

**UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW**

**Academic Standards Committee - Friday 30 May 2008**

**Departmental Programmes of Teaching, Learning and Assessment:  
Report of the Review of Department of Economics held on Thursday  
24 January 2008**

**Ms Jane McAllister, Clerk to the Review Panel**

**July 2008**

**Review Panel:**

Professor A Nolan	Vice Principal (Learning Teaching & Internationalisation) Convener
Professor F Analoui	Bradford Centre for International Development, University of Bradford
Professor J Briggs	Department of Geographical and Earth Sciences
Professor K Opong	Department of Accounting and Financial Studies
Dr S Mann	Learning and Teaching Centre
Mr Z Zhou	Students Representative Council, Postgraduate Students' Convener
Ms J McAllister	Academic Policy Manager, Senate Office Clerk to the Review Panel

**1. Introduction**

- 1.1 The Department of Economics at the University of Glasgow is one of nine departments in the Faculty of Law, Business and Social Sciences. It encompasses a Centre for Development Studies, which celebrates its 25th anniversary in 2008, and a new Centre for Economic and Financial Studies, which are vehicles for the provision of taught postgraduate programmes. It is a partner institution in the Scottish Graduate Programme in Economics, a collaborative MSc Programme, based at the University of Edinburgh, drawing on the expertise in eight Scottish universities. The Department considers its particular strengths to be in international finance, macroeconomics, financial economics, development economics and economic history.
- 1.2 The Department last underwent internal review in December 2000 and was subject to external subject review by the Quality Assurance Agency in January 2002. The outcome of this review was that the reviewers had 'confidence' in the academic standards achieved by the programmes in Economics: The quality of teaching and learning and the quality of student progression were commendable and the quality of learning resources was approved. The Department did not achieve commendable in this category due to concerns over the quality of accommodation in the Adam Smith Building.

- 1.3 The Self Evaluation Report (SER) was prepared by Professor Farhad Noorbakhsh, Head of Department, Mr Terry Moody, Director of Undergraduate Studies, Dr Alberto Paloni, Director of the Centre for Development Studies and Mrs Nicola Birkin, Departmental Quality Assurance Officer and Departmental Administrator. Comments were sought from staff and students and the feedback received was incorporated into the document. The Review Panel found the SER to be an extremely useful document in carrying out the review and **commends** the Department's awareness of its strengths and weaknesses and its willingness to address issues as they arise. The Panel had some concerns regarding the shortness of the consultation phase of the SER preparation but were reassured by the staff they met with who explained that it was a fair and objective summary of discussions that took place at a departmental away day and other forums earlier in the year.
- 1.4 The Panel met with the Dean, Professor Noreen Burrows; the Head of Department, Professor Farhad Noorbakhsh; the Director of Undergraduate Studies, Mr Terry Moody; the Director of the Centre for Development Studies, Dr Alberto Paloni and the Director of the Centre for Economic and Financial Studies, Professor Gabriel Talmain. The Panel met with 18 members of staff, including administrative staff, 5 probationary members of staff, 5 Teaching Fellows (Graduate Teaching Assistants), 7 postgraduate taught (PGT) students and 5 undergraduate students representing all levels of the Department's provision.

## 2. Background Information

- 2.1 The Department has 28 academic members of staff, 34 in total. The vast majority of staff are based in the Adam Smith Building, which the SER claims, is perceived by students to be the Department's administrative and teaching base.
- 2.3 The Department has experienced a period of turbulence in terms of staff turnover in the period since the last internal review in 2000. Since 2004-05, 27 new members of staff have been recruited; this represents expansion as well as replacement of those who have left. The range of PGT programmes and student numbers have increased in line with the increase in staff numbers. The Panel **commends** the Department on its recovery from this potentially destabilising time and its subsequent development into a thriving department.
- 2.4 Student numbers for 2007-08 were as follows (FTEs were not available at time of writing):

Students	Headcount
Level 1	513
Level 2	141
Level 3	9
Honours	127
Undergraduate Total	790
Postgraduate Taught	124
Postgraduate Research*	32

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

2.5 The Review Panel considered the following range of provision offered by the Department. A full list with notes is attached as Appendix 1.

- Single Honours in Economics<sup>1</sup>
- Single Honours in Economics with Business Economics
- Principal Honours in Economics with a subsidiary language
- MA Joint Honours in Economics and another subject
- MA Joint Honours in Business Economics and another subject
- 12 MSc Programmes (see Appendix 1 for full list)

The Department contributes to the following joint degree programmes offered with other departments.

- BAcc Joint Honours in Accountancy and Finance
- MSc International Banking and Finance (AACSB-accredited<sup>1</sup>)
- MSc Gender, Rights and Development
- MSc International Finance and Economic Policy (AACSB-accredited)
- MSc Management (Development Policy) (AACSB-accredited).

The Department also contributes to the following degree programmes offered by other departments or other institutions.

- Faculty of Engineering Undergraduate Degrees
- MSc in Carbon Management at Dumfries Campus
- Scottish Graduate Programme in Economics (collaborative MSc programme between 8 Scottish universities, hosted by the University of Edinburgh).

### Departmental Management

2.6 The Review Panel queried the management structure of the Department which appeared to be very flat. It was explained that the Directors of the two Centres and the Directors of Undergraduate Studies and Postgraduate Research reported to the Head of Department. The Deputy Directors supported the Directors and Co-ordinators were appointed to manage individual courses. The Department considered the structure to be robust enough to sustain the multiple initiatives currently going on in the Department.

2.7 Related to the management structure, the Head of Department confirmed that he was responsible for the Performance, Development and Review for all academic members of staff (with one exception) and the Departmental Administrator. The Head of Department explained that he had taken the decision to undertake all P&DR as a means of steering the Department and settling staff after a volatile period. He agreed that, as the Department had grown, he would now have to reconsider this position and devolve some of the responsibility. It was clarified that the Departmental Administrator undertook P&DR with the administrative staff. The Panel **recommends** that the Department introduce a P&DR structure that distributes responsibility for conducting reviews and line managing staff from the Head of Department to other senior staff within the Department.

2.8 The Review Panel also raised the management structure with the staff. The Panel heard details of the Department's committee structure and noted that the composition of the departmental committee did not include administrative staff other than the Departmental Administrator. It was reported that administrative staff could submit their comments through the Course Co-ordinator or the Departmental Administrator.

