

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

Academic Standards Committee: 20 November 2020

Periodic Subject Review: Responses to the Recommendations
arising from Review of the School of Engineering held on 7 and 8
March 2019

Lesley Fielding, Clerk to the Review Panel

The following recommendations have been made to support the School of Engineering in its reflection and to enhance provision in relation to teaching, learning 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**.

Strategic Approach to Enhance Learning and Teaching

Recommendation 1.1

The Review Panel **recommends** that the School, with the support of the College, rethinks teaching support and potentially restructures the teaching teams for large classes. The review should include the role of technical staff, learning technologists and GTAs in order to optimise the School's resources and to alleviate the pressure on all staff. [Paragraph 2.4.5]

For the attention of: The Head of School

The College Dean of Learning and Teaching

**For information: Vice Principal and Head of College of Science and
Engineering**

Response:

The School is currently carrying out two reviews of teaching support.

The first, internal review, considers learning and assessment in key common curriculum classes in levels 1 and 2, focussing on improving the quality of provision to students in large classes. Chaired by the Convenor of Learning and Teaching, the initial meeting of this committee was held on 7 October 2019. Consultations were held with all teaching staff in levels 1 & 2, as well as key technical staff and administrators, and a first report has been produced, and approved by the School Learning & Teaching Committee. 12 items of good practice were identified for sharing across the whole School, and a number of new initiatives flagged for action (ranging from optimising training of GTAs to further 'on-lining' of in-course formative assessments and better rotation of staff through large class teaching). Each common curriculum course is 'owned' by a Teaching Discipline, who are now actioning the initiatives and good practice, delegating to individual staff 'czars' where appropriate.

The second, University review focusses on assessment practice across the whole School and is described in the response to recommendation 2 below.

Recommendation 1.2

The Review Panel **recommends** that the School reviews communication, engagement and involvement of staff to ensure all staff are actively involved in the developments in relation to strategy and engage effectively with opportunities to contribute to strategy and teaching developments in an open and transparent environment. *[Paragraph 2.4.6]*

For the attention of: School Engagement Lead

For information: The Head of School

Response:

The Weekly Advisory Group of the School has included 'communications and engagement' as one of its standing items of consideration. School management has developed a Learning & Teaching Strategy since January 2020; a document which has been the subject of widespread consultation.

Teaching Discipline Meetings are held each semester and act as a small group forum to discuss teaching matters, with policy, including local teaching initiatives then discussed at alternating monthly Learning & Teaching Committee meetings, and Heads of Discipline Strategy Meetings, to harmonise initiatives with overall School strategy.

The Staff Handbook forms a growing source of information to staff, is regularly updated, and copies are physically mailed to each member of staff yearly, along with the clearly posted online version on the School web pages.

Teaching developments are flagged at each staff meeting, presented by the Convenor of Learning and Teaching and by the local staff associated with each development. Since January 2020, bulletins reporting the business of the Learning and Teaching Committee are published to the School on SharePoint after each meeting. Similarly, bulletins are published after each meeting of the School Executive Group.

Since March 2020, in place of physical staff meetings halted due to the Covid pandemic, the School has held very successful 'Virtual Coffee Mornings' as a drop in session weekly or bi-weekly for all members of staff (including academics, technicians and MPA staff), where pertinent aspects of teaching, learning and assessment are discussed. A School newsletter has also been issued weekly or fortnightly since the beginning of the lockdown and it routinely contains L&T stories.

