

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

Academic Standards Committee – Summer Powers

Periodic Subject Review: Review of School of Education held on 19 and 20 March 2018

Lesley Fielding, Clerk to the Review Panel

Review Panel:

Professor John Briggs	Clerk of Senate and Vice Principal, Panel Convener
Professor Norbert Pachler	University College London, External Subject Specialist
Dr Simon Kennedy	Senate Assessor on Court
Ms Emma Hardy	Student member
Professor Janeen Carruthers	School of Law, Cognate member
Dr Matthew Williamson	Learning Enhancement and Academic Development Service
Mrs Lesley Fielding	Senate Office and Clerk to the Panel
Mr Ken Muir	Observer
Dr Nathalie Sheridan	Observer
Ms Elisa Chirico	Observer

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The School of Education is one of five Schools in the College of Social Sciences and is based in the St Andrew's Building.
- 1.2 Preparation of the School of Education Self Evaluation Report (SER) was led by Professor Catherine Doherty and Ms Moyra Boland with input from the Head of School.
- 1.3 The Review Panel met with: Professor Trevor Gale (Head of School), Ms Moyra Boland (Deputy Head of School), Professor Catherine Doherty (co-author of the PSR), Professor Moira Fischbacher-Smith (College Dean of Learning and Teaching). The Panel also met with 33 members of staff, 13 undergraduate students, 6 postgraduate taught students (PGT), 3 Early Career Staff, 2 Associate Tutors and 2 Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTA).

2. Context and Strategy

2.1 Staff

The School currently operates with a total of 220 academic, administrative and associate members of staff employed to the equivalent of 120 FTE staff.

The student-staff ratio is 18.22:1 which is higher than the University average.

2.2 Students

Student numbers for 2017-18 are summarised as follows:

Individuals enrolled on one or more courses at each level	
Level 1	540
Level 2	277
Level 4 (Junior & Senior Hons)	446
L5/PGT	1188
PGR	128

2.3 Range of Provision under Review

2.3.1 Undergraduate Degrees

- Bachelor Arts Childhood Practice [BACP]
- Bachelor Arts Community Development [BACD]
- Master of Education (Primary) [MEduc]
- Master of Arts in Religious and Philosophical Education [MARPE]
- Bachelor of Technological Education [BtechEd]

2.3.2 Postgraduate/Initial Teacher Education (ITE)

- Adult Education for Social Change (Erasmus Mundus International Master) [IMAESC]
- Adult Education, Community Development & Youth Work¹ [MEd/PgDip]
- Advanced Educational Leadership [PgCert: online distance learning]
- Assessment in Education [MSc: online distance learning]
- Childhood Practice [MEdCP/PgDipCP]
- Children's Literature & Literacies [MEd]
- Children's Literature, Media and Culture [IntM]
- Education [MSc: online distance learning]
- Education (Primary) [PGDE]
- Education, Public Policy & Equity [MSc]
- Education (Secondary) [PGDE]
- Educational Studies [MEd]²
- Educational Studies [MSc]²
- Educational Studies (Adult Education, Community Development & Youth Studies) [MSc]

¹ MEd Adult Education, Community Development and Youth Work awards a professional qualification accredited by the Community Learning and Development Standards Council in Scotland.

² MSc and MEd Educational Studies programmes are distinguished firstly by their entry criteria: The MEd programmes require an undergraduate degree in education; the MSc programmes do not require this. There are differences in the dissertation requirements as well.

- In Headship [PgDip]
- Inclusive Education: Research, Policy & Practice [MEd]
- Inclusive Education: Research, Policy & Practice [PgDip/PgCert: online distance learning available]
- Into Headship [PgCert]
- Learning & Teaching of Modern Languages in the Primary School [PgCert]
- Middle Leadership & Management in Schools [PgCert]
- Museum Education [MSc: online distance learning]
- Museum Education [MSc]
- Professional Learning & Enquiry [MEd]
- Professional Practice with PGDE [MEd]
- Psychological Studies (conversion) [MSc]
- Religious Education by Distance Learning [CREDL] [PgCert: online distance learning]
- Teacher Leadership & Learning [PgCert]
- Teaching Adults [MSc]¹
- TESOL: Teaching of English to Speakers of Other Languages [MEd]²
- TESOL: Teaching of English to Speakers of Other Languages [MSc]²

The School has two collaborative programmes within the University (MSc Psychological Studies and MEd and MSc TESOL) with plans for another (an MBA Education with the Adam Smith Business School).

