

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

Academic Standards Committee

Periodic Subject Review: Review of Economic and Social History held on 6 March 2020

Mr Robbie Mulholland, Clerk to the Review Panel

Review Panel:

Professor Frank Coton, Vice Principal, Panel Convener

Professor Lucy Newton, University of Reading, External Subject Specialist

Professor Simon Kennedy, Senate Assessor on Court

Ms Anna Makova, Student Member

Dr Amanda Pate, Learning Enhancement and Academic Development Service

Mr Robbie Mulholland, Senate Office and Clerk to the Panel

Observer: Dr Andrew Struan, Learning Enhancement and Academic Development Service

Apologies: Dr Niall Mackenzie, Adam Smith Business School, Cognate Member

1. Introduction

1.1.1 Economic and Social History (ESH) is one of five constituent Subject Areas which make up the School of Social and Political Sciences (SPS) and part of the College of Social Sciences (CoSS). Two institutional centres, the Centre for Business History in Scotland and the Centre for the History of Medicine are based in ESH. A third institutional centre, the Centre for Gender History, based in the History Subject Area also includes ESH staff membership.

The Economic and Social History Subject Area is located in Lilybank House in Bute Gardens.

1.1.2 Preparation of the ESH Self Evaluation Report was led by Professor Ray Stokes, Head of the ETS Subject Area, with input and consultation involving several members of ESH academic staff. This included Dr Hannah-Louise Clark, Miss Maelle Duchemin-Pelletier, Dr Rose Elliot, Dr Jeff Meek, Dr Jim Phillips, Professor Neil Rollings, Dr Duncan Ross and Dr Helen Yaffe. Additional support and advice was provided by Ms Suzanne Hendry and Mr Aidan Simpson, ESH administrators, Dr Michael McEwan, Learning Enhancement and Academic Development Service (LEADS), Ms Amy Broad, Student Lifecycle Support and Development, and Dr Matt Dawson, Head of the Sociology Subject Area.

1.1.3 The Panel met with the following members of ETS staff and students:- Head of Subject; nine members of academic staff (four of whom are Early Career Staff); three other Early Career Staff; two ETS administrative staff; two Graduate

Teaching Assistants (GTAs); two Tutors; four undergraduate students (Levels 1, 2, 3 and 4); and one postgraduate taught student. The Panel also met with the Head of the School of Social and Political Sciences and the Professor of Scots Law, School of Law (standing in for the Dean of Learning and Teaching, College of Social Sciences).

2. Context and Strategy

2.1 Staff

The headcount delivering teaching in ESH is 15 as of early 2020. The Self Evaluation Report (SER, p5) notes that 'this includes two staff members who have 50% workload allocations for senior administrative positions, three members of staff who have research grant buyouts, and four members of staff who are on time limited contracts.' Furthermore, the SER (p5) states that 'the actual FTE of staff available for teaching is approximately 12.7 as of late 2019/early 2020' and 'a total of 3.13 FTE of this figure involves staff on time-limited contracts.'

2.2 Students

Student numbers as reported for sessions 2015-16 to 2018-19 are summarised below:

Student Numbers by Year of Programme – Undergraduate

Headcount	Term	Term	Term	Term
Year of Prog	2015	2016	2017	2018
1	11	20	17	17
2	38	29	44	25
3	36	35	28	42
4	22	34	33	28
5				1
Grand Total	107	118	122	113

Student Numbers by Year of Programme – Postgraduate

Head Count	Term	Term	Term	Term
Year of Programme	2015	2016	2017	2018
1	23	31	27	117
2	1	1	1	19
Grand Total	24	32	28	136

2.3 Range of Provision under Review

Undergraduate:

- MA Social Sciences (MA Soc Sci [Honours]), Single Honours degree in ESH
- MA Social Sciences with Quantitative Methods (MA Soc Sci [Honours])

- Combined Honours degrees in ESH and another subject offered from a range of subjects within the Colleges of Social Sciences; Arts; and Science and Engineering, subject to timetabling restrictions
- Level 3 courses contributing to the three-year, non-Honours MA within the College of Social Sciences
- Honours courses that are available to students on other subjects and/or programmes
- Teaching on courses on the MBChB and BSc Medical Humanities programmes including undergraduate courses in History of Medicine and also supervision of dissertations.

Postgraduate:

- MSc in Global Economy (ESRC recognised 1+3 pathway)
- Erasmus Mundus International Masters programme (IntM) Global Markets, Local Creativities (GLOCAL)

In addition, ESH offers or has recently offered course/s that contribute to the:

- MSc in History (ESRC recognised 1+3 pathway)
- MSc in History with emphasis on History of Medicine (ESRC recognised 1+3 pathway)
- Other MSc programmes across the School of Social and Political Sciences and the College of Social Sciences including Management programmes in the Adam Smith Business School
- MSc programme in International Relations offered at the University of Glasgow's strategic partner, the University of Nankai.

2.4 Strategic Approach to Enhancing Learning and Teaching

2.4.1 The Review Panel met with the Head of Subject who outlined his key strategic objectives for the Subject. Principal amongst these was the goal to preserve and sustain the Subject. He, and key staff that the Panel met with, considered that one of the great strengths of Economic and Social History as a subject was its interdisciplinary nature and the extent to which it drew on many different branches of knowledge. The Head of Subject pointed out that despite this interconnectedness, it was important that Economic and Social History be seen as a distinct and coherent discipline and that the Subject Area was able to consolidate its position structurally within the School and College.

It was noted that the University of Glasgow was one of only two higher education institutions in the UK which offered Economic and Social History – the other being the London School of Economics (LSE). Both the Head of Subject and staff the Panel met with stressed that although the Subject's academic staff had a variety of different subject specialisms, they all had a collective belief in the importance of Economic and Social History as a discipline and the role of the Subject Area as a near-unique provider in the UK.

Staff Demographic and Workload

2.4.2

The Head of Subject considered that another key objective for the Subject was to continue to provide a high-quality student experience in the face of a substantially changed staff demographic. Overall staff numbers had remained relatively stable over several years, but the age profile of staff had changed markedly. Two senior members of staff had retired and two (one senior and one junior) had taken up other posts outside the University. This meant that 38% of staff were under 45 years of age while 46% were 56 or over. These figures suggested that there would be a continuing trend of departure (through retirement) of senior staff. This presented a considerable challenge for the Subject, particularly in the face of the very large increase in PGT student numbers in both the MSc in Global Economy and GLOCAL programmes. [The headcount for the MSc in Global Economy programme had risen from 29 in session 2014-15 to 85 in session 2019-20.] The dramatic increase in numbers on this programme had coincided with the introduction of the GLOCAL programme which attracted an average of 600 applicants each year.

