UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

Academic Standards Committee - Friday 15 February 2008

Departmental Programmes of Teaching, Learning and Assessment: Report of the Review of the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Applied Social Sciences held on Monday 12 November 2007

Mrs Jackie McCluskey, Clerk to the Review Panel

March 2008

Review Panel:

Professor Robin Leake	Pro Vice Principal, Convener
Professor Ken Roberts	External Subject Specialist, University of Liverpool
Mr Gavin Lee	Student Representative
Mr Terry Moody	Director of Undergraduate Studies, Department of Economics
Professor Mike French	Senate Assessor on Court
Dr Sarah Mann	Learning and Teaching Centre
Ms Jackie McCluskey (Clerk)	Academic Policy Manager, Senate Office
Ms Marjory Wright (Observer)	Academic Policy Manager, Senate Office

A.   Introduction

A.1   The Review of the Department of Sociology, Social Anthropology and Applied Social Science was originally scheduled to take place on 8 March 2007.   Due to the unfortunate death of the External Subject Specialist the decision was taken to postpone the review until 12 November 2007.   The Self Evaluation Report (SER) and supporting documentation considered by the panel was originally prepared in January 2007.   All comments contained in this report refer to the Department's provision for academic session 2006-07.   With the agreement of the Head of Department (HOD), the panel was also provided with copies of the latest draft programme specifications and the Sociology benchmark statement for 2007 which were not available in March 2007.

A.2   The Department of Sociology, Social Anthropology and Applied Social Science evolved from the Department of Sociology which was founded in 1972.   An initial name change was made in 1999 to reflect the increased amount of teaching and research carried out by Anthropologists followed by a second, more recent change, which acknowledges the incorporation of the Centre for Disability Studies and the increase in policy related research being carried out within the Department.

A.3   The Department currently has 18 full-time academic staff including the Head of Department. Administrative support is provided by 4 FTE secretarial staff with one post filled on a job share basis.

A.4   The student numbers for session 2006-07 were:

COURSE	FTE
Level 1	109.66
Level 2	55.20
Level 3	1.78
Honours	135.33
PGT - Sociology	6.18
PGT - Global Movements, Social Justice & Sustainability	5.26
PGR - Sociology	11.20

A.5   The Department was subject to a review by the Funding Council (SHEFC) in 1996 and internal subject review in February 2001. Overall the Department was reviewed very favourably and was judged to be "Excellent" by SHEFC in aspects such as staff commitment and quality of teaching and learning.

A.6   The Review Panel commended the Department's SER, which was initially drafted by Mr Bert Moorhouse and subsequently modified through significant input from other members of the department. It was felt to be a positive, upbeat document which gave an honest view of the Department's constraints and identified areas for improvement.   The Panel noted that the SER had been considered by a specially convened undergraduate Staff Student Liaison Committee (SSLC) in January 2007.

A.7   The Review Panel met with Professor Noreen Burrows, the Dean of the Faculty of Law, Business and Social Sciences and the Head of Department, Professor Nick Watson. The Panel also met with key academic staff [14]; probationary staff [3]; Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) [3]; postgraduate students [3] and two representative groups of undergraduate students drawn from across the years [12].   There was no representative from the administrative staff available due to illness.

A.8   The Review Panel considered the following range of provision offered by the Department:

Undergraduate Programmes

- MA (Single Hons) (Soc Sci) Sociology;

- MA (Joint Hons) Sociology and Anthropology and a range of other Joint Honours combinations;

- MA (Joint Hons) (SocSci) Sociology and Anthropology and a range of other Joint Honours combinations;

Level 3 Sociology and Anthropology did not run in session 2006-07;

Departmental Programmes of Teaching, Learning and Assessment: Report of the Review of the
Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Applied Social Sciences held on Monday 12 November
2007

Post-Graduate Programmes

- MSc in Sociology;

- MSc in Global Movements, Social Justice and Sustainability.

The Department also contributes to teaching led by other departments:

- The Business of Sports - offered on the Glasgow MBA;

- Sport and Public Policy - offered on the Faculty's MRes programme and to Continuing Professional Development students as an evening course, led by the Department of Economics;

- The MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice, led by the Department of Law;

- The Faculty's Graduate School Training Programme;

- Several single lecture and similar contributions to courses in other departments and universities.

