UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

Academic Standards Committee: 24 May 2019

Periodic Subject Review: Responses to Recommendations Arising from the Report of the Review of the School of Education held on 19 and 20 March 2018

The School of Education welcomed its participation in the 2018 Periodic Subject Review of its programmes and courses, seeing this as an opportunity to receive critical-friend suggestions on its strategy and on innovative ideas for the future. We anticipated a high-level engagement that would contribute to future planning and development.

Unfortunately, this was not the experience. Most staff felt extremely disappointed that the Report and its recommendations did not fully or accurately reflect the School's performance and wanted this recorded in the School's response. In particular, the PSR did not consider the considerable development of the School in the period since the last PSR or the positive assessment of the School from external independent sources. Many of the issues raised in PSR were answered within the School's comprehensive Self Evaluation Report (SER) submitted prior to the Panel meeting and in the sessions that the PSR Panel held with staff. The PSR Report appears to be ignorant of this information and of the context in which the School operates.

Reflecting on this experience, the School of Education is of the view that the PSR has not made any substantive contribution to its planning and activities and that in light of this it would be timely for the University to review PSR purposes and processes. For example, the PSR makes frequent reference to workload and the need for this to be decreased but makes no recommendation about increasing staff numbers despite noting that the School has the highest SSR in the University. Workload underpins many of the comments made in the Report but the Report stops short of recommending a clear or workable solution to the workload problem.

The PSR recommendations are listed below, cross-referenced to the paragraphs in the text of the report to which they refer and grouped together by the areas identified by the Panel. They are listed in the order of appearance in the report. The School's responses follow each recommendation. Almost all of these responses were known at the time of the PSR and either documented in the SER or in the School's responses to the Panel's questions.

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**

Response:

As noted in the SER, the placement system is controlled by a third party at a national level, which means a significantly diminished level of control at School level over placement processes. This often leads to considerable differences in experience by students, staff and Schools of Education.

In short, the current placement system in Scotland is not fit for purpose; a point that the School made at the PSR and has made many times at every level of government (from the DFM, to SG public servants, to the GTCS Director and to those operating the system), directly and through the Scottish Council of Deans of Education. Indeed, all Schools of Education in Scotland are of a similar view. The School is aware that our students are extremely frustrated by the system and, with our encouragement, vigorously expressed this frustration to the PSR panel during their meeting. We thought it important that the owners of the placement system, who (on our initiative) were observers on the PSR panel, should hear directly from students of their frustrations. While the PSR panel acknowledges the above in its report, it does not appear to grasp its implications for the student experience. Many support issues are curtailed by a system that restricts that support and leads to late communication. These are matters that are largely outside the School's control. We would welcome the Academic Standards Committee making representation to the GTCS and to the SG about the placement system.

In addition, the PSR panel notes issues of staff workload as potentially contributing to support and communication issues but does not connect this with the School's high SSR and relatively reduced MPA staff numbers, which restricts the workload that can be allocated to such activities. In brief, the School is short staffed. It has the highest SSR in the University and in the Russell Group and a diminishing MPA staff workforce. Support and communication at the BACD level, which also entails a placement component, are impacted by the level of resource the School has available to devote to this. We would welcome a recommendation by the PSR panel for increased resource into the School for its use in increasing support and communication.

The School has done its best to address some of these issues at Primary ITE levels by introducing a partnership model of ITE, which the Panel singles out for commendation. We have been able to create a model that equally values the University and schools as sites of ITE student learning, and which values the subject knowledge of teachers in Secondary schools. In 2013 the School Executive took the decision (reaffirmed in 2018) to implement this partnership model at Secondary ITE levels.

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

Response:

As stated to the PSR panel, the School is fully committed to student representation on its committees and to supporting student representatives on these committees by encouraging their participation in SRC training. While these opportunities are made available, it can be difficult to find students willing to take on these roles.