Recommendation 2.1

The Panel explored adjusting the weighting of exams and course work, however, staff considered that, in view of the large class sizes, this would impact on staff time and workload. There were justified concerns that the current system disadvantaged some students in fulfilling their potential, therefore, the Review Panel **recommends** that the School review the current first year assessment design and identifies ways to increase the level of formative assessment as well as reduce the reliance on high stakes assessments, subject to remaining within the constraints of accreditation. *[Paragraph 4.2.2]*

The Review Panel considered the scanning and printing of examination papers from UESTC to be time consuming and in view of the technology available, potentially obsolete. The Review Panel **recommends** that the School review the current processes with a view to identifying a more efficient and streamlined process if possible, to alleviate the pressure on the Teaching Office and to free staff time for other processes. The Review Panel acknowledges that opportunities for streamlining may be limited in the absence of improved online assessment of mathematical subjects and **recommends** that the issue is raised with the Chair of the Assessment and Feedback Transformation Project, Professor Frank Coton, to include within considerations of online assessment. *[Paragraph 4.4.9]*

**For the attention of: The Head of School
Chair, Assessment and Feedback Transformation Project**

Response – Head of School:

The School has taken part in a review of current assessment design at the University level, as part of the NSS Action Plan; chaired by the Vice Principal, Learning and Teaching and involving Computing Science, Engineering, Psychology, and Initial Teacher Training. As part of this review, focus groups were held with students and staff in engineering, although due to the Covid-pandemic reports from these focus groups are not yet extant. The School participated in the development of a 'methods of assessment' document now more generally available across the University, aimed at giving academic staff suggestions of how to make assessment more 'authentic' and less 'high-stakes'. These have been shared with staff and reviewed in Discipline meetings with a view to incorporating them into our practice.

Note that the move to online processes to make the assessment of degree examinations in UESTC has been radically accelerated by the Covid-19 pandemic. Both the Glasgow and UESTC campuses have now moved to an entirely online assessment collection and marking system making use of secure OneDrive folders for each course, where administrators drop off student work for marking, academics mark using a range of annotation tools with which they are familiar, collate results, moderate the marking of others, and return annotated scripts. Students have the benefit of subsequent access to these marked scripts for feedback. Although staff are very much in the learning process for fully online assessment, feedback from external examiners at June 2020 exam boards praised the School for both rigour in the marking process and availability of examination materials for audit.

Response – Chair, Assessment and Feedback Transformation Project

I can confirm that the need for improved online assessment of all subjects, including mathematical subjects, is included within the recommendations for future development by the Assessment and Feedback project. The project has proposed a way ahead for the University which is currently being considered for approval. If the project is approved, the issue will be addressed over the next two years.

Recommendation 2.2

In view of the level of support provided by the Teaching Office and their pivotal role in relation to much of the School administrative processes, the Review Panel **recommends** that the support for the Teaching Office is reviewed to continue to streamline unnecessary processes and alleviate pressures where possible taking into account the role played by the IT team. [*Paragraph 4.4.11*]

For the attention of: The Head of School

Response:

The Head of School Administration meets regularly with the Learning & Teaching Manager to review and plan the workload and staffing of the Teaching Office. Following the Periodic Subject Review, the post of Learning and Teaching Manager was confirmed in December 2019 following the retirement of the previous incumbent at the end of March 2019. At this time, addition temporary resource was created to support the Teaching Office. The new Learning and Teaching Manager has been working closely with the School IT Manager, particularly on the move to completely online assessment (including continuous assessment). Although involving a significant initial workload, this has the prospect of reducing the ongoing workload of the Learning & Teaching Office.

Retention

Recommendation 3

The Review Panel was concerned about the high dropout rate, and whilst recognising the challenges, **recommends** that further consideration be given to the contributory factors and the potential solutions. Specifically, the Panel recommends that the School work closely with Planning and Business Intelligence to undertake an analysis of retention, progression and continuation for Levels 1 and 2 of the kind recently undertaken in Computing Science. [*Paragraph 3.1.4*]

For the attention of: The Head of School

**For information: The Director, Planning and Business Intelligence
Head of School of Computing Science**

Response:

Planning and Business Intelligence have carried out work specifically on the recruitment, retention and progression of students from Glasgow International College, where historically Engineering has noted poor progression rates. A qlikview model is now in place so those

managing teaching in the School (including each Discipline Head) can view detailed, 'live' statistics on progression, giving us the evidence to enhance our support for these students.