The Head of Subject and staff the Panel met with recognised that the very large increase in PGT numbers had placed an unsustainable workload on staff - a matter which would become particularly acute if the existing upward trend in PGT numbers continued. The loss of several senior staff had also inevitably impacted on established experience and institutional knowledge within the Subject. The Panel acknowledged these concerns and noted also that a lot of undergraduate work was being undertaken by staff on fixed-term contracts. This could present additional challenges for the Subject in future should these staff leave. The Panel enquired whether the Subject had examined the possibility of making teaching appointments on Learning, Teaching and Scholarship (LTS) contracts. The Head of Subject advised that he wanted to avoid the hierarchical staff structure that he thought might accompany such a move.

Approach to Curriculum Development

2.4.3

The Head of Subject noted that a further key strategic objective for the Subject was to further incorporate global history and its contemporary relevance within the curriculum, at all levels from pre-Honours to PGT. The curriculum at Levels 1 and 2 was being recast to place key themes such as industrialisation and social change in a more global and comparative context. This shift in emphasis was also taking place in the MSc in Global Economy and GLOCAL programmes.

As part of this, the Subject had utilised the new research and teaching expertise of recently appointed staff to offer several new courses, eg ones which related to Latin America and this region's impact on the global economy and international politics. The Head of Subject considered that developments such as these demonstrated the considerable work that the Subject continued to make to realise the University's strategic objectives in relation to internationalisation, interdisciplinarity and collaboration, particularly in the context of the MSc in Global Economy and GLOCAL programmes.

He pointed out, however, that many international students on the Subject's PGT programmes had less interest in the historical dimension of their studies than they did in economic aspects. The Subject had responded to this by adopting several new approaches to help further engage students with historical aspects of the curriculum. [See section 3.4.1].

The Panel was advised that the Head of Subject attached considerable importance to being able to 'mesh' the curriculum at undergraduate and postgraduate level. Recent academic staff appointments had been made with a view to further globalising the curriculum, in line with University, College, School and Subject strategies but also with the aim of achieving greater integration of programmes across undergraduate and postgraduate provision. Several staff, equivalent to 2.5 FTEs, had recently been appointed and would join ESH in spring and summer 2020. In addition, the Subject had a vacant post and consideration was being given as to how this should be filled. A key consideration would be the post-holder's ability to teach across the Subject, and at different levels, in the areas of economic, social and business history. The vacancy also provided an opportunity to make an appointment which would help address the current imbalance in the Subject's staff profile between junior and senior members.

The Panel acknowledged the considerable efforts that the Subject had made, and continued to make, to address the various challenges presented by staff retirements and departures. The Panel **suggests**, that in making the case for future staff appointments, the Subject emphasises how the post-holder would contribute to the Subject's perceived future provision - and not just the extent to which the appointee would address an immediate staffing need in a particular area of the curriculum.

The Panel welcomed the Head of Subject's comments on the importance of Economic and Social History promoting itself as a distinct and coherent discipline. In this regard, it noted that several undergraduate students remarked that while they were very enthusiastic about the diversity of the learning experience in ESH, they were sometimes unclear how certain aspects of the curriculum fitted in with the overall aims of the Subject. The Panel **suggests** that the Head of Subject reflect on the Subject's identity and how this is perceived by the student body.

3. Enhancing the Student Experience

3.1 Admissions, Retention and Success

3.1.1 Admissions and Recruitment

The Head of Subject advised the Panel that over the last few years, undergraduate numbers in Economic and Social History had been quite stable and displayed no discernible trend. It was clear, however, that very few undergraduate students came to the University with the intention of studying Economic and Social History.

Although there were fairly large numbers in Level 1 ESH courses, the number of students who had the subject in their study programme from the start was quite low. This could be explained, at least in part, by the fact that Economic and Social History was not offered as a subject in secondary schools and there was a consequent lack of general awareness of the subject amongst school leavers. It

was evident that many students decided to take up the subject explicitly after their first year of study. The numbers of students opting to continue with ESH into Honours was a reflection of the level of student interest and satisfaction with the subject at Levels 1 and 2, in spite of students not having had the benefit of taking the subject previously at school. This was in contrast to the situation with many other subjects which were taught at school level, whereby there was often a drop in the number of students choosing the subject explicitly from point of entry through to Honours.

One of the undergraduate students the Panel met with advised that they had come to the University with the intention of studying History and Politics but had decided to study ESH on the back of reports of the quality of teaching in the subject. All the undergraduate students the Panel met with reported that the richness and diversity of the learning experience they encountered once they had taken up ESH was a big factor in their desire to pursue the subject in later years of their programme. The rate of retention from Level 1 to Honours was therefore very high, eg 20 students in Level 1 in 2015, to 60 in Honours in 2018.

The Panel noted from the Self Evaluation Report (SER) that the gender profile of students in ESH was broadly similar at both UG and PGT level, in that the majority were female. However, in 2018, while the trend towards female participation at undergraduate level continued, there was a near equal proportion of males and females at PGT level. Regarding domicile, the vast majority of undergraduate students were from the UK and the EU with approximately 12-21% being international in any given year.

3.1.2 Widening Participation and Direct Entry

The Panel noted from the Self Evaluation Report (SER) that the School of Social and Political Sciences operated a new articulation programme whereby HNC social sciences students at Glasgow Clyde College could progress to the University to take Level 2 subjects, including Economic and Social History. Preparations were also underway to extend this scheme to West College (Paisley) in session 2021-22. The Subject also received international students who had taken degree preparation programmes, eg the Foundation Certificate in Business and Social Sciences at Glasgow International College (GIC) - one of the University's partner institutions.

3.1.3 Retention and Progression

As noted in section 3.1.1, the retention of students who had studied Economic and Social History at Levels 1 and 2 was quite high, particularly in view of the fact that few students had much awareness of the subject prior to coming to the University. In addition, nearly all students admitted to Honours in ESH completed the programme with good degree outcomes, eg in 2018, Honours classifications were awarded as follows:- First – 21; 2i – 36; 2ii – 9; Third Class – 0.

The Panel noted from the SER that attainment amongst students on PGT programmes was also high with the vast majority completing their studies successfully, and in most cases with Merit or Distinction.

3.1.4 *Postgraduate Taught Provision*

The Panel noted from the SER that PGT numbers were also relatively stable between 2015 and 2017, but from 2018 and in contrast to the undergraduate population, PGT numbers had increased dramatically, quadrupling from previous levels. This increase was due largely to a considerable upturn in student numbers on the MSc in Global Economy programme which coincided with the introduction of the GLOCAL International Masters programme. While student numbers on the latter programme had decreased slightly, the numbers on the MSc in Global Economy programme had remained at a high level with applications for entry in 2020 being four times the number received for entry in 2019.

