

University of Glasgow

Learning and Teaching Strategy Action Plan

Project: Process Improvement

Action 13: External Input to Programme Development

1. Action	<p>External input to programme development/ scrutiny (ELIR Report Para 87)</p> <p>The University requires that, as part of the programme approval process, advice is sought from external individuals or groups, such as existing or prospective external examiners, professional bodies or employers. University guidance on the selection and collation of external views in programme approval is not comprehensive and this, alongside the variations in faculty committee structures, has the potential to lead to inconsistencies in the use of external advice when approving programmes. The guidance offered by the <i>Code of Practice</i> published by QAA advises institutions to make use of external contributions of an appropriate kind, and highlights the potential for compromising impartiality when the external contribution comes predominantly from an existing external examiner. The University has been piloting revised arrangements for managing information relating to programme and course approval. Linked to this, the University is encouraged to review the guidance provided to faculties on programme approval, and to ensure that faculties adhere to <i>Section 7</i> of the <i>Code of practice</i>.</p>
2. Officers/Bodies responsible	ASC
3. Progress to date	<p>Following a review of external input in the programme approval process by the Programme & Course Approval Working Group (PCAWG), and comment from the College Deans of Learning & Teaching, ASC approved the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• current practice relating to external involvement in approval should remain unchanged, with external examiners providing advice through consultation prior to the submission of proposals to the College, rather than as formal members of approval panels;• external consultants should not be included on Programme Approval Groups, as the purpose of these is not to review the academic content of proposals. <p>The following actions were agreed to ensure that the current procedures were fully adhered to by Schools and Colleges:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Expansion of current guidance on the consultation process;• Revision of the consultation pro forma to ensure more detail on consultations was provided to College Boards of Studies and PAGs. <p>For further detail (including consideration of the predominant use of external examiners) see minute ASC/2010/36 from the meeting of ASC held on 18 February 2011. https://frontdoor.spa.gla.ac.uk/commdoc/senate/ASC/Minutes/minutes_2011-02-18.htm</p> <p>Note is also being taken of the review of the section of the QAA Code of Practice on External Examining.</p>
4. Timescale for implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Revised Guidelines were published in August 2011 and will therefore be available for use by programme teams developing proposals for approval from Semester 1 of session 2011-12 onwards.• The revised consultation proforma was published in August 2011 and will

	therefore be used for all proposals submitted in Semester 1 of session 2011-12 onwards.
5. How are/will you evaluate effectiveness	<p>Programme Approval Groups will be invited to report on the quality of consultation information provided to them during 2011-12 compared to previous years.</p> <p>The Senate Office monitored the number of proposals referred back to Colleges from PAGs due to inadequate consultation information in 2011-12 compared to 2009-10 and 2010-11.</p>
6. Evaluation of effectiveness thus far	<p>This exercise showed a reduction in the number of consultations being referred back due to inadequate consultation in 2011-12.</p> <p>2009-10 - 12 2010-11 - 25 2011-12 - 1</p>
7. New Actions arising from this work (optional)	
8. Suggested text to refocus the action (optional)	