Recommendation 4

The Review Panel **recommends** that the School works with the student body to enhance visibility of the formal elements of, and improve engagement with, the Advisory System and in particular, the first meeting with Advisers of Studies in order to identify those students who may need to withdraw or transfer at an early stage. [*Paragraph 3.3.3*]

For the attention of: The Head of School

Response:

We have re-iterated, both in the Staff Handbook, in messages from the Chief Adviser of Studies, and in calendaring Advising meetings by the Learning & Teaching Office at the beginning of each academic year, the expectation that staff meet with all their Advisees, to initiate interaction yearly.

Feedback Mechanisms

Recommendation 5

The Review Panel **recommends** that the School review the SSLC process in consultation with the SRC Sabbatical Officers/President to ensure sufficient dialogue and feedback between staff and students and to engage the wider student population in the process. [*Paragraph 3.4.1*]

For the attention of: The Head of School

For information: SRC President

Response:

The Chief Adviser of Studies, Dr Douglas Thomson, has held consultation meetings with members of the SSLC regarding the operation of these meetings and their fitness for purpose. In a School of the size of Engineering, SSLC meetings are only useful and tractable if held at Discipline level (we currently have 76 student representatives in six sub-SSLCs), and then chairs come together at a School level to discuss overarching items of interest. It is felt that the current system is working well.

In addition to SSLCs we have also instituted a yearly staff-student leaders dinner, where School academic and administrative leadership and SSLC and Student Society leaders meet together. This is a more relaxed forum for students to make their views known on a wide range of matters, in addition to the formal constraints of a SSLC.

Marketing

Recommendation 6

The Review Panel **recommends** that, in addition to the current practices, the School should review the marketing of the programmes, including the School website, to present a more contemporary and inclusive image. The School could compare the current website with those of other institutions, such as the University of Bristol and advice should be sought from External Relations and the Equality and Diversity Unit in the first instance, but potentially also from the School of Physics and Astronomy which has a Silver Athena Swan award, where a range of initiatives have been undertaken as part of the University's Gender Action Plan. *[Paragraph 3.2]*

For the attention of: The Head of School

For information: Vice Principal, External Relations

Manager, Equality and Diversity Unit

The Head of School of Physics and Astronomy

Response:

The School has held an Athena Swan Bronze award since 2016 and in November 2020 will be resubmitting an application for a Silver award. The SAT Committee is divided into four sub-groups: UG/PG Recruitment and Support; Staff Recruitment, Career Development and Promotion, Flexible Working and Career Breaks; and School Culture and Environment. The remit of the UG/PG Recruitment and Support sub-group includes the marketing of the programmes of the School to a wider audience and also to profile visible female role models as part of the outreach work of the School. The School website was updated as part of the rebranding to the James Watt School of Engineering in June 2019 and further updates included a video of student society members in January 2020. The imaging on the website is now balanced female and male, and has been updated to be more contemporary. The School's Athena Swan webpage was also updated and is highlighted as a link on the landing page for the School.

Staffing

Recommendation 7.1

In view of the pressure on staff to meet their marking obligations, the Review Panel **recommends** that the School should consider using GTAs for marking at pre-Honours, and possibly Honours level where appropriate, with suitable levels of training, supervision and support. *[Paragraph 4.2.5]*

For the attention of: The Head of School

For information: The Director, Learning Enhancement and Academic Development Service

Response:

This is now the case for some pre-Honours courses (typically large Common Curriculum course in levels 1 and 2), and for those Honours courses where the numbers of students on the course justifies management of a GTA marking team by academic staff.

