

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – 25 May 2012

**Periodic Subject Review: Report of the Review of Management held
on 12 and 13 March 2012**

Gavin Lee, Clerk to the Review Panel

Review Panel:

Professor Neal Juster	Vice Principal (Strategy and Resources)
Professor Ken Russell	Robert Gordon University, Aberdeen, External Subject Specialist
Professor Ken Gibb	School of Social and Political Studies, Cognate member
Dr Alan Owen	Senate Assessor on Court
Ms Niamh Smith	Students' Representative Council
Dr Mary McCulloch	Learning and Teaching Centre
Dr Lorenzo Vigentini	Learning and Teaching Centre
Ms Fiona Dick	Senate Office
Mr Gavin Lee	Senate Office, Clerk to the Review Panel

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Management, formerly known as the School of Business and Management, is one of three subjects within the Business School in the College of Social Sciences.
- 1.2 Management is located in the Gilbert Scott Building, adjacent to Accounting and Finance and soon to be joined by Economics to co-locate the three Subjects which form the School. Management makes extensive use of various large lecture theatres across campus to accommodate large undergraduate classes and the Western Infirmary Lecture Theatre is being developed and expanded to provide increased postgraduate teaching space for Management (see paragraph 3.9.14).
- 1.3 Management was last internally reviewed through the Departmental Programmes of Teaching Learning and Assessment (DPTLA) process in 2006. This review commended the Department for the retention of a high level of commitment from staff in times of extremely rapid change and for the appointment of a Convener of Postgraduate Student Affairs. (Further discussion at 3.7.4) It also recommended action, amongst other areas, in relation to organisation and management and the development of appropriate teaching space.
- 1.4 The Self Evaluation Review (SER) was prepared by Professor Martin Beirne, Professor of Management and Organisational Behaviour, considered by Programme Conveners, the Business School Directors of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies and Postgraduate Programmes Manager and approved by Head of Subject.
- 1.5 The Review Panel considered the SER to be comprehensive and descriptive of the Subjects current standing. The Panel was disappointed though that the SER did not

adopt a more reflective, strategic approach and include greater consideration of future developments. The Panel had some concerns regarding the limited consultation of students in the process of drafting and agreeing the SER and considered that the Subject could have made greater effort to engage students.

- 1.6 The Review Panel met with Dean of Learning and Teaching, Professor Tom Guthrie; Head of School, Professor Farhad Noorbakhsh; Head of Subject, Professor Iain Docherty; Lead on SER, Professor Martin Beirne; Director of Undergraduate Studies (Business School), Dr Moira Fischbacher-Smith; Director of Graduate Studies (Business School), Professor Robbie Paton; and the Director of Research (Business School), Professor Denis Fischbacher-Smith. The Panel noted that the Head of Subject was appointed part way through the PSR preparation process. The Panel also met with 25 members of staff, including administrative staff, 3 probationary members of staff, 4 Graduate Teaching Assistants, 7 postgraduate taught (PGT) students and 10 undergraduate (UG) students.
- 1.7 The Panel found meetings with staff and students very productive but expressed disappointment at the number of students who attended the meetings noting that they did not reflect the diversity of student population or the broad range of provision.

Background Information

- 1.8. At the time of the review, Management had 35 members of Academic Staff including 1 Research Associate, 4 Senior University Teachers, 7 Lecturers, 9 Senior Lecturers and 14 Professorial staff. The Subject had 7 members of Administrative Staff and was also supported by 2 senior members of Administrative Staff based in the Business School. In addition, 31 adjunct teaching staff were employed, as discussed in paragraph 3.9.5.
- 1.9 Student numbers for Session 2011-12 are as follows:

Students	Headcount
Level 1A	365
Level 1B	343
Level 2A	200
Level 2B	190
Level 3 Honours Joint	31
Level 3 Honours Single	80
Level 4 Honours Joint	34
Level 4 Honours Single	70
Undergraduate Total Enrolments	1313
MSc Generalist Total	276
Management	62
International Finance	116
International Real Estate	14
Human Resources	27
Enterprise and Business Growth	21

Engineering	36
MSc Specialist – Total	124
International Leadership and Management	15
International Management and Design Innovation	1
International Strategic Marketing	62
International Business and Entrepreneurship	46
Masters of Business Administration (MBA)	60
Postgraduate Taught - Total	460
Postgraduate Research*	16 Full Time 17 Part Time 3 Writing Up

*(for information only - research is not covered by the Review)

- 1.10 The Review Panel considered the following range of provision offered by the Subject:
- MA Business & Management
 - Master of Business Administration
 - MSc Management
 - MSc Management with Enterprise & Business Growth
 - MSc Management with Human Resources
 - MSc Management with International Finance
 - MSc Management with International Real Estate
 - MSc International Business & Entrepreneurship
 - MSc International Business & Economic Development
 - MSc International Management & Design
 - MSc International Management & Leadership
 - MSc International Management for China
 - MSc International Strategic Marketing
 - MSc in Engineering and Management (Aerospace, Civil, Electrical and Mechanical)
- 1.11 The Subject also delivered undergraduate and postgraduate taught service teaching for courses in Engineering, Media Studies, Public Health, Public Policy and Urban Studies.
- 1.12 The Panel noted that all Management programmes were accredited by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) and that the MBA was accredited by the Association of MBAs. Management intended to seek European Quality Improvement System (EQUIS) Accreditation in 2012-13.

