

Academic Standards Committee - Friday 20 November 2020

**Periodic Subject Review: Outcome Report from the Review of
School of Computing Science held on 4 and 5 March 2020**

Review Panel

Convener	Professor Moira Fischbacher-Smith, Vice Principal Learning & Teaching
External Subject Specialist, University of Edinburgh	Professor Jane Hilston
Senate Assessor on Court	Dr Bethan Wood, Senior Lecturer
Student Panel Member	Ms Teresa Banos
Learning Enhancement and Academic Development Services (LEADS)	Mx Nicole Kipar
Cognate Member	Professor Adrian Bowman
Clerk	Mrs Irene Bruce, Senate Office
Observers	Ms Elina Koristashevskaya, LEADS Mrs Catherine Omand, Senate Office

1. OUTCOME

- 1.1 The Panel **confirmed** there were no concerns regarding the academic standards of programmes delivered by the School of Computing Science and recommended the validation of all programmes for a further six years.
- 1.2 The Panel **confirmed** that nothing was raised as a concern during the PSR that had not already been identified by the School.
- 1.3 The Panel **confirmed** the School had a transparent academic governance and quality assurance structure which aligns to the University regulatory framework.

2. SUMMARY AND CONTEXT

- 2.1 The School of Computing Science (CS) is one of seven schools within the College of Science and Engineering which is one of four colleges within the University. The previous CS Periodic Subject Review (PSR) was undertaken in May 2014. The Panel were satisfied with the information provided by the School and noted the progress made on recommendations from the previous PSR. The Panel also noted that there was a commitment to ongoing enhancement in relation to the continued focus on assessment review and design.
- 2.2 The Chair confirmed the panel had no authority for allocating resources however the expectation is that solutions to some of the recommendations in this report will be provided in collaboration with key University central professional support services as required and may have resource implications.

Staff and Student Participation

- 2.3 The Panel met staff from across the School including those in leadership roles, key academic roles, early career academics, graduate teaching assistants, professional and support staff and technicians. The Panel met with undergraduate and postgraduate students including those studying on the graduate apprenticeship programme and had discussions with students from University of Glasgow Singapore (UGS) via video conference. Comments made by staff during the PSR were

supportive and constructive and demonstrated staff were focused on the best outcome for students. Details of staff and students interviewed are attached in **Appendix 1**.

School Preparation for PSR

- 2.4 The Reflective Analysis (RA) was drafted and co-ordinated on behalf of the School by the Head of School, Director of Learning and Teaching and the Head of School Administration and circulated to staff for comment. Contributions from five student focus groups helped to inform plans for the enhancement of the student experience which the Panel noted as **good practice**. The Chair acknowledged the time taken to prepare for the PSR and the impact this had on workloads at a busy time of year.

Student Numbers and Profile

- 2.5 The RA confirmed a significant increase in student numbers since the last PSR six years ago and detailed the impact this had on workloads, space and resources. The increase of 83% in undergraduate FTE and 246% in postgraduate taught FTE between 2014-15 and 2019-20 represented an overall taught growth of 115%.
- 2.6 Academic staff growth of 42% was primarily Early Career Research Academic staff which aligns with the research intensive nature of the School and the wider University teaching and research strategies.
- 2.7 The Panel noted the breadth and diversity of the student population which included scientists, investigators and entrepreneurs and were confident that the School demonstrated its commitment to reviewing its portfolio in line with the changing industry and commercial external expectations.

3. OVERVIEW

3.1 Strategy for Development

The Panel **commended** the School for its team ethos and its approach to developing a shared understanding of its opportunities and challenges.