Recommendation 7.2

The Review Panel **recommends** that the School review the oversight and training of GTAs to ensure that more consistency in the GTA experience and consult with LEADS for guidance and advice on GTA training [*Paragraph 4.4.2*]

For the attention of: The Head of School

Response:

A senior member of staff, and ex-Head of Department, Dr Marco Vezza, was charged with leading this training for the 2020-21 academic session. Unfortunately, the Covid-pandemic had radically altered the nature of the training needing to be given to GTAs. Dr Vezza now chairs our 'on-lining' team, and one of the roles of this committee is to manage the training of GTAs in a largely on-line laboratory and tutorial environment. The work is ongoing.

Recommendation 7.3

There was some uncertainty as to how involved GTAs can be in marking at different levels and the current University policy was considered to be unclear on certain aspects of GTA marking. The Dean of Learning and Teaching expressed a willingness to work with Academic Services to clarify current policy documentation. [*Paragraph 4.4.3*]

**For the attention of: The Convenor of Academic Standards Committee and
the Head of the Senate Office**

The Dean of Learning and Teaching, College of Science & Engineering

Response: Senate Office

Unfortunately this action has not yet been progressed. While there are some online resources referring to GTA marking and support for GTAs in the marking process, e.g. in the Assessment and Feedback Toolkit, there is a need to articulate University policy regarding GTA involvement in marking at different levels of study. This will be developed through the Assessment and Feedback Working Group; the Senate Office will prepare a discussion paper on approaches to GTA marking in order to facilitate development of a policy statement. The Dean of Learning and Teaching, College of Science & Engineering, is a member of AFWG and will therefore be involved in this work.

Response: Head of School

Details have now been provided, and as noted above, some pre-Honours and Honours courses now have GTA marking teams.

Recommendation 8

The Panel recommends that the PSR Convenor raises the ECDP and PGCAP feedback with the University's ECDP Lead (Prof Murray Pittock) and with the Director of LEADS in order that the feedback is acted on appropriately through the ECDP Champions in the Colleges and other appropriate ECDP committees as part of the wider governance of the ECDP programme. The Panel also recommends that the review of PSR that is currently underway within Academic Services, gives consideration to how issues relating to broader University initiatives (such as ECDP), but that don't lend themselves to specific recommendations that ASC might follow up on, could be more meaningfully recorded and addressed in future. *[Paragraph 4.4.7]*

For the attention of: the PSR Convener and the Manager, PSR, Senate Office

For information: ECDP Lead

Director of Learning Enhancement and Academic Development Service

Response:

This Recommendation has been shared with Professor Richard Hartley, the ECDP Champion in CoSE, and he will discuss as necessary with LEADS. LEADS does in any case regularly report on feedback, exemptions, PGCAP design etc through the ECDP governance process.

Response: Academic and Digital Development (LEADS)

I'd just like to confirm that there have been changes made to the core courses of the PGCAP and hence to Course 1 which is the one the points were made, which have come in effect with the start of this academic year.

Response: Senate Office

The review of the PSR process is nearing completion, and in its revised form the structure of the Reflective Analysis which is prepared by the Subject undergoing review will allow any issues they wish to be explored, including those relating to broader University issues, to be raised. In terms of output from the PSR and ensuring capacity to report on broader University issues even when they do not necessarily involve specific recommendations or actions, this question was also raised at the last meeting of ASC in October 2020. In response, steps have been taken to ensure that the format of the PSR report allows issues which are not linked to specific recommendations to be logged for the purposes of allowing common University-wide themes to be identified across reviews taking place in any given session. It is envisaged that University initiatives (such as ECDP) could be included in this space.

Feedback Mechanisms

Recommendation 9

At the meeting with students, it was confirmed that staff responded informally to student feedback via email. However, there were no student summary response documents to course evaluation questionnaires, a requirement of the University's Course Evaluation policy. The Review Panel **recommends** that the Subject provides summary response documents to course evaluation questionnaires and that these are placed on course Moodle pages as well as provided to SSLCs. [Paragraph 3.4.3]

For the attention of: The Head of School

Response :

This requirement has now been flagged at School Learning & Teaching Committee, and with Heads of Discipline in local Discipline meetings, and will be included in the next physical copy of the Staff Handbook to ensure that academic staff understand our expectations.