Nevertheless, the Directors of UG/ITE, PGT and PGR have an action going forward to monitor student representation, and mechanisms are in place to consult students and inform them of outcomes of these consultations. Under the direction of the School's Directors, all UG/ITE and PGT Programme Leaders have assumed responsibility for ensuring every year group has the

opportunity to have student representatives. Elected representatives will be invited to attend the SRC Rep Training, including training in the use of MyClassRep online system. They will also be invited to quarterly programme meetings with staff. The meetings will hear student feedback and concerns and offer opportunities for the student voice to be heard in an active forum with a loop of evaluation and action shared with students through meeting minutes and actions of staff. All representatives will be encouraged to use the online MyClassRep system to engage with the whole student cohort and gather their views.

All programme design changes include student consultation and feedback. Programme Leaders engage in a systematic gathering of student views around proposed amendments to content, delivery and assessment. For example, UG/ITE, students were extensively consulted through this session's course and programme approval processes, most notably in respect to changes to the MEduc, MARPE and MDTechEd

Directors of UG and PGT use NSS and in the future PTES open comments from students as part of the annual review process of all courses and programmes. Evasys comments from students will also be used to feed into the annual review process currently in place for all programmes within the School of Education. In 2018/19 a focus has been on improving what has been the inconsistent use of existing systems and processes for student feedback (e.g. EvaSys, student liaison) in certain UG/ITE programmes, rather than the implementation of new systems.

All programme leaders are working on increasing the visibility of what they do in response to student feedback (students have not always been made aware of the action taken). Students continue to be invited to attend the annual Staff/Student Liaison Group with minutes accessible to all students and staff post-meeting. The UG/ITE and PGT Directors will continue to work with Programme Leaders to ensure that opportunities for Information and Evaluation sessions take place twice annually at Programme Level. Student representatives are invited to attend the PGT and UG/ITE Committee meetings respectively.

In consultation with the SRC, PGR student elections are planned and representatives will attend the School's PGR Committee meetings. Elected students will be offered SRC training. In addition, RTGs are looking at ways to more actively involve PGRs in meetings. RTGs are developing bespoke approaches based on expertise within the RTG and on the number of PGRs within each group.

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

Response:

The School's vision for the future is clearly articulated in its Annual Strategic Planning Report (SPR), including a vision statement and key objectives. The School continues to operationalise its vision in the pursuit of these objectives, which are evidenced in various actions and activities listed in the SPR, in the SER and in this response. Pursuing these has seen the School recognised as 1st in Education in the UK on three league tables (Times Good University Guide, Complete University Guide and the National Student Survey). The extent of this recognition as #1 maintained over several years and league tables, is unprecedented among

faculties/ schools/ departments of education in the UK. Further, the School is also now listed in the top 50 in the world for Education by the QS World University Rankings, one of only two schools in the University to be included in the top 50. It is clear that being a world leader in Education is not simply an aspiration.

As reported to the Panel at the time of the Review, the School is subject to external imperatives to conform with other Schools of Education, for the purposes of programme accreditation, cross-sector standards and Scottish Government requirements and expectations. Within these constraints, the School has worked to distinguish its ITE offer from other Schools, characterised by its Catholic and STEM inflections, including an emphasis on developing statistical literacy through the Q step programme, and by its affirming disposition toward the communities of schools informed by the School of Education's community development expertise.

Through a series of internal and external forums, the School continues to develop a model of PGT programmes clusters aimed at demonstrating its distinctive offer. A PGT Profiling Group has been established, which has developed three clustering proposals (subject focussed, qualification focussed & audience focussed) and mock web landing pages that will be tested by staff, students and stakeholders. Final approval will be made by the School PGT Committee. This clustering will form the basis of external and internal representations of the School's PGT provision.