2.4 Strategic Approach to Enhancing Learning and Teaching

- 2.4.1 In the Self Evaluation Report (SER) the School articulated its commitment to social justice in education and outlined the School's achievements in contributing to the University's strategic plan. In response to the Donaldson³ report, the School has developed and invested in a Partnership Model of Teacher Education, working in collaboration with schools and local authorities. The Review Panel noted the development of the Partnership Model as an example of **good practice**. The Panel explored the School's academic vision for the next five years with the Head of School who emphasised the School's commitment to social justice and described how this was reflected through the School's programme provision. The Head of School expressed the view that these programmes were influential worldwide because of the Partnership Model and had attracted considerable attention within the UK and overseas, with visitors and enquiries from universities from South Africa, South America, and Asia. The Panel noted that the long term aim of the School was to be distinctive through diversifying the international student cohort and by exploring opportunities in the Philippines and South East Asia in the area of social justice. A new Masters degree (MEd Leadership in a STEM specialism) was highlighted, which would prepare students to become leading STEM teachers in secondary schools. The SER explained that this programme would include expert

³ Donaldson, G. (2011). *Teaching Scotland's future: Report of a review of teacher education in Scotland*. Edinburgh: The Scottish Government,

input from the University's scientists, teacher leadership development and placement experiences in schools in Canada or Singapore developed with partners at McGill University and the National Institute of Education.

The Panel agreed that the School's aim to expand in the area of social justice was a way forward for the future; however, from wider discussions with staff, the Panel concluded that the academic vision for the School over the next five years could be articulated more explicitly and in a more focused way, recognising that there are constraints imposed by the needs of external accreditation and regulation requirements. The Review Panel **recommends** that the School clearly articulates its vision for the next five years, building on the School's commitment to social justice and its aspiration to be a world leader. The School should identify exactly what is required for the School to be distinctive in a world market, building on its undoubted existing strengths.

Postgraduate Provision

2.4.2 The Review Panel discussed the School's extensive PGT provision (32 programmes), noting that there was low enrolment on some of these programmes, and explored the possibility of the School rationalising the PGT provision to provide focus and alleviate the challenges of marketing and staffing/resourcing such an extensive list of programmes. The Head of School advised that the management of the PGT provision required all proposed new programmes to submit a business case with no programme being introduced without the closure of an existing programme. The Panel noted that the School aimed to move to a model of 3-5 cluster groups linked to the interests of staff. The Panel noted that the School did not wish to align the clusters to the current provision or undertake a direct mapping exercise.

With regard to PGT provision, the Panel noted staff concerns regarding the challenges that increased enrolment at PGT level presents, particularly in relation to dissertation marking. The issue of dissertation marking will be discussed in more detail at paragraph 3.1.4.

Similarly, the Panel observed that the workload model created difficulties with regard to PGT teaching but acknowledged that the School is proactively addressing this. The workload model will be discussed in greater detail at paragraph 4.3.2.

The Panel considered that maintaining the current range of PGT provision was unsustainable in view of the low student numbers in some programmes and in some courses which may be shared between two or more programmes, as well as the substantial pressure that the extensive range of courses placed on staff. The Review Panel **recommends** that the School undertakes a rationalisation exercise on the PGT provision to streamline this to a manageable level, enabling the School to focus on delivering high quality teaching in focused areas.

Research and Teaching Groups

2.4.3 The Review Panel noted, from the SER, that a refreshed structure of four Research and Teaching Groups (RTGs) was established in September 2017 to strengthen the relationship between research and teaching. Each RTG has collective responsibility for specific UG and PG programmes, and the Panel noted that work allocation was the responsibility of the RTGs. The Review Panel had some concerns regarding the potential risk for RTGs to evolve into "sub schools".