2. Overall aims of the Subject's provision and how it supports the University Strategic Plan

- 2.1 The SER stated that the restructure of the University to create the Business School had been a catalyst to develop a School Strategic Plan. The Panel considered the plan and confirmed it was closely aligned with the aims of the University Strategic Plan and University Learning and Teaching Strategy, with aims and outcomes closely aligned to University Strategy. This was confirmed by the Panel during the review.
- 2.2 The Review Panel noted that restructuring of the three Departments into a single School had allowed the School to disseminate good practice between the Subject areas and allowed harmonisation of processes and practices in a number of activities. However, a number of staff reported disappointment that this exercise had sometimes led to standardisation rather than enhancement and had not always recognised the valid differences between the Subjects.
- 2.3 The Panel was disappointed that restructuring had led to uncertainty of role and confusion of responsibility between the Subject and the School and considered that moving key Administrative staff from Subject to School level had contributed to this. (Further discussion of staffing resources is in paragraph 3.9.1)
- 2.4 Management was also subject to external strategic influences through accreditation bodies and reviews and intended to continue to reflect upon wider views, experiences, market trends and research themes to forge a distinctive identity and enhance its international reputation for teaching and research.
- 2.5 The SER highlighted an ongoing review of the Masters of Business Administration. The Review had been initiated to consider increased challenge in recruitment, benchmark initiatives, allow for internal reflection and discussion of unique features and developmental opportunities. The Subject considers the MBA to be an essential programme for a comprehensive Business School and the review has involved academic and administrative staff from across all Subject Areas within the Business School. The Review Panel **encourages** the Subject to complete their review of the MBA, ensuring that students are included in the consultation process to ensure that the redeveloped MBA meets student requirements and supports the School and University strategic aims for growth.

3. An Evaluation of the Student Learning Experience

3.1 Aims

- 3.1.1 The Review Panel reviewed Programme Specifications for the Subject's undergraduate and postgraduate provision. The Panel noted that all Specifications took cognisance of the requirements established in the relevant Quality Assurance Agency Subject Benchmarks and, in addition, to the requirements set by AACSB and AMBA.
- 3.1.2 The School Management Team confirmed that the Subject seeks to meet and lead market trends in development of provision, particularly at postgraduate level. The Team pointed to the development of Management programmes jointly with Glasgow School of Art as evidence of their innovative approaches and reported a strong relationship with Recruitment and International Office that allowed them to ensure the postgraduate provision was meeting market demands.

3.1.3 The Review Panel, guided by the views of the External Subject Specialist, confirmed that the programmes offered by the Subject remain current and valid in light of developing knowledge in the discipline, and practice in its application. At the time of writing the report the External Panel Member noted the importance of ongoing review to ensure currency and relevance.

3.2 *Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs)*

3.2.1 The Review Panel noted that students were provided with programme and course intended learning outcomes through course and programme handbooks. Students who met the Panel confirmed that this information was available in course and programme materials but most of the students acknowledged that they had not read this section of the handbook.

3.2.2 The Panel noted that while the Intended Learning Outcomes were appropriate, they did not conform to the Cowan and Harding format as suggested in the SER. The Review Panel **encourages** the Subject to review the intended learning outcomes to ensure they adhere to the University guidance on course design.

3.3 *Benchmarking and External Engagement*

3.3.1 As noted in paragraph 1.12, all Management's current programmes were subject to external accreditation and the Subject intended to seek additional EQUIS accreditation in 2012-13. In addition to external accreditation, the School consults a Strategic Advisory Board with membership appointed from a cross section of the international, professional and academic business community. The role of the Strategic Advisory Board is to comment on the validity of taught provision, programme developments and highlight academic and commercial opportunities.

3.4 *Assessment, Feedback and Achievement*

Code of Assessment

3.4.1 The Review Panel noted that Undergraduate and Postgraduate Student Handbooks contained information on the Code of Assessment and students confirmed they were aware of the marking scheme. The inclusion of grade descriptors in the MSc Student Handbook was particularly welcomed by students who met the Panel. However, some of the students considered the 22-point scale to be more confusing than a percentage-based marking scheme and sought greater subject-specific grade descriptors.

3.4.2 Students who met the Panel expressed a desire for courses that are taught in Semester 1 to be assessed in Semester 1 rather than in the May Exam diet. While the Subject's approach to assessment meets the Code of Assessment requirements, the Panel **encourages** Management to consider amending assessment arrangements or to explain clearly to students the pedagogical reason for assessing in this timescale.

3.4.3 Probationary staff were very positive about the Code of Assessment and felt it was intuitive and had been clearly explained and communicated to them. They felt confident in applying the Code of Assessment and were confident that the Code of Assessment was being applied consistently across the Subject.

Double Marking

3.4.4 The Review Panel noted that the Subject applied appropriate double marking and moderation requirements dependent upon the course, level, type of assessment and the original marker. The SER reported that the extent of second marking increased

with the level of study, and was highest where marking or supervision was undertaken by contract or adjunct staff, including practitioners from outside the University. All dissertations at honours and postgraduate level were double-marked and a minimum of 20% of assessments were reviewed by External Examiners. The Review Panel found the processes for moderation and second-marking to be appropriate.

Dissertations

- 3.4.5 Staff expressed dissatisfaction with the management of undergraduate dissertation supervision allocation process believing that it was based on the operational process of supervising a dissertation rather than relevant subject specialisation. Staff felt this limited their ability to constructively engage with the topic and support the student to produce their best. The Review Panel were concerned to hear that workload allocation for supervision, including marking, of an undergraduate dissertation was limited to four hours per student. The Panel felt this was insufficient to provide adequate support. The Panel **recommends** that Management review the workload allocation for supervising undergraduate dissertations to ensure sufficient support can be provided to students. Undergraduate and Postgraduate students who met the Panel also expressed frustration at the length of time required to gain ethical approval for dissertations, citing delays of up to two months. Staff confirmed the ethical approval process for dissertations was bureaucratic and caused unnecessary delay. The Review Panel **recommends** that the process for ethical approval of dissertations be reviewed to ensure that the approval process does not delay students undertaking research for their dissertations.