---

<sup>1</sup> All MA (Social Sciences) programmes are accredited by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)

The Panel suggested that the administrative staff involved with course organisation could have a valuable contribution to make if they had the opportunity to be directly involved in the Undergraduate and Postgraduate Teaching Committee and Departmental Committee meetings.

### **3. Overall aims of the Department's provision and how it supports the University Strategic Plan**

- 3.1 The Review Panel noted the Department's aims which were appropriate and closely linked to the University's Strategic Plan and Learning and Teaching Strategy. On the day of the Review, discussion focused on the Department's aims at programme and course level as set out under 4.1 below.

## **4. An Evaluation of the Student Learning Experience**

### **4.1 Aims**

- 4.1.1 The Review Panel noted from the SER and programme specifications that the Department had well developed programme aims which were in line with Departmental aims. The SER demonstrated that the undergraduate programme aims could be mapped to the aims set out in the Subject Benchmark Statement and the outcome descriptors in the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF).
- 4.1.2 The Review Panel discussed the relationship between the Department's assessment practices and its strategic aim to be "renowned internationally for providing an enquiry-led, research-led teaching and learning environment" with the Head of Department and the Directors of Studies. The Panel were particularly interested to know how the Department fostered an enquiry-led approach in its students as it claimed to, and how this was reflected in its assessment practices. It was explained that, broadly speaking, the programmes became more research orientated as students progressed to higher levels. This was particularly demonstrated by the relative weighting of the dissertation, which contributes an eighth of the credit for programmes at undergraduate level and a third at postgraduate level. The Panel considered that the Department's approach to enquiry-led learning, particularly at Levels 1 and 2, was not well evidenced in the documentation or in the Panel's discussions with the Departmental staff. The Panel's discussion of enquiry-led learning is continued at paragraph 4.4.4 below.

### **4.2 Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs)**

- 4.2.1 The Review Panel was interested to explore, with the Head of Department and staff, the methods employed by the Department to ensure that the programme aims and intended learning outcomes were achieved in practice. The Director of Undergraduate Studies explained to the Panel that the early years of the undergraduate programme focused on the development of students' knowledge of economics. This was done through study of current policy issues and problem solving scenarios to maintain currency and relevance. This knowledge base was then developed through a more enquiry-led approach at Honours and PGT level where student engagement and skills training were promoted through activities such as class discussion and group work. The Panel considered that the assessment methods used by the Department to measure students' achievement of ILOs were fairly narrow in range generally and very narrow in range for Levels 1 and 2. The Department had acknowledged this in its SER and was reviewing its assessment methods and considering new methods through an

Assessment Working Group. Assessment related matters were discussed further in section 4.3 below.

### **4.3 Assessment, Feedback and Achievement**

4.3.1 The Review Panel noted that the Department had acknowledged several issues related to assessment and feedback in the SER and had already established an Assessment Working Group to look at these. The issues identified by the Department included the effectiveness of assessment methods in measuring the achievement of ILOs and the need for a range of assessment methods to develop students' skills. The Panel received copies of the remit of the Assessment Working Group. The Panel asked the staff if there was student representation on the Working Group, which there was not. The Panel considers that where assessment and feedback policies and practices are being reviewed and developed, the views of students should be an integral part of the discussion. Therefore, the Panel **recommends** that students are brought in to the discussion in a meaningful manner through the inclusion of one or more of their representatives as full members of the Assessment Working Group. Further discussion on student participation in Departmental Committees is reported alongside other student representation matters in paragraph 6.3.

#### **Alternative Assessment Methods**

4.3.2 The Review Panel discussed the development of assessment to enhance the learning experience during its meeting with staff and noted that some members of the Department were using interesting types of assessment in postgraduate taught and Honours programmes. The undergraduate students who met the Panel made suggestions that tutorial time could be used more creatively with group presentations, student feedback and peer assessment. Referring to the remit of the Department's Assessment Working Group, the Panel was satisfied that the Department was aware of and actively addressing these points. However, to ensure that the outcomes of the Working Group are reported to the Panel and to the University, the Panel **recommends** that the Department ensures that the Assessment Working Group fulfils its stated aims and that a report on the outputs of the Working Group is included in the Department's responses to the recommendations of this Review.

#### **Feedback on Assessment**

4.3.3 The undergraduate students who met with the Panel raised some specific concerns about feedback. They reported some variations in quality and legibility of feedback; an example was given of an assessment in a previous Level 1 class where all students received the same marks and feedback, despite differences in their level of experience of economics. They reported that information on the timescales for return of marked assessments and feedback, e.g. within three weeks, was published in course documents, but set dates and times were not arranged in advance. They agreed that the timescales were normally adhered to and that staff were available for individual feedback, if students sought it, even if approached outside set office hours. Despite the remarks above, the undergraduate students reported that they were generally satisfied with the Department's arrangements for providing them with feedback on assessment.

4.3.4 The Panel also discussed feedback on assessment with the postgraduate taught students they met. Some of the postgraduate students reported that they had received feedback on assessments handed in between 18 November 2007 and Christmas only on the day prior to the Review (23 January 2008). They reported that they had been told that they could expect feedback within three weeks of the submission date and that they had been disappointed that the feedback had been very brief when they did receive it. The students acknowledged that there may have been some disruption due to the Christmas

break. The Panel **recommends** that the Department continue with its plans for its Assessment Working Group to investigate methods of improving the formative element of assessments in both undergraduate and postgraduate programmes with a view to increasing the opportunities for students to receive timely, meaningful and useful feedback on their assessed work. The report on the outputs of the Working Group should be included in the Department's responses to the recommendations of this Review (see Paragraph 4.3.2 and Recommendation 8).

