teaching staff would allow them to spend more time on their teaching and research activities, e.g. preparing and submitting more research proposals and hence generating income for the University, for a relatively small investment. Sadly this comment is a recurring theme and Chemistry should have benefitted from such an appointment years ago.

Once again, a lack of tutorial-size accommodation within the Joseph Black building is noted, which hampers small group teaching.

Some comments relating to MyCampus suggest that more control is needed to avoid students being able to enrol on the Science Fundamentals course, which is not at a suitable level for all students.

Automated entry of course statistics into the AMRs would be a huge help.

AMRs should be available in June, so that they can be completed following the exam boards. School QA officers should be sent a link where these forms can be downloaded. There are comments from Class Heads that suggest websites required for downloading the forms have in some cases not been updated in a timely manner.

Engineering

Staff have commented on the very broad ability range and commitment levels of students, indicated by the wide spread of grades in some courses. This is exacerbated by the very short timescales associated with the 1st semester.

Related to the above point staff continue to express concern over poor attendance at lectures. The increased provision of course materials available on Moodle is suspected to be the root cause of this. Students have been reminded that Moodle is not an alternative to attending lectures.

Large class sizes in the early years continue to pose a problem with regard to providing adequate tutorial support. Use of graduate teaching assistants has helped. However this is limited by the availability of graduate students with the appropriate background in conjunction with the maximum hours allowed for teaching assistant duties.

Across the campus there are many lecture theatres which are not best suited to the teaching of technical subjects. Often it is simple, avoidable, mistakes in the basic design of the theatres – no provision for simultaneous projection and use of a whiteboard, for example. This is a continuing problem.

With regard to industrial projects, the code of assessment appeared to be fairly incomprehensible to many external supervisors, despite the fact that the supervisors also deal with students from other universities.

The severe staff shortages, and hence increased workloads, in some discipline areas, notably Aerospace and Civil Engineering, have led to increased stress levels amongst existing staff. A programme of new appointments is underway which should help to alleviate some of the difficulties.

In some areas of the School the benefits associated with the change in line management structure have yet to be fully appreciated by staff. Some work remains to be done to alleviate concerns of staff regarding the loss of identity within discipline areas, and the risk that this is transmitted to the students.

With regard to concerns raised, these have been associated with both specific and general aspects of the provision. Reports and responses have been communicated to the Senate Office, and include comments associated with:

- 90 min exam durations and IT problems in Civil Engineering
- Ensuring consistent quality of industrial projects for Aerospace students
- Time scale between end of teaching and exams in semester 1
- Continued dislike by some External Examiners of the 22 point scale associated with the Code of Assessment (CoA)
- Adequacy of the abilities of a significant number of students in Maths and English

Maths and Stats

1) There is a concern that not all Senior Advisers of Studies fully understand which students to encourage into Mathematics 1R/1S and which into Mathematics 1X/1Y, causing a great deal of confusion and unnecessary work for the School at the start of the session.

2) A perceived difficulty in finding appropriate tutorial rooms was mentioned in several reports, especially (but not only) at Levels 1 and 2.

3) One class head described problems with the AV equipment in Rooms 515 and 516, Mathematics Building.

4) It was suggested that new blackboards or whiteboards were urgently required in Rooms 416/417, Mathematics Building.

GES

- The School would benefit hugely from being based in a single building.
- Exceptionally high student / staff ratios remain a problem to the School, well in excess of all our “main competitors” in the UK.
- State of lecture theatre 109 in the Gregory building. Nice looking new theatre but its either too hot and stuffy or freezing. There is no air supply and conditions are basically not suitable for lecturing to students. This room is the responsibility of Central Room Bookings.
- The heating system in the Graham Kerr Lecture Theatre was abysmal during January – March 2011. Many students complained about the lack of heating.
- The cost of fieldwork does not appear to be considered in the funding of degree programmes. If we wish to maintain the academic integrity of our degree, and the student experience and satisfaction, programmes that rely on fieldwork as a critical part of delivering the vocational skills need to be adequately resourced.
- Better funding and availability of library resources.

Physics and Astronomy

It is essential that the teaching spaces in the Kelvin building are properly maintained. Lecture theatre 222 is still in need of maintenance, with lectures experiencing problems with AV equipment and broken seats.