Strategy and Resources

- 3.1.1 The Panel commended the School for maintaining its reputation and integrity despite the challenges associated with the significant increase in student numbers and noted that its national and international reputation continues to attract a high level of applicants which aligns with the University strategy for growth in particular disciplinary areas. The Panel noted concerns raised by the School Executive regarding the impact the increased numbers had on their ability to plan and manage resources and **encouraged** the School, External Relations and College Finance (who have oversight of recruitment targets and the admissions process) to work collaboratively to agree recruitment targets.
- 3.1.2 The Panel **commended** the School on the creative use of laboratory space as a response to growing student numbers and limited space and **encouraged** the School to seek support from central university IT services to develop a system for monitoring the usage of the laboratories as a way of maximising the benefits from and evaluation of this initiative.
- 3.1.3 The new line management structure was viewed positively and feedback from academic staff holding key roles suggested it could be further enhanced if leadership and management development could be available. The Panel **recommends** the School seeks support from the University central staff development services to establish a programme of leadership and management training and that bespoke training is also developed in collaboration with colleagues in LEADS.

3.1.4 The Panel noted that a small Working Group had been tasked with development of a comprehensive Work Allocation Model (WAM) that will enable effective planning of academic resource. This will be available for implementation in 2020-21. The Panel **encouraged** the School to ensure future refinement of the model includes time for sharing good practice and assessment and to collaborate with colleagues in Planning Insights and Analysis (formerly Planning and Business Intelligence) to align where possible the principles with University level thinking on workload modelling.

Graduate Teaching Assistants

3.1.5 The Panel **strongly recommends** the School develops a process to provide oversight at School level to monitor workloads and ensure a consistent approach is taken to providing support and development to the GTAs. The inconsistency of workloads at subject level does not at present give cause for concern in relation to employment terms and conditions including visa compliance, but lack of oversight could lead to problems in the future. The GTA's interviewed described a mixed understanding of the level of training and support available to them and that some of the training was mandatory.

Early Career Research Academic Staff

3.1.6 ECRs acknowledged the reduction in teaching hours as part of their probationary period provided them with a structured opportunity to develop but voiced concerns about the increased workload as a result of studying for the Post Graduate Certificate of Academic Practice (PGCAP). The Panel **recommends** that the School works with colleagues in LEADS to review the timetable for this mandatory development and to monitor teaching workloads to facilitate completion. The Panel were satisfied that processes were in place to allow ECRs to influence the future teaching portfolio within the School and the wider student experience.

Strategy for Growth

3.1.7 The School acknowledged the University strategy for growth is at postgraduate level however they are confident there is scope to increase international undergraduate numbers. The RA confirmed the School is planning to develop an international recruitment strategy to address unknown changes to undergraduate EU recruitment following BREXIT when numbers were expected to fall. The Panel **encouraged** the School to work in collaboration with External Relations to obtain a more detailed and tailored market analysis to inform its strategy for growth. The Panel also noted the anticipated gains in international recruitment through the new 2+2 British University in Dubai (BUiD) commencing in 2020.

3.2 Learning, Teaching and Enhancement

Strategic Development for Learning and Teaching

3.2.1 The Panel were impressed with the approach taken by the School to develop its learning and teaching vision as part of the Strategic Planning process which included formal and informal mechanisms. Discussions with staff confirmed this helped to create a shared understanding and ownership of the strategy. The bottom-up and inclusive approach was noted by the Panel as **good practice**.

3.2.2 The Panel were satisfied with plans to review the effectiveness and efficiency in teaching practices and supporting technologies and noted the Annual Teaching Away Day as an example of **good practice**. The School should continue to build on the benefits from this event by ensuring outcomes are shared across all staff and that participation is more formally recognised as Continuing Professional Development

(CPD). The panel **recommends** that in order to build on the strong team ethos ECRs and GTAs should be invited to attend.

- 3.2.3 A member of the CS Learning and Teaching Committee had delegated responsibility to review academic support on behalf of the School. A review of new technologies had already taken place and the Panel noted the plan to review the effectiveness of support from the Library.