### **Assessment at Level 1**

4.3.5 During the discussion noted above, the Undergraduate students who met the Review Panel reported that there had been no in-course assessment during the first semester at Level 1. This meant that there had been no opportunity for feedback on progress before the in course examination in January. The students reported that this had made preparation for the examination and the examination itself very stressful. Staff acknowledged that the lack of assessment and associated feedback could have a negative impact on students and explained that assessment at Level 1 had been pared down to a minimum at a time when staffing resources were stretched. The SER noted that "The Department has, at various times addressed, the question of whether it has struck the right balance between summative and formative assessment. Large class sizes in Level 1 have militated against a more substantial assessment load – the course is currently assessed by two 2-hour examinations". The Panel noted that the Department had recognised the need to broaden the range of assessment methods to promote skills and employability in relation to other aspects of its provision at its away day event in October 2007. However, the Panel **recommends** that the Department review the current assessment of Level 1 with a view to improving the frequency and quality of formative feedback in semester 1 and broadening the range of assessment methods used to reduce the focus on examination and help students acquire and develop a range of skills as detailed in the programme ILOs. The Panel also **recommends** that existing interactive activities, such as problem solving scenarios (see paragraph 4.2.1) be extended to further develop enquiry-led learning at Levels 1 and 2.

### **Assessment and Grade Criteria**

4.3.6 The undergraduate students met by the Review Panel reported awareness of the assessment criteria used by the Department but were not aware that these were subject specific, or different to the generic University assessment criteria published in the University Calendar. The staff confirmed that the grade descriptors set out in the Undergraduate and MSc Handbooks were subject-specific. The Panel was content with the Department's efforts to communicate assessment criteria to students.

## ***4.4 Curriculum Design, Development and Content***

### **Postgraduate Taught Programmes**

4.4.1 The Review Panel **commends** the Department for its rapid and strategic development of its Postgraduate Taught Provision. The format and structure of the 12 MSc programmes currently available appeared to be very appealing to potential students as was demonstrated by successful recruitment, particularly of international students. The Department recognised in the SER that the rapid development of these programmes had brought challenges along with success. The Panel heard from some of the postgraduate students with whom they met that the structure of their programmes had not been as flexible as they had expected in terms of the availability of options and that they had noted some duplication of content between the compulsory and elective courses. The Head of Department reported that the number and choice of elective courses that could be made available on each programme was, to some extent, affected by timetabling.

He pointed out that, because of this, adjustments to benefit one programme would not necessarily benefit others. The Panel **recommends** that the Department examines its postgraduate taught programme structures with a view to eliminating possible duplication of content and ensuring that, in reality, students experience the flexibility of choice set out in recruitment and programme information documents.

### **Seminar Provision**

4.4.2 The postgraduate students who met with the Review Panel reported that some of the courses were delivered through lectures only. Members of the Panel were concerned and considered such a format to be unsuitable for a class of around 20 students at postgraduate level. The Panel discussed this issue with staff who explained that the lectures referred could sometimes be split format with the first half of the time being a lecture and the second a seminar. The Panel was concerned that the postgraduate students on some programmes were not receiving a similar quality of experience. Staff reasoned that the different practice with regard to seminar formats was driven by differences in subject matter between financial economics and development studies. The Head of Department reassured the Panel that some new courses were being designed to include tutorials. The Panel **recommends** that the Department move towards ensuring that all existing courses include tutorials, i.e. smaller group sessions with a high level of student participation, as quickly as is practicable, and that this type of tutorial be an integral part of all postgraduate programmes in future. The Panel expects significant change in this matter to be reported in the Department's responses to recommendations at the end of session 2008-09 (one year from the submission of the report to Academic Standards Committee).

### **Research Methods Course**

4.4.3 Members of the Review Panel raised concerns regarding the research methods course being non-credit bearing. The Head of Department and staff explained that the purpose of the research methods course was to equip the students with the necessary skills to complete the dissertation which accounts for one-third of the credit for the programme. If they were to attach credit to it, the weighting and time available for either the dissertation itself or the taught elements of the programme would need to be reduced. The Panel was of the view that it would be very unusual for a student to have experience of research at the required level. The Head of Department agreed and confirmed that it was very rare for a student to opt out. He also noted that he was not aware of any student having expected credit in relation to this course. The Panel **recommends** that consideration be given to making the research methods course compulsory for all postgraduate taught students to emphasise and recognise its importance in gaining the skills necessary to write a postgraduate level dissertation.

### **Enquiry-Led Learning**

4.4.4 The Review Panel asked the students with whom they met for their views on enquiry-led learning. The students' view was that Levels 1 and 2 were purely theoretical but that enquiry-led aspects began to develop in Level 3 and Honours courses. The undergraduate students that met with the Panel reported only limited awareness of the research activity of staff, except in one case where the individual's research closely matched the topic of the course. This had made a positive difference to their experience of the course in question. The Panel accepted that incorporating specific research into general subject teaching at Levels 1 and 2 could be problematic, but were pleased to note that staff and teaching fellows expressed enthusiasm for the idea of sharing their research with students. The Panel discussed the balance between research and teaching with staff. The Panel were particularly interested to know how the staff understood the term enquiry-led learning and how they encouraged it. Staff

reported that new courses were developed based on the current research interests of staff. The Panel noted that the Department had made some research-teaching linkages and had introduced some enquiry led learning activities but that the effect of these was limited (see also discussion at paragraph 4.1.2). The Panel **recommends** that the remit of the Assessment Working Group be extended to consider how new assessment practices might further support and promote enquiry-led learning across the curriculum in particular at Levels 1 and 2.

## **Level 1**

4.4.5 The Review Panel noted that the Department was in the process of restructuring its Level 1 course from single 40 credit course to two 20 credit courses. This had been undertaken in response to student feedback and to move into line with other departments in the Faculty. Staff reported that the restructuring and possibility of 20 credit courses had encouraged the development of new courses, as staff perceived the work required to design and teach shorter courses to be correspondingly less and therefore more easily fitted into existing workloads. The Panel were pleased to note that teaching fellows (graduate teaching assistants) were given opportunities to input into course design.

## **4.5 Student Recruitment**

4.5.1 It was noted that there had been a slight downturn in the numbers of international students recruited and the Department was asked about its plans in this regard. The Department reported that despite numbers having reduced slightly in session 2007-08, they were still at a high level. The Panel acknowledged the current, and remarkable, cohort profile where 90% of postgraduate taught students were from outwith the European Union and **commended** the Department for its success in recruiting international students to its postgraduate taught programmes. The Department considered this to be an essential position to maintain. The numbers of international students at undergraduate level were disappointing in comparison but was largely outwith the control of the Department, possibly influenced by the faculty entry system. However, the Department was pleased to report healthy numbers of incoming Erasmus students, a remarkably international staff profile and developing links with other institutions as their contribution to the internationalisation agenda of the University Strategy.