The following programme developments were noted but were not considered as part of the review:

- MSc in Racism and Imperialism, introduced in September 2007;

- MSc in Equality and Human Rights, introduced in September 2007;

A.9 The Department is housed mainly in the Adam Smith Building though it teaches across the campus.

A.10 The Review Panel noted that, as stated in the SER, the Department was currently in a "*complex period of change and transition*" due in the main to a rapid turnover of staff; changes of Head of Department – four since the last review in 2001-02; the decision in 2006-07 to end Levels 1 and 2 Anthropology; expansion of taught postgraduate (PGT) provision and the move to semesterisation.

B.   Overall aims of the Department's provision

B.1 The Review Panel welcomed the Department's overall aim to produce "*well educated and independent thinking graduates by offering an appropriate balance of the assimilation of knowledge, the practice of analytical and critical capabilities, and the acquisition of transferable skills*".

B.2 The Panel agreed that the aims of the Department were appropriate and met the aims of the degree programme in respect of learning and teaching.

B.3 The Panel was encouraged to note from the SER the importance placed by the Department on research skills: "The Department regards the development of research skills and presentation skills as an integral part of teaching and learning across its programme of provision". This is supported by traditional modes of teaching and learning such as dissertation, project report writing and tutorial and seminar preparation but also in more innovative methods such as the use of videos and other audio-visual materials and the use of the VLE.   In addition, Research skills are prioritised as part of the enhanced induction process for Honours students.

B.4   The Review Panel acknowledged that employability, although not explicit in the stated overall aims of the Department, was embedded in its provision, particularly at Honours level. The aims of the PGT provision also embraced the employability agenda and highlighted the preparation of students for future academic research.   It was noted, however, that there was little reference to the University's Learning and Teaching strategy in the overall aims.   The Panel encourages the Department to review this.

B.5   The Review Panel noted that the SER outlined the Department's significant contributions to other programmes across the University.   The Panel would encourage the Department to make the best of all opportunities to highlight such collaborations to strengthen further its position within the University.

C.   Undergraduate and Taught-Postgraduate Provision

C.1   *Aims*

C.1.1   The programme specifications available to the Panel at the date of the review were not fully complete however, on the basis of the information provided the Panel was reassured that the Department's course and programme aims were broadly aligned to the benchmark statements.

C.1.2   The Panel found the Department's aims to be clear, informative and appropriate and readily available to students in the course documentation and covered fully in the Honours induction programme.

C.2   *Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs)*

C.2.1   The Panel concluded that the undergraduate (UG) and postgraduate (PG) students had a good understanding of the aims and intended learning outcomes (ILOs) and found the courses to be appropriately challenging.   There was a suggestion from both the UG student body (Level 1) and the PG students that the pace of the programmes was very fast, particularly for those new to the subject but they agreed that this was ameliorated by the course material being available on MOODLE.

C.3   *Assessment*

C.3.1   The SER outlined that each level of the Department's programmes has a pattern of assessment decided by the teaching team and each contained an element of indicative (formative) assessment.   The Review Panel commended the Department on its range of assessment methods in particular the Dissertation and the General Paper, which carries 30 credits and is available to single Honours Sociology or Joint Honours Sociology/Anthropology students.   The Panel noted the change in the General Paper from a 2 hour seen to a 3 hour unseen paper as a result of student feedback. The staff and students interviewed indicated their support of the General Paper.   The Panel encourages the Department to make the General Paper more widely available to students on other Joint Honours with Sociology combinations and to identify the teaching and study hours underpinning it.   The staff saw the General Paper as a good means of bringing four years of Sociology together but they raised concerns regarding its viability in the context of the current discussions regarding a split examination diet.   The Department felt that a split diet would encourage students to learn incrementally. The Dean confirmed that the move to a split diet was a Faculty decision. The Panel noted that feedback from the

Departmental Programmes of Teaching, Learning and Assessment: Report of the Review of the
Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Applied Social Sciences held on Monday 12 November
2007

undergraduate students interviewed endorsed examinations at Junior Honours Level. The Panel **recommends** that the Department review the General Paper and Dissertation in the context of the introduction of a split diet examination as a matter of urgency to identify ways in which the Department might be able to continue to offer the General Paper and Dissertation option.