Curriculum Review and Development

- 3.2.4 The Panel **noted** the Annual Curriculum Review as an example of **good practice**, and **encouraged** the School to look at how this event could be used to rationalise the portfolio where possible and create space for the development of new collaborative opportunities including TNE. The Panel were **satisfied** that the School demonstrated its commitment to deliver student centric education drawing on the latest research including both theoretical and applied Computing Science and that graduate attributes were articulated within the curriculum. It was also noted the focus of the Centre for Computer Science Education on curriculum development and pedagogical research continued to influence the wider educational community which in turn could include influencing government policy.
- 3.2.5 The Panel **commends** the introduction of the new Graduate Apprenticeship programme as part of the School's commitment to diversify the UG portfolio. The RA confirmed an intake of 34 in 2019-20 with annual numbers expected to rise to 70. The Panel supports the School's plans to participate in the annual bidding process with Skills Development Scotland who provided the external funding to support this initiative. Feedback from students confirmed a high level of satisfaction with the overall experience. Students liked the mixture of work based and on campus learning and confirmed the Adviser of Studies helped them to feel part of the School community when off campus. It was evident to the Panel that various methods of communication, including Zoom were used by this cohort to keep in touch while off campus. The School is **encouraged** to seek support from University External Relations Services to help raise the profile of this programme and promote the added value it brings to the School, College and University reputation.

Assessment and Feedback

- 3.2.6 The RA confirms work had been undertaken since the previous PSR in 2014 to make explicit the linking of assessment to learning outcomes and that this was still an ongoing exercise. Discussions with all student groups provided the Panel with assurance that multiple methods of assessment were in place but there was some confusion around the weighting, workload, expected effort and word count for ten credit modules at UG level and the word count for dissertation at Master level. Students and staff acknowledged some inconsistency of approach to assessment design, the associated differential workload demand across some courses and the need to prioritise this area of review and development. This does not mean that the assessment does not meet the ILOs. From the focus groups with students, the concern was that some assessments required much more effort than others that were similarly weighted and students did not understand the variability. Similarly, staff did not consider that the differences were always merited. There was no concern about the alignment with the ILOs. As such, this work demonstrates a good understanding of the Scottish Credit and Qualification Framework (SCQF) and alignment with the University Code of Assessment and the Panel **strongly recommends** the School does further work to ensure consistency and parity of experience for students.

3.2.7 The Panel were satisfied with plans outlined to review assessment and feedback processes and **recommends** that as part of the review, the School benchmarks across the College regarding online assessment methods already established and to work in partnership with colleagues in University central support services, (in particular LEADS) to develop staff training workshops to support this recommendation.

Collaboration and external engagement

3.2.8 All students interviewed stated the collaborative nature of programmes on offer in the School influenced their choice when applying to study at the University of Glasgow. Feedback from students studying at all levels suggested that studying on programmes which were aligned to industry and commerce prepared them well for a professional life. The Panel noted some students studying at Masters level had already secured employment as a result of their work experience.

3.2.9 The Panel were impressed with the strategic approach to collaboration with commerce and industry and were satisfied that the Industry Advisory Board (IAB) provided an effective governance framework to oversee the development and monitoring of these activities. In line with good governance practice the School reviews the membership, which includes Alumni, on a regular basis and also the range of companies it collaborates with in order to ensure the learning experience remains up to date. The Panel were also satisfied that opportunities for internships were available to students.

Glasgow International College

3.2.10 The Panel noted concerns raised by academic staff regarding the challenges facing the international UG students entering year two from Glasgow International College (GIC). Student numbers had increased significantly since the previous PSR in 2014 and the School were concerned that the student experience was not as good as it could be. The UG cohort has grown from 15 in 2018/19 to 39 in 2019-20 and now makes up 43% of the overall UG international cohort. The students require a high level of support in order to ensure they are prepared for full time academic study and the Panel **encourages** the School to continue to work with colleagues in GIC and External Relations services in order to improve the sustainability of this pathway and to continue to review the support needs for this cohort of students.