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**

Response:

It should be noted that the School is already delivering high quality teaching, as evidenced in its NSS and PTES scores and in its standing on UK and international league tables (see above and below). Also for noting, the School employs a strategy of courses being available to multiple programmes. Indeed, this 'hub and spoke' model was recommended by the last PSR. Thus while some programmes might appear to have small student enrolments, these are much higher when examined at the level of course. That is, questions of rationalisation need to focus on, if not be led by, 'course' as the unit of analysis.

As noted above, the School is engaged in a process of establishing PGT programme clusters, which may lead to rationalisation. In addition, over the past four years the School has been engaged in a process of rationalisation of its courses and programmes. As part of a College-wide initiative, from 2016, the School has removed 28 courses, the highest number of discontinued courses of any School in the College.

In addition, the School has recently removed the following programmes:

- Postgraduate Diploma Teaching Adults
- MSc Teaching Adults
- MA Religious and Philosophical Education

The School's experience has been that removing a programme is extremely difficult given the University's minimally defined and uncertain processes, which work against programme discontinuation, and can be a protracted process. The School recommends that Senate

establish clear guidelines for programme discontinuation, including who has authority to do so and under what circumstances.

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

Response:

A diagram of all committees in the School and their formal reporting and communication lines, was provided in the School's SER. This is a diagram that was consultatively developed in the twelve months leading up to and shared with staff at a whole school meeting in mid 2017 (a meeting attended by 75% of academic and MPA staff) and subsequently made available to all staff on the staff Moodle site. The School Executive is the hub of these committees, with every committee feeding into it and the flow of information from the Executive to other committees through their respective representative chairs.

The sharing of information between RTGs and the School's committees occurs within School Executive meetings, which are attended by RTG leaders and the chairs of lead committees in the School (see diagram). Information sharing between RTGs also occurs at monthly meetings of RTG Leaders with the Head of School.

Actions related to this recommendation must be considered in line with workload concerns raised above. Record keeping of issues discussed at RTG meetings is frustrated by the lack of MPA staff available to take minutes. Increased MPA staff numbers would allow the School to address this record keeping and sharing aspect. At the moment, each RTG leader provides a report twice per year to the School Executive of issues arising in their RTG, which are then shared more widely by RTG leaders – a practice established in 2017. In addition, key leaders in the School, including the HoS, attend RTG meetings on a rotational basis. Indeed, there has been considerable progress made in bedding down what were very new RTGs at the time of the PSR, and communication flows are improving as a result.

The specific question on whether a minuted record of RTG meetings should be instituted, is being taken forward by RTG Leaders. The issues include how RTG meetings can allow for open dialogue while also providing for staff who (on the odd occasion) are not able to attend, which might be better served by summary statements or in-house blogs.

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

Response:

The School notes that a review of workload is currently underway at both University and College level. The following comments should be read in that context.

The point is made at the outset of this response, that the School has the highest SSR in the University and is in urgent need of increased investment in staffing. In short, workload problems cannot simply be remedied by allocating more workload hours to staff, in part because these hours are not available within the School.

Within these constraints the School has done its best to address issues to do with workload. Responding to the 2018 Staff Survey, the School Executive again identified 'workload' as a major area, influencing most concerns in the survey identified by staff. The Executive identified three priorities for action:

1. **Identify 'hidden' work**, i.e. work that academics need to do or are required to do but this work is not recognised by the workload model (e.g. work not required in the past; work that has shifted from MPA staff to academic staff; etc.). Once identified, determine how this work is recognised in the workload model.

2. **Re-examine Workload allocations** (Workload with a capital W) – revisiting the time currently allocated to various tasks to determine whether this remains adequate, given changed circumstances (e.g. increased PGT student numbers; a new CoSS Graduate School requirement that vivas are only chaired by professors; etc.)

3. **Investigate ways to support the work of staff** (workload with a small w), making adjustments to processes and systems to make the work easier to do (e.g. staggering assignment due dates to avoid the concentration of marking at the one time or marking over holiday periods; etc.