The composition of the postgraduate population in terms of domicile also differed markedly from the undergraduate population in that the vast majority of students were international – the figure being between 70-78% between 2015 and 2018. The composition of the Subject's two PGT programmes also showed significant differences in terms of the nationality/ethnicity of its students. The students in the MSc in Global Economy programme were mostly Chinese while GLOCAL students came from over 20 different countries. The Head of Subject reported that there appeared to be no obvious reason which explained the large upturn in numbers in the MSc in Global Economy programme in 2018.

With regard to the GLOCAL programme, however, the large number of applicants could be explained, at least in part, by the high quality of the programme, the availability of scholarships for students and the recognition it had received from the European Union's (EU) Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). The EU's initial funding amounted to over 3 million Euros. The Head of Subject considered that the UK's departure from the EU posed many challenges for this programme and it would require to be thoroughly recast going forward.

With regard to the MSc in Global Economy, the Panel advised the Head of Subject that careful consideration would have to be given to how numbers on the programme were managed in future. The recent large increase in numbers might continue, but on the other hand, the programme's reliance on international students, and particularly those from one country – China, could potentially leave the programme very susceptible to market fluctuation. In addition, the onset of the coronavirus in many countries was likely to have a significant impact on international recruitment generally. The Head of Subject advised that a process of scenario planning was on-going within the Subject with regard to PGT admissions to enable a managed response to possible outcomes. The Panel stressed that the Subject should consider the balance between its UG and PGT numbers in planning its future development.

3.2 Equality and Diversity

3.2.1 The Economic and Social History SER outlined the Subject's commitment to equality and diversity at various levels. Themes linked to equality and diversity ran through the Subject's teaching at all levels and the LEADS representative who undertook student focus groups in ESH prior to the PSR reported that 'inclusion (as participation) is actively encouraged in classes through both pedagogy and

culture by many/most staff.' (SER, p17). Also, a new lectureship in Global Inequalities had been proposed by the Subject, and approved by the College of Social Sciences, with the new member of staff due to take up post shortly.

The Panel heard that over the last few years the Subject's student population had become more diverse with more mature students, including some with caring responsibilities. One of the undergraduate students the Panel met with reported, that as a parent, they had received strong support from Subject staff.

At undergraduate level there was an increasing number of students whose first language was not English, and at PGT level this group constituted a majority. The Head of Subject considered that diversity in the student body also helped to bring a range of perspectives to the learning and teaching environment.

Good Cause

3.2.2

The Panel heard from both the Head of Subject and many staff regarding two matters which they considered impinged significantly on Equality and Diversity, namely, the increasing incidence of Good Cause claims linked to mental health issues and the availability/accessibility of suitable teaching rooms.

The Head of Subject reported that the number of students applying for an extension to work deadlines and/or Good Cause had grown exponentially in recent years. He considered that lack of appropriate support capacity across the University made this situation unsustainable going forward. The Panel understood the concerns expressed by the Head of Subject and staff and confirmed that steps were being taken across the University to address these matters. The Panel observed that the increasing incidence of issues linked to mental health was a matter which affected large parts of society and not just the higher education sector.

The Panel recognised the very considerable efforts which the Subject was making to support students affected by mental health concerns.

Teaching Accommodation

3.2.3

The Head of Subject and staff the Panel met with highlighted a range of difficulties they had experienced with the central room booking system. A significant number of teaching rooms across the campus were not accessible to students and staff with disabilities. Furthermore, room booking requests were required to be made before information on student disability was available. Also, it was often impossible for students with disabilities to move between rooms far apart on campus in the 10 minutes allocated for this. The Head of Subject added that teaching in certain Courses, particularly at PGT level, often took place in different rooms week to week. All in all, the Subject considered that these factors were significant impediments to the learning and teaching experience and impacted directly on issues around equality and inclusion. The Panel shared many of the concerns that the Subject had expressed regarding the room booking process and confirmed that this matter was in the process of being examined across the University.

3.3 Supporting Students in their Learning

Learning Environment

3.3.1

All the students the Panel met with felt that the Economic and Social History Subject Area provided a highly supportive and stimulating learning environment. They reflected enthusiastically on the richness and diversity of the curriculum, high quality teaching and the level of autonomy they had in their learning. The students considered that they benefitted greatly from the Subject's desire to link student learning and teaching to the research expertise of staff. They also felt that most Economic and Social History students had a general awareness of what the research interests of Subject staff were.

The students appreciated the excellent library and archival resources that were available to them, including the collections contained in the University Library, the Mitchell Library and those in the two institutional centres based within Economic and Social History – the Centre for Business History in Scotland, and the Centre for the History of Medicine. The students the Panel met with also welcomed the new courses that had been introduced (see section 2.4.3).

The students considered that the Subject, in general, relied heavily on a traditional lecture-followed-by-seminar model of teaching, but didn't feel this detracted from their overall learning experience. They did note that there were several examples of innovative teaching that most students particularly enjoyed. This included the historical hackathon in archival research, and also the use of musical playlists in one course as a learning tool to give historical context to the study of cultural movements.

One of the students the Panel met with expressed a preference for more group work, but several others felt they learned better when working individually. They all considered that given the range of nationalities in the ESH student body, there was inevitably going to be different cultural approaches to learning and a range of preferred learning styles. The Panel heard that the structure of seminars was well-received by students who felt they were conducted in a very inclusive manner where full student participation was encouraged.

The Review Panel **commends** Economic and Social History for its high quality teaching across all levels of provision, as evidenced by the comments of the External Subject Specialist and the students the Panel met with.

Induction and Support

3.3.2

The students the Panel met with indicated that they were generally content with the induction activities that they received at the beginning of their studies. Members of the Panel did wonder, however, if the Subject could do more to engage with new students prior to beginning their studies, over and above the current arrangement whereby (PGT) students received a welcome letter.

Students advised that both academic and administrative staff in ESH were very approachable and supportive regarding any problems they might have. One student did point out, however, that they occasionally had difficulty booking an appointment to meet with a member of academic staff.

The Panel noted that at PGT level, dissertation supervision was undertaken in groups. A PGT student remarked that this arrangement worked satisfactorily, in general, however they considered that the process of allocating Supervisors to students did not always bring about the best alignment between student and staff interests. The Head of Subject explained that the process of allocating Supervisors to students was based on the proposed topic and the workload commitments of staff. A PGT student also remarked that they would prefer more explicit advice from Supervisors on how dissertations should be presented in terms of format and structure.

Advisers of Study

3.3.3

The Panel was advised by both students and staff that they felt considerable confusion existed regarding the role of Advisers of Study. Students reported several instances where there had been mutual confusion between the staff member recorded as being their Adviser of Study on MyCampus, and students as to the purpose of meetings between them. In practice, at undergraduate level, students relied mostly on the team of administrative staff based in the advising offices of the Colleges of Social Sciences and Arts. At PGT level, Programme Convenors fulfilled the role of Adviser of Studies. In view of the uncertainty expressed by students and staff regarding the responsibilities attached to the role of Adviser of Study, the Panel **recommends** that the Head of the School of Social and Political Sciences considers what additional steps could be taken to establish greater clarity around the responsibilities of the role for both staff and students.