C.3.2   The Review Panel noted from the SER a potential over-reliance on the use of examinations both in UG and PGT provision, but no real concerns were voiced by the staff or students in this regard.   The Panel was reassured that the Department's use of examinations was in line with the rest of the Faculty.

C.3.3   The Panel was unclear about the appeals procedure outlined in the SER. Levels 1 and 2 students can "*appeal the mark*" awarded for essays with the essay being "*re-marked by the appropriate lecturer*".   The HOD clarified that this process occurred very rarely and was used as another means of providing feedback. The Panel highlighted that the University had a formal academic appeals procedure in place which only permitted appeals on procedural or medical grounds and that this procedure should be followed in all cases. The Panel **recommends** that the Department no longer operates a system of permitting students to "appeal the mark" and thereby having their essays remarked to ensure consistency with the University's appeals procedures.

C.3.4   The Review Panel considered that the Department had a proactive approach towards plagiarism and clearly articulated it to students in course documentation and induction events.   The Panel was encouraged to note the Department's participation in a pilot of plagiarism software in session 2007-08.   The students interviewed were all aware of these developments.

C.3.5   The Review Panel noted that both the UG and PG student groups were very positive about the nature and frequency of the feedback provided.   The UG students particularly approved of summative assessment. The Panel noted the Department's Annual Assessment Day for Course Co-ordinators as an example of good practice.

C.3.6   The Review Panel was pleased to note from student feedback that staff were considered to be very approachable and supportive and that they provided clear and informative feedback.

C.3.7   The Review Panel noted that the Department awarded few first class Honours degrees. This appeared to reflect reluctance on the part of staff to use the full range of grades contained within the Code of Assessment (COA). The HOD indicated that the COA was bedding down and that more first class Honours would be likely in future.   The low number of firsts was endorsed by the External Examiners who encouraged use of the full range of grades.

C.4   Curriculum Design and Content

C.4.1   The Review Panel noted from the SER that due to budgetary restraints, the frequency of the Levels 1 and 2 tutorials had decreased which had had a direct impact on the size of each tutorial. However the HOD reported that weekly tutorials at Level 2 had since been reintroduced following student feedback. The Review Panel welcomed this and the plans for staff to take Level 2 tutorials. It was felt that this was a good way to address retention and increase the Honours conversion rate.

C.4.2   The HOD reported that in response to semesterisation, the Department was currently reviewing the structure of the UG degree to replace the 30 credit courses with 20 credit courses.   In discussion with the Dean, Professor

Burrows, the Panel noted that Faculty level discussions still had to take place with the Department, but there was no intention of imposing a particular structure across the Faculty.

C.4.3 The Review Panel noted the Department's decision in 2006-07 to end Levels 1 and 2 Anthropology but that Joint Honours would still continue. The Department acknowledged that demand existed however there was a requirement to focus their efforts in other areas such as expansion of PGT provision. The staff felt that this was the only way to ensure the viability of teaching Anthropology. They expressed a level of concern over the decision to end Levels 1 and 2 Anthropology as their perception was that the closure had been imposed on them. Most Level 1 and 2 students would have welcomed the opportunity to study both subjects whereas the Honours students expressed slight regret that anthropology appeared to have been sidelined, Neither group were overly concerned with the closure of Anthropology at Levels 1 and 2.The Panel concluded that although students' expectations might have been managed better, there were no major concerns associated with this issue.

C.4.4 The Review Panel was disappointed to note that neither the UG or PG students appeared to have a clear understanding of employability or Personal Development Planning (PDP) though when prompted they agreed that their studies were providing them with transferable and core skills. The staff confirmed that there were no immediate plans for PDP and reasoned that it did not fit well with a non-vocational subject such as Sociology. The Panel clarified that PDP would be implemented across the University and the availability of PDP would be compulsory. The Panel **recommends** that the Department engage with the Careers Service and the Learning and Teaching Centre with respect to employability and PDP and seek to make explicit their existing practices. In addition the Head of Department should ensure that staff are given the appropriate training to understand PDP.