Singapore Institute of Technology (SIT)

3.2.11 The School at present delivers a BSc (Honours) degree in partnership with the Singapore Institute of Technology (SIT) and is in the process of transitioning to a new joint degree which started in 2019-20. Following discussions with the School Executive and academic staff, including those in Singapore, it was evident that clarity was required between the School and the University central Academic Collaborations Office regarding the, governance arrangements, resource allocation and teaching commitments in particular. It was clear that the current collaborations between SIT and the School – which include research collaborations, shared staff development and a shared teaching ethos - would be difficult to sustain given the changed relationship emerging under the new joint degree arrangements. In order to minimise the risk of strategic drift, and a loss of institutional knowledge on the part of the School and University of Glasgow Singapore (UGS), the Panel **strongly recommended** the School collaborates with the Academic Collaborations Office to obtain all necessary information to inform resource planning and ensure appropriate good governance arrangements are in place.

Professional Accreditation

- 3.2.12 The Panel were satisfied with the plans and timetable supporting professional accreditation of programmes and that the School were in continual dialogue with other Universities across the sector regarding the future relevance of professional accreditation for both students and employers.

Staff Development and Academic Support

- 3.2.13 Following discussions with academic staff groups it was evident that the School provided formal and informal approaches to staff development. The Panel noted the positive feedback from academic staff on the benefits of peer review and GU staff based in Singapore found the ongoing collaboration with Glasgow campus staff beneficial to their professional development. The Panel noted an inconsistent awareness of central university staff development services and **recommends** the School speaks to colleagues in these services to discuss ways to promote their services more widely across the School.
- 3.2.14 The panel noted various online platforms developed locally by expertise in CS which were used for multiple purposes including teaching and learning and databases for collecting and analysing data and encouraged the School to work collaboratively with University IT services to ensure adequate backup and alignment to University networks and systems where possible.

3.3 The Student Voice

- 3.3.1 The Panel **commended** the School for its approach to raising the profile of the student voice and its willingness to hear constructive feedback. Feedback from academic staff and all students confirmed the benefits of the work undertaken by the Student Staff Liaison Committees (SSLC). It was evident from the minutes of the SSLC and wider discussions with all student groups that they were comfortable in raising issues with staff and that they would be listened to. The students gave explicit examples of actions taken by the School following feedback which demonstrated closure of the feedback loop. The Panel **encouraged** the School to continue to build on this successful model and to collaborate with colleagues in External Relations (Student Communications) to look at methods of promoting this across the College and wider University.
- 3.3.2 It was evident from discussions with class representatives, including those studying in Singapore, that they took their role seriously. The School is **encouraged** to look at additional methods of promoting the role and to promote the training and development programme for class representatives provided by the Student Representative Council (SRC) as well as the newly developed Student Representation Toolkit.

3.4 Supporting Student Wellbeing

Student Support Officer / Adviser of Studies

- 3.4.1 The recently introduced role of Student Support Officer (SSO) created as part of a two year pilot in collaboration with Student Support Services (SSS) was viewed positively by staff and students. The Panel **noted** the remit of the SSO is to sign-post students to a variety of support services and to act as a bridge between the School and University central professional services. Following discussions with staff and students the Panel were concerned to note the volume of work being undertaken by the SSO and significant blurring of boundaries between the SSO and Adviser of Studies (AS) who had delegated responsibility for academic advice related to degree programmes. Discussions with students confirmed some students were going to the SSO for academic advice and the increased workload of the SSO had the potential to

become a single point of failure. The Panel **recommends** the School continues this work in partnership with colleagues in SSS to ensure there are evaluation criteria around the pilot that capture the range of relationships and type of support that this new role creates and affects, and look at ways to promote the post as being a collaboration between the School and University Student Support Services.

- 3.4.2 It was evident following discussions with students that meetings with AS were inconsistent experiences as some met them on a one to one basis and others were meeting in groups. The Panel **strongly recommends** the School reviews the remit of the Adviser of Studies to make explicit the boundaries between academic support and generic support and to put in place methods to ensure a consistent approach to AS student meetings. In addition, the School must make explicit to students the appropriate route for academic related advice and generic support.