From the meetings with staff, the Panel discerned mixed opinions regarding the value and effectiveness of RTGs. Some staff viewed them positively and appreciated the opportunity to meet colleagues working in cognate areas. There

was some comment made regarding the perceived disproportionate influence of some senior staff on the RTGs.

A further concern regarding the RTGs was the perception among some staff that the RTGs were overly research-focused, leaving no open forum for the discussion of more fundamental issues related to learning and teaching. The Panel was impressed by the experience and knowledge of the administrative staff and was concerned that the exclusion of senior administrative staff from the RTGs, and the subsequent loss of their expertise and knowledge, might compromise the efficiency and effectiveness of some processes, such as programme approval. The Panel also had concerns that the School may be overly focused on ITE provision, to the possible detriment of the BA Community Development programme and considered that the School needed to be mindful that, in aspiring to be one School, other less dominant programmes should not be overlooked.

From the documentation and discussions, the Panel was concerned to note that the reporting structure for the RTGs was unclear and variable with no formal minutes being available, which the Panel considered could compromise the role of the RTGs as collective and collaborative units.

The Panel supported the concept of the RTG structure and the rationale behind the restructuring and acknowledged that the RTGs were a recent initiative with issues still being identified and addressed. However, the Panel had some concerns that the RTGs lacked adequate formal structure in relation to membership and reporting structures which impacted on the effectiveness and cohesiveness of the groups.

The Review Panel **recommends** that the School formalises the reporting structure of the RTGs to ensure there is a record of any issues discussed and resolved that can be made available to share across the RTGs. In addition, reporting between RTGs and other School committees should be clarified.

3. Enhancing the Student Experience

3.1 Admissions, Retention and Success

Admissions: UG

- 3.1.1 Admission to the School's ITE programmes (UG and PGDE) is supported by designated School Admission Officers who liaise with the University's Central Admissions (CA). The handling of admissions by CA was introduced in Session 2015-16. The Review Panel noted from the SER that the enrolment targets set by the Scottish Funding Council were currently not being met. The Head of School acknowledged that the targets set by SFC presented a challenge in secondary ITE areas where it had proved difficult to attract potential students, in particular STEM fields (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) but also English. The Head of School advised that the School now offered Taster sessions for STEM secondary school pupils in third and fourth years and, in addition, had written to STEM alumni to try to set up a bursary scheme to enable individuals to change to teaching as a career. In addition, the School was a participant in the Stakeholder Forums which brought HEIs together to discuss and identify ways to resolve the issue. In view of the difficulties identified with enrolment, the Review Panel **recommends** that the School outlines a plan as to the future of both UG and PGT numbers together with a plan to review the initiatives in place and to increase UG applicant numbers to meet the SFC targets.

Admission: Taught Postgraduate

- 3.1.2 The Review Panel noted that there had been a significant increase in PGT recruitment with a 26% increase in 2017-18 and an additional 18% increase anticipated for session 2018-19.
- 3.1.3 In view of the expected continued increase in PGT numbers, the Panel enquired about the impact this would have on staffing, and was advised that the School would address this issue through the workload model and the collective RTG groups. This item will be discussed further at paragraph 4.3.2.

Group Supervision for Masters Dissertation

- 3.1.4 The Panel noted, from the various meetings, that a major challenge in PGT provision was dissertation supervision. The Head of School informed the Panel that this issue was being addressed through the introduction of group supervision in the Masters Dissertation model. The Panel understood that Senior Associate Tutors and Graduate Teaching Assistants participated in group supervision.

From discussions with the early career staff, the Panel noted that there was pressure for staff to use the group dissertation supervision model. However, this was complicated by the students' dislike of this form of supervision and reluctance to consult with Graduate Teaching Assistants. Staff advised that, after a group supervision meeting, individual students would wait behind to talk directly to the tutor. There were also concerns that staff were undertaking supervision outwith their area of expertise.

The Review Panel acknowledged the challenges that dissertation supervision presented, but considers that the current system requires further review. The Review Panel **recommends** that the School reviews the current system of dissertation supervision to ascertain if a more acceptable and workable form of supervision can be identified.

