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1. Executive Summary

Periodic Subject Review (PSR) is the University of Glasgow's Institution-led subject review process and is an integral part of the University's Academic Quality Framework. The PSR process provides a formal opportunity for a School/Subject to reflect on and critically evaluate its provision and to benefit from a constructive dialogue with senior academics from both within and outwith the University. It is intended to be a positive and constructive activity, supporting the School and Subject in the enhancement of their provision and learning experience of their students.

2. General Information

Periodic Subject Review covers all taught undergraduate and postgraduate programmes undertaken by Subject or School. This includes:

- Any joint degree programmes, including joint degree programmes with other institutions where the University of Glasgow is the administering university
- Service teaching provided for another School or College within the University i.e. where the School is responsible for the administration, organisation and/or content of the courses. (The Subject that provides the course co-ordinator and organises the examination is a good indicator of which school is responsible)
- Collaborative provision where collaborative activity can be with partners both in the UK and overseas and includes student mobility arrangements.
- New programmes or courses that are about to be introduced (the SER should include an explanation of the rationale behind their development and programme specifications/draft handbooks should be provided where available).

It does not include research programmes as these are reviewed as part of the Graduate School Review process.

2.1 Periodic Subject Review (PSR) process

The PSR review process provides support to School/Subject(s) in evaluating taught provision and will cover the following aspects:

- strategic approach to enhancing learning and teaching
- enhancing and supporting the student learning experience
- enhancement in learning and teaching
- quality assurance and maintaining and reviewing academic standards
- approaches to identifying and sharing good practice

2.2 Frequency and Timing of Reviews

i) A six-year rolling review schedule is approved, in consultation with the Vice Principal (Learning and Teaching), Deans (Learning and Teaching) and Heads of School. Reviews are normally undertaken at School level, but due to the interdisciplinary nature of some Schools, this is not always practical and Heads of School are invited to advise on appropriate groupings for reviews. The schedule aims to distribute the reviewing load in any one year across Colleges and takes account, where possible, issues such as joint degrees and articulation with external accreditation timetables.

---

1 More details on the University’s Academic Quality Framework can be found at: [www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_127773_en.pdf](http://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_127773_en.pdf)
ii) Reviews are not normally held at the beginning or end of the academic session or during examination periods. For this reason, the reviews are typically held in the period December to March when students are available to meet with the Review Panel. The Senate Office will consult and liaise with School/Subjects over possible dates.

iii) In advance of the review, the PSR Manager, will arrange a briefing session, which all Head of School/Subject and other relevant staff from the School/Subject(s) will be invited to. This year, it will take place on 28 August 2019. The Senate Office will continue to liaise with the School/Subject thereafter.

3. Documentation for the Review

3.1 Self Evaluation Report (SER)

3.1.1 Prior to the visit, a Self-Evaluation Report (SER) is prepared, normally by the Head of School/Subject, in conjunction with other staff. The format of the SER should follow the Guidance Notes on the Preparation of the Self Evaluation Report (see Appendix 1).

3.1.2 The SER should be approximately 30 to 35 pages in length.

3.1.3 Support in preparing for the PSR is available from staff in the Learning Enhancement and Academic Development Service (LEADS). The Senate Office will provide the Head of School/Subject(s) with a named contact from LEADS who will provide assistance and advice on writing an SER. Subjects are urged to make use of this service and to contact LEADS before beginning the SER or at an early stage in the drafting process to gain the best advantage from it.

3.1.4 Staff and students should be consulted on the SER. Normally, students are consulted via Staff: Student Liaison Committee (SSLC) meetings and/or focus groups and/or Moodle, to elicit input to the reflection on provision and establish whether or not it reflects their experience of the School/Subject.

3.1.5 If it is a Subject-level review, the Head of School should be given an opportunity to review the SER prior to submission to the Senate Office.

3.1.6 Once the Senate Office receives the SER, it will be forwarded to the Vice-Principal and Head of College and Dean of Learning and Teaching who are invited to provide the Panel with any additional commentary prior to the Panel visit.