4.5.2 One international postgraduate student reported that he had not received a response to his application until he had met someone from the University in person who had assisted in progressing matters. The Convener expressed her regret at this but reported improvements to the admissions process which is handled by the International and Postgraduate Service (and not by the Department) were in hand, and this would not happen in future.

**Note:** This comment has been passed to the Director of the International and Postgraduate Service for information.

## **4.6 Student Progression, Retention and Support**

### **Employability**

4.6.1 The Review Panel acknowledged the Department's efforts to promote Employability through the curriculum and through various extra curricular activities for students. The Panel explored an issue noted in the SER which indicated that career planning and associated workshops organised by the Department and Careers Service had met with a poor response from undergraduate students. The Department expressed the view that



the poor uptake might have been caused by targeting the workshops at Honours students and too late in the curriculum. The Department planned to open up the workshops to Level 1 and 2 students and hoped that this audience would respond more positively. The undergraduate students who met the Panel were aware of the opportunities provided by the Department but expressed the view that this type of information should be obtained or delivered through the Careers Service. They reported that they had had good experiences of seeking help from the Careers Service. With this in mind, the Panel **recommends** that the Department explore the possibility of marketing career planning provision and opportunities to students in a way that emphasises the Careers Service input to attract those students who would normally seek information directly from Careers Service. The Panel also **recommends** that the Department encourage students to think about employability from the earliest stages of their studies by including Level 1 and 2 students in invitations to employability related workshops as was suggested by the Department above, and exploring embedding employability in curriculum development (good practices resources are available through the Learning and Teaching Centre website at <http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/learningteaching/goodpracticeresources/employability>)

- 4.6.2 The postgraduate students that met with the Panel appeared less aware of the employability agenda than the undergraduates, but they reported they had received advice about careers or continuing to PhD study promptly on request. They also reported a less positive experience of the Careers Service, particularly, that one had received different advice from different members of staff and that the Careers Fair they had attended had not been helpful. The Panel **recommends** that the Careers Service be informed of the students' comments regarding being given different advice by different members of staff and finding the Careers Fair unhelpful to assist with ongoing improvements to the Service.
- 4.6.3 The Review Panel was concerned about the quality and sparseness of the first employment destination data; however, it was acknowledged that these data were supplied centrally and did not reflect on the Department. Based on anecdotal evidence, the Department was confident that its graduates were finding good employment and reported that it was planning to set up a graduate network. The network would be a source of confirmed information on employment destinations and would give the Department access to a pool of recent graduates who would be able to offer advice from a perspective closer to that of students. The Panel **recommends** that the Department take its proposed development of a graduate network forward in consultation with Careers Service staff and the Development and Alumni Office Director, with a view to improving employment data and building on links with employers.
- 4.6.4 The Review Panel noted that the Department was being proactive in developing links with employers in terms of seeking advice on what qualities they expected to see in graduates and exploring opportunities for offering students work placements. The Panel suggested that work placements would be good at postgraduate level but recognised that there were practical difficulties in finding time for this in the curriculum. The Panel was pleased to hear that a faculty post (funded through the Learning and Teaching Development Fund) was to be created to assist with identifying and running placements. The difficulties of organising a reliable supply of placements was acknowledged but the Department reported that negotiations currently in progress were going well.

## **Retention**

- 4.6.5 The Review Panel asked about student retention at Levels 1 and 2, and its priority within the department. The staff considered that attendance monitoring was the only

way to trigger early warnings of students at risk and pointed to the Department's system for monitoring attendance at tutorials as a means of addressing this. As reported in the SER, the Department had noted that poor attendance at Honours tutorials was a growing problem and had addressed the matter by introducing a formal attendance policy whereby students receive notices if they were absent from 50% or more tutorials for a single course or unexpectedly did not submit assessments. The Department also writes to Honours students following each tutorial absence. Poor attendance is then taken into account in decisions on progression or at Board of Examiners meetings where a student's grades fall into a discretionary zone. The Department noted that attendance had risen by 6% following the introduction of this policy in 2007-08.

#### **Other comments on support**

4.6.6 The Review Panel heard that the international postgraduate students they met had been pleasantly surprised by the amount of support available in terms of language support and academic skills. They had been particularly impressed by the support provided by the Faculty's International Officer. The postgraduate students reported that funding and scholarships for international students was limited and expressed disappointment with this. The undergraduate students expressed surprise at how little contact they had had with their advisers of studies. The Panel **commends** the support provided by the Faculty International Officer.

#### **4.7 *The Quality of Learning Opportunities***

4.7.1 The postgraduate students who met with the Review Panel commented positively on the comprehensive range of programme pathways available but some reported that they had had problems in terms of the range and timing of electives. They reported that some courses they had wanted to take, e.g. corporate finance and financial analysis, had not been available to them. They also reported that they felt that there was a lot of repetition of some subjects, particularly monetary policy. The postgraduate students confirmed they had received guidance on their choice of electives and had been able to participate in any course for up to two weeks before making their final choices.

4.7.2 The Review Panel discussed the issue of dissertation preparation with the postgraduate students that they met. The students reported that they were attending the research methods class and were choosing their topics with the guidance of staff. The students complimented the research methods class and appreciated its practical value. However, they expressed the view that the time allocated to each class could be reduced from two hours. One student commented that some of the content of the research methods course overlapped with that of the writing classes in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Unit. Another suggested that earlier allocation to a dissertation supervisor would be helpful, reporting that a friend who attended another university had been allocated a dissertation supervisor at the beginning of semester 1.

4.7.3 The postgraduate students were complimentary of the Department's use of Moodle and the instant access to information it provided.

4.7.4 The Review Panel noted the Department's relative success in encouraging increasing numbers of students to take up opportunities for study abroad. The Department's practice of introducing the available opportunities, including those for half year duration, to students early in second year appeared to be successful. The Department was also exploring possibilities for partner institutions to teach some parts of courses in English to reduce students concerns over their language ability. The Panel had serious concerns about the Department's practice of discounting the grades from partner

institutions in the final calculation of degree classifications. The discussion of this matter is set out in paragraph 5.2.