International students

- 3.1.5 The SER stated that "MSc Educational Studies attracts a high international enrolment, which has presented both a challenge and an opportunity". Some students expressed concern at the impact of the large numbers of students from different cultural backgrounds which can affect the overall class experience. The Panel noted that the School was addressing this challenge by supporting international students on the MSc programmes by providing preparatory tasks, working with GTAs to discuss classroom strategies and the use of language support.

Retention

- 3.1.6 The Panel noted from the SER that the School's transition figures were lower than the College averages for retention from Year 1 to 2 and that the rates improved from Year 2 to 3 and were higher than the College average.

Equality and Diversity

- 3.1.7 The Review Panel was pleased to note the School's Gender Action Plan. The Panel acknowledged the traditional gender imbalance in Education and considered that the School's Gender Action Plan was an example of **good practice**.

The Panel noted from the SER that the School's student population had a higher proportion of students who reported a disability than the broader College population. To ensure that the needs of students with a disability were met during placements, the School's disability officer and Chief Adviser of Studies liaised with local authority schools. In addition, students with disabled access requirements were allocated priority rooms within the St Andrew's Building. The Review Panel

commends the School's procedures in relation to the reporting and support of students with disabilities.

3.2 Supporting Students in their Learning

Undergraduate students

- 3.2.1 At the meeting with undergraduate students the level of satisfaction with individual programmes was mixed. Areas of concern identified included insufficient teaching time for the MEduc and dissatisfaction with the timetabling system which required students to travel across the Gilmorehill campus between classes, reducing teaching time and contact time with their tutor. Teaching time will be discussed further in paragraph 4.3.2 and timetabling in paragraph 4.3.3.

Placements

- 3.2.2 The Review Panel noted that the General Teaching Council allocated student placements. For the ITE programme, in particular, the new system was complex, with the Partnership Model involving 28 local authorities. Administrative staff endeavoured to refine the automated matching to ensure that students were placed within the appropriate cluster group. Students from programmes outwith ITE expressed some concern with the placement process, with some students perceiving a "placement lottery". The Panel acknowledged the allocation of the actual placements was outwith the control of the School, but noted that members of the School were being proactive in trying to improve the system in their roles as members of external committees.

Other issues raised in relation to placements included variability in the level of support offered to students during placement in schools. A number of students, particularly on the PGDE Primary programme, reported excellent levels of support and communication, while others, including those on the PGDE Secondary and BA Community Development programmes, reported a more uneven experience, particularly in relation to communication and support. The Panel noted that staff acknowledged the limitations on the level of support provided to students while on placement, which they attributed to work-related pressures and inadequate time allocation for this activity. Staff considered that additional support, beyond the time allocated in the workload model, was dependent on the goodwill of individual staff.

The Panel appreciated that the timing of the placement presented a challenge as teaching was still ongoing in parallel with the placement, and, in addition, that staff had to manage student expectations regarding the level of support available. However, the Panel considered that the unevenness of support and communication provided to students on placement needed to be addressed. The Review Panel **recommends** that the School reviews current placement processes to ensure parity in the level of support and communication provided to students.

Social interaction

- 3.2.3 The students advised the Panel that the lack of forums and societies contributed to a sense of isolation within the School of Education. The Panel noted that, beyond the movement problems presented by timetabling [see paragraph 4.3.3], the students enjoyed lectures in other parts of the campus as it made them feel part of the wider university community.

The Panel noted from the SER that the School organised some open social events, however, students did not consider these to be sufficient. This issue was also identified from discussion with the postgraduate students. The Review Panel **recommends** that the School considers offering more frequent social events and

that the School strongly encourages/facilitates both undergraduate and postgraduate students to establish their own forums and societies. .

Handbooks

- 3.2.4 The Panel noted from the documentation that the course handbooks were inconsistent in format. The Review Panel **recommends** that the School reviews all handbooks to ensure consistent information is presented to students.