Direct Entry Support

- 3.4.3 The Panel were satisfied with arrangements in place to provide additional support for widening participation and direct entry students including a four week Summer School. The Panel also noted that the School was working on a plan and resource model to develop this further.

Student Communication

- 3.4.4 The School uses multiple methods to communicate with students including face to face, email, Moodle and other online platforms. Feedback from students suggests a level of confusion and frustration associated with some of these methods which resulted in duplication of information. The Panel noted comments around the awkwardness of log-in and password problems which added to the level of frustration. The Panel **encourages** the School to review its communication methods and to make explicit to students the appropriate route for key information, in particular around assessment deadlines.

4 GOOD PRACTICE

- 4.1 The Panel noted a number of areas of good practice and strongly encourages the School to maximise the support, guidance and advice available from University central professional support services to promote and share the best practice more widely across the College and University.

- 4.2 A list of examples of **good practice** are listed below:

- A strong culture of teaching ambition, for example the Centre for Computing Science Education.
- Establishing a reflective and enhancement focus for teaching and learning by introducing the Annual Learning and Teaching Away Day and the Annual Curriculum Review events.
- Innovative approach to managing resources and developing people by creating a new divisional management structure with clear lines of responsibility and the creation of a new academic Work Allocation Model (WAM).
- Creating a bottom up approach to the Strategic Planning process which is shared and understood by the School community.
- Collegiate and reflective approach to preparation for the PSR.

5. COMMENDATIONS

- 5.1 The Panel **noted** the following areas of work which should be **commended**.

- The School should be **commended** for creating an innovative, team culture and should be confident in promoting this at a higher level within the University.
- The strategy for supporting the Student Voice should be **commended** as there was significant evidence to demonstrate closure of feedback loops.
- The School should be **commended** for retaining its national and international reputation while working with significant growth in student numbers.
 - The School should be **commended** on its innovative approach to the use of laboratory space to accommodate significant growth in student numbers.
 - The School should be **commended** for its strategic approach to working collaboratively with industry as a way of ensuring the employability of its graduates and for ensuring the curriculum remains vibrant and relevant.
 - The School should be **commended** for taking part in the collaborative pilot project with Student Support Services to establish the role of a School Student Support Officer.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER ENHANCEMENT

- 6.1 The Panel **noted** the ambition to enhance the student experience embedded in the culture of the School. The recommendations from the Panel builds on work already undertaken by the School.
- 6.2 The Panel **strongly recommends** that the School should maximise the support available to them from key University central professional support services and looks for opportunities at College and University level to promote, share and learn from best practice.

6.3 The recommendations for enhancement detailed in the table are aligned to the four key thematic sections of the Reflective Analysis as follows with the recommendations listed in order of priority within each section.

- Strategy for Development
- Learning Teaching and Enhancement
- The Student Voice
- Supporting Student Wellbeing

The enhancement activities associated with each theme are presented either as: strong recommendations; recommendations; or, encouragements. In the case of strong recommendations there may be more urgency required in addressing the issue. Updates on actions arising from recommendations and strong recommendations will be formally presented to the Academic Standards Committee, and commentary on responses to encouragements will also be presented if the Subject area submits this information to the Senate Office although there is no requirement for them to do so.