C.5 Student Recruitment, Support and Progression

Student Recruitment

C.5.1 The Review Panel explored the expansion of PGT provision outlined in the SER and was assured that there was a healthy level of interest in the Department's MSc programmes. The Dean confirmed that future PGT provision would be reviewed on a Faculty basis to ensure it was marketable, particularly internationally. The Panel noted that there did not appear to be a shift of resources from UG to PGT provision, though the staff highlighted some concerns over potential pressures associated with a successful MSc programme (see paragraph C.6.8)

C.5.2 The SER noted that approximately 10% of the Department's students had non-standard qualifications or were recruited through an access programme. The Review Panel applauded the Department's approach to diversity but noted that there was no evidence of this in the course handbooks or the SER. The Panel **recommends** that the Department make its diversity and equal opportunities policies and procedures explicit to communicate to the wider University community their work in this area. They should include them in their course handbooks and on the Departmental website. When questioned further about support for disabled students, the HOD outlined certain mobility difficulties across the University but acknowledged that there were no real concerns with computer support or access to equipment.

Departmental Programmes of Teaching, Learning and Assessment: Report of the Review of the
Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Applied Social Sciences held on Monday 12 November
2007

Student Support

C.5.3   Both UG and PG students commented that they felt well supported by staff and were very positive about their experience of teaching within the Department. They particularly welcomed the Department's "open-door" policy and the level of accessibility of staff either on a one-to-one basis or via e-mail.

Student Progression

C.5.4   Although the Panel expressed a degree of caution over the data provided centrally, they noted that the data provided seemed to indicate that it   was difficult to get an A grade in Level 1 or a first class Honours degree. This was borne out by the discussions with the Head of Department and staff. A possible reason for this is outlined in paragraph C.3.7.

C.5.5   From the data supplied, the Review Panel noted a good progression rate to Honours.

C.6   The Effectiveness of Provision

C.6.1   The Review Panel commended the Department's innovative use of MOODLE particularly in the 'Sociology of Mass Media' course.   The UG and PG student groups interviewed saw MOODLE as a very useful resource however feedback suggested that, despite having received training, not all staff were using it. The Panel acknowledged that the Department was in the early stages of the development of MOODLE as a Learning and Teaching resource.   Students also suggested to the Panel that they felt hard copies of lecture notes and important communications could be provided. The Panel accepted that it was not practical or cost effective to provide everything in hard copy but felt it important to ensure that students, particularly those in first year, were given as much hard copy information as required to support their induction into the Department and the University.   The Panel **recommends** that all staff should engage with MOODLE and that the Department should develop a set of guidelines for staff and students clarifying what will be issued in hard copy, and what will be posted on MOODLE.   As a routine issue the Review Panel **recommends** that the HOD should ensure all staff read and fully understand the University's IT regulations as   outlined   on   the   University's   website   at http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/it/regulationscommitteesandpolicies

C.6.2   The Panel noted that the Department's teaching was underpinned by research and, where possible, teaching duties were allocated on the basis of research expertise. The Panel commended the Department for this. The staff highlighted that the expansion of PGT provision and the established research clusters had provided a useful focus for staff recruitment.

C.6.3   The Review Panel noted that academic staff and students were happy with the balance between staff contact hours and the use of GTAs.   The students in particular valued the interaction with GTAs who were seen to be closer in age and experience.   They acknowledged that the GTAs were not always teaching in their particular area of expertise but the students were content with GTA's ability and willingness to follow up on any of their queries.

Accommodation

C.6.4   The Review Panel was concerned to note the level of dissatisfaction with the teaching accommodation in the Adam Smith Building, particularly lecture theatre T415 which was used for Honours classes.   T415 had damaged and