Postgraduate Students

- 3.2.5 Most postgraduate students expressed satisfaction with the level of feedback, indicating that it was useful, helpful and timely. Staff seemed to be responsive to the needs of the students. However, some students commented on some methods of teaching, such as large lectures, which were considered to be less engaging.
- 3.2.6 From discussion it emerged that not all postgraduate students had the opportunity to experience formative assessment. The Panel noted that the programmes Into Headship and In Headship offered formative assessment. Other comments on this issue included that one exam paper was worth 100%, but there was no feedback provided and hence it was difficult to judge performance. The Review Panel **recommends** that the School reviews assessment and feedback provision to ensure consistency of policy and the provision of formative feedback to all PGT students.

Graduate Attributes

- 3.2.7 The Review Panel noted that the SER made no direct reference to Graduate Attributes; however, the Panel noted that the School promoted an annual Employability Conference for PGDE and MEd students which encouraged students to consider employability skills by participation in CV and interview workshops. There were keynote speakers on a variety of topics, such as working abroad, transferable skills and further study. The Panel considered that the Employability Conference was an example of **good practice**. The postgraduate students indicated satisfaction with the information provided on employment. However, the Review Panel **recommends** that the School highlight Graduate Attributes more explicitly in documentation and with students.

3.3 Student Engagement

Course Evaluation

- 3.3.1 The Review Panel explored the poor response rates in EvaSys, a challenge which is common across the University. The Deputy Head of School advised that, with regard to the NSS/PTES surveys, the School had a clear, targeted action plan which had resulted in an improvement in their scores. However, with regard to course evaluation, the School considered that the students had “email survey fatigue” which was reflected in the low response rate. The Panel highlighted that the EvaSys questionnaire was intended for the School to reflect on their practices and had been operational for four years. In view of the good NSS student participation rate, the School should consider using different incentives to encourage students to engage with formal course processes.

NSS

- 3.3.2 The Panel noted that the School had introduced a Programme Action Plan to address scores in the NSS. The Head of School advised that, when the NSS survey was issued, many students were on placement and that the School advised

them to complete the survey after the end of their placements. The Panel noted that the NSS results were lower than those in 2014-15, but remained above the University average. The School considered that this was due to the introduction of the new MEd program which had changed from a four year degree to five years.

Student Feedback Mechanisms

- 3.3.3 The Review Panel noted from the documentation inconsistencies in the School's engagement with student representation. Both undergraduate and postgraduate students expressed some concern with the process, citing poor communication and support. In addition, there was a general lack of awareness among the students of Staff Student Liaison Committees. The students, overall, indicated a preference to raise issues directly with their tutors. The Panel asked both undergraduate and postgraduate students about their involvement with the SER process, but none of the students present at the meetings had seen the self-evaluation report.

The Panel noted that it was difficult to determine, from the limited selection of committee minutes available to view on Sharepoint, whether issues were responded to adequately. The Review Panel **recommends** that the School reviews its student representation and committee structures to ensure full functionality and to ensure feedback loops are closed and students informed of actions resulting from these consultations. The School should ensure that all students are made aware of the class representative system and encourage class representatives to engage with the students and to utilise the MyClassRep online system.

4. Enhancement in Learning and Teaching

4.1 Learning and Teaching

Curriculum Design

- 4.1.1 The Review Panel noted from the SER that, for the ITE programmes and other externally accredited programmes such as BACP, BACD and MScPsych, curriculum renewal was driven by accrediting bodies and their requirements. In line with these accredited bodies, the School stated that it had found opportunities for innovative design, in particular the possibility of an international placement and the suite of interdisciplinary electives developed for the MEd. In response to the Scottish Government's push for new routes into teaching to address particular teacher shortages, the School of Education had introduced two new routes: the Middle Years (Maths) which enables teachers to acquire a qualification to teach mathematics as a specialist subject in primary and secondary schools (P6-S3) and the International (Irish) route which, in the first instance, recruited newly qualified teachers from Ireland.

Approach to Intended Learning Outcomes

- 4.1.2 The Review Panel noted from the documentation that the ILOs were explicitly outlined in all course specifications and was satisfied that these were appropriate.

Technology Enhanced Learning and Teaching

- 4.1.3 The Review Panel noted the lack of IT support provided centrally during evenings and weekends. This was of particular concern as the rationale for undertaking evening teaching was to alleviate the issues with timetabling.