#### **4.8 Resources for Learning and Teaching**

##### **Staffing - Gender Balance**

4.8.1 The Review Panel was concerned by the gender imbalance of the staff profile, particularly in terms of senior staff, and asked the Department if there was a strategy in place to address this. The Head of Department reported that the loss of staff in 2003 had led to the appointment of 11 new professors. He had been involved in headhunting around 100 applicants of which only approximately 20 were female; one female professor had been interviewed but was not successful. In terms of other academic staff, it was noted that two female lecturers had recently been appointed. The Panel recognised the challenges faced within the discipline and acknowledged that the Department was aware of the issues. However, the Panel **recommends** that the Department adopt a proactive approach to addressing the gender balance amongst staff and, as suggested by Head of Department, include a statement regarding the Department's "aim to achieve gender balance" when advertising, particularly for senior positions.

##### **Staffing - Probationary Staff**

4.8.2 The Review Panel met with the probationary staff of the Department who confirmed the statements in the SER that all new staff were mentored. They reported that they were extremely satisfied with the arrangements and support provided by the Department. They expressed particular appreciation of the Head of Department who they considered to be very helpful and approachable. In addition to formal mentoring, the probationary staff reported that other staff were available and willing to help with advice personally or to give direction to other sources. In response to questions from the Panel, the probationary staff reported that they were aware of what was required of them during their probationary period and that they had clear, achievable goals for the year ahead. These goals were planned over a three year period and were reviewed every year.

4.8.3 The Review Panel discussed the New Lecturer and Teacher Programme (NLTP) with the probationary staff. They reported that they had found it very interesting; it had been the source of inspiration for new approaches and had exposed them to techniques of which they had not previously been aware. The probationary staff considered the requirement to prepare a written portfolio to be helpful for promoting reflective practice although this had not been apparent at first. All probationary staff agreed that the structure of the programme could be more intensive and shorter. They reported that they had introduced teaching methods such as presentations for formative assessment, role play activities including focus groups to analyse how effective they had been and other types of group work. There were also plans to introduce an element of peer assessment with peer review of essays prior to marking by the lecturer or tutor.

4.8.4 The Review Panel confirmed with the probationary staff that their workloads were balanced and that their teaching contact hours had been reduced to accommodate NLTP commitments and course development. It was reported that their administrative load had been higher than expected, possibly due to the development of new courses. The probationary staff acknowledged that the Department had made efforts to reduce their administrative load where possible. One probationary member of staff reported that the teaching contact hours had been higher than expected but anticipated that these would be reduced in other years. The Panel confirmed that they could expect fluctuations in the relative teaching, research and administrative loads from year to year. In

conclusion, the probationary staff confirmed that their teaching and research loads were generally well balanced.

### **Staffing - Teaching Fellows (equivalent to Graduate Teaching Assistants)**

4.8.5 The teaching fellows who met with part of the Review Panel confirmed that their work was enjoyable, well balanced with their research commitments and that they undertook no more than six hours teaching per week. There was some uncertainty as to whether or not they were being paid according to a standard rate of payment that was equivalent to their peers in other institutions. The Panel **recommends** that the University (through the Director of Human Resources) ensures that rates of payment for Graduate Teaching Assistants, or equivalent, are comparable to that of neighbouring institutions, and that these are reviewed annually.

4.8.6 The teaching fellows also confirmed they had attended the Graduate Teaching Assistant Training module. The Panel discussed the level of support that the teaching fellows received from the Department. Those who met with the Panel reported that they had received copies of the staff Teaching and Administration Handbook and were able to discuss and obtain advice from staff. They also received feedback and evaluations from students on their performance. However, they felt that they could have received more guidance as they started teaching and that they had found variation in what was expected from them in each course. The Panel **recommends** that the Department provide structured guidance to new teaching fellows and encourages staff to either adopt a uniform approach or explain clearly what is expected of them on each course.

### **Accommodation**

4.8.7 The undergraduate students who met the Panel requested that all teaching be done in the Adam Smith Building. No other significant issues regarding the quality of accommodation were raised by students. The Convener of the Panel was aware of ongoing problems with the fabric and state of repair of Adam Smith Building.

## **5. Maintaining the Standards of Awards**

### **External Examiners**

5.1 The Review Panel was interested in the Department's Internal Scrutiny Team established to review examination papers. Staff explained that the team reviewed draft examination papers for clarity and overlaps and to address any problems prior to the papers being sent to the external examiners for approval. In terms of the external examiners reports, it was explained that the Directors of Studies consider the reports and prepare responses as required. They consulted other staff where necessary and directed issues to the appropriate departmental committee. Annual Monitoring Reports included a section on the issues and responses and provided a means of ensuring that issues have been dealt with.

### **Assessment of Study Abroad**

5.2 The Review Panel was extremely concerned by the Department's stated practice of discounting marks from study abroad in the calculation of final grades, as they considered it to be potentially unfair. The Panel also questioned whether this approach had been approved by Faculty or Senate. The Department explained that students were awarded credit for classes that they had passed but the grades achieved would only be considered in the final classification if the result fell into one of the discretionary zones. This practice had been adopted when the Department had not had enough students

going abroad to allow them to gain familiarity with the marking practices of other institutions. This difficulty was acknowledged but the Panel members noted that other departments use second marking or moderation to translate other institutions' marks to the structure of grades at University of Glasgow. The staff reported that they had adopted their system because they had not found other means of translating marks to be fair and equitable. They considered that the risks of basing grades on one diet of assessment balanced the disadvantages of being assessed in a foreign language. They also pointed out the difficulties for the University of Glasgow marker of reading scripts in a different language and marking on subjects with which they might be less familiar. In response to a question from the Panel, it was confirmed that no result would be recorded on the University of Glasgow transcript but that it would be supplemented by a transcript from the other institution. The Dean reported that the Faculty had recently identified the need for an Equivalence Committee and the Panel **recommends** that the Department avail itself of the advice of this Committee as soon as it is in operation to enable the Department to include marks from study abroad in the students' final grade. This would emphasise the importance the University places on the educational value of the study abroad experience and the importance of maintaining academic work while away from this University.