Assessment Methods

- 3.4.6 The Head of Subject acknowledged that despite the significant growth in undergraduate and postgraduate student numbers, assessment methods had remained largely the same. This had led to an increase in workload for members of academic staff.
- 3.4.7 The Review Panel noted however, that a number of alternative assessment methods had been developed, such as e-assessment in Level 1A intended to encourage in-depth subject knowledge through multiple knowledge diagnostics. Undergraduate students who met the panel highlighted and commented favourably on the opportunity, at Honours level, to have more control over their own assessments and to select their own topic and, within reason and with the agreement of the course coordinator, method of assessment.
- 3.4.8 The Panel members who reviewed the programme specifications suggested the Subject area was over-reliant on examinations to the detriment of more innovative, continuous assessment. Undergraduate and postgraduate students who met the Review Panel expressed a desire for a broader range of assessment methods, in particular assessment by presentation.
- 3.4.9 Students expressed a clear understanding of the transferable skills developed through various assessment methods, and provided examples of using skills developed through assessments, such as presentations and team problem solving skills, in interviews for summer internships and graduate careers.
- 3.4.10 The SER highlighted a recommendation from the AACSB Accreditation review that Management should take a holistic overview of assessment and learning outcomes across provision within a programme not just within a course and undertake a mapping of programme outcomes to assessment method.

- 3.4.11 The Review Panel **recommends** that the Subject develop alternative assessment methods, in consultation with students, and increase the focus on continuous assessment and consider the correlation between assessment methods and programme learning outcomes.
- 3.4.12 Students should be involved in the consultation process to determine the alternative assessment methods as students raised concerns about the equity of effort and subsequent grading involved in group work. Students particularly raised concerns with regards to English language ability of some students and the negative impact that can have on group dynamics and the fair and equitable distribution of work amongst the group.

Feedback on Assessment

- 3.4.13 The SER stated that feedback on assessment was provided through summative feedback on a cover sheet and formative feedback throughout the piece of assessed work. The cover sheet is intended to highlight areas that have been handled well, areas of deficiency and guidance on how to improve. This feedback cover sheet was praised by students and GTAs for providing a structure for comments and clear guidance on how to improve. However, it was unclear if the standard cover sheet was employed consistently across all undergraduate and postgraduate provision as some students were not aware of it.
- 3.4.14 Students who met the Panel acknowledged that in 1st and 2nd year the large class numbers mitigated against the provision of full and thorough feedback on assessed work though they praised staff for being approachable and reported that staff would provide extended feedback in one-to-one meetings when requested.
- 3.4.15 The SER acknowledged low levels of student satisfaction with the level of feedback provided on assessed work. In 2011 44% of final year Management students reported receiving detailed feedback on their work and only 36% reported receiving feedback on their work promptly in the National Student Survey. The Review Panel noted that the Subject's policy on feedback was to return within three to four weeks which was partially out of line with the University policy which requires feedback to be provided within three weeks. Further, undergraduate and postgraduate students who met the panel reported instances of assessed work being returned two or three months after submission. Postgraduate students who met the Panel reported that they had often submitted subsequent pieces of coursework before having the first returned, which limited their ability to learn from the feedback. The Review Panel **encourages** the Subject area to consider the timetabling of assessments to allow pieces of continuous assessment to be returned to students in advance of their next submission to allow them to learn from the first piece. This was particularly important for postgraduate students who had a short space of time to develop their skills.
- 3.4.16 The Review Panel **recommends** that the Subject reviews its approach to providing feedback on assessed work with a view to fully meeting the timescales set out for the return of feedback in the University Assessment policy. The Subject should also ensure these timescales are met consistently throughout its provision.

3.5 *Curriculum Design, Development and Content*

- 3.5.1 The SER reported that the MSc provision was recently reviewed to ensure that the provision was addressing market demand and leading market trends (see paragraph 3.6.2). The Review Panel recognised that this was a welcome and positive review. This rationalisation has been broadly welcomed by teaching staff, however, it was noted that teaching MSc Core Courses to students on the Generalist MSc and

Specialist MSc programmes was challenging due to the differing experience and ability of the classes.

- 3.5.2 The Subject area provided a broad-range of elective courses at Honours and postgraduate level giving students access to courses delivered by academics with specific research or teaching interests in a specialism. The SER stated that, in order to retain this breadth of provision, Honours course were now taught on a biennial basis. Students who met the panel understood the rationale behind this but felt that communication could be improved to ensure that students were aware which courses would be available in which years.
- 3.5.3 The Subject area indicated an intention to further develop opportunities for placement-based learning opportunities and the Review Panel **encourages** the Subject to develop these opportunities.

3.6 *Student Recruitment*

- 3.6.1 The Review Panel **commends** Management on meeting and exceeding its recruitment targets for international students and contributing significantly to the University's internationalisation agenda by attracting a student body with international backgrounds.
- 3.6.2 The Subject area attributes its success in international recruitment to its strong relationship with Recruitment and International Office (RIO) where regular communication helps to ensure that the postgraduate provision meets market demand. Importantly, the Subject area was also in discussion with RIO regarding amendments to the recruitment process to ensure that Management could recruit the highest quality students. Further discussion of student integration is at 3.9.10.
- 3.6.3 The SER reported that the articulation route from Glasgow International College (GIC) was being re-evaluated. GIC offers pre-entry qualifications for international students in English language and pre-degree level training and had previously provided a number of students into undergraduate and postgraduate Management programmes. The Head of School reported that Glasgow International College recruitment figures had now decreased and the School and Subject had had to ensure, through alternative student recruitment routes, that student numbers in Management were not affected by the reduction in intake from GIC.
- 3.6.4 The Review Panel noted that it was intended to continue the growth in PGT numbers and **encouraged** the Subject area to consider its staffing resources to ensure that sufficient administrative support was in place to support academics, students and their learning and teaching activities (further discussed in paragraph 3.9.1).