Following on from this identification of the issues, meetings between March – June 2019 will put the following proposals to staff:

1. Increased allocation of preparation time for teaching
2. Increased allocation of time for masters dissertation supervision
3. Introduce repeat teaching for large student cohorts
4. Introduce limits on the amount of assessment marked by any one staff member at any one point in time
5. Realign course assessment requirements with course credit weighting

With respect to hidden work, feedback will be sought from staff on the following:

1. Where it can be added to an academic's Workload
2. Where it can be shared with MPA staff
3. Where it can be redistributed to MPA staff

Feedback will also be sought on how to adjust workload practices to reduce problems. The Directors of UG/ITE, PGT, and PGR will follow up on this feedback by organising workshops on workload practices, from September 2019.

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

Response: Director of Strategy, Performance and Transformations, Estates and Buildings

At the present time the University is experiencing significant pressures on space. As a result, it is not always possible to allocate the preferred type of space for every class.

Further, the University is in a period of transition – moving from fairly traditional teaching spaces, most suited to a didactic mode, to spaces which offer greater flexibility and support active learning. At the present time these latter space types remain in the minority yet are in high demand. Over time and with the levels of investment planned, this situation will be remedied with the majority of spaces supporting active and collaborative learning.

Room allocations are made on the basis of 'best fit' – taking account of the size of the class, the features and equipment requested and the available pool of rooms.

Account is also taken (as far as possible, based on the data supplied) of distance between locations where back-to-back teaching is scheduled.

The defined process is for data relating to all the above items to be supplied to the central team annually (via CMIS) with the timetable/room allocations being produced based on that. School staff then have a period of time to review this and request any changes in light of local knowledge or experience prior to students enrolling on courses and teaching starting.

However, even where an ideal allocation is achieved at this point, any subsequent changes (e.g. increase in student numbers, accessibility requirements, different equipment needs) are likely to result in a less-than ideal allocation, these changes having to be achieved within any 'spare' capacity or negotiated 'swaps'.
The Central team, in addition to ad hoc/on request engagement with the School on matters relating to space and timetabling, continues to offer direct support to School timetablers throughout the period February – April each year as the timetable data is being created so as to assure the quality of the data and optimise the output of the process.

The team will continue to engage with the School on this matter, both to address any specific concerns and to initiate a review of the schedule for Education courses.

Response: School of Education

The School welcomes this recommendation and looks forward to the Director of Strategy, Performance and Transformation, Estates & Buildings contacting the School to develop a plan

that will reduce the negative impact of the allocation of rooms on School of Education students and staff.

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

Response:

In 2018/19, the School of Education piloted a new model of masters supervision that included group supervision. In the pilot, Graduate Teaching Assistants were embedded in each programme. The GTAs supported dissertation supervisors and students by offering workshops in data analysis, academic writing, proof reading and ethics submission.

At the end of the session the model was reviewed and evaluated with staff and students. A key concern that emerged was the number of hours allocated to staff to undertake individual student supervision. In response, the model was amended to increase the overall time allocation for one-to-one supervision. The role of GTAs was also amended to tailor their use more closely to the needs of individual programmes, to ensure support offered matched the individual needs of students and the overarching needs of the programmes.

With increased PGT numbers, the number of academic staff required for masters supervision has increased. A team of part-time Associate Tutors has been established to increase the pool of masters supervisors. The 'pool' is led by a full time Senior Lecturer, to provide support and direction, ensuring they have appropriate, effective and ongoing training. Development and support for these and other academic staff has been provided in 2019/20 through LEADS training and Programme Leader induction.

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

Response:

The School has revised its deployment of GTA staff. GTAs no longer teach on PGT programmes and are not involved in PGT assessment. In 2018/19 the School introduced a rigorous and centralised process for the recruitment of GTA staff. Within one month of their contractual appointment, GTAs are required to complete training with LEADS. It is anticipated that the need to recruit new GTA staff will reduce significantly from 2018/19 but the Director PGT will continue to work with PGT staff to ensure that all GTA staff are supported as appropriate to their needs, on a case-by-case basis.