### **Departmental Policy on Second Marking**

- 5.3 The Review Panel requested clarification on the Department's use of second marking in relation to a concern that the Department appeared to be operating two different systems. The Head of Department and staff explained that differences mainly reflect differing class sizes. At level 1, where the class size is large and there are multiple markers, markers are provided with marking guides for each question, markers meet at an early stage of the process to exchange marked scripts and check for consistency, and when all scripts have been first marked, marks are moderated by the course co-ordinator. At level 2, a similar process applies; each question is marked by a single marker, marking guides are provided for each question, and marks are moderated by the course co-ordinator. For Honours and PGT courses all assessments are sample second marked, with the sample consisting of ten scripts or a third of the total, whichever is the greater. All markers provide feedback to the students on in-course assessments. Where scripts are retained by the department, markers complete feedback sheets, otherwise they annotate scripts. In addition to individual feedback, any comments that are widespread and/or potentially of use to the whole class are posted on Moodle.

### **Plagiarism**

- 5.4 The Panel discussed the use of Turnitin Plagiarism Detection Software with the undergraduate students that they met. The students reported that they had had little experience of it to date, although one student reported he had had experience of it from another university. It was noted that students would need help in interpreting the reports when they did come to use it. On plagiarism in general, the students reported that there was a great deal of information in the handbook but admitted that they had skimmed over most of the detail. The postgraduate students who met the Panel were positive about the emphasis placed by the Department on preventing plagiarism but were not sure that the guidelines provided in the handbooks were effective. They reported finding them "scary" and "confusing". The Panel **recommends** that the Department review its advice on plagiarism and Turnitin to ensure that it is clear and direct and does not have any inadvertent demotivating effect.

### **Generic Regulations for Taught Masters**

- 5.5 The Review Panel noted the Department's concerns regarding the effect of the University's implementation of generic regulations for taught postgraduate degrees on the department's MSc degrees, and the level of attainment required for the award of merit or distinction. The Department's observation was that the adoption of the generic regulation had resulted in "a significant lowering of standards across the board". The Panel **recommends** that the Academic Standards Committee explore these concerns with the Department at the point where the implementation of the Generic Regulations for taught postgraduate degrees is appraised.

## **6. Assuring and Enhancing the Quality of the Students' Learning Experience**

### **Student Feedback**

- 6.1 The Review Panel noted that the Department had identified that feedback from Honours students was "ambivalent" and asked if the reasons for this were known. The statement was clarified by an explanation that this particular group of students appeared to be more likely to give a 'satisfied' response or to opt for the middle ground in their responses on feedback forms. To address this, the Department planned to remove the middle option and force responses one way or the other. The Panel asked the students with whom they met for their views on the opportunities provided by the Department to evaluate their courses. The students noted that this was now done through Moodle rather than on paper.
- 6.2 The undergraduate students who met the Panel confirmed that there were opportunities to raise issues through class representatives. This worked well at tutorial group level where the communication could be very direct. It was suggested that it could be made more accessible for the larger groups by adding a section to Moodle where any student could add items to the agenda of the Staff Student Liaison Committees (SSLC).
- 6.3 The Review Panel was concerned that there was no student representation on the Undergraduate and Postgraduate Teaching Committees or the Departmental Committee. The staff reported that they considered that it was not appropriate to include students at committees where professional decisions had to be taken and that they considered that students had sufficient opportunity to provide input through other channels. The staff were not enthusiastic about the practice of reserving business. The External Subject Specialist on the Panel reported that similar objections had been raised at his institution but that they had been dismissed. Students were now included and with any reserved business taken at the end of the meeting. The Panel considers that student representation, on teaching committees should be the norm and **recommends** that the Department appoint student representatives to participate in these committees as full members as a matter of priority, reserving business only where necessary, in reflection of practice at Faculty and University level. The Panel also suggests that the Department consider the appointment of a student on to its departmental committee.

### **Communication of Departmental Responses to Issues Raised by Students**

- 6.4 The members of the Review Panel who had reviewed the Department's committee minutes reported that there were some issues that appeared not to have been resolved. The Head of Department told the Panel that issues were normally minuted, actioned and the action being reported either through the minutes or annual monitoring reports. The Undergraduate students who met the Panel were satisfied that they received feedback on the Department's responses to issues that they raised. They were able to access committee minutes through Moodle or received emails on the outcome of discussions on particular issues. At the beginning of the session, the class

representatives had also received a summary of actions arising from issues raised by their colleagues in the previous year. The postgraduate students who met the Panel were less satisfied with the feedback they had received. They reported that there had been little feedback on responses to issues through their class representatives and that they would like to receive more feedback through the representatives and the Department, either in person or through the website and Moodle. The Panel **recommends** that the Department review its methods of communication of actions taken in response to issues raised by students, particularly those related to postgraduate taught programmes. The Panel did not consider that posting summaries of feedback on Moodle was sufficiently proactive having noted that those students they met who were not class representatives reported that they did not normally read the minutes of committees.

- 6.5 The Panel asked the class representatives among the undergraduate students that they met with, if they had had opportunities to report back to classmates, in person, on discussion at SSLC meetings. They reported that their duties as they had understood them from SRC Student Representative Training were not always facilitated by staff. They gave the example of being allowed a few minutes to speak to the class at the end of a lecture, which they appreciated, but did not feel was an effective means of communication because their classmates were preparing to leave and were not attentive. The Panel **recommends** that the Department explore alternative mechanisms for facilitating the effective operation of the class representative system. This should be done in consultation with the Student Representative Council and the Class Representatives in the Department and take account of any recommendations arising from the current University Working Group on the student feedback mechanisms. The Panel also **recommends** that staff are made aware of the role of student representative as defined in *The Code of Practice on Student Representation* (<http://senate.gla.ac.uk/qa/studentrep/index.html>) and that they be required to facilitate the function of student representatives at all meetings of the relevant classes.

### **National Student Survey**

- 6.6 The Review Panel asked staff to summarise the Department's plans in relation to its response to feedback received through the 2007 National Student Survey (NSS). The Panel heard that outcomes on assessment and feedback from the NSS were one of the drivers for the Working Group that had been set up to look at assessment in general. They commented that, in their view, the feedback on assessment issue was also linked to the Skills and Personal Development Planning agendas. In direct response to the NSS, the Department was in the process of consulting student focus groups to obtain more detailed information about the issues behind the results. The staff were expecting these groups to highlight issues related to the need to manage student expectation in terms of the amount and timing of feedback.

