



University
of Glasgow

PERIODIC SUBJECT REVIEW

Guidance Notes for School and Subjects

Session 2020-21

CONTENTS

1. Executive Summary
2. General information
 - 2.1 The Periodic Subject Review process
 - 2.2 Frequency and Timing of Reviews
3. Documentation for the Review
 - 3.1 Reflective Analysis Submission
 - 3.2 Supporting documentation
4. Engaging Students in the PSR process
5. The Review Panel
6. Review of Documentation
7. The Panel Visit
8. The outcome of the Review
9. The PSR Report and Follow-up
10. Summary of Review Process
11. Annual Overview of PSR
12. External Access to Reports

Appendix 1 – Template for Reflective Analysis

Appendix 2 – Checklist for Head of School

To follow:

13. *Timetable for Review*
14. *Report*
15. *Recommendations*
16. *Responses to Recommendations*
17. *Further Update*

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 Framework¹. 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 RA should include an explanation of the rationale behind their development and programme specifications/course information 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 into 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

- 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, and for session 2020-21 it is anticipated that reviews will be held in March (with the exception of the MVLS PGT Cluster which will be held in June 2020 to coincide with PGT student availability).
- 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. The Senate Office will continue to liaise with the School/Subject thereafter.

3. Documentation for the Review

3.1 Reflective Analysis Submission (RA)

- 3.1.1 Prior to the visit, a Reflective Analysis (RA) is prepared, normally by the Head of School/Subject, in conjunction with other staff. The format of the RA should follow the Guidance Notes in the RA Template document (see Appendix 1).
- 3.1.2 The RA Template indicates page lengths for each section with a total of c12 pages.
- 3.1.3 Support in preparing for the PSR is available from staff in [Academic & Digital Development](#) which is part of the Learning Enhancement and Academic Development Service (LEADS) . The Senate Office will provide the Head of School/Subject(s) with a named contact from ADD who will provide assistance and advice on writing a RA. **Subjects are urged to make use of this service and to contact ADD before beginning the RA 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 RA. 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 RA prior to submission** to the Senate Office.
- 3.1.6 Once the Senate Office receives the RA, 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 courses 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 provided when the School/Subject confirms its provision to the Senate Office 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. A School/Subject contact for the student data should also be provided. This person and any other relevant colleagues will be added to the Student Data Teams site

which will be the primary means by which colleagues in Planning Insights and Analysis provide advice on the availability of central data.

3.2.2 The Senate Office requires the documentation **at least five 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 RA 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 RA, 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 time to hear from staff and so a short anonymous survey will be distributed to staff prior to the review. This provides the Panel with a sense of how staff across the Subject/School view 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 be advised at review meeting of any key trends or issues arising from the survey which the panel wishes to explore further.

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 RA²:

Schools/Subjects are asked to provide an evidence-based approach to their RA and should therefore provide contextual narrative in introducing any data that is presented. The core data requirements are listed below, however it is recognised that additional data may be included to reflect the particular priorities or context for the area under review: for example additional variables may be included in student numbers or performance indicators such as: EU/international demographics, growth in numbers; MD20/40; disability.

To be provided by the School/Subject:

School/Subject Profile	
Details of School/Subject organisation, management and administration (including collaborative arrangements)	include organisation chart and list of key postholders (ie Quality Officer/L&T Convener etc)
A list of all current School staff (highlighting those with involvement in subject(s) under review)	include academic staff; associated lecturers; research staff (if involved in teaching), hourly paid teaching staff (e.g. PGT students who act as GTAs as tutors/demonstrators) and support staff. Include full-time equivalent and highlight any vacancies
Details of the School workload model and current workload details	include responsibilities for academic staff
Programme information	
Subject information provided for students from the current session	e.g. Information documents for courses and programmes

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 RA.