A working group was established in January 2019, including the Deputy HoS, Director of PGT, the Staff Workload Coordinator and the HoSA. The group's purpose is to review the job

descriptions, roles and training of GTAs within the School. It will also undertake an annual review of the School's GTA policy, share findings with staff and ensure GTA training and support is in place by the start of the next session.

As noted during the PSR Review, the School is unusual in the University in that GTAs are utilised predominantly at PGT rather than UG level. This is because to work in the School's UG programmes requires registration with the various bodies that accredit these. Most of the School's full time PGR students are international students and very unlikely to have such registration. This means that opportunities for the School's PGR students to gain teaching experience during their candidature is limited.

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

Response:

The School has established a cross-programme working group to identify and rectify inconsistencies in the UG/ITE School Experience Handbook. Issues here include variability across the MEducation and the PGDE, with respect to aspects of placement assessment and guidance on a range of policies. BTechEd and MARPE handbooks have also been revised as part of the GTCS reaccreditation process, as has BA Childhood Practice documentation for SSSC accreditation.

In 2018/19, all PGT Programme Leaders and Programme Administrators collaborated to ensure that Programme Handbooks were revised to produce one consistent handbook format. The PGT Director continues to work with staff to ensure that new handbooks are formatted accordingly.

Enrolment[i]

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

Response:

The PSR Report records plans being implemented by the School, including close cooperation with the University's planning office. In pursuing these plans, the School was the only School of Education in Scotland in 2018/19 to meet its PGDE Secondary targets, including in hard-to-fill subjects. 40% of these students now come from outside the School's traditional 9 LA catchment areas, suggesting national recognition of the School as a centre of excellence for ITE.

The School has also instituted with considerable success, innovative programmes that attract students from Ireland to undertake its ITE programmes and has plans for attracting students from other nations (visa restrictions notwithstanding). Ability to do this is dependent on receiving support from the GTCS and the SG.

While the School is performing extremely well in recruiting to hard-to-fill subject areas, there are aspects of student recruitment to ITE programmes that are beyond the School's control. The Scottish Government continues to impose targets on the School that are unrealistic – i.e. beyond the capability of any school of education to meet. However, the SG has recently increased teacher salary levels in Scotland, which might have a positive impact on future application and enrolment rates. The current SG review of teacher career trajectories (chaired by the School's Deputy HoS) might also have a positive impact on future application and enrolment rates.

With regard to PGT student numbers, the School works closely with the University's planning office (James Brennan) and the College Marketing Manager (Laura Macfadyen) to monitor and regulate the School's increasing student enrolments received each year. The MEd/MSc Educational Studies programme is a particular focus. Given the University requirement for the School to continue to expand its PGT provision, the options available to the School are to: 1. close enrolments once enrolments meet targets set in the School's budget; 2. close enrolments to international students once an agreed figure has been reached while remaining open to EU/UK enrolments; and 3. remain open to enrolments, giving preference to student diversity. The School chooses between these options, and their combination, in response to demand as it unfolds.

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**

Response:

The School has an excellent record in providing students with clear, fair, timely and useful assessment and feedback. In the last NSS, the School achieved the highest score in the University for Assessment and Feedback (at 87%), one of only two Schools to achieve the University's KPI (75%). In the last PTES in which the University participated, the School also achieved the highest score in the University for Assessment and Feedback (at 80.3%), the only School to achieve the University's KPI.

As part of its NSS and PTES Action Plans aimed at continuous improvement, the School has begun a process of adjusting courses to realign their assessment requirements with course credits (e.g. for UG/ITE, 1000 words for every 10 credits). This will provide greater consistency for students and staff. The School has also undertaken a review of the timeliness of feedback, aimed at determining the feasibility of returning assessments to students within 15 working days of submission. One of the challenges posed by a 15 day turnaround is for repeat teaching at PGT level (and thus double marking), required to accommodate increased PGT student numbers.