Communications

3.3.4

The students the Panel met with were of the opinion that the sense of community within the Subject was strong, particularly at Honours level where there was small classes. One student expressed a wish that there was more engagement between PGT and undergraduate students but acknowledged that the Subject was trying to address this in terms of its approach to curriculum development (see section 2.4.3). The Panel observed that Economic and Social History did not have a student society and wondered if students might want to consider forming one, perhaps in liaison with the Student Representative Council (SRC), as a means of fostering greater student interaction.

Several students the Panel met with felt that there was some room for improvement regarding general communications across the Subject. Students expressed a general feeling that the content of notifications they received from staff (normally issued via Moodle email and University email accounts) could benefit from being more explicit and consistent. Acknowledging these observations, the Review Panel

recommends that Economic and Social History undertakes a review of communications within the Subject Area with a view to improving the efficiency and effectiveness of information sharing between:

1. Individual members of staff in the Subject Area; and
2. Members of staff in the Subject Area and students.

As part of this review, the Subject Area should consult with student stakeholder groups to gain a better understanding of their experience of current communications and to identify specific opportunities for improvement.

Writing Support

3.3.5

The Panel noted that, in line with University policy, all first year undergraduate and new PGT students in Economic and Social History undertook the Academic Writing Skills Programme (AWSP) run by the Learning Enhancement and Academic Development Service (LEADS). The students the Panel met with advised that the range of resources and expertise provided by LEADS was recommended to them strongly by staff in ESH.

Staff the Panel met with advised that a member of ESH staff gave study skills seminars on writing skills and supplemented this by giving additional group supervision sessions for Chinese students. The Head of Subject advised the Panel that undergraduate and PGT Convenors also engaged with international students on a regular basis to offer support for any problems they might have. This included offering help with comprehension and written English. A PGT student the Panel met with whose first language was not English, advised that one of the reasons they came to the UK was to improve their English skills and they had benefitted greatly from writing support. The student also stressed, that given the majority of PGT students in ESH were international, the writing support they received was particularly welcome.

Graduate Attributes

3.3.6

Several staff the Panel met with expressed the view that the interdisciplinary nature of Economic and Social History meant that the content of the subject often overlapped with that of other academic disciplines. They considered that this contributed to a very diverse student learning experience. This diversity helped students to develop a variety of personal and intellectual strengths which the Subject tried to build on in its work to develop graduate attributes and employability skills.

The Panel was informed that, as part of induction, both undergraduate and PGT students attended sessions given by the College of Social Sciences Employability and Careers team on skills development. The same team gave a more detailed presentation to Junior Honours students at the Reading Party held each year in the first semester. The Subject also sought to embed graduate attributes within their modes of assessment, eg in Level 1 tutorials, students received feedback on

academic writing and communication skills. This support continued through Level 2 and into Honours where study skills and careers sessions formed part of the programme. Experiential learning opportunities and skills-based assessments also formed an important part of PGT courses. Most of the students the Panel met with were aware of the Subject's efforts to link course/programme Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) with the development of graduate attributes.

The Panel considered that the Subject had worked hard to align its teaching with the University's Graduate Attributes Roadmap, particularly with regard to issues such as internationalisation and the development of self-aware, confident graduates.

3.4 Student Engagement

Approaches to Teaching Delivery

3.4.1

The students the Panel met with were very complimentary about the support and advice they received from staff in ESH who they felt were highly committed to the student learning experience. They considered them to be approachable and any student concerns raised with them were addressed and acted on. The Panel noted that, following a recommendation made at the last Periodic Subject Review, the Subject had introduced improved practice in relation to Staff Student Liaison Committee (SSLC) meetings to ensure that meetings were clearly documented and actions arising assigned to specific individuals. A PGT student noted, however, that SSLC meetings were not particularly well attended by students.

Students advised the Panel that, in the main, the Subject relied on a traditional lecture-followed-by-seminar model of teaching delivery. As noted in section 3.3.1, students indicated that they were generally content with this approach. The students the Panel met with did recognise, however, the benefits of new teaching methods where they considered this added value to the learning experience.

The Panel heard about several new teaching activities introduced by the Subject which had been very well received by students, as evidenced by course evaluation questionnaires. This included, in particular, the historical hackathon – this being an active learning activity which involved students conducting group research in archives and other historical repositories to develop a greater awareness of the value of primary source materials. The Panel noted from the SER (p23) that staff from ESH had received, through LEADS, an award from the Learning and Teaching Development Fund for a six-month pilot project linked to the hackathon initiative. This led to the publication of an open-access resource which was subsequently highlighted by The Wellcome Trust and JISC as a model for teaching involving archival collections. The Panel **commends** Economic and Social History on the use of the history hackathon as an innovative learning tool in the field of archival research.

The Head of Subject advised the Panel that in semester one of the current session, the School of Social and Political Sciences had canvassed student feedback on individual courses at UG and PGT courses using an on-line method only. This had

resulted in a very low level of feedback, with many courses having less than a 20% response rate. This matter was being reviewed through the School Executive.

National Student Survey

3.4.2

Feedback from graduating students was obtained through the National Student Survey (NSS). The Head of Subject observed that, in the NSS, the results for Economic and Social History were amalgamated with those for the History Subject Area, so it was difficult to draw any meaningful conclusions from the response. However, ESH Subject staff did discuss NSS free-text answers which related specifically to ESH at Subject meetings. With the above consideration in mind, the NSS results for ESH (and History) in the 2019 survey included the following outcomes:-

- Assessment and Feedback – 72.6%, compared with the School of Social and Political Sciences (71.5%); College of Social Sciences (69.8%); College of Arts (70.2%); University (66.8%);
- Teaching Quality – 88.4%; compared with the University (86.5%); and
- Overall Satisfaction – 87.2%, compared with the School of Social and Political Sciences (87.0); College of Social Sciences (87.0); College of Arts (87.2); University (86.1).

4. Enhancement in Learning and Teaching

4.1 Learning and Teaching

Study Abroad

4.1.1

Undergraduate

The Panel was advised that, in common with the rest of the College of Social Sciences, the take up of study abroad opportunities by undergraduate ESH students was fairly low. The Subject was working with the College Mobility Adviser to develop their provision in this regard.

The students the Panel met with were aware of the educational benefits of study abroad but several highlighted factors which served to discourage them from participating. They were wary of interrupting their studies out of concern that this might negatively impact their final degree outcome. They had reservations about moving to a country where English was not widely spoken and were aware that the structure of the teaching year in terms of semesters/terms might not fit well with the structure of their own programme.