Accreditation

Recommendation 10

The Review Panel **recommends** that the School encourage and assist staff to assume active roles within the accreditation bodies to contribute and influence future policy and accreditation requirements in relation to teaching and assessment in Engineering.

[Paragraph 4.2.3]

For the attention of: The Head of School

Response:

This has been flagged at School staff and Discipline meetings.

We note the successful 5 year accreditation round for the School of Engineering. As of June 2020 all but our Mechanical Engineering degrees have been fully accredited for the next five years (the visit from IMechE was delayed because of the Covid pandemic – but accreditation for those degrees has been extended by the IMechE).

Staffing

Recommendation 11

The Review Panel **recommends** that the College review the staffing and recruitment practices with the School to identify ways to improve the process and reduce the impact

on existing staff. There may also be the opportunity to feed into the World Changing Glasgow project on recruitment. *[Paragraph 4.3.2]*

For the attention of: The Head of College HR

For Information: Vice Principal and Head of College of Science and Engineering

The Head of School

For information: Ms Emma Pickard, World Changing Glasgow Transformation Team

Response:

A more holistic workforce planning approach is being developed with the School working in partnership with College HR and Finance colleagues to define requirements in line with strategic goals and the drive to achieve a sustainable SSR. This work will be challenging in the context of the potential impact of C-19 on student numbers. New posts are built into the budget on an annual basis as well as posts which become vacant due to a variety of reasons, such as resignation and retirement. Recently, the School has undertaken two large recruitment campaigns to backfill vacancies. It is our usual practice to include the Convenor for L&T (or a representative) as a member of the interview panel. The two rounds took place in October/November 2019 and April-July 2020. Applicants were required to present an example of their teaching as well as their research background as part of their presentation. As some roles are particularly specialist, it can often be difficult to fill them in the first round and they then need to be re-advertised. The new Head of College HR is keen to work with the School on succession planning and workforce planning and embed this into the business of the College and the School. The Head of College HR is also working closely with central HR colleagues to feed into World Changing Glasgow projects focused on improving HR processes. This collaborative partnership approach between the School and College will continue to focus on improving the School's SSR and addressing any potential gaps in the teaching provision.

Recommendation 12

The staff advised that several essential processes required by the University presented challenges. These included the Tier 4 monitoring system for students and GTA recruitment. The staff indicated that although they believe their approaches to be robust, they were aware that each School has developed individual solutions with no means of sharing expertise. The team considered that as the processes and challenges in managing them were not unique to the School of Engineering, and rely on specialised knowledge, that it would be beneficial to approach them more centrally and consistently across the University. The Panel **recommends** that guidance on best practice in these matters be explored with College of Science and Engineering HR, and with the Central Services HR. *[Paragraph 4.4.10]*

For the attention of: The Head of College of Science and Engineering, HR
Head of Central Services HR
For Information: The Head of School

Response: HR

With regard to Tier 4 Monitoring for GTA Recruitment there is no option for this to be managed centrally, it is a locally managed process, in line with accurate reporting to the Home Office whilst also being mindful of GDPR restrictions.

Each school requests that their Tier 4 holders taking up a GTA appointment complete and submit a Tier 4 Declaration Form as well as presenting their current BRP to ensure we are compliant with UKVI regulations each year.

As the Sponsor, we have a responsibility to monitor hours of work allocated to ensure our students do not breach their restrictions (usually 20 hours).

The guidelines are already in place for staff follow the same process set out by both the GTA Recruitment Policy and in line with UKVI compliance therefor best practice is already in place, this is backed by a robust audit last year by the home office and an internal review of the GTA recruitment process last year, which was managed by Central HR with input from both local HR and GTA's. An independent audit (by PWC) of the GTA process subsequently commenced and concluded in Feb 2019.