3.2. Supporting documentation

3.2.1 Documentation should be provided for all programmes and course under review (please see 3.2.6 below)

Documentation does not need to be provided for programmes where the administrative/organisational responsibility of the course lies in another School/Subject or programmes or courses that are withdrawn or about to be withdrawn, i.e. will not run in the following session. These will not normally be covered in the review but a list of any such programmes should be included in the SER along with a brief statement of the reason(s) behind withdrawal.

Please note that examples of student’s assessed work are not required for PSR.

The Senate Office will liaise with a named contact for the School/Subject(s) regarding documentation.

3.2.2 The Senate Office requires the documentation at least six weeks in advance of the review date. All documents should be uploaded to the Sharepoint site (Senate Office will provide the
link well in advance of the deadline). The SER and link to the Sharepoint site will be given to each member of the Review Panel four weeks in advance of the review date. In addition to reviewing the SER, each Panel member will also be asked to comment on a selection of the documentation for their particular attention.

3.2.3 Where the review will involve a particularly large volume of documentation, the Senate Office will work with the School/Subject to select a representative sample to be made available to the Panel. Panel members may request to see any documents not selected.

3.2.4 There is not always much to hear from staff and so a short survey will be distributed to staff prior to the review. This provides the Panel with a sense of how staff across the Subject/School views the provision of, and support for, teaching and those involved in teaching. The majority of questions are drawn from a Universitas 21 Teaching Practices Survey that the University of Glasgow has previously participated in. The results of the survey will be shared with the PSR panel and members of the Subject/School.

3.2.5 Requests for other documentation may be made in advance of, or on the day of the review, or post-review.

3.2.6 The following is a list of the documentation required in addition to the SER:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To be provided by the School/Subject:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School/Subject information</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details of School/Subject organisation, management and administration (including collaborative arrangements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A list of all current School staff (highlighting those with involvement in subject(s) under review)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details of the School workload model and current workload details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject and Programme information</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject information provided for students from the current session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality Enhancement &amp; Assurance information</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details of School quality enhancement and assurance procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual monitoring reports for the previous three complete sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Evaluation Student Summary and response reports for all taught courses for the last three years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most recent reports of Professional, Statutory and Regulatory bodies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 The School/Subject(s) may also provide other data if routinely collected in regard to teaching and learning activities which have been referred to in the SER
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership and remits of any School/Subject committees concerned with teaching, learning and assessment activities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minutes of all staff/student committee meetings for the current and previous two sessions</td>
<td>include remit and membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes of the main School/Subject committee(s) dealing with teaching, learning and assessment</td>
<td>include main School/Subject level management meetings and Learning and Teaching Committee, the title of the committee should be easily identifiable in the title, ie “LTC December 2016” These should be provided for the current and past two sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes of Employer Liaison Committee (or equivalent)</td>
<td>(if appropriate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other minutes or other reports relating to operation or review of courses and programmes (e.g. reports of any course reviews etc. but not course approval pro-form)</td>
<td>We do not require Board of Studies/Exam Board minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following information will be gathered by the Senate Office and will be uploaded directly to Share Point site

Subject and Programme Information

| Student numbers in the previous complete session (headcount) | • student numbers by year of programme  
• career (UG/PGT Nos)  
• academic load (FT/PT)  
• gender  
• domicile  
• ethnicity  
• disability  
• course enrolments |
|---|---|
| Student Success Performance Indicators (SSPIs) and degree classification results | • course results  
• pass rates  
• graduation numbers by programme  
• awards achieved |
| Progression and completion data by programme. | Data is frequently at College level for indicators of student retention e.g. 1 – 2 progression rates; year 1 continuation rates; these data along with the data above will be used to discuss student retention |
| Evaluation of grade profiles and degree classifications |  |
| First employment destinations |  |
| Academic staff age profile (10-year intervals) i.e. 25-34; 35-44, etc | includes information on gender balance, ethnicity and disability |

Subject and Programme Information

| Relevant subject benchmark statements |  |

Quality Enhancement & Assurance Information

---

3 Any queries regarding accuracy of data should be directed to the Senate Office
4. Engaging Students in the PSR process

4.1 Engagement with and the participation of students are vital components of the PSR process.

4.2 Student engagement takes place prior to the review, during the review and following the review. There is also indirect engagement with students’ views and feedback through the documentation submitted for the review.