The Panel acknowledged these concerns but suggested that the Head of Subject continue to look at ways which might improve the take-up of study abroad opportunities at undergraduate level. Further development in this area would also align well with the Subject's ambitions to embed global perspectives within the curriculum. At the Panel's suggestion, the Head of Subject agreed to examine whether there might be scope to shorten the length of time a student would require

to be abroad. This might help mitigate some of the concerns that students had expressed. The Head of Subject would take this forward with the School of Modern Languages in the first instance.

Postgraduate Taught

The Panel noted that, at PGT level, extensive student mobility was an integral part of the Erasmus-Mundus International Masters GLOCAL programme and that some students on the MSc in Global Economy programme had spent time at Kyoto University in Japan. The Panel observed that the Subject might consider using the experience of its PGT students who had spent time abroad to encourage greater participation from its undergraduates.

Placement Learning

4.1.2

The Panel noted from the SER that Economic and Social History did not in general, engage in work-based learning. The Subject attributed this to the level of administrative support involved in such activity. However, some students on the GLOCAL programme had undertaken work-based learning organised by partner universities. The Panel acknowledged that work-based opportunities were difficult to support but noted that there were other forms of work-related learning which the Subject might consider which were less onerous in terms of the administrative support required. In addition, there might be scope for the Subject to help students look for appropriate summer internships and other opportunities.

Curriculum Design and Development

4.1.3

The Self Evaluation Report noted that ESH's overarching approach to curriculum design and development reflected the guiding principles contained in the History Benchmarking Statement, the University's Learning and Teaching Strategy and the College/School Learning and Teaching Strategies. These principles were expressed at Subject level through Programme Specifications which outlined Programme Aims and Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs).

As noted in section 2.4.3, the Subject had incorporated themes around global history and its contemporary relevance within the curriculum, particularly at PGT level. At Levels 1 and 2, the curriculum was being recast to include a range of other themes in a more global and comparative context, and at Honours level curriculum innovation such as the history hackathon had been introduced.

Several staff noted that another aim of the ESH curriculum was to show how study of the industrial and social heritage of Glasgow could help illuminate wider global issues, and vice-versa. Curriculum developments were intended to further support the Subject's aim to produce critically engaged and resourceful graduates equipped with strong graduate attributes and employability skills.

The Head of Subject stressed the importance that the ESH curriculum be research-led and research-informed and advised that proposed changes were reviewed with the research expertise of new and existing staff in mind. The Panel acknowledged

the efforts that the Subject had made with regard to curriculum design and development. It wondered, however, if the Subject could do more to highlight specific strengths in its approach to curriculum design and, in particular, how it incorporated innovation in its provision. The Panel considered that strengthening this aspect would help set the Subject's offering apart from similar programmes in the University and elsewhere.

Course Approval Process

4.1.4

The Head of Subject and staff the Panel met with expressed frustration with the current Course Approval process in the College of Social Sciences. At present, the process for approving new courses involved the submission of new proposals to Subject meetings; SSLCs and external examiners; the School Portfolio Review Committee; and finally the College Board of Studies (UG or PGT). The relevant Board of Studies met once a year – although recently a second round of consideration for new courses (and programmes) had been introduced.

The Head of Subject advised the Panel that because of the fixed timing of the approval bodies it was often not possible for new staff to deliver courses at Honours and PGT levels in their own areas of expertise timeously. On occasion, staff had been unable to deliver new courses until the year after their appointment. The Head of Subject advised the Panel that this also had the effect of restricting the range of courses on offer at a time when the subject wanted to grow the curriculum to support the demands of the increasing number of students, especially at PGT level.

The Panel shared the frustration expressed by the Head of Subject and staff over this matter. The Convenor noted that he had already recently brought this matter to the attention of the Head of the College of Social Sciences and consideration was being given to possible re-design of the current process.

Approach to Intended Learning Outcomes

4.1.5

The Panel noted from the SER(p25) that the Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) of individual programmes were included in programme specifications and reference was made to them in induction sessions. ILOs for individual courses were placed on Moodle and issued to students in course documentation. The Head of Subject advised the Panel that, at Levels 1 and 2, ILOs were linked broadly to themes aimed at marrying historical and social scientific approaches to the subject. At Honours level, ILOs were more closely articulated and fed into the general ILOs of the programme. At PGT level, the principles of ILOs at undergraduate level were extended to reflect matters related to training for postgraduate social scientists and also research skills.

One student observed that their understanding of ILOs was helped by their experience as a senior student, however, they were not sure that all students were fully aware of the intention behind ILOs. The student thought it would be helpful to have a rubric on the front page of assignments which outlined the ILOs that the

particular piece of work was intended to promote, as a way of reinforcing the relevant concepts for students.

Technology-Enhanced Learning and Teaching

4.1.6

The Panel noted that the Subject used Technology-Enhanced Learning and Teaching (TELT) in several areas of its work. It used the Learning on Screen audio and video archive resource and also Padlet. The Subject had trialled online marking in two courses which was well-received by students, and also audio recording in one course. The broader roll-out and format of lecture recording was under discussion within the Subject. The Subject was clear, however, that lecture recording was not intended as a substitute for lecture attendance.

Several students the Panel met with welcomed the extension of lecture recording, not just as an important educational tool, but also as a means of promoting both access to learning and inclusivity. This was particularly important in the case of international students for whom English was not their first language. The students shared the staff's view, however, that lecture recording should not be seen as a substitute for physical attendance at lectures.

The Head of Subject and many staff the Panel met with reiterated their concern that the issue of availability of suitable teaching rooms was an impediment to supporting the use of TELT. Staff often taught in different rooms week to week and were uncertain what IT and other facilities would be available to them at various locations.

The Panel acknowledged the efforts that the Subject had made regarding the increased use of TELT but wondered whether there might be opportunity to expand this activity further. The Subject had experienced a very large increase in student numbers in the period since the last review which had placed an increased work burden on staff. The Panel considered that there may be opportunities, through the increased use of TELT, to reduce staff workload.

For example, several students and staff the Panel met with had expressed a desire to undertake more innovative group work, especially at PGT level, and one student advised that they would like the opportunity to participate in seminars via Skype. The Panel noted that Microsoft Teams has a Moodle Plug-in and wondered whether the Subject might like to consider the increased use of such collaborative tools to support learning. The Panel **suggests** that the Subject takes steps to increase its use of Technology-Enhanced Learning and Teaching. This could involve seeking advice from the Adam Smith Business School on how it used TELT to support the teaching of large groups of students, or liaising with the Learning Enhancement and Development Service (LEADS) on possible development opportunities.

A student attending the pre-PSR student focus group commented that the use of lap-tops, or similar, in class was not allowed - in at least one course. The Panel considered that it would benefit students if the Subject clarified arrangements around the use of mobile devices.