Departmental Programmes of Teaching, Learning and Assessment: Report of the Review of the
Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Applied Social Sciences held on Monday 12 November
2007

missing seats, bad acoustics and was consistently cold.   The students highlighted the varying standards of the audio-visual equipment as well as the varying abilities of the staff to use it.   Students cited the Joseph Black main lecture theatre (B419 in the Chemistry Building) as an example of an appropriate teaching space.   The perception of the staff was that access to technology in the Adam Smith Building was inferior to that elsewhere in the University.   The accommodation concerns were echoed by the GTAs who reported that their main problem related to the lack of teaching rooms of an appropriate size to accommodate the increasing tutorial numbers. The Dean also voiced similar concerns about the suitability of the Adam Smith Building for teaching and learning functions.   Both staff and students welcomed the Panel's suggestion that a computer should be available in each tutorial room to allow access to MOODLE. The Review Panel **recommends** that the Dean and HOD should review the Department's overall teaching space provision with the Director of Estates and Building as a matter of priority and investigate the possibility of providing a computer in each tutorial room for MOODLE access. It was suggested that this might be supported by the University-wide bid being submitted by the Vice Principal (Learning, Teaching and Internationalisation). In addition, the Panel **recommends** that the Department should arrange for appropriate training for staff in the use of the audio-visual equipment available within Lecture Theatres for those who feel they would benefit from it.

C.6.5   The Review Panel noted that the criticism of the Adam Smith Building related to the teaching space and not the Library or the Computer Labs.   Both UG and PG students were positive about the Library and Computer Lab provision in both the Adam Smith Building and the Main Library but both groups noted difficulties in some cases in accessing material for popular or new courses. PG students suggested to the Panel that it would be very helpful if the computer labs in the Adam Smith Building could be open before 9 a.m.   The Panel **recommends** that the Faculty and Department should consider earlier opening hours for the computer rooms to address the request from the PG student body for access to computer labs before 9 a.m.

Staffing

C.6.6   The Review Panel noted the relatively high turnover of staff in recent years which had resulted in four different HODs since the last review in 2001-02. The current HOD, Professor Nick Watson, had been in the post for over a year. In addition, due in the main to retirement, 7 full-time posts were vacant at the start of session 2006-07 and to date 3 posts had been filled.   The Review Panel commended the Department on the positive view stated in the SER that although there had been a loss of experienced teachers and course administrators, the turnover had meant the introduction of highly qualified and motivated younger members of staff with related research interests.

C.6.7   Feedback from the GTAs and probationary staff endorsed the Panel's view that the Department was very supportive of new staff.   A slight concern was noted however that in some cases, as the staff member had progressed from being an UG student in the Department, certain assumptions had been made about their level of knowledge or experience of the Department. Of the three members of probationary staff interviewed, two had attended the New Lecturer and Teacher programme – one was exempt due to previous experience.   Both had found the programme helpful though would have preferred if it had been provided in more concentrated blocks, for example, one full week block per year.   Due to timing issues one GTA had not yet received any formal support from the Department or the Learning and Teaching Centre.   The Review Panel was pleased to note that

Departmental Programmes of Teaching, Learning and Assessment: Report of the Review of the
Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Applied Social Sciences held on Monday 12 November
2007

the HOD was aware and was addressing this.   The Panel recognised that there were a number of very good existing practices relating to staff induction and support, but suggested that the Department needed to formalise the good practice currently taking place to ensure a consistent experience for all.   The Panel **recommends** that the Department develops a set of staff induction procedures which should include the issue of a departmental procedures guide to all new staff.

C.6.8   The Review Panel was concerned to note the absence of a workload model within the Department or an understanding amongst the staff of what their standard workload should be.   The Panel noted the difficulties of establishing appropriately reduced workloads for probationary staff in the absence of any agreed workload norms. Staff acknowledged that the Department's average annual contact hours was lower than the Faculty average. However there was concern that engagement in teaching a successful Masters programme would significantly impact on their opportunities for research.   The Programme Coordinator of the MSc Global Movements, Social Justice and Sustainability programme was cited as an example of someone who had a high workload. The Review Panel was encouraged to note that the Department was discussing the issue of staff workload and **strongly recommends** that the HOD should engage with the Faculty and colleagues across the University with a view to developing a transparent workload model as a matter of urgency.

C.6.9   The Review Panel welcomed the feedback from GTAs on the positive system of Peer Review that operated in the Department as a means of disseminating good practice.   The GTAs found if beneficial to their development.   The Review Panel thought it should be extended beyond the Head of Department and GTAs to all staff. The Panel **recommends** that the Department adopt a more general, collegiate approach towards Peer Review and extend it beyond the GTAs to all staff as a means of disseminating good practice.

D.   The Maintenance and Enhancement of Standards of Awards

D.1   The Review Panel was confident that the Department was effectively maintaining the standards of its awards.