We are also working to improve consistency of practice in formative assessment, especially for MEducation, where assessment requirements in this regard have been variable in terms of quantity and quality. To facilitate this, the role of the School's Assessment Officer has been expanded beyond responsibility for UG/ITE to include PGT. The Assessment Officer now

oversees assessment processes and practices of programmes and courses in the School of Education at both undergraduate and postgraduate taught levels.

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

Response:

The School has developed a schedule for progressively examining the prominence of graduate attributes in each of its UG/ITE programme documentation, as these programmes fall due for reaccreditation. In early 2019, this has been actioned in the reaccreditation of the BTechEd and the accreditation of its replacement MDTechEd, and will also feature in the reaccreditation of the MEducation in early 2020. In addition, the School is working to demonstrate to students the compatibility between UofG graduate attributes and the professional attributes required by bodies such as GTCS. We are exploring this through the mechanism of the L&T committee.

The PGT Director is working with academic and administrative staff to highlight graduate attributes more explicitly in programme and course documentation. For example, a number of PGT programmes include extended work placement opportunities that facilitate the development of knowledge and skill sets desirable for the workplace. This information will feature more prominently in course and programme documentation and on the School's website. To enhance awareness of graduate attributes associated with PGT courses and programmes, the School has planned a range of employability initiatives at PGT Level for 2019/20. These will include two employability sessions for students, tailored to their degree specialism and an Employability Conference in June 2020. Graduate Attributes will be addressed via these sessions.

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

Response:

The School is already very active in providing social events for both staff and students.

In responding to the 2016 staff survey, the School established a Social Activities Team (including academic and MPA staff, PGR students and RAs), which offers various activities and events for staff and also PGR students. This includes a social event following every School Council meeting (including things like the 'Pub Quiz' and pizza event), as well as a monthly 'Walk and Talk' through the Kelvingrove Park, regular Friday afternoon drinks at a local restaurant, family days at local venues (e.g. Loch Lomond), free soup in the Staffroom two days per week during January and February, free pilates classes in the gym once every week, a (fiction) book club, coffee mornings (Thursdays), group participation in charity fun

runs, the School Christmas Dinner for staff and PGR students, and the School's 20th anniversary of merging with the University. There are also quasi-social activities organised by a 'spin-off' Building Enhancement Group which has arranged a rotation of sculpture exhibits by contemporary artists from the National Sculpture Group in the St Andrew's Building and reframed pictures of previous School leaders. The above is just a sample of the activities organised by the Social Activities Team.

In addition to the above, the School offers a number of social activities and events for PGT and UG students (UG student attendance is limited due to the large placement requirements of their programmes). A sample of these over the last 12 months include: Burns Buffet (January 2019), Chinese New Year (February 2019), Spring End of Term Party (April 2019), St Andrew's Day Ceilidh (November 2018), Winter Warmer (November 2018). In addition, the PGT Office is in the process of organizing a day trip to Scotland Street School and New Lanark for all MEd/MSc Educational Studies students. The School is funding transport and tour guides for this event.

Social events for students are also organised by the St Andrew's Foundation, particularly for students in the School's UG/ITE programmes. These include weekend pilgrimages, pancake making and eating on Pancake Tuesday and other events associated with major occasions of the Catholic faith.

The School has also established a Community Building Team to support the development of a PGT/PGR community, which organises social and academic events (e.g. PhD student led seminars).

The School is very supportive of the active involvement of students in leading the above and in establishing their own forums and societies. Many committees have student representatives and the Directors of UG/ITE, PGT and PGR are taking forward actions to ensure School support for student-led forums/societies and that student representation is ensured across all relevant School committees. However, it should be noted that developing a sense of community and engagement in clubs by UG/ITE students is easier on smaller programmes (the School has several large UG programmes) and that the School has a higher ratio of live-at-home students compared with other Schools. In addition, the capacity to run such clubs is limited by staff numbers and workload from other priorities.

---

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