Response – Head of School:

Tier 4 monitoring of students continues as it was as there is no University system available to support this monitoring activity. With regards to GTA recruitment, the School built a bespoke system to advertise opportunities to demonstrators and the recruitment process is through this bespoke system. The Schools have worked with HR colleagues to agree a standard contract and in CoSE the contract can be for up to 3-years (the duration of the PhD) and for a minimum number of hours. Students then submit their timesheets onto

CoreHR and these are approved within the School. Discussions will start to take place about improving the reporting of the information on these timesheets.

Recommendation 13

Early career staff commented to the Panel that it would be useful to have a School induction handbook and an annual calendar of events. The Head of School advised that there was such a handbook which included these headings together with a checklist and was available on the web. In view of the uneven awareness of the handbook, the Review Panel **recommends** that the School seeks input from Early Career Staff on the contents and the dissemination of the information. [*Paragraph 4.4.6*]

For the attention of: Senior Administrator, School Office

For the attention of: The School Engagement Lead

For information: The Head of School

Response:

A physical copy of the Staff Handbook is sent to each academic, technician, and MPA staff member of the School, and is sent yearly. This handbook is also on the School's staff webpages. The School's ECR committee will be invited to suggest items for inclusion.

TNE

Recommendation 14

Given the maturity of the TNE relationships at this point, the Review Panel **recommends** that the School takes the opportunity to consider how to reprofile this activity so as to incorporate TNE more prominently, recognising its importance as part of the School's strategic contribution to research and teaching, and considers how to strengthen partnerships around research and teaching initiatives. [*Paragraph 6.4.1*]

For the attention of: The Head of School

Response:

The Head of School has instituted monthly strategy meetings with the Dean of Glasgow College UESTC to ensure strengthened partnerships in both research and teaching.

As an example of the efficacy of these meetings is the integrated response to 'on-lining' our learning and teaching materials, with a number of initiatives producing materials for **both** the Glasgow and UESTC campuses, created by **both** UESTC fly-in and locally based staff.

Recommendation 15

The Panel would have valued more time with the TNE staff and students and, therefore, the Review Panel **recommends** that, in future, Student and Academic Services and the School, give consideration to whether the Engineering TNE activity is reviewed separately or that the review visit is extended. The Panel acknowledges there is a trade-off between considering the School holistically and giving due attention to TNE but certainly given the scale of endeavour, there is a need for further time to explore and acknowledge in full, the TNE activity in the future. *[Paragraph 6.1.1]*

For the attention of: The Head of School

Transnational Education Deans

Vice Dean Glasgow College UESTC

For information: Vice Principal and Head of College of Science and Engineering

Response: Joint Response

Currently Most of the UESTC dedicated staff are based in Glasgow and deliver teaching at UESTC on a fly-in basis. They are also members of a Research Division and contracted to be based at Gilmorehill. While TNE activities in both Singapore and China could be considered separate entities, the synergies between the School and both TNE activities is important to place within a School context. Staff are also significantly involved in research and scholarship, and it would be contrary to the School's overall strategy to disaggregate research structures along teaching-only lines. Therefore, we believe the review of Glasgow College UESTC and UGS should be conducted as part of the overall review of School of Engineering, but accept that an extended and dedicated session on the TNE activities would be extremely beneficial to both the panel and our dedicated TNE staff. Addressing the specific point regarding more time with the TNE students, this might be best addressed most effectively by a face-to-face meeting at the TNE location by panel members.

Recommendation 16

The Review Panel **recommends** that the University review the support models for the TNE students and staff to recognise the different requirements of these institutions to Glasgow and to ensure that these requirements are understood and met. Additionally, the Review Panel recommends that the School review how to achieve wider awareness of TNE partners through representation at key School committees. *[Paragraph 6.4.2]*

For the attention of: Executive Director, Information Services

For information: Transnational Education Dean

Vice Dean Glasgow College UESTC

Response: Executive Director, Information Services

Information Services staff have met with colleagues from the Academic Collaborations Team to understand the requirements of TNE institutions.

