

University of Glasgow**Academic Standards Committee – Tuesday 16 April 2013****Periodic Subject Review: Review of Timescale for Update Reports****Catherine Omand, Senior Academic Policy Manager, Senate Office****12-Month Update Reports**

At the meeting of ASC on 16 February 2013, the Senate Office was invited to consider reviewing the current 12-month timescale for PSR update progress reports as conclusion on actions were not being finalised until a considerable time after the initial review event.

Senate Office has considered this request and proposes the following:

- a six-month timescale for those recommendations highlighted as requiring urgent attention, thus update reports on pressing matters would be received by ASC at its November meeting
- retain the 12-month timescale for other recommendations received by ASC at its May meeting

A timescale of six months for urgent matters was considered achievable. However, a six-month for all recommendations was not considered feasible as the majority of recommendations could not be met within this timescale and could possibly lead to multiple update progress reports being presented to ASC. In addition

- Heads of Subjects/Schools receive recommendations following ASC approval at the May meeting. This is when Board of Examiners and annual monitoring are taking place and the likelihood of recommendations been given full consideration at this time is unlikely
- July and August are associated with longer periods of annual leave and with research hence delaying immediate consideration of the recommendations further
- In practice, six or nine months would not allow for implementation of many recommendations to be embedded and therefore a further progress report would be required, defeating the purpose of moving forward the deadline
- There is resource/operational implication on Senate Office if a nine-month timescale is implemented. Due to other work commitments, the workload on the administrative support would be excessive if all update reports were received in January for the February meeting of ASC. January through to March is the normal period reviews are undertaken as well as the busiest time for supporting University Committees

To ensure sufficient time is given to Subjects/Schools to implement urgent recommendations, it is proposed that Review Panel Conveners have responsibility for identifying urgent matters in order for them to be drawn to the Subject/School's attention following the review itself to allow for immediate action to be taken and therefore prior to ASC approval in May.

It should be noted that, as per current arrangements, ASC has authority to request alternative timescales for specific recommendations, either shorter or longer, if deemed appropriate.

Action required

ASC is asked **to approve** the amended 6-month timescale for urgent recommendations arising from Periodic Subject Review.

ASC is asked **to retain** the 12-month timescale for all other recommendations; with the option to request alternative timescales for specific recommendations as deemed appropriate.

ASC is asked **to approve** that responsibility for identifying urgent matters lies with Review Panel Conveners who should advise Subject/School accordingly prior to ASC approval in May.

Senate Office to implement the above amendments and revise the Guidelines for Panel Members and Academic Policy Managers and Conveners' briefing meeting accordingly.