3.7 *Student Progression, Retention and Support*

Progression

- 3.7.1 The SER noted that 64% of students progressed from Level 1 Management to Level 2 Management and 53% progressed from Level 2 into Management Honours in 2009. While the Subject area noted that this compared favourably with other Subject areas across the University staff who met the Review Panel indicated intentions to increase the percentage progressing in Management. The Subject had undertaken 'Honours Fairs' to encourage students to consider studying to Honours level in Management.

- 3.7.2 The Review Panel noted that the Subject area encouraged University of Glasgow undergraduates to progress to postgraduate taught education through a ten percent discount on tuition fees. The postgraduate students who met the Panel confirmed that this discount had been a key deciding factor in choosing to remain at Glasgow for their postgraduate degree. The Subject also had plans to introduce twenty five new Scholarships from 2012-13 to further encourage progression from undergraduate to postgraduate education.

Retention

- 3.7.3 It was confirmed in the SER that the Subject had engaged with the University's 'Early Warning System', particularly for first year students, and that it closely monitored attendance at tutorials and followed up with any student who missed a tutorial. The Subject considered that it was an important element of student support for the Subject to take on a monitoring role and provide pastoral support for students.

Support

- 3.7.4 The Review Panel discussed the student support available and, in the context of significant growth in student numbers, asked whether student support was delivered proactively or reactively. Staff considered they had remained proactive in providing student support and developing student support provision despite increasing student numbers. However, it was thought that capacity had been reached and there was limited opportunity for development work given time constraints. Students displayed an understanding of the competing demands on staff time and were grateful for the support that administrative and academic staff provided. The Review Panel **commends** the student support provided despite the high workloads and pressures on staff within the Subject area.
- 3.7.5 The SER highlighted the importance of the role of Convener of Postgraduate Student Affairs which provided additional pastoral support for MSc and MBA students beyond the formal Adviser of Studies role. The Review Panel noted that in the previous DPTLA the role had been recognised as an important, innovative development and were pleased to see that the role had been continued and had developed. The Panel considered that the role was wide-ranging and had made a significant impact in its areas of work; student health, social and community development, learning skills development and pastoral advice. The Review Panel **commends** Management for maintaining the role of Convener of Postgraduate Student Support and the Convener of Postgraduate Student support for her dedication. The Panel **encourages** the Subject to consider the effect of increasing student numbers on the workload of the Convener of Postgraduate Student Support and expectations of one member of staff.
- 3.7.6 As noted above, Management have been very successful in recruiting an international student body, see paragraph 3.6.1, which adds to the vibrancy of the Subject and corresponds to University Strategy. The Review Panel noted that many of these students required additional support with their learning and with their adjustment to the academic culture of the University. The Review Panel **recommends** that consideration is given to additional learning support that might be provided to support students whose first language is not English e.g. to develop an understanding of assessment requirements and criteria in order that students are enabled to reach their academic potential. Students reported very positively on the value and reward in having an international student body and the myriad of approaches and perspectives, morally and philosophically that it contributed an important element to discussion, particularly at postgraduate level.

3.7.7 The Review Panel noted that NSS results for the Business School showed a comparatively low level of satisfaction with 'Academic Support' and that the SER reported a trend of decreasing satisfaction with Academic Support. The SER reported that a Working Group had been established, convened by the Business School Director of Undergraduate Studies, to review the NSS results and develop an action plan. The Review Panel reviewed the minutes of the School NSS Working Group and noted that the Group considered that the appointment of a new Honours Convener had improved the students' experience. The students who met the Panel suggested that greater academic guidance and support could be provided if, in future, Advisers of Studies were based within the Business School and could therefore provide more contextualised support.

3.8 *The Quality of Learning Opportunities*

3.8.1 It was reported in the SER that a key feature of the approach to learning and teaching in the School and Subject was an emphasis on Research-led teaching. The Review Panel **commends** the high quality, research-informed teaching, particularly at postgraduate level, which was highly valued by the students who met the Review Panel. The Panel was pleased to note that Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) were encouraged to discuss their research-focus with their students in tutorials and the students and GTAs who met the Panel considered this to be a very valuable aspect of research-led teaching.

3.8.2 Undergraduate students who met with the Panel reported their appreciation of the broad-based College-entry system and saw great employability benefits in the opportunity to combine Management with another subject. A number of the students who met the panel were studying towards joint honours Management and a modern language.

3.8.3 Students reported very positive experience with the use of Moodle by the Subject, citing it as a vital tool for communication and provision of information. The Review Panel **commends** the use of Moodle as a tool to support student learning.

3.8.4 The Review Panel was informed by Probationary staff that innovation was an important element of the culture in the Subject area of Management and staff were regularly encouraged to enhance their teaching and assessment methods. Students who met the Panel recognised that a number of staff actively sought student input when developing their courses but others were less willing to adapt their materials or style. Student Feedback Questionnaire responses reviewed by the Panel also suggested that some of the case studies and examples given were dated and students would appreciate more relevant case studies.