E.   The Maintenance and Assurance of Quality

E.1   The Review Panel was pleased to note the External Examiners' reports, which were highly satisfactory and provided good feedback to the Department. Any issues that had arisen had been dealt with appropriately by the Department.

E.2   The Review Panel commended the comprehensive 'Departmental Quality Assurance Procedures' document produced by the Departmental Quality Assurance Officer, and applauded the stated departmental culture of encouraging student feedback at all times.

E.3   There were two Staff Student Liaison Committees (SSLCs) which were chaired by the HOD, one each at UG and PG level.   SSLC discussions input into staff meetings as appropriate and were taken into account in determining the Department's academic strategy and practice.   The Panel noted from student feedback that students did not make full use of the student representative system and, possibly reflective of the size of the Department and the open-door policy, that students tended to go directly to staff with their concerns.   The Review Panel suggested that student representative system should be utilised more by inviting the student representatives to convene the SSLCs and by promoting the

SRC training and support for this role. The Panel was encouraged to learn that the Department already had plans in train to effect this. The HOD confirmed that students would be consulted about the proposal to develop 20 credit courses as outlined in paragraph C.4.2. He also acknowledged that the Department had been guilty in the past of changing courses and not telling students why. Their intention was to ensure the cycle of evaluation was fully completed by reporting on evaluations at SSLCs and posting the minutes of SSLC meetings on MOODLE.

E.4   The Review Panel was assured by the range of feedback mechanisms in place. Student comments confirmed that actions were taken as a result of their feedback. They felt their views were being listened to.

F.   Enhancing the Student Learning Experience

F.1   The Review Panel considered the student learning experience to be very positive, and attributed that to the quality of the support and teaching provided by staff. The UG and PG students endorsed this. There was a culture of students progressing from UG to PG study in the Department and, in some cases, joining as staff - two of the Probationary staff interviewed were in this category. The Review Panel concluded that this was reflective of a high quality student learning experience.

F.2   The Panel commended the Department on its extensive Honours induction programme and encouraged it to provide the same level of induction to all students. The Panel was encouraged to hear that the Department was already working towards this. A slight problem was highlighted by the PG students, who reported that the communication of the Faculty induction events could have been better. The Panel **recommends that** the Department review the processes for communicating information on Faculty events, including induction, to their students to better promote the events.

F.3   The Review Panel was assured that the Department had effective contact processes in place to identify and support students at risk and those who were not attending. The UG students interviewed were aware of these processes but, despite the information being available in course documentation, they were unclear about the required levels of attendance. The Panel **recommends** that information on attendance should be made more explicit in the course handbooks and highlighted to students at induction so that they are made aware of the required levels of attendance.

F.5   The Review Panel noted the appointment of a new Student Exchange Co-ordinator following the retiral of the previous incumbent in 2006. The Panel applauded the proactive measures taken to date to promote student exchange opportunities and encouraged the Department to develop this further with a view to increasing the numbers of incoming exchange students and so further enhance the international experience for home students.

G.   Summary of Key Strengths and Areas to be Improved or Enhanced in relation to Learning and Teaching and Conclusions and Recommendations

Key Strengths

- The quality of the support and teaching provided by staff

- Developing the use of MOODLE to enhance Learning and Teaching

- Excellent library facilities in the Adam Smith Building

- Good use of the varying range of assessment methods

- Wide range of student feedback mechanisms

- Research-led teaching

- Willingness to respond to changing circumstances, including a high staff turnover, and adjust assessment methods and other practices accordingly

- System of Peer Review for GTAs

Areas to be improved or enhanced

- Staff workloads

- Employability and PDP

- Teaching space

- Review of provision of hard copy documentation to students.

- Formalise induction for new staff

- Extend the use of Peer Review for all staff in the Department

- Coordination (explicit) with University strategies (eg Learning and Teaching; Employability; Internationalisation agenda)

Conclusions and recommendations

Conclusions

The Review Panel commends the Department on the overall quality of its provisions, its maintenance of standards and for its conscientious approach to the student experience and to research-led teaching. The Panel was pleased to note that the feedback from staff and students was very positive.