4.2 Assessment and Feedback

4.2.1

Range of Methods of Assessment

The Panel noted from the Self Evaluation Report (p27) that assessment in Economic and Social History was 'based primarily on essays and unseen examinations as well as, to a more limited extent, presentations and peer and self-assessment.' Formative assessment was offered in several ways but mainly through seminar discussions. Summative assessment took several forms with a mixture of coursework and examinations, however, at PGT level, summative assessment was undertaken entirely through coursework and presentations.

The SER (p27-28) states that 'in Level 1 and 2 courses there are three assessments: an examination, which constitutes 50 per cent of the overall grade; and two items of coursework, an essay plus source-criticism exercise in Level 1 and an essay plus project in Level 2'. Also, 'at Honours level, most courses involve one or two coursework assignments, weighted at 40 per cent, and an examination weighted at 60 per cent.' At PGT level, 'virtually all assessment in all courses involves short assignments or essays'.

The students the Panel met with were generally content with the range of assessment used within the Subject. They pointed out that the sequence in which assignments were given was important and they appreciated the efforts that the Subject made to stage assessments so that early ones attracted the least marks. The students noted that opportunities to have different types of assessment, eg formative assessment related to archive work were well-received. One student advised the Panel that they would welcome the opportunity to have more active learning related to assessment.

4.2.2

Engagement with the Code of Assessment and Assessment Policy

The Panel noted from the SER (p28) that 'the University Code of Assessment is augmented at all levels by discipline-specific grade descriptors which are included in all course documentation'. These had been designed to help students understand how the grades they were awarded reflected their level of achievement in a range of subject-specific skills. The students the Panel met with advised that they understood the Code of Assessment and what the grades they received represented.

Several students advised the Panel that as they did not receive examination feedback, they had to derive the result of their performance in the exam from their overall grade on MyCampus. The Panel noted that this occurred elsewhere in the University.

4.2.3

Feedback on Assessment

The Panel noted that feedback was communicated to students via standard feedback sheets. The sheets allowed markers to record the Code of Assessment level of achievement in tick-boxes. Free text could be used to highlight particular strengths and weaknesses in the piece of work.

Both UG and PGT students the Panel met with considered that arrangements regarding feedback were generally acceptable but highlighted several aspects which they wished the Subject to consider. The students advised the Panel that feedback they received on assignments was not always received within the prescribed 15 working days turn-around time, and it was often too general. They expressed a wish that feedback be more specific on the detail of their submission. As noted in section 4.2.2, they also advised that they did not receive examination feedback and this was something that they would welcome. They pointed out that it was sometimes difficult to book an appointment to see a member of staff in connection with their work.

The students asked that the Subject might consider a secure hand-in system for completed assignments, eg a bar-code system with a date-submitted facility as was used elsewhere in the University. Several students reported that work had occasionally been mis-placed and such a hand-in system would be more robust than the current arrangement.

The Panel acknowledged the matters highlighted by the students and discussed whether the use of an Assessment and Feedback Calendar by the Subject might help address some of these issues. The Panel considered that the Subject used a range of assessment methods but noted the reference in the SER (p36) which stated that the Subject thought it had room for improvement regarding consistent and timely feedback to students.

The Review Panel **recommends** that Economic and Social History reviews its practice in relation to providing feedback on examinations, in line with University policy, and encourages staff to provide generic and, where appropriate, individual feedback on exam performance.

4.3 Resources for Learning and Teaching (Staffing and Physical)

4.3.1

Workload Model

As noted in Section 2.4.2, the Panel observed that one of the major challenges facing the Subject in the last few years had been how to sustain its existing level of activity in the face of a substantially changed staff demographic. As outlined elsewhere in the Report, the Subject had taken steps to capitalise on the research and teaching expertise of new staff in terms of curriculum development and new approaches to learning.

The Head of Subject and staff the Panel met with reflected on what they considered to be significant inadequacies of the College/School workload model and its ability to reflect an accurate picture of staff workloads. The SER(p5) stated that the workload planning model had 'exacerbated the mismatch between academic staff headcount and student headcounts at UG and PGT level'.

The Head of Subject advised the Panel that the workload model underestimated the activities of colleagues and omitted many important areas of activity, eg the Subject's teaching of the History of Medicine; its teaching in the Adam Smith Business School; work associated with the student admissions process; pastoral support and work associated with the setting up of a new course. The Head of Subject and staff the Panel met with considered that there were significant concerns regarding the transparency of the model and also the extent to which it accurately reflected the allocation and distribution of academic staff workload in the Subject. The Head of Subject was of the view that these and other shortcomings in the workload model had 'impeded effective and equitable deployment of staff.' (SER, p36).

The Panel acknowledged the concerns expressed regarding the workload model and considered that ideally the aim of such a tool should be to indicate core activities of staff while highlighting where space existed for creativity and development. The Review Panel **recommends** that the School of Social and Political Sciences working with the College of Social Sciences, reviews the application of the College/School Workload Model, with a view to delivering a meaningful and transparent mechanism for allocating and distributing academic staff workload in the Subject Area that is understood by staff.

Administrative Support

4.3.2

The Head of Subject and most of the staff the Panel met with advised the Panel that the Subject had inadequate levels of administrative support – this being in terms of the scale of the support available and not the staff themselves who worked very hard and were highly committed. The Panel heard that there had been a very high turnover of administrative staff with the consequent loss of expertise that went with it.

The Panel heard that administrative staff worked under significant pressure and this allied to other factors, such as perceived limited opportunities for career development, had led to an almost entire turn-over of administrative staff. The Panel was advised that the Subject had also experienced some delays in the HR recruitment process of filling vacancies. The staff the Panel met with advised that inadequate levels of administrative support impacted on the activity of academic staff and ultimately on learning and teaching.

Acknowledging the concerns that had been expressed, the Review Panel **recommends** that the School of Social and Political Sciences/College of Social Sciences as appropriate, reviews the effectiveness of the current administrative support arrangements in the Subject Area in light of the recent high turn-over of administrative staff in the Subject Area and to ensure that the level and quality of support continues to be fit for purpose.

Workload Credit

4.3.3

The Head of Subject advised the Panel that several instances had occurred where the Subject had not received resource credit for work undertaken on behalf of other Schools. He advised that this was an issue that had led the Subject, on occasion, to turn down requests from other Subjects to provide supervision for PGT dissertations. The Panel Convener undertook to raise this matter with the Head of the College of Social Sciences.

4.3.4

Resources for Learning and Teaching

The Panel noted from the SER that the Subject had developed close links with the University's Archives and Special Collections, the Mitchell Library and the Hunterian Museum. The Subject encouraged students to use the resources of local repositories to link into, and throw light on, global themes, eg Glasgow and Scotland's involvement in the slave trade. Several students the Panel met with expressed great satisfaction at this type of learning, and some of the materials they had 'unearthed' were being used by the Subject as teaching resources at Level 1.