	THEMATIC ACTIVITY (Section 3.1 Strategy for Development)	Shared Enhancement Benefits	For the attention the School (for action)	Attention of University support service(for info)
1.	Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTA) The Panel strongly recommends the School develops more formal mechanisms to ensure School oversight of GTA workloads and their wider activities including support and development needs. Ref: Section 3 para 3.1.5	School oversight will create parity of experience for the GTAs and will provide the School with an opportunity to monitor workflows and progress against staff development requirements for GTA.	Academic Tutor Liaison	
2.	Leadership and Management Training It is recommended that the School works with University Staff development services to ensure leadership and management training opportunities are made available to staff in new roles as part of the restructuring. Bespoke training for academic related matters should be developed in collaboration with LEADS. Ref: Section 3 para 3.1.3	The success of the new divisional line management structure will be maximised if appropriate leadership and management training is provided for individuals who are new to these roles and responsibilities. Individuals will feel supported and more confident. Working collaboratively with central services will broaden the knowledge across professional services of the unique requirements of the School and its subject.	Head of School Director of Learning and Teaching Head of Administration	Head of HR: College of Science & Engineering Director of Employee and Organisational Development. Deputy Director, ADD
3.	Early Career Research (ECR) It is recommended that the School continues to work collaboratively with colleagues in LEADS to ensure the schedule for mandatory PGCAP development is achievable for ECRs. Ref: Section 3 para 3.1.6	This should provide LEADS with an opportunity to raise awareness of its support within the School and working collaboratively should provide an opportunity for both to reflect on the programme content and the timetable.	Director of Learning and Teaching	Deputy Director, ADD
4.	Laboratory Space	Working collaboratively with central IT services will provide professional services	Head of School	Director of IT Services

	The School is encouraged to speak to central University IT services to develop an approach to monitor the use of laboratories. This should help them build on the innovative use of the laboratory space already undertaken. Ref: Section 3 para 3.1.2	with an opportunity to broaden their understanding of the use of university resources. It will also broaden knowledge regarding the use of space to inform the wider university Estates strategy and potentially the smart campus developments.	Head of Administration Systems Manager (Operations and Staffing)	Director of Estates and Commercial Services
5.	Strategy for Growth The School is encouraged to work in collaboration with External Relations to develop a tailored market analysis to inform its strategy for growth. Ref: Section 3 para 3.1.7	This should provide the School and ER with a full understanding of the ambition and scope for increasing student numbers which will inform any recruitment and marketing strategy required to support this objective.	Head of School Head of Administration	Vice Principal (External Relations) Head of College
6.	Workload Allocation Model (WAM) The new Academic Work Allocation Model (WAM) should include time for sharing best practice and assessment. The School is encouraged to collaborate with University Planning, Insights and Analysis to maximising knowledge & resources. Ref: Section 3 para 3.1.8	Refining the WAM will create more transparency across the School. Collaboration with College and central services will provide an opportunity to share unique insight into the subject knowledge and align resource models where appropriate.	Head of School/Deputy Head of School Director of Learning and Teaching Head of Administration	Director of Planning, Insights and Analysis
	THEMATIC ACTIVITY (Section 3.2 Learning Teaching Enhancement)	Shared Enhancement Benefits	For the attention the School	Attention of University support service
7.	Assessment and Feedback Aligning assessment to learning outcomes has been an ongoing initiative since the PSR in 2014. However, in considering assessment, students and staff had acknowledged some inconsistency of approach to assessment design particularly in relation to differential workload demands across some courses. Therefore, this area was seen as a priority in the continuing review and development of assessment. The Panel strongly recommends the school undertakes this work to	This will provide clarity for the students as well evidencing parity of experience. CS can demonstrate further alignment to the University Code of Assessment and with the SCQF. Sharing best practice across the College will provide an opportunity to promote good practice in CS and will provide the School with an opportunity to discuss and pilot models used by colleagues in other Schools.	Head of School Director of Learning and Teaching	Head of College