There are also major issues with several of the classrooms outside the Kelvin building used for lectures. Room C407 in the lecture theatre is still regarded as unsuitable for teaching. It is still used for A2 lectures, despite consistent request for a better location, and its awkward layout is causing problems given the significantly increased A2 class size in 2010-11. Moreover, most astronomy students take physics courses, so a lecture theatre in the Kelvin building will reduce the time it takes to move between classes.

Physics honours lectures are still being allocated by Central Room Bookings to many different lecture theatres all around campus. It would be preferable if most students studying Physics were able to have their lectures in the Kelvin Building.

A seminar room in the Kelvin Building (room 235) should be refurbished so that it may be used for teaching of small classes (less than 30 students), which would accommodate most optional Honours classes

The teaching space at the University Observatory is struggling to cope with the astronomy honours class size and needs to be improved.

Psychology

Room booking for Level 3 is a perennial issue. The class are required to change rooms within one 2 hour teaching Block which causes disruption.

Quality Officers Forum February 2012

Discussions highlighted good practice with regards to input from external examiners. A number of Subject Areas use the Board of Examiners meeting as a forum for the initial consideration of annual monitoring because it allows timely input from all colleagues and, importantly, it elicits feedback from the external examiner without waiting for receipt of their formal report.

4.3 Reflection on Results

*Overview of the standard of reflection on results patterns in SAMS
(Please identify any deviations from the College norm which may require the attention of the College or the University)*

The SAMS commented on failure rates as appropriate. In addition, through the College L+T Committee, the head of teaching from each school was asked to comment on the failure rates for the previous session. Data from the Planning Unit was circulated for courses with more than 25 students and with a failure rate of more than 20%. I presented a brief summary to the Committee.

The courses identified by these criteria tend to be those with problem based questions, often involving numerical or mathematical analysis. As expected, the replies from the schools indicated that the problem courses evident from the data had already been identified within the department/school and remedial action had been taken where possible or was planned e.g. students taking Physics (Astrophysics 4) or those resitting 3rd year Chemistry. Analysis of pass rates in Electronics and Electrical Engineering following the introduction of 90 minute exams to conform to the Senate Policy on exam duration showed a fall in pass rates. Subsequently Electronics and Electrical Engineering reverted to 2 hour exams and the pass rates recovered.

Engineering has many more courses than other schools in COSE because it is bigger. The data for Engineering can be broken down but only by research division instead of teaching discipline. This illogical approach does not map well onto the degree programmes and hinders analysis of problems. Lack of visibility of the teaching disciplines was identified by the PSR for Electronics and Electrical Engineering in February 2011 and the School of Engineering was asked to fix it but have not yet done so. This also hinders clarity of presenting information to students in the course catalogue. At the February meeting of ASC, problems arising from a split teaching/research structure were identified in the recent PSR for Biological and Life Sciences. It would seem prudent for Engineering to be formally alerted to this fact and to be reminded of the recommendation to make the teaching disciplines more visible.

Increasingly I would expect high failure rates to be detected and commented on more rapidly at exam boards.

Chemistry reported that some of their large courses were missing from the overall planning office data – not just the data for the courses with poor pass rates.

4.4 College Learning and Teaching Plan

Progress made by Schools this session with identified aspects of the College Learning and Teaching Plan

(a) Topic

Since the College of Science and Engineering was a new entity for session 2010-11, the College Learning and Teaching Plan, written mainly by David Fearn with input from the L+T Committee, was not in place until during the session. However, retention and feedback were highlighted in the plan and these topics appeared in all the school quality returns. Both the timeliness and nature of feedback has been improved across the College. However none of us is complacent and we recognise that more still needs to be done. Attendance monitoring and follow-up of students who show signs of dropping out are widely practised, particularly in first year. COSE also has a Retention Officer (Lorna Love), a university teacher whose primary remit is to keep retention at the forefront of the College's Learning and Teaching agenda.