Prior to the review

- The School/Subject should inform students about the review at an early opportunity e.g. at the first SSLC meeting in the academic session in which the review will be held and later reinforced by communication with all students e.g. Moodle and/or Student Voice. An information sheet for students is also available through the Senate Office website.

- SER author(s) should endeavour to liaise with the wider student body on an early draft and later to seek endorsement prior to submission. To reach beyond student representatives, the School/Subject should consider posting a draft on Moodle and/or Student Voice so that all students (undergraduate and postgraduate have the opportunity to comment). Obtain student feedback and ensure that the student experience is evaluated and captured meaningfully in the development of the SER.

- The Student Panel member will arrange a short meeting with class representatives prior to the Review to gain some initial feedback. The clerk to the Panel will liaise with the School/Subject and Student Panel member in arranging this meeting.

- Student feedback obtained via routine quality mechanisms will also inform the Panel e.g. summary and response documents for end of course questionnaires, staff: student liaison committee minutes, annual monitoring reports, other student surveys, etc.

Engagement during the review

- The Review Panel includes a student member. Experience has found that the inclusion of a student member provides the Panel with a greater focus on the student experience and an additional perspective on other issues from the student point of view.

- Undergraduate and taught postgraduate students will be invited to meet with the Review Panel to share their views on learning, teaching and assessment and on their engagement with developments in learning, teaching and assessment and their wider experience as students of the University. Experience has shown that students are generally willing to

---

4 Programme specifications should now be in place for all programmes across the University. The School/Subject should ensure that the specifications are up-to-date and reflect current programmes.

5 [www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_104342_en.pdf](http://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_104342_en.pdf)
participate, particularly if they have had an early briefing about the review and have been engaged in the preparation for it.

Engagement with students following the review

• School/Subject to provide feedback to students after the review. Following approval of the review report by the Academic Standards Committee (ASC), the Senate Office will circulate this to the School/Subject. Please ensure that this is provided for consideration at SSLCs and for posting onto School/Subject websites and/or Moodle/Student Voice.

• The School/Subject will be asked to report on the steps it has taken to feedback to students on the outcomes of the review and on the actions taken in the six month progress report to ASC.

5. The Review Panel

5.1 A Panel will undertake the review whose membership will comprise at a minimum:

• a Vice Principal or the Clerk of Senate or the Convener of ASC (Panel Convener)
• at least one external subject specialist from other HE institutions, normally in the UK
• a student representative from outwith the School and normally from another College
• a Senate Assessor on the University Court
• an academic from a cognate School, normally within the same College
• a representative from the Learning Enhancement and Academic Development Service (LEADS)
• an administrator, normally from the Senate Office, who will also act as clerk to the Panel

5.2 The School or Subject will be asked to nominate the external examiner specialist(s). The number of external subject specialists appointed to the Panel will depend upon the size of the subject(s) and or the range of provision. The Head of the School/Subject will be asked to suggest external subject specialists for the consideration of the Convener; the Convener will appoint external members. External members will receive a fee plus reimbursement of expenses (subject to taxation). The Senate Office is responsible for the payment of costs and for all communication with the external member(s).

5.3 Suggestions for external subject specialists should be drawn from HEIs, normally within the UK. The School/Subject will be asked to indicate whether, in their view, the Panel should include one or two external members and to suggest potential external members. The School/Subject should provide three names, four where two external members are requested, ranked in order of preference. A note of preferred combinations should also be included if more than one external member is to be invited.