4.2 Assessment and Feedback

- 4.2.1 In the SER the School stated that “a sustained effort to improve assessment practices in all programmes” was being made. However, it acknowledged that there were ongoing challenges with regard to feedback on PGDE assignments. The SER highlighted that, on most of the MEd courses, staff were expected to highlight a grade in relation to each criterion, to provide ‘Next Steps’ and to provide an overall comment. Where appropriate, students are now provided with immediate verbal feedback on placements.

4.3 Resources for Learning and Teaching (staffing and physical)

Staffing

- 4.3.1 The Review Panel noted from the SER and the Staff Survey that there were a number of issues regarding recruitment and staffing. Issues identified in the Staff Survey were outwith the remit of the Review Panel and have been referred to Human Resources for consideration.

Workload Model

- 4.3.2 The Review Panel noted that the workload model, as described in the SER, seemed rather opaque. From the various meetings with staff, the Panel observed that there were a number of issues arising from the workload model, including ‘invisible work’ not identified in the workload model. There were also issues with the amount of time allocated to staff in the support of students on placement which had resulted in an uneven experience for students, particularly as extra support provided was dependent on the goodwill of staff involved. Senior Associate Tutors who had assumed programme leader roles advised that they were unable to provide appropriate levels of support to students due to additional work pressures.

In addition, the Panel had concerns regarding the School's aim to manage group supervision of dissertations through the workload model. As noted at paragraph 3.1.4, there was additional pressure placed on staff as a result of students seeking individual consultations outwith the group dissertation supervision sessions.

The Review Panel **recommends** that the School undertakes a review of the current workload model to ensure that staff are allocated appropriate time to undertake their duties and to enable staff to provide parity of experience to students throughout their placements

Learning and Teaching Space

- 4.3.3 The Review Panel noted the substantial difficulties presented by timetabling, particularly exacerbated by the geographical situation of the St Andrews Building. Issues identified included: students not receiving full teaching time; cancellation of classes due to shortage of rooms; inappropriate teaching spaces which raised pedagogy issues; difficulties in securing one room for an entire day for block teaching; difficulties in transporting teaching materials across the campus; rooms not fit for purpose and often not facilitating group work.

The Panel shared the concerns of the staff and students on this issue. The School of Education aims to be a leader on pedagogy, but is unable to access appropriate and adequate teaching space. It must be recognised that the School of Education is part of the University campus and given due consideration wherever possible. The Review Panel **recommends** that Central Timetabling urgently reviews the allocation of rooms for the School of Education, in collaboration with the School of

Education, to reduce the negative impact on the student and staff experience and the University's reputation through NSS results.

Engaging and Supporting Staff

Early career support

- 4.3.4 The Review Panel met with early career staff who were extremely positive about their experience within the School. They considered that there was an “empowering” atmosphere and that their RTG and School colleagues were supportive and encouraging. The early career staff advised that they had opportunities to assume more responsible roles and that the Deputy Head of School had been most supportive in this regard. The Panel was impressed by the enthusiasm of the early career staff and identified the support and encouragement they received as **good practice**.
- 4.3.5 The early career staff commented favourably on the PGCAP which they found to be very useful with helpful instructors, although comment in the SER was less favourable. In addition, they found the opportunity to meet other new staff from elsewhere in the University to be beneficial.
- 4.3.6 The early career staff had sometimes found the ECDP programme repetitive. This feedback had been communicated directly to their mentor
- 4.3.7 There was less clarity among the early career staff with regard to the workload model, with some considering that the workload model did not clearly reflect their workload and that a number of ‘invisible tasks’ were omitted from the model. The early career staff were also unclear if they had had a reduction in workload associated with participation in ECDP.

Graduate Teaching Assistants

- 4.3.8 The GTAs reported that they were mainly involved with dissertation supervision, assisting students who required additional support. The Review Panel noted that the GTAs received only basic training, but they would welcome more support and guidance with regard to their role. The Review Panel **recommends** that the School reviews the training and support of GTAs.