4.5 University Learning & Teaching Strategy

Summary of College and School initiatives and the progress made in the current academic session in relation to the topics that follow:

(a) Assessment and Feedback

See 4.4 (a)

(b) Retention

See 4.4 (a)

4.6 Periodic Subject Review (where applicable)

*Evaluation of the effectiveness of arrangements for consulting with students during the preparation of Self Evaluation Reports (SERs) for Subjects undergoing Periodic Subject Review (formerly known as DPTLA)
(This will require discussion with SQOs)*

This is best answered by direct quotes from the summaries of the finding of the two PSRs.
PSR in Electronics and Electrical Engineering Feb 2011.

*1.1.3 The Self-Evaluation Report (SER) had been prepared by the Head of Discipline, together with the QAA Officer, the MSc Director of Studies, the MSc Co-ordinator and the former Staff/Student Committee Convener. It was noted that input had been sought from staff and students. This inclusive approach was **commended** by the Panel as good practice.*

Psychology

The SER, which the Review Panel considered to be exemplary in its honest and reflective approach, delivering a comprehensive and engaging account of the School's activities, and describing many areas of impressive innovation and good practice. [para 1.1.5]

4.7 Reviews by Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (where applicable)

*List of Subjects that have undergone professional accreditation/reaccreditation this year, including aspects of good practice and any areas of concern identified in accreditation reports submitted to the College Learning and Teaching Committee and how they will be/have been disseminated/addressed.
(This may require discussion with SQOs)*

Reports on these will be available after the April 2012 meeting of ASC.

4.8 Collaborative Activity (where applicable)

Please comment on any additional arrangements that Schools may have put in place to monitor and support the learning experience of students on established UK or international collaborative programmes such as joint/double (dual) award arrangements or those involving students who have articulated onto a programme or course offered by the College from a partner institution.

(This may require discussion with SQOs)

No comments were offered by the SQOs for year 2010-11. However, in session 2011-12, Singapore Institute of Technology will come on stream with students taking the BEng in Mechatronics and in Mechanical Design Engineering. The students in Singapore will enter into year 3 of the Glasgow students' curriculum. This development will be reported in the quality forms for next session.

The 2+2 arrangement for students from Brunei to enter the BEng in Electronics and Electrical Engineering has come to an end – the final students on this programme will graduate in July 2012.

4.9 QAA Enhancement Themes

Prevalence of Schools' engagement with the enhancement themes and proposals for promoting wider engagement where relevant

(This will require discussion with SQOs)

The prevailing attitude of SQOs in COSE is that the quality process should focus on ensuring that problems are identified and sorted and that good practice is disseminated. Consideration of these wider themes has naturally received less attention as staff adjusted to their changed circumstances in the aftermath of restructuring.

4.10 Observations on the effectiveness of the University's revised Annual Monitoring process and how it might be improved

Issues raised by SQOs (not just from COSE) at the Quality Officers Forum in February were

Restructuring

- One School Quality Officer reported being unable to engage meaningfully with all Subjects in a large School (not a comment from COSE)
- Poor communications links between Subjects
- Summarising issues from a course to School level dilutes a great deal of the useful detail

Engagement

- Staff are disillusioned with Annual Monitoring (and more generally)
- Response rates to student questionnaires (particularly electronic) is low
- Timing of AMR means submitting to an SSLC for comment is difficult

Role of School Quality Officer

- SQO lacks influence to bring about change
- SQO requires additional training and support

4.11 Observations on the usefulness of the University's Quality Officers Forum

The workshop also posed a number of questions of principle which require further consideration:

- Is the purpose of Annual Monitoring to report issues or to report that issues arose and were resolved?
- Does Annual Monitoring promote annual rather than continuous reflection?
- Is Annual Monitoring a digest of evidence or a commentary on the evidence?
- How can feedback on actions be improved within Schools?

4.12 Overall conclusions

1 Simplify the AMR forms into 4 sections

- previous unresolved issues,
- current problems within the school and beyond school,
- good practice and
- comments.

[Discuss at ASC for action by QOF]

2 Design the forms (AMR, SAMS and CAMS) to improve linkages between them.

[Discuss at ASC for action by QOF]

3 Faster turn round time and inclusion in the ASC annual timetable

[Discuss at ASC]

4 Forward infrastructure issues to Estates and Buildings in April or May

[Senate Office to alert SQOs]

5 Visibility of disciplines within Engineering

[Discuss at ASC]