The Review Panel commends the Department in particular for its use of MOODLE and encourages it to continue to develop the use of MOODLE further to support student learning.

The inadequate teaching space concerned the Review Panel and it requests that the Director of Estates and Buildings meets with the Dean to address the provision of appropriate teaching space.

Recommendations

The Recommendations included earlier in the report and summarised below are made in the spirit of encouragement to the Department to continue to evolve and develop the student experience. The recommendations are ranked in order of priority and have been cross-referenced to the paragraphs in the text of the report to which they refer.

Recommendation 1:

The Panel **recommends** that the Department review the General Paper and Dissertation in the context of the introduction of a split diet examination as a matter of urgency to identify ways in which the Department might be able to continue to offer the General Paper and Dissertation option. [Paragraph C.3.1]

For the attention of: **Head of Department**

Recommendation 2:

The Review Panel was encouraged to note that the Department was discussing the issue of staff workload and **strongly recommends** that the HOD should engage with the Faculty and colleagues across the University with a view to developing a transparent workload model as a matter of urgency. [Paragraph C.6.8]

For the attention of: **Head of Department**

Recommendation 3:

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Dean and HOD should review the Department's overall teaching space provision with the Director of Estates and Building as a matter of priority and investigate the possibility of providing a computer in each tutorial room for MOODLE access.   It was suggested that this might be supported by the University-wide bid being submitted by the Vice Principal (Learning, Teaching and Internationalisation).   In addition, the Panel **recommends** that the Department should arrange for appropriate training for staff in the use of the audio-visual equipment available within Lecture Theatres for those who feel they would benefit from it. [Paragraph C.6.4]

For the attention of**:   Dean/Head of Department/Director of Estates and Buildings**

Recommendation 4:

The Panel **recommends** that all staff should engage with MOODLE and that the Department should develop a set of guidelines for staff and students clarifying what will be issued in hard copy and what will be posted on MOODLE. [C.6.1]

For the attention of: **Head of Department/Academic Staff**

Recommendation 5:

The Panel **recommends** that the Faculty and Department should consider earlier opening hours for the computer rooms to address the request from the PG student body for access to computer labs before 9 a.m. [Paragraph C.6.5]

For the attention of: **Dean/Head of Department**

Recommendation 6:

The Panel **recommends** that the Department engages with the Careers Service and the Learning and Teaching Centre with respect to employability and PDP and seek to make explicit their existing practices.   In addition the Head of Department should ensure that staff are given the appropriate training to understand PDP. [Paragraph C.4.4]

For the attention of: **Head of Department**

Recommendation 7:

The Panel **recommends that** the Department review the processes for communicating information on Faculty events, including induction, to their students to better promote the events. [Paragraph F.2]

For the attention of: **Head of Department**

Recommendation 8:

The Panel **recommends** that the Department produces a set of staff induction procedures which should include the issue of a departmental procedures guide to all new staff. [Paragraph C.6.7]

For the attention of: **Head of Department**

Recommendation 9:

The Panel **recommends** that the Department adopt a more general, collegiate approach towards Peer Review and extend it beyond the GTAs to all staff as a means of disseminating good practice. [Paragraph C.6.9]

For the attention of: **Head of Department**

Recommendation 10:

The Panel **recommends** that information on attendance should be made more explicit in the course handbooks and highlighted to students at induction so that they are made aware of the required levels of attendance. [Paragraph F.3]

For the attention of: **Head of Department**

Recommendation 11:

The Panel **recommends** that the Department make its diversity and equal opportunities policies and procedures explicit to communicate to the wider University community their work in this area.   [Paragraph C.5.2]

For the attention of: **Head of Department**

Recommendation 12:

The Panel **recommends** that the Department no longer operates a system of permitting students to "appeal the mark" and thereby having their essays remarked to ensure consistency with the University's appeal procedures. [Paragraph C.3.3].

For the attention of: **Head of Department**

Recommendation 13:

As a routine issue the Review Panel **recommends** that the HOD should ensure all staff read and fully understand the University's IT regulations as outlined on the University's website at
http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/it/regulationscommitteesandpolicies   [Paragraph C.6.1]

For the attention of: **Head of Department**

Prepared by: Janet Fleming, Senate Office

Last modified on: Wednesday 26 March 2008