Associate Tutors

- 4.3.9 The Panel met with Associate Tutors (AT) who had been Deputy Head Teachers at schools where the students undertook placements. The ATs are staff employed on an ad hoc basis. The ATs advised that they felt well supported by managers and lecturers, and found that their professional, practical experience and expertise were valued in their current posts.
- 4.3.10 The ATs were satisfied with the level of training and support they received to undertake their duties. The ATs confirmed that they were members of the RTGs and attended seminars, and they advised that they ran the national symposium on partnership which was attended by the Teaching Specialists. The Review Panel identified the training and support provided to ATs as **good practice**.
- 4.3.11 The ATs advised that they provided feedback on students' assessments. They considered that, over the last six years, assessment practice had become much clearer with students in both primary and secondary education now receiving regular feedback.
- 4.3.12 The ATs were allocated to students more in relation to where they were geographically placed rather than by teaching specialism. Following the allocation, ATs look at the student's work/performance from a pedagogic perspective rather

than a subject perspective. ATs recognised that the model of generic tutors was not universally approved of within the School, however, they personally found it very positive.

5. Academic Standards

- 5.1.1 The Review Panel considered that the School of Education had a variety of robust and effective procedures in place which ensured that the Subject is engaged in a continual process of self-reflection and self-evaluation with regard to academic and pedagogical practice.

Currency and Validity of Programmes

- 5.1.2 The Panel, guided by the views of the External Subject Specialist, confirmed that, at the time of the Review, the programmes offered by the School of Education were current and valid in the light of developing knowledge and practice within the subject area.

Plagiarism

- 5.1.3 The Panel noted the School's concerns regarding the perceived rise in instances of plagiarism. The SER outlined that programmes had been introduced to address these risks, with attention paid to building the necessary academic literacies. Within the SER, the School expressed the desire for further discussion around the relative strengths of different anti-plagiarism software programmes. A Learning & Teaching Committee Working Group is currently reviewing the similarity detection software Turnitin and Urkund, with recommendations due to be reported to LTC later in the year.

6. Collaborative provision

6.1 Key features of the School/Subject's context and vision in relation to Collaborative provision

- 6.1.1 As outlined in the SER, the School has collaborations with McGill University and the International Masters in Adult Education for Social Change (IMAESC) which is a two-year joint Masters degree awarded by the Universities of Glasgow, Malta, Tallinn, and the Open University of Cyprus. The programme has an optional summer school in Malaysia at the Universiti Sains Malaysia and summer placement with UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning.

7. Summary of perceived strengths and areas for improvement

7.1 Conclusion

The Review Panel was impressed by the School of Education's strong commitment to the Partnership Model of Teacher Education and its collaboration with local authorities and schools. Similarly, the Panel was impressed by the School's commitment to both research and teaching through the Research and Teaching Groups. The School has developed a broad definition of education and offers a wide range of programmes which involve close liaison with external professional bodies and external partners and agencies, and there is much to be admired here. However, the Review Panel was concerned that there was an insufficiently clear vision for the future, together with some processes that required revision as outlined in the following recommendations.

7.2 Areas for improvement

The Review Panel highlighted the following areas as opportunities for improvement:

- Develop a more coherent and strategic long-term vision in terms of international excellence and recognition;
- Review the processes for school placements to ensure a more consistent experience for all students;
- Review and rationalise the wide-ranging PGT provision to address issues related to staffing and the workload model;
- Review processes for Student Representation;
- Review Research and Teaching Groups to ensure that the membership criteria are coherent and that reporting structures are robust.

Specific recommendations addressing these areas for work are listed below, as are a number of further recommendations on particular matters.

7.3 Good Practice

- The School's Partnership Model of Teacher Education, working in collaboration with schools and local authorities;
- Gender Action Plan
- Employability Conference
- Support and training for Associate Tutors and Teaching Specialists
- Support and Training for Early Career Staff
- Leadership programmes

7.4 Commendations

The Review Panel commends Education on the following:

Commendation 1

The Review Panel commends the School's procedures in relation to the reporting and support of students with disabilities. *[Paragraph 3.1.7]*

7.5 Recommendations

The following recommendations have been made to support the School of Education in its reflection and to enhance provision in relation to learning, teaching and assessment. The recommendations have been cross-referenced to the paragraphs in the text of the report to which they refer and are **grouped together** by the areas for improvement/enhancement and are **ranked in order of priority within each section**.