The Library has increasingly been purchasing electronic content to support learning and teaching and research. We are continually investigating how we can broaden our access to

electronic content, in particular e-textbooks where the models are currently problematic and very expensive. The current crisis has led to publishers re-thinking these models and the possibility we may be able to offer more access to e-textbooks in the future. E-content is available to staff and students wherever and whenever they study. The Library has a close relationship with the Library Service at UESTC.

We have staffed the UofG Helpdesk 24-hours during the recent examination period, in order to support students sitting exams in locations across the world. The 24-hour Helpdesk will run again during the resit period. This is a model that is likely to continue into the future.

We are developing a Virtual Desktop Infrastructure which may make it easier to offer specialist software to students and staff wherever they may be located.

Response: Transnational Education Dean

It is gratifying that the panel recognise the importance of our TNE activities in the context of the University's internationalisation strategy and the impact of support infrastructure in delivering exceptional student experience. Within a School context the TNE activities are well recognised but beyond the College the scale and significance is less well understood. Given the differing demands on infrastructure and support from TNE students, it may be prudent to appoint experienced TNE staff to central committees (such as IT services etc) to represent the views and requirements of both staff and students involved with TNE activities.

At a School level, Dr Kelum Gamage has recently been assigned as the School Quality Officer – one of the most senior learning & teaching positions in the School (thus ensuring two fly-in staff as members of the School Learning & Teaching Committee). Dr Sajjad Hussain has recently been appointed to the School 'on-lining' committee, a key in transitioning our teaching to blended provision in the 2020-21 session as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic.

Recommendation 17

Also in relation to TNE, the Review Panel **recommends** that a review of the marking process be undertaken to ensure consistency of approach in terms of explaining the grading criteria when providing feedback on assessment. [*Paragraph 6.3.1*]

For the attention of: Transnational Education Dean
Vice Dean Glasgow College UESTC
For information: The Head of School

Joint Response:

We recognise the importance of consistency of approach in terms of explaining the grading criteria when providing feedback on assessment and we made some significant changes to improve the consistency of the marking and feedback process. A further example of TNE activities influencing School procedures is the updating of the exam moderation process where moderators are required to comment and confirm grading criteria as part of the moderation process – this will be introduced school-wide from the 2021 session. We have also introduced a "continuous Assessment Guideline" document to ensure consistency of approach during the marking and feedback process. In response to advice from our accreditation body, we now review continuous assessment marks for each module using

scatter plots during the exam board. This ensures coursework is suitably discriminatory and consistent across different modules.

Recommendation 18

Also in relation to TNE, the Review Panel **recommends** that there is a general review of the curriculum and teaching approach to address the issues identified in relation to overlapping content, opportunities for more interactive teaching and students' understanding of the material at UGS on an ongoing and formative basis. [*Paragraph 6.2.1*]

For the attention of: Transnational Education Dean

For information: The Head of School

Response: Head of School

In the past academic year, a review of teaching was initiated as part of a School Learning and Teaching Day, held whilst UGS staff were in Glasgow as part of the student Overseas Immersion Programme. Staff from UGS and GCU, as well as Glasgow campus staff, presented in the areas of: curriculum development, on-line teaching and the use of technology in enhancing interactive teaching techniques.

Note that our TNE offering in Singapore is transitioning from a Glasgow-driven to an SIT-partnership model, as SIT itself transitions to a fully-fledged University. Degrees associated with mechanical and aero engineering will transition in the 2021 academic session. This has resulted in a broad curriculum review and restructure, involving consultations with students, external academic experts, the Singaporean ministry of education, and industrialists, as well as academics in GCU, SIT and the Glasgow campus. We are confident that the resulting course curricula are fit for the future.