5.4 Supporting background information must be provided for each person, particularly in relation to their relevant, current experience in learning and teaching. A statement should also be included indicating whether or not the person has had any previous involvement with the Subject(s). Previous involvement will not normally exclude a person from acting as an external member (the information is requested mainly for the benefit of the Convener and the other Panel members). Exceptions to this are where the suggested person has been a member of staff or a student of the University in the three years prior to the review or is the current external examiner. Where the external member has been an external examiner at this University, their

---

6 Suggestions for external subject specialists from outwith the UK may be made but it will be important for them to be familiar with the Scottish and or UK HE system. Consideration will also need to be given to travel and other costs.

7 Three or four names are requested from the outset in order to avoid delays in the event that the School/Subject’s first choice(s) are unable or unwilling to participate in the review.
nomination will only normally be considered if their appointment has ended at least three years prior to the review.

6. Review of Documentation

6.1 Each Panel member scrutinises the Self Evaluation Report (SER) and considers the extent to which it is reflective, evaluative, and constructively self-critical. It will also consider how staff and students have contributed to its development.

6.2 Each Panel member is assigned an area of documentation to review.

- Internal Panel members focus on the robustness of the School’s procedures and mechanisms for assuring quality and its plans for enhancement, particularly plans related to the University’s Learning and Teaching Strategy and College Learning and Teaching Plans.

- External subject specialists will have a key role in programme review aspects, in particular: (a) reviewing the programmes in the light of relevant national subject benchmark statements and other external reference points, including the requirements of any relevant Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies, where relevant; and (b) the appropriateness of the School/Subject’s mechanisms for assuring the standards of awards.

- The student member focus is on student related matters, in particular: (a) the usefulness of student handbooks/Moodle pages and other key information; (b) the opportunities for students to engage in curriculum, teaching, learning and assessment development and innovation; and (c) the effectiveness of mechanisms for obtaining and responding to student feedback.

6.3 Each Panel member provides the clerk to the Review Panel a report on topics for exploration in advance of the review date for consideration at a pre-visit meeting, which is normally held approximately one week in advance of the review. The Panel will agree the areas and topics to be covered in the visit and this will be provided to the Head of School/Subject. The School/Subject should not respond in advance of the visit to the items identified; the note is for information only. However, where the Panel wishes some clarification on minor points, it may make an explicit request for a response prior to the visit.

6.4 The Panel may explore some topics in more than one meeting and will not be restricted from exploring others as they arise on the day. Likewise, they may not raise all the topics listed on the day.

6.5 The relevant Vice Principal and Head of College and Dean (Learning and Teaching), are sent a copy of the Subject/School's Self Evaluation Report to have the opportunity to review the SER and provide commentary on factual accuracy in relation to College policy, if deemed appropriate. Any commentary received, will be forwarded to the Panel and the Subject/School in advance of the review visit.

7. The Panel Visit

7.1 The Panel will visit and meet with individuals and groups of staff and students in the Subject(s) under review. The normal pattern of the visit is:

- a meeting with the Head of School and Subject(s) may be accompanied by one or two other senior members of staff who have delegated responsibility

- separate meetings with undergraduate and postgraduate students on taught courses/programmes

- a meeting with academic staff and others who have pivotal roles in teaching and supporting students or staff (normally without the Heads of School/Subject). This should include:
(i) Course or Programme or Year Co-ordinators
(ii) the Head of Learning and Teaching
(iii) the School Quality Officer (QO)
(iv) staff representatives including support and professorial staff

- a meeting with early career staff
- a meeting with hourly paid staff (e.g. GTAs, demonstrators)
- a meeting with the Head of School/Subject and the relevant Dean of Learning and Teaching (or Dean of Graduate Studies if appropriate) to discuss matters that have arisen during the course of the day and to highlight main areas likely to be included in the report. The relevant Vice-Principal and Head of College will also receive an open invitation to this meeting. Issues highlighted in this meeting may be shared with colleagues immediately after the Panel visit.