	ensure consistency and parity of experience for the students. It also recommends that they benchmark with other Schools within the College to help inform good practice when looking at developing new assessment models – in particular online assessment methods. Ref: Section 3 para 3.2.6	The College can evidence to the University their strategic commitment to enhancement.		
8.	Singapore Institute of Technology (SIT) The Panel strongly recommends the School seeks clarity with the University Academic Collaborations office regarding the new agreement with SIT. Ref: Section 2 para 3.2.11	Clarity will provide the School with the necessary information to allow them to manage strategic planning, budget and resources and for the University to continue to develop the strategic partnership with SIT. Ownership of the Agreement will reduce institutional governance risks associated with monitoring and evaluation. Working with colleagues in Academic Collaborations Office (ACO) should provide CS with a broader understanding of the University governance and provide ACO with an appreciation and clarity regarding the information required by CS and for what purpose.	Head of School Head of Administration	Head of Academic Collaborations Office. Head of College College finance
9.	Annual Curriculum Review Having established this within the annual schedule of activities the Panel recommends the School uses the event to create further innovation within the portfolio and to seek opportunities for further TNE activities. Ref: Section 2 para 3.2.4	Using space already allocated in the School diary should allow CS to have a more structured agenda taking consideration of longer-term ambitions which would inform the Strategic Planning process.	Head of School Director of Learning and Teaching	
10.	Continual Professional Development (CPD) The School should continue to build on the reflective approach taken at the Annual Learning and Teaching away day by ensuring the outcomes are more widely shared across the School and that attendance at the event is recognised formally as CPD.	Formal CPD recognition should help to raise the profile of the need for academic development. Working collaboratively with central staff development services and LEADS should help provide a shared understanding across	Head of School Director of Learning and Teaching.	Head of Employee and Organisational Development.

	The School is encouraged to seek advice and guidance on CPD recognition from colleagues in Staff Development Services and LEADS. Ref: Section 3 para 3.2.2	the University of some of the unique subject related work undertaken in the School. Academic staff can use CPD for professional purposes e.g. promotion and professional membership.		Director of Academic Services
11.	Annual Learning and Teaching Away-Day The School is encouraged to invite the ECRs and GTAs in the Annual Learning and Teaching away day as a way of sharing knowledge and capturing innovation. Ref: Section 3 para 3.2.2	Will provide the ECR and GTAs with a wider School network and allows the School to share ideas and initiatives across the whole community.	Head of Administration Director of Learning and Teaching	
12.	Graduate Apprenticeship Programme The School is commended on development of this programme and positive student experience. The School is encouraged to seek support from External Relations to find methods of raising the profile of this programme and promote its added value to the School, College and University reputation. Ref: Section 3 para 3.2.5	Added value to School, College and University will help contribute to further enhance reputation and diversity.	Head of School GA Programme Director Head of Administration	Head of College Vice Principal (External Relations)
	THEMATIC ACTIVITY (Section 3.3 The Student Voice)	Shared Enhancement Benefits	For the attention the School	Attention of University support service
13.	Student Feedback/Student Voice The significant work undertaken to support the Student Voice /student feedback could be further enhanced and the School is encouraged to seek support from External Relations services to help promote this work across the College and University. Ref: Section 3 para 3.3.1	Sharing across the wider University will raise the profile of CS. Working collaboratively with External Relations will provide an opportunity for them to broaden their knowledge of the institutional need to enhance student experience.	Head of Administration	Vice Principal (External Relations)
14.	Student Representatives The School is encouraged to look at additional methods to promote the training and development provided by the SRC.	Further promotion of training and development will hopefully encourage students to see the benefits of volunteering to be representative.	Head of Administration	SRC President

	Ref: Section 3 para 3.3.2			
	THEMATIC ACTIVITY (Section 3.4 Supporting Student Wellbeing)	Shared Enhancement Benefits	For the attention the School	Attention of University support service
15.	Student Support Officer and Adviser of Studies The recently introduced role of Student Support Officer (SSO) as part of a pilot project is viewed positively by staff and students however there are concerns regarding the workload and the boundaries between the role and the Adviser of Studies. The Panel strongly recommends the School reviews the role descriptor for the Adviser of Studies and makes explicit to students Ref: Section 3 para 3.4.2	Maximises the use of University professional service support staff and will raise the profile of support services provided. Provides central professional services and the School with an opportunity to develop shared ownership and understanding of the student experience and the significance this has to the University reputation and status.	Head of Administration Head of School Senior Adviser of Studies	Clerk of Senate
16.	Student Communications The School is encouraged to look at its methods of communication with students and to make more explicit the appropriate route for key information, in particular around assessment deadlines. Ref: Section 3 para 3.4.4	This will provide clarity for the students and a better experience. The School will have an opportunity to review and streamline its communication process and reduce duplication.	Head of Administration Director of Learning and Teaching	