3.8.5 Key Staff highlighted a number of courses which they considered to be innovative, engaging and valued by students e.g. Management as a Performing Art which employed theatre and drama to promote reflection explaining to students that collaborative art helps focus innovative activity, permit learning, encourages initiative and expands the range and depth of management and workplace contributions to organisational effectiveness. The Skills Development Workshop Series aimed to put students in contact with an experienced practitioner, as an alternative to an internship, to develop key management skills under the tutelage of the practitioner. The workshops were designed to reflect the needs and circumstances of the students on the course as the topics were chosen based on the previous years' workshops and requested topics from the current in-take of students. The teaching approaches used in the workshops were also adapted to suit the topics and to enhance student learning. Approaches used included: interactive discussion; case studies; individual and group exercises; psychometric testing and role play. The

Review Panel **commends** the Performing Art and Skills Development Workshop Series as a demonstration of the innovative teaching and assessment methods employed by Management and of its responsiveness to student needs and feedback to enhance the student learning experience.

- 3.8.6 The Review Panel noted the development of extra-curricular activities through the creation of the student-led UG and PG Business Clubs. The Business Clubs offered events and networking opportunities as well as engaging with University priorities such as graduate attributes and employability. The Clubs had recently organised a Business Skills Week in collaboration with the Careers Service. The Review Panel **commends** the student-led UG and PG Business Clubs and acknowledges the financial support given to them by the Subject area and the personal support given to them by dedicated members of staff.
- 3.8.7 The Review Panel discussed the issue of recording of lectures with students and staff. As noted above in paragraph 3.7.5, students whose first language was not English could struggle to engage effectively in lectures and seminars. Students reported that they understood that permission to record lectures was at the discretion of the lecturer and that opportunities were therefore inconsistent. Students confirmed that the desire for lectures to be recorded was not to remove the need to attend lectures but to overcome the challenges of accents and fast-paced lecturing styles which meant that students whose first language was not English sometimes struggled to comprehend sufficiently to take detailed notes in lectures. The Panel heard concerns from staff that if lectures were recorded attendance at lectures would drop and students would miss the benefit of the interaction within lectures. Staff also raised concerns with regards to intellectual property rights and the potential for distribution of their learning materials online. The Review Panel reported that a University Working Group had been established to consider the implications of recording of lectures. The Review Panel **recommends** that the School permits recording of lectures by individual students, or adopts a policy whereby all lectures are recorded officially and provided online to the relevant group of students to ensure that the students can benefit equally from the learning opportunities provided by recorded lectures.

Transferable Skills and Graduate Attributes

- 3.8.8 Students at undergraduate and postgraduate level who met the Review Panel displayed a clear understanding of transferable skills and the opportunities provided to them, within the curriculum and through extra-curricular activities that enhanced their employability. Students valued the opportunity to engage in the Graduate Skills Programme though students on the MBA would welcome a more subject-focussed programme designed for the specific needs of MBA students.

Course Handbooks

- 3.8.9 The Panel noted that staff and students viewed the Course Handbooks as a 'contract' which could be relied upon by both parties to ensure that promises and expectations expressed in the handbook would be delivered. The postgraduate students who met the Panel valued the programme handbooks and suggested that the Subject consider providing the handbooks at the point of offer to enhance the induction process.
- 3.8.10 The Review Panel considered the Undergraduate and MSc General Course Handbook to be comprehensive and thorough, particularly the general information in relation to student support. The Review Panel **recommends** that the Subject review the course and programme handbooks to ensure greater consistency of content, terminology and style.

3.9 *Resources for Learning and Teaching*

Staffing Resources

- 3.9.1 Staff and students that met the Review Panel were very positive about the support provided by administrative members of staff in the Subject and the School. The Panel noted the significant increase in workload on administrative staff which had been created by the continued growth in student numbers and compounded by the movement of staff during the restructuring process. Students displayed a great deal of empathy and understanding of the pressures faced by administrative staff though noted that there had been some impact on some aspects of organisation and management such as the timely communication of important information such as class cancellation or amendments to assessments. The Head of Subject identified the need for additional senior administrative management to support the development of postgraduate provision and the Review Panel **encourages** the Subject area to review administrative staffing levels to ensure that staff workloads are reasonable and equitable, that students have access to the support they need from administrative staff and that the Subject can continue to support further development of postgraduate provision.

Workload Model

- 3.9.2 The Review Panel was concerned that the workload model currently in place was not being used as a tool to manage the workloads of academic staff. This issue was discussed with staff who confirmed that the current workload model was informational and not used to ensure appropriate, equitable and effective deployment of staff. The Review Panel noted that the Business School was developing a workload model which would be implemented across the School in 2012-13. The Review Panel **recommends** that the new Workload Model is implemented and used as a management tool to review staffing profiles to ensure administrative and teaching loads are manageable and to ensure that the workload allocations take cognisance of local requirements and the impact of high student numbers.

Induction and Support for Probationer and GTA Staff

- 3.9.3 The Review Panel met with probationary staff and discussed induction and support available to them. The probationary staff who met the Panel commented very positively on the support available from colleagues, formally through mentoring, and informally from other colleagues, and felt that colleagues were open, supportive, reactive and flexible. The staff particularly praised the support provided to new international members of staff to assist their transition to the University. The Panel considered that the Subject took cognisance of probationary workloads and training commitments and adjusted their teaching and research loads appropriately. The probationary staff were very enthusiastic about the Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice (PGCAP) and the support provided by the Learning and Teaching Centre. They did, however, express views that there could be greater focus on the practical element of it and that the assessment burden could be lightened. The Review Panel **commends** the Subject area's exemplary induction, mentoring and support for Probationary staff.
- 3.9.4 It was noted that Management employed 14 Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) to deliver tutorials and undertake assessment across undergraduate and postgraduate provision. The Review Panel met with a group of engaged, enthusiastic Graduate Teaching Assistants with a range of one year to five years teaching experience at the University. The GTAs who met the Panel were very appreciative of the training provided by the Learning and Teaching Centre and the additional training and ongoing support offered by Management staff. The GTAs

praised the open-door policy employed by most staff and valued the opportunity to discuss teaching practice and approaches to assessment. As noted in paragraph 3.8.1, GTAs were encouraged to use their research to inform their teaching and the GTAs felt that this was a practical and beneficial approach particularly at postgraduate level. The Review Panel **commends** the training and support provided to GTAs by the Learning and Teaching Centre and the Subject area. The Review Panel also noted that the GTAs were unclear on the policy regarding payment for teaching preparation. The GTAs reported that tutors in other subject areas were paid for the tutorial time plus time for preparation for teaching and sought parity with other GTAs across the institution. The Review Panel **recommends** that the Subject area review their practice and ensure they are compliant with the University policy on GTA payment.