### **Social Integration and Support**

- 6.7 The Honours students that met the Panel reported that they were enjoying honours courses much more than Level 1 and 2. They had not felt part of a group or recognised by staff during the earlier years but the Reading Party and smaller groups at Honours had changed their perception of the friendliness of the Department. However, the Panel consider isolation to be a potential issue for student retention and would encourage the Department to continue to offer social events and to adjust the curriculum, where possible and appropriate, to combat any sense of isolation amongst students in the early years of the undergraduate programme.
- 6.8 The postgraduate students who met the Panel reported that the diversity of the student population in Economics, in terms of the large proportion of international students from

a wide range of countries, was beneficial. There were opportunities to learn from each other informally as well as through formal activities such as those where students were asked to explore the implications of financial structures in their own countries and then make presentations to educate their classmates. They reported that they had found other students very friendly and ready to help and had experienced the same attitude from staff. Course administrators were particularly singled out for praise in this regard. The staff who met the Panel considered informal contact with students to be very important.

## **7. Summary of Perceived Strengths and Areas for Improvement in Learning and Teaching**

### ***Key Strengths***

- The range of provision available and its match with market demand as demonstrated by successful recruitment.
- The rapid and strategic development of Postgraduate Taught Provision.
- Successful recruitment of international students to postgraduate taught programmes.
- Support provided for international students by the Faculty International Officer
- The Department's concern for, and awareness of, the employability of its graduates which it promotes through the curriculum and extracurricular initiatives.
- The Department's international focus with a remarkable 90% of postgraduate taught students from outwith the European Union, a notable number of international staff and links being developed with a number of institutions outwith the UK.
- Cohesion amongst staff, both academic and administrative, who were described as supportive, helpful and friendly by probationary staff and students
- Head of Department's leadership skills
- An open, dynamic and reflective environment supportive of enhancement of the student experience.

### ***Areas to be improved or enhanced***

- Assessment and feedback
- Engagement of Students with the Department's Employability related activities
- Postgraduate Taught Programmes (minor refinements)
- Management and Support of Staff and Teaching Fellows
- Tutorial Provision
- Student Representation

### ***Conclusions and recommendations***

#### **Conclusions**

The Review Panel commends the Department on its awareness of its strengths and weaknesses and its willingness to address issues as they arise and, although a number of recommendations have been made, they are made to enhance the quality of the student experience, and the management of teaching and learning. The Panel was impressed by the Department's rapid recovery from a time of intense change and its development into a thriving department, and congratulates the Head of Department whose success in leading the Department to its current position was borne out by the high regard with which staff spoke of him.



## **Recommendations**

The recommendations interspersed in the preceding report are summarised below. It is important to note that the majority of these recommendations refer to tasks or issues identified by the Department for action either prior to the Review or in the SER. Some of these actions are already in hand.

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

### **Assessment and Feedback**

#### *Recommendation 1:*

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department review the current assessment of Level 1 and consider broadening the range of assessment methods used to reduce the focus on examination and help students acquire and develop a range of skills detailed in the programme ILOs. The Panel also **recommends** that existing interactive activities, such as problem solving scenarios (see paragraph 4.2.1), be extended to further develop enquiry-led learning at Levels 1 and 2. [paragraph 4.3.5, 4.1.2 and 4.2.1]

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

#### *Recommendation 2:*

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department continue with its plans for its Assessment Working Group to investigate methods of improving the formative element of assessments in both undergraduate and postgraduate programmes with a view to increasing the opportunities for students to receive timely, meaningful and useful feedback on their assessed work. [paragraph 4.3.4]

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

#### *Recommendation 3:*

The Panel **recommends** that the remit of the Assessment Working Group be extended to consider how new assessment practices might further support and promote enquiry-led learning across the curriculum including at Levels 1 and 2. [paragraph 4.4.4 and 4.1.2]

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

#### *Recommendation 4:*

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department ensures that the Assessment Working Group fulfils its stated aims and that a report on the outputs of the Working Group be included in the Department's responses to the recommendations of this Review to ensure that the outcomes of the Working Group are reported to the Panel and to the University. [paragraph 4.3.2]

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

#### *Recommendation 5:*

The Dean reported that the Faculty had recently identified the need for an Equivalence Committee and the Review Panel **recommends** that the Department avail itself of the advice of this Committee as soon as it is in operation to enable the Department to include marks from study abroad in the students' final grade. This would emphasise the value the University places on the educational value of the study abroad experience

and the importance of maintaining academic work while away from this University.  
[paragraph 5.2]

For the attention of: **The Head of Department**  
with the support of: **The Dean of the Faculty**

*Recommendation 6:*

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department review its advice on plagiarism and Turnitin to ensure that it is clear and direct and does not have any inadvertent demotivating effect. [paragraph 5.4]

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

**Employability**

*Recommendation 7:*

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department explore the possibility of marketing career planning provision and opportunities to students in a way that emphasises the Careers Service input to attract those students who would normally seek information directly from Careers Service. [paragraph 4.6.1]

For the attention of: **The Head of Department**  
**The Director of the Careers service**

*Recommendation 8:*

The Panel **recommends** that the Careers Service be informed of the students' comments regarding being given different advice by different members of staff and finding the Careers Fair unhelpful to assist with ongoing improvements to the Service.

For the attention of: **The Director of the Careers Service**  
**Senate Office**

*Recommendation 9:*

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department encourage students to think about employability from the earliest stages of their studies by including Level 1 and 2 students in invitations to employability related workshops as was suggested by the Department above, and exploring embedding employability in curriculum development. [paragraph 4.6.1]

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

*Recommendation 10:*

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department take its proposed development of a graduate network forward in consultation with Careers Service staff and the Development and Alumni Office Director, with a view to improving employment data and building on links with employers. [paragraph 4.6.3]

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

**Postgraduate Taught Programmes**

*Recommendation 11:*

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department examines its postgraduate taught programme structures with a view to eliminating possible duplication of content and

ensuring that, in reality, students experience the flexibility of choice set out in recruitment and programme information documents. [paragraph 4.4.1]

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

*Recommendation 12:*

The Review Panel **recommends** that consideration be given to making the research methods course compulsory for all postgraduate taught students to emphasise and recognise its importance in gaining the skills necessary to write a postgraduate level dissertation. [paragraph 4.4.3]