Placements

Recommendation 1

The Review Panel **recommends** that the School reviews and reinforces current placement processes to ensure more parity in the level of support and communication provided to students. *[Paragraph 3.2.2]*

For the attention of: The Head of School

Student Feedback Mechanisms

Recommendation 2

The Review Panel **recommends** that the School reviews its student representation and committee processes to ensure full functionality, and to ensure feedback loops are closed and students informed of actions resulting from these consultations. The School should ensure that all students are made aware of the class representative system and encourage class representatives to engage with the students and to utilise the MyClassRep online system. *[Paragraph 3.3.3]*

For the attention of: The Head of School

Strategic Vision

Recommendation 3

The Review Panel **recommends** that the School clearly articulates its vision for the next five years, building on the School's commitment to social justice and its aspiration to be a world leader. The School should identify exactly what is required for the School to be distinctive in a world market, building on its undoubted existing strengths. *[Paragraph 2.4.1]*

For the attention of: The Head of School

Postgraduate provision

Recommendation 4

The Review Panel **recommends** that the School undertakes a rationalisation exercise on the PGT provision to streamline this to a manageable level, enabling the School to focus on delivering high quality teaching in focused areas. *[Paragraph 2.4.2]*

For the attention of: The Head of School

Research and Teaching Groups

Recommendation 5:

The Review Panel **recommends** that the School formalises the reporting structure of the RTGs to ensure there is a record of any issues discussed and resolved that can be made available to share across the RTGs. In addition, reporting between RTGs and other School committees should be clarified. *[Paragraph 2.4.3]*

For the attention of: The Head of School

Workload Model

Recommendation 6:

The Review Panel **recommends** that the School undertakes a review of the current workload model to ensure that staff are allocated appropriate time to undertake their duties and to ensure that students experience parity in the level of support provided throughout their placements. *[Paragraph 4.3.2]*

For the attention of: The Head of School

Learning and Teaching Space

Recommendation 7:

The Review Panel **recommends** that Central Timetabling urgently reviews the allocation of rooms for the School of Education, in collaboration with the School, to reduce the negative impact on the student and staff experience. [Paragraph 4.3.3]

**For the attention of: The Director of Strategy, Performance and Transformation,
Estates & Buildings**

For information: The Head of School

Group Supervision for Masters Dissertation

Recommendation 8:

The Review Panel **recommends** that the School reviews the current system of dissertation supervision to ascertain if a more acceptable and workable form of supervision can be identified. [Paragraph 3.1.4]

For the attention of: The Head of School

Graduate Teaching Assistants

Recommendation 9:

The Review Panel **recommends** that the School review the training and support of GTAs. [Paragraph 4.3.8]

For the attention of the Head of School

For information: Director, LEADS

Course Handbooks

Recommendation 10

The Review Panel **recommends** that the School reviews all handbooks to ensure consistent information is presented to students. [Paragraph 3.2.4]

For the attention of: The Head of School

Enrolment

Recommendation 11:

In view of the difficulties identified with regard to enrolment, the Review Panel **recommends** that the School outlines a plan as to the future of both UG and PGT numbers together with a plan to review the initiatives in place and to increase UG applicant numbers to meet the SFC targets. [Paragraph 3.1.1)

For the attention of: The Head of School

Assessment and Feedback Provision

Recommendation 12

The Review Panel **recommends** that the School review assessment and feedback provision to ensure consistency of policy and the provision of formative feedback to all PGT students. [Paragraph 3.2.6]

For the attention of: The Head of School

Graduate Attributes

Recommendation 13:

The Review Panel **recommends** that the School highlight Graduate Attributes more explicitly in documentation and with students. *[Paragraph 3.2.7]*

For the attention of: The Head of School

Social Events

Recommendation 14:

The Review Panel **recommends** that the School consider offering more frequent social events and that the School strongly encourages/facilitates both undergraduate and postgraduate students to establish their own forums and societies. *[Paragraph 3.2.3]*

For the attention of: The Head of School

ⁱ Recommendations 11 to 14 were additional recommendations requested by Academic Standards Committee which have been agreed by the Clerk of Senate.