Student Data³	
Student numbers (headcount and FTE) in the previous complete session, and the previous three years if available	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 in the previous complete session, and the previous three years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • course results – headcount by level • pass rates – headcount (pass, fail, other, and % pass) • graduation numbers by programme • awards achieved – headcount by degree classification
Continuation and Progression data by programme in the previous complete session, and the previous three years	by programme and level (based on HESA data for UK full-time and first degree students only: Continuation – where student appears in one years' HESA student records and also appears in the subsequent year; Progression is when a student appears in one years' HESA Student Record and also appears in the following years' HESA Record, with the year of programme incremented.
Evaluation of grade profiles and degree classifications	
Graduate destinations – five year trend	Positive destination and Professional destination for the Subject, comparison with Subject across the Sector
National Student Survey (NSS) results	
Other surveys (such as Welcome Survey, Glasgow Life, PTES and ISB)	
Quality Enhancement & Assurance information	
Details of School quality enhancement and assurance procedures	(if available)
Annual monitoring reports for the previous three complete sessions	include any School/Subject analysis/overview of the reports
Course Evaluation Student Summary and Response reports for all taught courses for the last three years	(Semester 1 of the current year can be included as one of your 3 years)
Most recent reports of Professional, Statutory and Regulatory bodies	(if appropriate)
Committee information	
Membership and remits of any School/Subject committees concerned with teaching, learning and assessment activities	
Minutes of all staff/student committee meetings for the current and previous two sessions	include remit and membership

³ Much of the Student Data is available centrally and guidance will be provided from Planning Insights and Analysis (PIA) on access to these sources.

Minutes of the main School/Subject committee(s) dealing with teaching, learning and assessment	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 2019" These should be provided for the current and past two sessions
Minutes of Employer Liaison Committee (or equivalent)	(if appropriate)
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 forms)	We do not require Board of Studies/Exam Board minutes

The following information will be gathered by the Senate Office and will be uploaded directly to Share Point site⁴

School/Subject Profile	
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 QAA subject benchmark statements	
Quality Enhancement & Assurance Information	
Programme specifications ⁵ for all taught programmes (undergraduate and postgraduate) for which the School/Subject is responsible.	https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/senateoffice/qa/progdesignapproval/
External examiners' reports and related correspondence	include the School/Subject's response to any issues raised in those reports for the previous 3 complete sessions
Previous PSR review report together with the response of those mentioned in the recommendations	

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 before, during 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.
- RA 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 so that all students

⁴ Any queries regarding accuracy of data should be directed to the Senate Office

⁵ Programme specifications should now be in place for all programmes across the University and are published [here](#). The School/Subject should ensure that the specifications are up-to-date and reflect current programmes.

(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 RA.

- 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 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
- an Academic member of Court⁶
- an academic from a cognate School*, normally within the same College
- a representative from the Academic and Digital Development Unit
- an administrator, normally from the Senate Office, who will also act as clerk to the Panel

* To be nominated by the School – as follows:

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

⁶ Formerly called Senate Assessors on Court.

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 UK⁷. 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 names⁸, 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 nomination will only normally be considered if their appointment has ended at least three years prior to the review.
- 5.5 The School or Subject will be asked to make suggestions for the nomination of the academic from a cognate School. This will normally be from within the College and they should be an experienced colleague and practising academic with significant Subject/School responsibility for teaching, possibly a member of the relevant College's Learning and Teaching Committee (or equivalent). The Dean (Learning and Teaching) of the relevant College will be asked for their recommendations and will be made aware of any suggestions made by the Subject/School.

6. Review of Documentation

- 6.1 Each Panel member scrutinises the Reflective Analysis (RA) 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 course information/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.

⁷ 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.

⁸ Three or four names are requested 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.

- 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 at the review 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 RA to have the opportunity to review the report 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 review⁹. 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.¹⁰ 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 on the day. 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,

⁹ Given social distancing guidelines and requirements associated with the Covid-19 pandemic, PSR events may be held online – this will be arranged by the Senate Office.

¹⁰ 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.

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, should not exceed 30 minutes. It should be limited to showing specific areas referred to in the RA, 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 unless the review meeting is held remotely 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
- 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. At an early stage following the review visit the Convener and the panel Clerk will meet with the Head of School/Subject to outline the recommendations arising from the conclusion of the review and to discuss the best way to ensure effective actions can be taken forward.

- 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. 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 Planning & Technological 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

Timescale	Prior to visit
August prior to review	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. Appendix 2 provide a checklist for Heads of School/Subject.
January	Staff Survey conducted via Evasys (issued to staff in December/January). Senate Office makes arrangements for the survey and collates results which are issued to Panel in preparation for the review meeting.
February/March	Student panel member meets with student representatives to gather feedback.