7.2 The meetings with students are held before meetings with staff in order to allow students’ views to be discussed with staff. Panels will not formally review students’ work or observe teaching.

7.3 The Senate Office will ask the School/Subject to assist in approaching students to participate in the review and meet with the Panel. Efforts should be made to ensure that the students who attend the meetings include representatives of as many different sections of the student body as possible, e.g. each level of study, mode of study (part-time, full-time, distance learning) etc. To facilitate discussion with the students, the meetings will normally be conducted by splitting the students into smaller groups (maintaining a representative selection as far as possible) led by one or more Panel members. The Senate Office Administrator will ensure the necessary arrangements are in place and will liaise with the named PSR contact to co-ordinate the groups.

7.4 The Panel may request other meetings. The Panel may also undertake a tour of School/Subject(s) accommodation and facilities. These matters will be decided following consultation with the Heads of School/Subject and Convener of the Review Panel. Any tour of facilities should not be too ambitious and as a rule not exceed 30 minutes. It should be limited to showing specific areas referred to in the SER, contrasts between the different standards of facilities or providing an opportunity to view student learning and teaching work. Consideration may be given to conducting a tour on the day before the review visit if the external member(s) plans to arrive early.

7.5 The Senate Office is responsible for the organisation of the review visit and for liaising between the School/Subject and Convener over the timetable for the visit. Please note that suitable accommodation needs to be provided within the School/Subject for the duration of the visit, it is the responsibility of the School/Subject to be reviewed to organise this. The Senate Office will organise catering.

8. The Outcome of the Review

- an evaluation of the quality of the provision under review, including a statement on the Panel’s conclusions on the currency and validity of the programmes offered
- an evaluation of the School/Subject's procedures for assuring the standards of awards and the quality of provision
- an evaluation of the School/Subject’s approach to the enhancement of the student learning experience in taught provision

---

8 Further meetings between the Panel Chair and the Dean (L&T)/Dean of Graduate Studies and/or Head of School/College may be held if the Panel considers this necessary to clarify outstanding issues.
• an evaluation of how effectively the School/Subject engages with students in developing teaching, learning and assessment practice, including preparation for the PSR process
• an evaluation of collaborative provision (if appropriate)
• an evaluation of student mobility and work based and placement learning
• the identification of good practices for dissemination across the University, as appropriate
• recommendations for action to address any identified weaknesses and to further strengthen provision and thereby further enhance the provision of teaching, learning and assessment

9. PSR Report and Follow-up

9.1 The Review Panel will produce a report identifying the key strengths along with conclusions and recommendations for improvement or change. The recommendations contained within the report will indicate who is to take action: this may be targeted at the Subject(s), School, the College, a University Service, etc. Resource implications will only be considered where there is an adverse impact on the quality of learning and teaching. In such cases, the Panel may recommend that this is considered by the budget holder.

9.2 The Clerk to the Panel will draft the report, which will be circulated initially to the Convener and afterwards to other Panel members for comment or amendment. Within eight weeks of the review visit, the final draft report will be made available to the Head of School/Subject, the relevant Vice Principal and Head of College and the relevant Dean of Learning and Teaching for the correction of factual inaccuracies and comments regarding the text, particularly in relation to commendations and recommendations. The draft can be discussed with colleagues but should not be widely circulated. Recipients will have two weeks to provide comments. Any suggested changes will be subject to the approval of the Convener of the Review Panel.

9.3 The report is submitted to Academic Standards Committee (ASC), which scrutinises the report and will either endorse the report or suggest amendments. Following ASC, the recommendations are forwarded to the School/Subject and others named in the recommendations for action. ASC will report to Education Policy and Strategy Committee on any issues of educational policy that impact beyond the School. Senate, the Senior Management Group and the University Court will be advised, as necessary, of recommendations that have more serious academic or resource implications.