The students the Panel met with expressed general satisfaction with the resources that were available to them in the University Library and the Subject library in Lilybank House. They also felt that the Subject made considerable efforts to refresh subject bibliographies and reading lists each year.

As already noted in section 3.2.3, the Subject considered that one of the biggest impediments to effective learning and teaching was the central room booking system which staff advised frequently allocated rooms to the Subject which were unsuitable or inaccessible to students and staff with disabilities. These concerns were shared by most of the students the Panel met.

4.4 Engaging and Supporting Staff

On-going Support and Development

4.4.1

One of the staff the Panel met with remarked that Economic and Social History was 'the most collegial University department I have worked in'. Several staff considered that this strong team ethic was evident in the willingness of staff to take on additional work commitments.

Staff were generally of the opinion that issues linked to the very large increase in student numbers had been their greatest challenge, but they also highlighted several other areas of concern, already highlighted in the Report, which included issues linked to administrative support, room bookings, the course approval process and the workload model. Staff advised the Panel that resolution of such issues would help them to focus on their core activities in learning and teaching and reduce the overall level of staff stress.

The Panel noted from the staff survey that several staff had expressed a wish for more Subject Area training and information regarding Learning and Teaching practice and the use of TELT. At present, although there was a School-level Learning and Teaching Forum, most discussion around teaching innovation in the

Subject was done informally between staff. The Review Panel **suggests** that the Subject Area examines ways by which it could provide more Subject-level opportunities for staff training in learning and teaching.

Early Career Support

4.4.2

The Panel was advised by early-career staff that they had received little School-level induction on taking up post, something which had led to a delayed understanding of some key University systems and processes, eg MyCampus. Some staff considered that a handbook which contained information on such matters would be useful but it was realised that this would date very quickly. The Review Panel **recommends** that the School of Social and Political Sciences, introduces a School-level induction day for all new ESH staff to facilitate their early introduction to the School's structure, policies and practices.

The early-career staff the Panel met with advised that staff on probation were formally assigned a mentor but noted that there was no recording of the meetings that took place. One member of staff also observed that the mentoring process would benefit from the greater involvement of senior female staff.

One of the early career staff that the Panel met with advised that they had undertaken the Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice (PGCap) and would recommend it very highly. The Panel was advised that the member of staff had used skills and expertise gained on the programme to inform several aspects of their teaching. The Panel heard, however, that staff undertaking the PgCap did not receive a reduction in their teaching load, something which the Head of Subject attributed to the shortcomings of the Workload Model. The Review Panel **recommends** that Economic and Social History ensures that ESH staff who undertake the Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice (PgCap) should have protected time and a corresponding reduction in their teaching load in recognition of the time commitment involved in undertaking the programme.

Role of Tutor

4.4.3

The Panel met with several Tutors who, at a junior level, had teaching and administrative duties as well as scholarship responsibilities. From discussion, the Panel formed the opinion that the role of Tutor was somewhat ill-defined and lacked support. Furthermore, there appeared to be no clear developmental structure around the role. With a view to increasing the effectiveness of the role, the Review Panel **recommends** that Economic and Social History, in liaison with the School of Social and Political Sciences:

1. Clarifies, and more clearly defines, the responsibilities of the role of Tutor within the Subject Area;
2. Puts in place more systematic and structured support for Tutors, this to include developmental opportunities; and
3. Ensures that both Tutors and their line managers are made aware of the above expectations.

Graduate Teaching Assistants

4.4.4

The Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) the Panel met with reported that they felt well-informed and part of a very supportive Subject community. They considered that they had adequate resources in terms of administrative support and materials and were satisfied with the level of training they had received.

GTAs were given reading lists for the course/s they taught and met with the relevant Course Convener ahead of the semester. GTAs were responsible for marking essays and other shorter papers and were guided in this by Course Conveners who moderated their work. The GTAs welcomed the fact that they were given autonomy to develop their own approaches to teaching and they felt that their input to academic staff decision-making was valued.

The Panel heard that GTAs were not expected to provide pastoral support and they were advised to refer students seeking support on these matters to the relevant Course Convener. GTAs also reported that they felt clear about what issues they should approach their Course Convener with, and which they should refer to their programme Supervisor.

Acknowledging the strong support that was in place, the Review Panel **commends** Economic and Social History on the very high level of satisfaction reported by Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) on the support they receive from the Subject Area.

5. Academic Standards

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

Currency and Validity of Programmes

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

6. Collaborative Provision

6.1 Key Features of the Subject's Context and Vision in Relation to Collaborative Provision

As noted in section 3.1.4, Economic and Social History, along with several collaborative partners, offered the Erasmus Mundus International Masters Programme (IntM) Global Markets, Local Creativities (GLOCAL). This EU-funded programme commenced in 2016 and involved collaboration involving three European partner institutions – the Universities of Barcelona, Gottingen and Rotterdam. The Self Evaluation Report (p10) noted that the EU grant covered 'tuition fees, mobility and living costs for three cohorts of approximately 22 students

per year from around the world'. In 2019, a successful application to renew and extend the grant to three additional partners was made. The SER alluded to the programme's international profile and the fact that it attracted approximately 600 applicants each year.

6.2 Enhancing the Student Experience

The Panel noted that the GLOCAL programme was a highly innovative programme and allowed students to move between the (currently) four partners, depending on the year/semester they were in. The curriculum encouraged students to examine a variety of themes linked to globalisation and several internships and industrial placements were available to support these aims. Students from the programme were unable to attend the Review as they were abroad, but several had responded to an electronic questionnaire regarding their experience on the programme. The comments received and considered by the Panel were very positive.

6.3 Enhancement in Learning and Teaching

The Panel noted from the SER (p12) that ESH's provision was 'designed to encourage cross-national and cross-cultural comparisons and learning...'. The Panel considered that the aims of the GLOCAL programme met many of these ambitions. The programme also offered diverse opportunities in terms of internationalisation and innovative learning which aligned with the University's Learning and Teaching Strategy.

6.4 Academic Standards

The Panel was pleased to note that the External Examiner commented in 2018 that 'teaching and learning standards (on the GLOCAL programme) are set (at) a high level...and the commitment of the staff to the subject matter is evident'. The Panel noted, however, that one area identified by the External as requiring attention was the need 'for more in-course feedback formative and/or summative'. The External had commented, however, that this was being addressed.

The Panel made a general point that it was important that the Subject keep External Examiners (for all programmes) updated on action taken on their comments and feedback. It was pleased to see that the Subject had already acknowledged that it could do more in this regard (SER p36).