- 5 weeks	School/Subject submits the Reflective Analysis to the Senate Office (supporting documentation is submitted at least a week earlier).
	Review of the RA and documentation by the Panel (some further information may be sought at this stage). Vice Principal/Head of College and Dean (L&T), are also sent a copy of the RA and any commentary received is forwarded to the Subject/School in advance of the review visit.
-4 weeks	Clerk to the Review Panel to liaise with School/Subject to establish suitable timetable for review visit.
-1 week	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)
0	The Review Visit
	Over the day(s), the Panel meets with the Head of School/Subject(s), Dean (Learning and Teaching), staff, GTAs and students
	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&T). These can be discussed with colleagues.
	Following Visit
within 2 weeks	Convener and Clerk meet with Head of School/Subject to discuss proposed outcomes and most effective means for taking forward actions.
+ 8 weeks	The draft report is provided to the Head of School/Subject and the College/Dean (L&T) to check for factual inaccuracies and to ensure recommendations and commendations are transparent
+ 10 weeks	Any feedback received is subject to approval by the Panel Convener. The draft report is submitted to ASC for scrutiny and approval.
Following ASC approval (normally May but also under summer powers)	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.
+ 6mths from date of ASC meeting (ASC can request an earlier response if action deemed urgent)	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.
+ 1 year	Further progress reports/updates may be requested by ASC, if deemed necessary.

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 elements are incorporated into the University's Annual Report on Quality Assurance which is submitted to the Scottish Funding Council at the end of each academic year. A copy of this report is also submitted to Academic Standards Committee with onward reporting to the Education Policy and Strategy Committee, and 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) <https://teachingtips.gla.ac.uk/login.php>, 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. (Please note that publication of reports from 2019-20 reviews, and responses to the 2018-19 reports, has been delayed due to the Covid pandemic).

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 of the School of
 Reflective Analysis (RA)

The purpose of the Reflective Analysis (RA) is for the School/ Subject or Unit (S/S/U) under review to consider and evaluate its learning and teaching provision, consider the impact of its approach, evaluating what works well and reflecting on areas that could be improved. The narrative should **incorporate evidence with cross-referencing to associated documentation**.

There are 4 sections to the RA. The first is important in terms of setting the scene and understanding the S/S/U under review. The list of areas to cover is indicative. Please include others if they are considered important for understanding your S/S/U. The remaining 3 sections address the S/S/U's practice in relation to supporting learning and teaching, involving students and supporting their wider experience. The questions in these sections do not need to be answered in turn. They are intended to support a reflective approach and a focus on enhancement.

1. STRATEGY FOR DEVELOPMENT

[4 pages]

1.1 Progress made since last review

1.2 Strategy for development referring to statistics and short-term plans, and connection to wider L&T strategy and action plans at University, College (and if a Subject Area, School) level. Refer to data on:

- UG and PGT Programmes (both internally and in collaboration with external partners)
- Student numbers, staffing, physical resources (including infrastructure and IT support)
- Diversity of staff
- Widening participation, with commentary on the School's support for students from WP backgrounds, referring to wider policy such as the Accessible and Inclusive Learning

The Strategy should also cover:

- How the School ensures that the student experience is equivalent regardless of the location or mode of delivery, referring to cohorts, or programmes, involving external partners, alternative modes of delivery such as part-time, or online distance learners
- Links with professional bodies (including accrediting bodies), peer institutions, policy makers or other external agencies and their influence on the School's development strategy

1.3 How does the School communicate its vision to staff and students and ensure their 'buy in'?

1.4 How will the School assess progress with the Strategy? Identify what forms of evidence will be reviewed to demonstrate achievement of development objectives (consider use of data referred to in sections 2&3)

1.5 What are the School's main strengths, challenges and opportunities?

2. LEARNING AND TEACHING ENHANCEMENT

[4 pages]

2.1 How is the curriculum designed and developed and how are new forms of learning, teaching and assessment incorporated?

2.2 How does the curriculum connect with the world of work and personal development? Areas to consider:

- Development of Graduate Attributes - Integration of professional skills, employability and work-based learning in the curriculum
- Opportunities for internationalisation and study abroad?

- In what ways are students enabled to engage in learning and/or personal development outside of the classroom?
 - Refer to graduate destination data and any activity the School undertakes to focus on career development including: Is there engagement with graduates after study?
- 2.3 Has an active learning approach been adopted and how is technology being used to enhance learning?
 - 2.4 How is assessment aligned with learning outcomes? How are approaches to assessment and (assessment feedback) kept under review?
 - 2.5 Does the School reflect of the effectiveness of academic support such as the Library, on-line resources, etc?
 - 2.6 Quality of Teaching – how is this evaluated? How is up-to-date knowledge of effective approaches to teaching and assessment disseminated to staff. What improvements have been made and to what effect?
 - 2.7 How does the School use the [Scottish quality enhancement framework](#) to enhance learning and teaching? Are there any processes that the School has introduced over and above the standard University academic standard quality processes?
 - 2.8 What staff support is in place to accommodate the changing learning environment?
 - 2.9 In addition to PGCAP and the GTA statutory training provided by LEADS, what support has been established to support early career staff and GTAs/tutors?
 - 2.10 Where changes have been made to learning, teaching and assessment, what evidence is there of the impact this has had on enhancing the student experience?
 - 2.11 What opportunities are there for sharing good practice?
 - 2.12 What areas have been identified for improvement?