9.4 Should it prove necessary, the Review Panel may produce a confidential annex to the main report, which is for internal use by the Vice Principal (Academic & Educational Innovation). This annex is produced only if there is information that the Panel considers sensitive and inappropriate for the main report e.g. information relating to individuals or interpersonal relations, etc. It is anticipated that the need for a confidential annex will be exceptional.

9.5 Schools/Subject(s) are expected to provide a progress report in addressing the recommendations of the review, submitted to ASC approximately 6 months from the date ASC has approved the Report. In some cases, ASC may request a response within a shorter timescale, if deemed appropriate. Those responsible for taking action will be contacted by the Senate Office and advised of the relevant timescales. The School/Subject should also report on the steps taken to feedback to students on the outcomes of the review and on the actions taken. The Convener of the Panel will review the progress reports to ensure that the recommendations have been adequately addressed and reported, including evidence of dissemination of recommendations to students.

9.6 ASC may request further follow-up reports in certain circumstances, e.g. where progress has been limited or delayed. ASC will be responsible for maintaining an overview of the PSRs. In addition to reporting to ASC, School/Subjects should reflect on the impact of PSR during annual monitoring.
### 10. Summary of the Review process and follow-up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Prior to visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August prior to review</td>
<td>VP Learning and Teaching and PSR Manager will provide a PSR session with Head and other relevant staff from the School/Subject to discuss arrangements for the review and documentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 6 weeks</td>
<td>School/Subject submits the Self Evaluation Report and supporting documentation to the Senate Office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review of the SER and documentation by the Panel (some further information may be sought at this stage). Vice Principal/Head of College and Dean (L&amp;T), are also sent a copy of the SER and any commentary received is forwarded to the Subject/School in advance of the review visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4 weeks</td>
<td>Clerk to the Review Panel to liaise with School/Subject to establish suitable timetable for review visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 week</td>
<td>Internal Panel members hold briefing pre-meeting and Head of School/Subject provided with a note of the main topics for discussion at the review visit (some further information may be sought at this stage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>The Review Visit</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over the day(s), the Panel meets with the Head of School/Subject(s), Dean (Learning and Teaching), staff, GTAs and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At final meeting of the visit, the Convener of the Panel will give an indication of main areas likely to be included in the report to Head of School/Subject and the College/Dean (L&amp;T). These can be discussed with colleagues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following Visit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 8 weeks</td>
<td>The draft report is provided to the Head of School/Subject and the College/Dean (L&amp;T) to check for factual inaccuracies and to ensure recommendations and commendations are transparent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 10 weeks</td>
<td>Any feedback received is subject to approval by the Panel Convener. The draft report is submitted to ASC for scrutiny and approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following ASC approval (normally May but also under summer powers)</td>
<td>The ASC approved report is provided to the School/Subject for wider circulation. Action on the recommendations should be initiated by the School/Subject and others named within the report highlighted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 6mths from date of ASC meeting (ASC can request an earlier response if action deemed urgent)</td>
<td>Provision of a progress report on recommendations by the School/Subject and others to be provided to ASC. The School/Subject should also report on the steps taken to feedback to students on the outcomes of the review and progress made in addressing the recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 1 year</td>
<td>Further progress reports/updates may be requested by ASC, if deemed necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Annual Overview of PSR

11.1 The Senate Office produces an annual overview of the reviews conducted within each session and summarises any key issues or themes arising out of the review recommendations that may require attention at College or University level.

11.2 The Senate Office produces a summary of good practice identified by the Review Panels with a view to commending a number for wider dissemination.

11.3 The above two reports are submitted to Academic Standards Committee with onward reporting to the Education Policy and Strategy Committee, Senate, the Senior Management Group and Court, as appropriate.

11.4 Examples of good practice identified for wider dissemination are brought to the attention of the Good Practice Adviser, LEADS. In the first instance, the Good Practice Adviser will contact Schools and will work with staff to develop a range of electronic and online materials in a variety of media. These will be made widely available to the University of Glasgow community.