7. Summary of Perceived Strengths and Areas for Improvement

7.1 Key Strengths

The Review Panel identified the following areas as key strengths:

- High quality learning and teaching
- Strong sense of community and collegial learning environment
- Innovative use of the hackathon to support archival research
- Strong support for Graduate Teaching Assistants

7.2 Areas for Improvement

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

- Promotion of study abroad opportunities for undergraduate students
- Use of TELT in learning and teaching
- Support for work-based and/or work-related learning
- Perceptions of Subject identity
- Communications between individual members of staff in the Subject Area, and members of staff in the Subject Area and students
- Opportunities for subject-specific staff training in learning and teaching

8. Conclusion

8.1

The Review Panel commended the Head of Subject and all staff for the open and constructive way in which they had engaged with the PSR process.

The Review Panel concluded that Economic and Social History demonstrated a clear commitment to excellence in learning and teaching. The Panel was very impressed by the quality and dedication of all staff they met during the Review and agreed that they had created a very collegial and supportive learning environment. The Subject had addressed the recommendations arising from the last Periodic Subject Review in a positive manner and, in the intervening period, had made particular progress in internationalising its curriculum and student base.

The Subject had been faced with several significant challenges in recent years but had responded to these with agility and a continuing commitment to broaden and enrich the student experience. This was evident in the development of new courses and the introduction of the collaborative GLOCAL programme.

The students the Panel met with conveyed great enthusiasm for their studies and the Panel noted, in particular, their strong engagement with the opportunities provided by the hackathon.

The Panel highlighted some areas where it saw opportunities for improvement and these are summarised above in section 7.2.

8.2 Commendations

The Review Panel commends Economic and Social History on the following which are listed **in order of appearance** in this report:

Commendation 1

The Review Panel **commends** Economic and Social History for its high quality teaching across all levels of provision, as evidenced by the comments of the External Subject Specialist and the students the Panel met with. **[Paragraph 3.3.1]**

Commendation 2

The Review Panel **commends** Economic and Social History on the use of the history hackathon as an innovative learning tool in the field of archival research. **[Paragraph 3.4.1]**

Commendation 3

The Review Panel **commends** Economic and Social History on the very high level of satisfaction reported by Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) on the support they receive from the Subject Area. **[Paragraph 4.4.4]**

8.3 Recommendations

The following recommendations have been made to support Economic and Social History 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.**

Recommendation 1

Adviser of Study

The students and staff the Panel met with expressed uncertainty regarding the responsibilities attached to the role of Adviser of Study. The Review Panel **recommends** that the Head of the School of Social and Political Sciences considers what additional steps could be taken to establish greater clarity around the responsibilities of the role for both staff and students. **[Paragraph 3.3.3]**

[For the attention of: Professor Kerr, Head of the School of Social and Political Sciences]

Recommendation 2

Communications

The Review Panel **recommends** that Economic and Social History undertakes a review of communications within the Subject Area with a view to improving the efficiency and effectiveness of information sharing between:

1. Individual members of staff in the Subject Area; and
2. Members of staff in the Subject Area and students.

As part of this review, the Subject Area should consult with student stakeholder groups to gain a better understanding of their experience of current communications and to identify specific opportunities for improvement. **[Paragraph 3.3.4]**

[For the attention of: Professor Stokes, Head of Subject]

Recommendation 3

Examination Feedback

The Review Panel **recommends** that Economic and Social History reviews its practice in relation to providing feedback on examinations, in line with University policy, and encourages staff to provide generic and, where appropriate, individual feedback on exam performance. **[Paragraph 4.2.3]**

[For the attention of: Professor Stokes, Head of Subject]

Recommendation 4

College/School Workload Model

The Review Panel **recommends** that the School of Social and Political Sciences working with the College of Social Sciences, reviews the application of the College/School Workload Model with a view to delivering a meaningful and transparent mechanism for allocating and distributing academic staff workload in the Subject Area, that is understood by staff. **[Paragraph 4.3.1]**

[For the attention of: Professor Kerr, Head of School of Social and Political Sciences]

[For information: Professor Stokes, Head of Subject; Professor Carter, Head of the College of Social Sciences; Professor Juster, Senior Vice-Principal]

Recommendations 5,6,7 and 8

Staffing

Recommendation 5

Administrative Support

The Review Panel **recommends** that the School of Social and Political Sciences/College of Social Sciences as appropriate, reviews the effectiveness of the current administrative support arrangements in the Subject Area in light of the recent high turn-over of administrative staff in the Subject Area and to ensure that the level and quality of support continues to be fit for purpose. **[Paragraph 4.3.2]**

[For the attention of: Professor Kerr, Head of the School of Social and Political Sciences; Professor Carter, Head of the College of Social Sciences]

[For information: Professor Stokes, Head of Subject]

Recommendation 6

Early Career Staff – Reduction in Teaching Load

The Review Panel **recommends** that Economic and Social History (ESH) ensures that ESH staff who undertake the Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice (PGCap) should have protected time and a corresponding reduction in their teaching load in recognition of the time commitment involved in undertaking the programme. **[Paragraph 4.4.2]**

[For the attention of: Professor Stokes, Head of Subject]

[For information: Professor Pittock, ECDP Programme Director; Ms Cummings, Director of Performance and Reward, Human Resources]

Recommendation 7

Role of Tutor

The Review Panel **recommends** that Economic and Social History, in liaison with the School of Social and Political Sciences:

1. Clarifies, and more clearly defines, the responsibilities of the role of Tutor within the Subject Area;
2. Puts in place more systematic and structured support for Tutors, this to include developmental opportunities; and
3. Ensures that both Tutors and their line managers are made aware of the above expectations. **[Paragraph 4.4.3]**

[For the attention of: Professor Stokes, Head of Subject]

[For information: Professor Kerr, Head of the School of Social and Political Sciences]

Recommendation 8

Staff Induction

The Review Panel **recommends** that the School of Social and Political Sciences introduces a School-level induction day for all new Economic and Social History staff to facilitate their early introduction to the School's structure, policies and practices. **[Paragraph 4.4.2]**

[For the attention of: Professor Kerr, Head of the School of Social and Political Sciences]

Recommendation 9

Strategic Planning

The Panel observed that several issues had been highlighted during the PSR that were considered to be under review/development or of concern, but regarding which, no specific recommendation had been made.

In order to promote further Subject engagement with such matters, the Panel **recommends** that Economic and Social History develops an overarching plan, which as well as setting out its vision and overall plan for the future of the Subject Area, shows how it intends to address areas of concern highlighted in the report but that were not the subject of a specific recommendation. This would include, but not be limited to, issues around student mental health; the management of fluctuations in PGT student recruitment; and the alignment of assessments with Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs). This plan should be agreed with the Head of School to ensure alignment with other areas of the School and should contribute to the strategic planning process within the School. **[Paragraph 3.2.2, 3.1.4, 4.1.5]**

[For the attention of: Professor Stokes, Head of Subject].

[For information: Professor Kerr, Head of the School of Social and Political Sciences]