3. THE STUDENT VOICE

[2 pages]

- 3.1 How does the Subject/School respond to student feedback and how is this communicated? (refer to Staff Student Liaison Committees, course evaluation, NSS, PTES, Welcome Survey, etc.) and how is this linked to School and College action plans?)
- 3.2 What are the key messages from qualitative and quantitative analysis of feedback from students? Provide examples of changes to curriculum, teaching or assessment arising from student feedback.
- 3.3 Provide examples of staff/student partnerships within the Subject/School and comment on any benefits from these.
- 3.4 Do you keep in contact with alumni to provide opportunities for students to meet and also seek feedback in order to inform future curriculum?
- 3.5 Comment on any improvements (planned, or recently implemented) for positive engagement with students.

4. SUPPORTING STUDENT WELLBEING

[2 pages]

- 4.1 What student support mechanisms has the School established? (At induction and at each level of study.)
- 4.2 Does the School reflect on the effectiveness of the Advising system in place and is there reflection on how to support students both academically and pastorally? For example, can students easily contact staff? Is sufficient advice and guidance given in relation to course choice?
- 4.3 Has the School any established links with other University and College support services?

- 4.4 How is the effectiveness of student support activity monitored at School level and how does this relate to College or University-wide student support? Refer to any plans for development of School level support initiatives
- 4.5 Comment on student retention and progression data and identify any processes or action undertaken to enhance continuation rates.

PSR Preparation: Checklist for Heads of Subject/Schools

Timing	Activity
September	<p>Dialogue with Senate Office to facilitate confirmation of Panel and Date of Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submit 3 nominations for External Subject Specialist – please note that there is no need to contact the externals as Senate Office will make contact once the Convener of the Review Panel has approved. Please provide name and institution and any relevant background details; • Submit 2 nominations for cognate panel member – please note these nominations will be forwarded to the relevant College Dean of Learning and Teaching for approval; • Discuss possible dates for the Review visit – this should either be during the last two weeks of February or first two weeks of March (before Spring vacation). For most events in 2020-21 we will aim for the last two teaching weeks in March (think about student availability – e.g. avoid exams and project weeks); • Identify who is going to lead on the PSR process; identify a key contact between the School and Senate Office and nominate a key contact to join the Teams Student Data Teams group; • Confirmation of range of provision covered by the Review (to include UG, PGT and TNE). Identify whether any programmes are accredited (in which case accreditation reports will need to be provided with the documentation). Also report on any programmes due to be withdrawn – they will not be covered but a note of these and the reasons for withdrawal should be provided.
September- submission date (5 weeks before date of Review)	<p>Development and production of RA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider approach to the writing of the Reflective Analysis (RA) and collation of documents – you will be sent a link to a Teams page specifically for the Review – documents should be uploaded to the relevant folders, clearly marked as .pdfs where possible (please identify by programme/course name rather than code); • Support with drafting the RA will be provided by Academic & Digital Development (ADD). Named contact will be provided by Senate Office and the School is responsible for arranging a meeting with their contact and/or requesting feedback on the draft RA; • Prepare documentation and data to accompany submission (see section 3.2). Take an evidence-based approach to RA by identifying links to supplementary data within the RA narrative – provide contextual information/introduction to datasets. Work with PIA on Student Data Teams site to ensure best access to central data; • Plan consultation process for draft RA – both staff and students should be able to provide input. If Subject PSR, the Head of School should be provided copy of RA prior to submission to Senate Office.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Senate Office will forward copy of RA to Dean (Learning and Teaching) and Head of College who may provide the Panel with additional commentary.
Late October/early November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Once a date has been identified for the Review, Senate Office will issue a timetable for receipt of documents etc, nearer the time a clerk will be appointed who will liaise with you, meantime any queries please contact Janet Fleming (janet.fleming@glasgow.ac.uk).