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

*Recommendation 13:*

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Academic Standards Committee explore concerns relating to the generic PGT regulation with the Department at the point where the implementation of the Generic Regulations is appraised. [paragraph 5.5]

For the attention of: **The Convener of Academic Standards Committee**

**Management and Support of Staff and Teaching Fellows**

*Recommendation 14:*

The Panel **recommends** that the Department introduce a P&DR structure that distributes responsibility for P&DR for all academic staff, which currently lies solely with the Head of Department, to other senior staff within the Department. [paragraph 2.7]

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

*Recommendation 15:*

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department adopt a proactive approach to addressing the gender balance amongst staff and, as suggested by Head of Department, include a statement regarding the Department's "aim to achieve gender balance" when advertising, particularly for senior positions. [paragraph 4.8.1]

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

*Recommendation 16:*

The Review Panel **recommends** that the University (Human Resources) ensures that rates of payment for Graduate Teaching Assistants, or equivalent, are comparable to that of neighbouring institutions and that these are reviewed annually. [paragraph 4.8.5]

For the attention of: **The Director of Human Resources**  
**The Dean of the Faculty**

*Recommendation 17:*

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department provide structured guidance to new teaching fellows and encourages staff to either adopt a uniform approach or explain clearly what is expected of them on each course. [paragraph 4.8.6]

For the attention of: **The Head of Department  
supported by Learning and Teaching Centre  
and the Coordinator of GTA programme**

### **Tutorial Provision**

#### *Recommendation 18:*

The Panel **recommends** that the Department move towards ensuring that all existing courses include tutorials, i.e. smaller group sessions with a high level of student participation, as quickly as is practicable, and that this type of tutorial be an integral part of all postgraduate programmes in future. The Panel expects significant change in this matter to be reported in the Department's responses to recommendations at the end of session 2008-09 (one year from the submission of the report to Academic Standards Committee). [paragraph 4.4.2]

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

### **Student Representation**

#### *Recommendation 19:*

The Review Panel considers that student representation, on teaching committees should be the norm and **recommends** that the Department appoint student representatives to participate in these committees as full members as a matter of priority, reserving business only where necessary, in reflection of practice at Faculty and University level. The Panel also suggests that the Department consider the appointment of a student on to its departmental committee. [paragraph 6.3]

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

#### *Recommendation 20:*

The Panel considers that where assessment and feedback policies and practices are being reviewed and developed, the views of students should be an integral part of the discussion. Therefore, the Panel **recommends** that students are brought in to the discussion in a meaningful manner through membership of one or more of their representatives on the Assessment Working Group.

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

#### *Recommendation 21:*

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department explore alternative mechanisms for facilitating the effective operation of the class representative system. This should be done in consultation with the Student Representative Council and the Class Representatives in the Department and take account of any recommendations arising from the current University Working Group on the student feedback mechanisms. [paragraph 6.5]

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

#### *Recommendation 22:*

The Review Panel also **recommends** that staff are made aware of the role of student representative as defined in *The Code of Practice on Student Representation* (<http://senate.gla.ac.uk/qa/studentrep/index.html>) and that they be required to facilitate the function of student representatives at all meetings of the relevant classes. [paragraph 6.5]

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

*Recommendation 23:*

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department review its methods of communication of actions taken in response to issues raised by students, particularly those related to postgraduate taught programmes. The Panel did not consider that posting summaries of feedback on Moodle was sufficiently proactive. *[paragraph 6.4]*

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

## **Full List of Programmes and additional notes**

### ***Undergraduate programmes - MA, MA (Social Sciences)***

- Single Honours in Economics
- Single Honours in Economics with Business Economics
- Principal Honours in Economics with a subsidiary language
- MA Joint Honours in Economics and another subject
- MA Joint Honours in Business Economics and another subject

All MA (Social Sciences) programmes are accredited by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)

### ***Postgraduate programmes - MSc***

- Central Banking (new in 2007/08)
- Development Studies
- Economic and Financial Sector Policies (AACSB-accredited).
- Economic Development
- Economics, Banking and Finance (AACSB-accredited)
- Environment and Sustainable Development
- Finance and Economic Development
- Financial Economics
- International Development (new in 2007/08)
- International Financial Economics
- International Trade and Finance
- Project Planning and Development Policy Analysis.

### ***Joint programmes***

- BAcc Joint Honours in Accountancy and Finance and Economics
- International Banking and Finance: organised jointly with the departments of Accounting and Finance and Management (AACSB-accredited)
- MSc Gender, Rights and Development, Department of Politics: one compulsory course, a range of elective courses and dissertation supervision for appropriate topics
- MSc International Finance and Economic Policy: organised jointly with the Department of Accounting and Finance (AACSB-accredited)
- MSc Management (Development Policy): organised jointly with the Department of Management (AACSB-accredited).

The Department also contributes to the following degree programmes offered by other departments or other institutions

- Faculty of Engineering undergraduate degrees: two 10-credit courses, Structure of Industry and Microeconomics E1. Structure of Industry is a compulsory course for first year students taking degrees in Aerospace Engineering and Microeconomics E1 is an elective course for Mechanical Engineering students in second year. Both are available as elective courses for other students in the Faculty of Engineering.<sup>2</sup>
- MSc in Carbon Management, Dumfries Campus: one compulsory course and a range of elective courses

---

<sup>2</sup> Structure of Industry is due for a major revamp in conjunction with the Department of Management to provide a programme of 'Economics for engineers' courses that will run over successive years.

- Scottish Graduate Programme in Economics (collaborative MSc programme between 8 Scottish universities, hosted by the University of Edinburgh).

***In 2008-09, the Department plans to offer new MSc programmes in:***

- Banking and Financial Services (in collaboration with the Department of Accounting and Finance)
- Financial Forecasting and Investment
- Investment Banking and Finance
- Europe and International Development (Politics and Economics) (in collaboration with the Department of Politics)
- International Development and Education (in collaboration with the Faculty of Education).
- Macroeconomics (as part of the introduction of two taught PhD programmes)
- Quantitative Finance (as part of the introduction of two taught PhD programmes)

*Prepared by: Janet Fleming, Senate Office*

*Last modified on: Thursday 24 July 2008*