The Role of Adjunct Staff

- 3.9.5 Management employed 31 adjunct staff on hourly paid contracts to supplement the teaching provided by full-time University teaching and research staff. The adjunct staff had a wealth of experience in business and academia as active researchers and practitioners and were involved as Course Conveners, Project and Dissertation Supervisors. The adjunct staff were well embedded within the delivery of teaching across the Subject and the Adjunct Staff felt a strong sense of community, particularly due to the excellent administrative support provided to them. As Adjunct Staff were involved in all areas of teaching, learning and assessment the Review Panel **encourages** Management to ensure that adjunct staff were provided with appropriate training for teaching and assessment in the Subject and through the Learning and Teaching Centre.
- 3.9.6 Adjunct Staff were encouraged to develop innovative programmes and use their current practical experience to develop a blended learning style to support and enhance the student learning experience. As noted above in paragraph 3.8.5 Adjunct members of staff were drivers for delivering innovative, exciting courses to students.

Student Integration

- 3.9.7 The Undergraduate and Postgraduate Business Clubs provided a regular and varied programme of student-led learning events and networking, social activities which fostered a sense of community and cohesion for both staff and students. The students and staff involved in the Business Clubs are commended for their activities in paragraph 3.8.6.
- 3.9.8 The removal of the PG Social Learning Space is noted above in paragraph 3.9.15 and the Review Panel considered that the development of alternative social and learning postgraduate space would encourage greater integration between Management postgraduate taught students.
- 3.9.9 The School Management Team reported that they had discussed integration with Residential Services in an attempt to reduce the 'clustering' of nationalities in University Residences which further restricted international students abilities to integrate into the wider student body.
- 3.9.10 The Review Panel heard from staff and students that the significant recruitment from China hampered student integration as students tended to socialise with and gather in groups with others from their national or cultural background. Student feedback through questionnaires and surveys highlighted this was a concern for Home and EU students and for International students who did not expect to study abroad with such a high percentage of fellow students from their home country. The Review

Panel **encourages** Management to consider how to achieve greater diversity amongst the student body and counteract the issues of cultural dominance or isolation which students reported in feedback.

Provision of Central Services

- 3.9.11 The Review Panel noted that the Management Accreditation bodies placed a number of requirements on services provided by University Services. The undergraduate students who met the Panel reported positively on the work of the Careers Service, particularly valuing the Club 21 placement opportunities. International students at undergraduate and postgraduate level particularly welcomed the CV checking service offered by Careers Service. Postgraduate students however felt that there was scope for specialised career support to cater for the specific graduate requirements of MSc and MBA graduates.
- 3.9.12 The Subject area highlighted the role of Alumni in supporting the Subject and providing guidance to current students. At the time of the Review the Subject were in the process of appointing a member of staff with responsibility for engaging alumni. The Review Panel **encourages** the Subject area to increase the engagement with the Development and Alumni Office to maximise the benefits of their high quality alumni.

Accommodation

- 3.9.13 The Subject area was based within the Gilbert Scott Building though due to class sizes was often required to carry out teaching, particularly for undergraduate classes, in various locations across the University, including in some of the University's very large lecture theatres, such as the James Watt South. At Postgraduate level, due to the smaller group teaching, more teaching was undertaken in the local area and in the Gilbert Scott Conference Suite. The SER acknowledged that improvements made to centrally-managed rooms in previous years had improved the teaching and learning experience for undergraduate and postgraduate students.
- 3.9.14 As noted in paragraph 3.6.1, student numbers in Management have expanded rapidly in recent years, particularly at PGT level which has led to increased pressure on finding sufficient, appropriate teaching space. Due to the teaching style of a number of the Management MSc courses, i.e. long days with a combination of lectures and small group work in seminars, the Subject had very specific requirements for accommodation. The University had recognised this requirement and was seeking to develop the Western Infirmary Lecture Theatre (WILT) to provide additional lecture theatre capacity and greater, more flexible seminar space. The Subject reported positive engagement from academic colleagues in the design of the refurbished spaces to ensure they would meet teaching requirements. It was considered that the development of the WILT would help improve the collegiate feeling for the Subject. The Subject area **encourages** the University develop the WILT as a focal point for the Management and Business School MSc community within the timelines agreed.
- 3.9.15 Postgraduate students who met the Panel highlighted the lack of available social and learning space for postgraduate students which catered to the specific needs of postgraduates rather than those provided through the undergraduate-focussed Student Unions or the learning spaces in the Library. It was noted that the Postgraduate Learning Space in the Gilbert Scott Building had been used extensively by Management students previously, and had been highlighted as a benefit in the recruitment and induction processes, but had not been available to students in 2011. The Review Panel **encourages** the University to develop specific

postgraduate social and learning space to accommodate the increase in postgraduate student numbers and any temporarily unavailable learning spaces.