Staff engaged in good practice will be encouraged to:

- share their teaching tips by submitting them to ‘Glasgow University’s Teaching Tips Online’ (GUSTTO), which is a bespoke resource designed for staff to share practice
- consider offering a presentation at the annual Learning and Teaching Conference
- contribute to regular CPD events run by LEADS

It is hoped that this will help build a community ethos of sharing and embedding good practice across the University.

12. External Access to Reports

12.1 PSR reports are published on the University’s web pages and are publicly available at: https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/senateoffice/qea/periodicsubjectreview/#/reports

Progress reports on recommendations are also published. School/Subjects should provide links from their own websites to these reports.

12.2 PSR reports, recommendation responses and overview reports are made available to the QAA for annual engagement meetings and Enhancement-led Institutional Review.

12.3 An annual report is also made to the Scottish Funding Council on the progress with the schedule for and the outcomes of PSRs, together with details of any engagements with Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies.
The University of Glasgow

Periodic Subject Review: Self Evaluation Report
School/Subject

Guidance notes on the preparation of the Self Evaluation Report

Periodic Subject Review (PSR) is the University’s Institution-led subject review required by the Scottish Funding Council. The Self Evaluation Report (SER) is central to the PSR process. The SER should demonstrate the School/Subject’s approach to enhancement and provide a sense of the student learning experience. It provides an opportunity for greater reflection on areas relevant to the School/Subject’s current situation and an opportunity to reflect on strategy for future development. The SER will set the agenda for the Review visit itself.

The SER template is indicative of topics for inclusion but is not exhaustive and other areas can be included, if the School/Subject considers them relevant. The SER should approximately be no longer than 30-35 pages in length. This can be augmented by supporting data, if required.

1. Introduction

1.1.1 This section should also include a brief outline of the process to develop the Self Evaluation Review e.g. who was involved in the process. This should include consultation with students.

2. School/Subject Context and Strategy

2.1 Key Features of the School/Subject Context and Vision

2.1.1 This section should provide a (brief) overview of the School/Subject including:
- Range of provision under review
- Staffing (summary of staff cohort, FTEs and SSR)
- Significant changes since the last review e.g. restructuring, physical resources
- Strategic Vision and future plans

2.2 Strategic approach to enhancing learning and teaching

2.2.1 This section should detail the School/Subject’s overall aims and linkage with the University Learning and Teaching Strategy and College Learning and Teaching Plan.

3. Enhancing the Student Experience

3.1 Admissions, Retention and Success

3.1.1 This section should:
- Include student numbers over the review period
- Composition and key trends in student population (including alternative routes)
- Approaches to recruitment
- Retention and progression rates e.g. first year completion rates should be analysed
- Reference to Destination of Leavers in Higher Education (DLHE Survey) data

3.2 Equality and Diversity

---

9 Details can be found at: [https://www.hesa.ac.uk/stats-dlhe](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/stats-dlhe)
3.2.1 This section should identify how equality and diversity is supported in relation to admissions, student support and pedagogy.

3.3 **Supporting students in their learning**

3.3.1 Detail student support mechanisms including:
- Support for transition\(^{10}\) and induction
- Improving the Student Experience\(^{11}\)
- Specific support for International students, widening participation students, Direct Entry into Year 2, etc.
- Role of Advisers of Studies/supervisors

3.4 **Student Engagement**

3.4.1 Analysis of how the School/Subject engages students in their learning

3.4.2 Approaches to promoting the development of graduate attributes, including employability and internationalisation

3.4.3 Effectiveness of feedback mechanisms e.g. role of class representatives and effectiveness of Staff-Student Liaison Committees, use of Student Voice, role of local and institutional surveys and closure of feedback loops

3.5 **Reflect on the effectiveness of the School/Subject’s approaches to enhancing the student learning experience**