- 3.9.16 The Review Panel noted that the teaching space allocated for the MBA had not been updated in a number of years and that the Subject felt that the quality of accommodation lagged behind the quality provided at competitor institutions. The Subject considered accommodation to be a key consideration in the review of the MBA provision and a key factor in attracting the highest calibre students to undertake the MBA programme at the University. The Review Panel **recommends** the College redevelop the MBA teaching space to bring it to a standard of comparable Business School competitors to allow the University attract the best possible students in a competitive market.

4. Maintaining the Standards of Awards

- 4.1 The Business School QE&A Officers had responsibility for maintaining the standards of awards and the quality assurance and quality enhancement activities. In practice these officers were the Director of Undergraduate Studies, the Director of Graduate Studies and the Director of Research. These three Directors have roles on the School's Executive Group and carry overall responsibility for the delivery and development of programmes. They are supported by two senior administrators, taking leading roles for UG and PG support respectively.

Accreditation

- 4.2 The Subject area were subject to standards and expectations through their Accreditation bodies AACSB and AMBA (for further discussion of accreditation see paragraph 1.12). The AACSB require verification of provision against their 21 standards every five years through an onsite review. The last AACSB Review was conducted in December 2011 and confirmed that the Subject area continued to meet the expectations set commending the engagement of staff, students and external stakeholders and encouraging the Subject to align intended learning outcomes to provision and assessment methods. The AACSB Report had not been published at the time of the Periodic Subject Review so the Review Panel was grateful to the Subject for the verbal feedback on the report outcomes.

Annual Monitoring

- 4.3 The SER reported that Annual Monitoring was 'extremely valuable' and prompted systematic reflection about the nature and effectiveness of the Subject's programmes and courses and produced 'some extremely candid and thoughtful submissions that demonstrate a genuine concern for the quality of the student experience'. The Review Panel noted that Graduate Teaching Assistants were invited to provide feedback to the Course Convener informally as part of the Annual Monitoring Process. The GTAs who met the Panel valued the ability to provide this input as they felt their direct experience with students often meant that students would provide informal feedback on the course that they may omit from formal feedback questionnaires. The Panel **recommends** that the Subject area formalise the engagement of GTAs in the annual monitoring and review of courses to benefit from their direct delivery and engagement with students.

5. Assuring and Enhancing the Quality of the Students' Learning Experience

- 5.1 The University places a significant focus on the successful engagement of students in quality process and ensuring that the quality of the students' learning experience is high. This focus is partly driven by Scottish Funding Council requirements

articulated through the Quality Assurance Agency and partly to the University strategic aims to deliver an excellent student experience.

Operation of Staff Student Liaison Committees

- 5.2 The Review Panel reviewed the minutes of Staff Student Liaison Committees from the past three years. The Panel noted that the SER reported that SSLCs were held once per Semester at UG and PGT level. From the review of the minutes the Panel noted that SSLCs met once per Semester at Undergraduate, MSc General, MSc Specialist and MBA level. The Panel were disappointed that the minutes of SSLC meetings showed inconsistencies in quality and style, while some minutes appeared incomplete and some were missing. The Self Evaluation Review noted that 'SSLCs continue to be problematic' and in meetings with staff it was acknowledged that SSLCs had become largely mechanistic which staff considered to be due to the increase in student numbers.
- 5.3 The Review Panel did not consider there to be evidence of consideration of and progression of issues raised at SSLC evident in the minutes of the meetings. Students who met the Panel noted that similar issues arose on an annual basis and it was not clear to students on the SSLC that actions had been progressed. It was unclear to the Review Panel if actions were not being progressed or if the minutes were not constructed to demonstrate actions which were actually being undertaken.
- 5.4 The Review Panel **recommends** that Management ensure that monitoring and progression of issues raised at SSLCs are clearly recorded in the minutes and actions are published on Moodle and communicated to students.

Responsiveness to Student Feedback

- 5.5 The Review Panel acknowledged that responding to feedback from students is a recognised challenge across the University and noted the challenges in receiving feedback and responding within a timeframe that allowed the students providing the feedback to benefit from the related action. The Review Panel noted that this was particularly challenging in Management due to the significant number of postgraduate students studying in the Subject area for only one year. The Review Panel noted the importance of feeding back on action taken in response to feedback obtained from the previous cohort to increase the sense of responsiveness. The Review Panel **encourages** the Subject to consider undertaking mid-course feedback which will allow them to be more responsive to student feedback.

Feedback on Tutors

- 5.6 Graduate Teaching Assistants who met the Panel reported that feedback questionnaires had been introduced to evaluate teaching delivered by tutors. While the GTAs were initially apprehensive about this, they had found feedback on their performance as teachers very valuable which had allowed them to adapt their teaching style based on feedback from their students.

Student Representation on Subject and School-level Committees

- 5.7 The Review Panel noted from the SER and the documentation provided to the Panel that students were not members of the School Learning and Teaching Committee, Management Subject Committee or Business School Committee. The University guidelines following restructuring encourage Schools, and Subjects, to elect or appoint student representatives to School Learning and Teaching Committees as full members and other committees as appropriate. The Panel noted that student representatives will shortly be appointed to the Business School Learning and Teaching Committee and the Panel **encourages** School to implement this, in line with University policy.