Opportunities, challenges and good practice identified

---

4. **Enhancement in Learning and Teaching**

4.1 **Learning and Teaching**

4.1.1 Provide an introduction to the School/Subject’s approach to enhancing learning and teaching including:
- Curriculum design and development
- Approach to Intended Learning Outcomes
- Evaluation of work based learning and placement and whether these continue to meet requirements
- Technology-Enhanced Learning and Teaching e.g. use of Moodle, Mahara, impact of the E-Learning Strategy in enhancing learning and teaching through technology
- Study Abroad (promotion, provision and support)

4.2 **Assessment and Feedback**

4.2.1 This section should outline the School/Subject’s approach to, and effectiveness of, assessment and feedback including:
- Range of assessment methods
- Engagement with the Code of Assessment and Assessment Policy
- What/how do students receive feedback on assessed work

---

\(^{10}\) Support for Transition was the National Enhancement Theme for 2014-17 but the University has continued to focus on this theme

\(^{11}\) Evidence for Enhancement: Improving the Student Experience is the current enhancement theme, launched October 2017. The theme reflects on data available to help understand what we do well and what we could improve. Details can be found at: [https://www.enhancementthemes.ac.uk/current-enhancement-theme](https://www.enhancementthemes.ac.uk/current-enhancement-theme)
Balance of formative and summative assessment

4.3 Approaches to identifying, disseminating and extending good practice

4.3.1 School and Subjects are encouraged to identify areas of good practice and to highlight how they disseminate and extend good practice within the School/Subject and beyond.

4.4 Resources for Learning and Teaching

4.4.1 This section may deal with topics such as staffing and physical resources.

4.5 Engaging and Supporting Staff

4.5.1 The School/Subject should seek to analyse support for staff:

- Probationer and early career development support
- Ongoing support and development during academic career
- Support and training for GTAs and hourly paid staff

4.6 Reflect on the effectiveness of the School/Subject’s approaches to enhancement in learning and teaching.

5. Academic Standards

5.1 Approach to setting, maintaining and reviewing academic standards

5.1.1 This section should briefly outline the approach the School/Subject takes to assure the quality of learning and teaching and the student experience. This should include consideration of:

- Course and Programme Approval
- Annual Monitoring
- External Examiners
- Student Feedback
- Subject Benchmark Statements
- Scottish Credit and Qualification Framework (SCFQ)
- Accreditation requirements
- Other external references

5.2 Reflect on the effectiveness of the School/Subject’s arrangements for securing academic standards

6. Collaborative Activity (where applicable)

6.1 Key Features of the School/Subject Context and Vision

This section should briefly outline key features of any collaborative activity, range of provision and include strategic priorities.

6.2 Enhancing the Student Experience

This section should provide student numbers, approaches to recruitment and how students are supported including during induction, transition and how equality and diversity is supported.

---

12 Collaborative activity can be with partners both in the UK and overseas. This includes student mobility arrangements. Information on the types of collaborative activity can be found at: https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/academiccollaborations/typesofcollaboration/
6.3 Enhancement in Learning and Teaching
This section should provide reflection on:
- Curriculum design
- Student engagement
- Approach and effectiveness of assessment and feedback
- Resources for learning and teaching
- Engaging and supporting staff

6.4 Academic Standards
This section should reflect on the effectiveness of the management of collaborative activities; how academic standards are maintained and enhanced.

7. Summary of perceived strengths and areas for improvement

7.1 Self-evaluation
This section should be a conclusion to the self-evaluation and a guide for the Review Panel and should highlight:
- Aspects of provision that are considered to be particularly successful and or worthy of wider dissemination as examples of good/best practice, where the evidence supports this
- Areas recognised for improvement, which should be prioritised, with indications given of how they will be tackled.
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       2.1.4 Vision/future plans

   2.2 Strategic approach to enhancing learning and teaching

3. Enhancing the Student Experience

   3.1 Admissions, Retention and Success
       3.1.1 Student numbers
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5. Academic Standards

5.1 Approach to setting, maintaining and reviewing academic standards

5.1.1 Course and Programme Approval
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5.1.3 External Examiners
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