6. Summary of Perceived Strengths and Areas for Improvement in Learning and Teaching (referencing both good practice and recommendations for improvement)

Key Strengths

- The successful recruitment of international, postgraduate students
- The rapid and strategic development of postgraduate provision to meet and lead market requirements
- The support provided to the postgraduate student community through the Convener of Postgraduate Student Support
- The valued, high quality, research-led teaching at undergraduate and postgraduate level
- The commitment of administrative staff to providing support to students and academics in challenging times of rapid growth and restructuring
- Exemplary levels of support provided to Probationary staff through formal and informal programmes

Areas to be improved or enhanced

- Additional administrative support
- Fair and equitable workload allocations
- Engagement of students in quality processes
- Additional support for international students
- Provision of feedback on assessed work within shorter timescales in accordance with University Feedback Policy

7. Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

The Review Panel commends Management on its delivery of a broad range of programmes at undergraduate and postgraduate level, and the quality of teaching evident across the provision. The importance the Subject area places on research-led teaching is commendable and appreciated by students and teaching staff. Management have successfully met and exceeded their targets to recruit international students and the Review Panel notes that Management are aware of the challenges posed by increased student recruitment. The Review Panel encourages Management to consider administrative staffing levels to ensure that the Subject area can continue to provide sufficient support to academics and students and ensure a fair and equitable workload balance.

Commendations

1. The Review Panel **commends** Management on meeting and exceeding its recruitment targets for international students and contributing significantly to the University's internationalisation agenda by attracting a student body with international backgrounds. [paragraph 3.6.1]
2. The Review Panel **commends** the student support provided despite the high workloads and pressures on staff within the Subject area. [paragraph 3.7.3]
3. The Review Panel **commends** Management for maintaining the role of Convener of Postgraduate Student Support and the Convener of Postgraduate Student support for her dedication. [paragraph 3.7.4]
4. The Review Panel **commends** the high quality, research-informed teaching, particularly at postgraduate level, which was highly valued by the students who met the Review Panel. [paragraph 3.8.1]
5. The Review Panel **commends** the use of Moodle as a tool to support student learning. [paragraph 3.8.3]
6. The Review Panel **commends** the Performing Art and Skills Development Workshop Series as a demonstration of the innovative teaching and assessment methods employed by Management and of its responsiveness to student needs and feedback to enhance the student learning experience. [paragraph 3.8.5]
7. The Review Panel **commends** the student-led UG and PG Business Clubs and acknowledges the financial support given to them by the Subject area and the personal support given to them by Senior University Teachers Mr David Logan and Ms Sheena Bell. [paragraph 3.8.6]
8. The Review Panel **commends** the Subject area's exemplary induction, mentoring and support for Probationary staff. [paragraph 3.9.3]
9. The Review Panel **commends** the training and support provided to GTAs by the Learning and Teaching Centre and the Subject area. [paragraph 3.9.4.]

Recommendations

The recommendations interspersed in the preceding report are summarised below. The recommendations have been cross-referenced to the paragraphs to which they refer in the text of the report. They are grouped together by the areas for improvement/enhancement and are ranked in order of priority.

Recommendation 1

The Review Panel **recommends** that the new Workload Model is implemented and used as a management tool to review staffing profiles to ensure administrative and teaching loads are manageable and to ensure that the workload allocations take cognisance of local requirements and the impact of high student numbers. [paragraph 3.9.2]

For the attention of: Head of School

Recommendation 2

The Review Panel **recommends** that Management ensure that monitoring and progression of issues raised at SSLCs are clearly recorded in the minutes and actions are published on Moodle and communicated to students. [paragraph 5.4]

For the attention of: Conveners of Staff Student Liaison Committees
For information: Head of Subject

Recommendation 3

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Subject develop alternative assessment methods, in consultation with students, and increase the focus on continuous assessment and consider the correlation between assessment methods and programme learning outcomes. [paragraph 3.4.11]

For the attention of: Head of Subject
For information: Head of Academic Development Unit

Recommendation 4

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Subject review its approach to providing feedback on assessed work with a view to fully meeting the timescales set out for the return of feedback in the University Assessment policy. The Subject should also ensure these timescales are met consistently throughout its provision. [paragraph 3.4.16]

For the attention of: Head of Subject

Recommendation 5

The Review Panel **recommends** that consideration is given to additional learning support that might be provided to support students whose first language is not English e.g. to develop an understanding of assessment requirements and criteria in order that students are enabled to reach their academic potential.. [paragraph 3.7.6]

For the attention of: Head of School, School Management Team
For information: Student Learning Service, College of Social Sciences
International Student Learning Officer

Recommendation 6

The Panel **recommends** that Management review the workload allocation for supervising undergraduate dissertations to ensure sufficient support can be provided to students.

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

Recommendation 7

The Review Panel **recommends** that the process for ethical approval of dissertations be reviewed to ensure that the approval process does not delay students undertaking research for their dissertations. [paragraph 3.4.5]

For the attention of: Head of Academic and Student Administration,
College of Social Sciences

Recommendation 8

The Review Panel **recommends** that the School permits recording of lectures by individual students, or adopts a policy whereby all lectures are recorded officially and provided online to the relevant group of students to ensure that the students can benefit equally from the learning opportunities provided by recorded lectures. [paragraph 3.8.7]

**For the attention of: Head of Subject
For information: Head of Learning and Technology Unit**

Recommendation 9

The Review Panel **recommends** the College redevelop the MBA teaching space to bring it to a standard of comparable Business School competitors to allow the University attract the best possible students in a competitive market. [paragraph 3.9.16]

**For the attention of: Head of College, College of Social Sciences
For Information: Director, Estates and Buildings**

Recommendation 10

The Panel **recommends** that the Subject area formalise the engagement of GTAs in the annual monitoring and review of courses to benefit from their direct delivery and engagement with students. [paragraph 4.3]

For the attention of: Head of Subject

Recommendation 11

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Subject area review their practice and ensure they are compliant with the University policy on GTA payment. [paragraph 3.9.4]

For the attention of: Head of Subject

Recommendation 12

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Subject review the course and programme handbooks to ensure greater consistency of content, terminology and style. [paragraph 3.8.10]

For the attention of: Head of Subject