

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

Academic Standards Committee – Summer Powers

Periodic Subject Review: Review of Theology and Religious Studies held on 17 February 2020

Mr Chris Buckland, Clerk to the Review Panel

Review Panel:

Professor Neal Juster	Senior Vice Principal and Deputy Vice Chancellor, Panel Convener
Professor Morwenna Ludlow	University of Exeter, External Subject Specialist
Dr Simon Kennedy	Senate Assessor on Court
Mr Liam Brady	SRC Vice President (Education), Student representative
Professor Glen Pettigrove	School of Humanities, Cognate member
Dr Matthew Williamson	Learning Enhancement and Academic Development Service
Mr Chris Buckland	Registry, Clerk to the Panel
Dr Carol Collins	Learning Enhancement and Academic Development Service (Observer)

1. Introduction

- 1.1.1 The Subject of Theology and Religious Studies is one of four subjects within the School of Critical Studies, which is one of four Schools within the College of Arts.
- 1.1.2 The previous Periodic Subject Review of Theology and Religious Studies was in March 2014. The Panel was impressed with the actions taken in response to the recommendations made at the last Review, in particular the interdisciplinary links which have developed with the School of Education in relation to developing Catholic Teacher training, and the attempts to encourage internationalisation of the student experience by developing links with partner institutions.
- 1.1.3 Preparation of the Theology and Religious Studies Self Evaluation Report (SER) was led by Professor Scott Spurlock, Head of Subject, with support from Professor Charlotte Methuen and Dr Sean Adams. A number of staff were consulted, including Subject area staff, Graduate Teaching Assistants, and staff within the School of Critical Studies. A consultation exercise was undertaken with Undergraduate, Postgraduate Taught and Postgraduate Research Students.
- 1.1.4 In advance of the Review meeting, a focus group was conducted by the Student Panel member with student representatives from the Subject on 3 February, and a staff survey was conducted within Theology and Religious Studies during January 2020.

1.1.5 The Review Panel met with Professor S Spurlock, Prof W Anderson (Dean of Learning and Teaching) and Professor A Jenkins (Head of School), with a subsequent meeting taking place between Panel Convenor and the Head of the College of Arts. The Panel also met with 6 members of Academic Staff, 1 member of Administrative Staff, 2 Early Career staff, 3 Tutors, 5 Graduate Teaching Assistants and 4 UG students.

2. Context and Strategy

2.1 Staff

The SER indicated that the Subject has 25 academic staff, including 5 Graduate Teaching Assistants, totalling 14.67 FTE. The Panel noted that the Subject has a relatively high number of part-time Early Career staff, as well as 3 Tutors whose posts are funded by endowments.

The Subject has one full-time Undergraduate administrator, and further administrative support is provided to the Subject by the School.

The staff:student ratio is 1:11.9, based on core teaching staff (i.e. not including GTAs) which is lower than University of Glasgow and Russell Group averages.

2.2 Students

Undergraduate student numbers for session 2019/20 are summarised as follows:

Individuals enrolled on one or more courses at each level	Class enrolment (headcount)
Level 1	344
Level 2	139
Level 3	3
Level 3 & 4 (Hons)	253
Total	739

Students on a TRS single or joint programme:

Headcount	Term
Year of Prog	2019
1	35
2	31
3 Hons	34

4 Hons	31
--------	----

Postgraduate student numbers for session 2019/20 are summarised as follows:

Form of Study - Postgraduate	
Part-time	9
Full-time	0
Total	9

2.3 Range of Provision under Review

Undergraduate:

- MA Honours in Theology and Religious Studies (single honours)
- MA Honours degree in Theology and Religious Studies (joint honours)
- BD Honours and General Degree
- BD (Min) Honours and General Degree

The Subject also contributes to the three-year general MA degree overseen by the College of Arts.

Postgraduate:

- MTh in Ministry, Theology and Practice

3. Review Outcomes

3.1.1 It was evident to the Panel from both the SER and the meetings with staff and students that the Subject's academic team showed a clear commitment to teaching, learning and providing a strong level of pastoral support to students, and that both staff and students valued the sense of social community fostered within the Subject. The Panel **commend** the Subject's reflective and open approach taken to the PSR process.

3.1.2 The Panel congratulate the Subject on a well-structured and broad curriculum, which gives students in other subjects the opportunity to gain an introduction to Theology and Religious Studies and the option to continue on to joint Honours.

The following paragraphs detail the key points discussed during the review visit along with commendations recognising good practices and areas where the Review Panel identified scope for improvement. Commendations and recommendations are made to support the subject in its reflection and to enhance provision in relation to teaching, learning and assessment. Appendix 1 provides a summary list of the commendations and recommendations.

4. Strategic Direction

4.1.1 The SER indicated that although all four of Scotland's ancient Universities presently have a statutory obligation to provide training for the ordained ministry of the Church of Scotland, the Church is expected to undertake a tender process for Initial Ministerial Education training partners, which may have an impact upon the continued structure of the Subject's Bachelor of Divinity programme. At the meeting with the Head of the Subject it was highlighted that whilst the exact details of the tender were unclear, the intention is not to stop ministerial training at Glasgow, rather that changes were currently being proposed to the structure of ministerial training programmes to increase its flexibility, including the withdrawal of the Bachelor of Divinity (Ministry) degree, and the introduction of an option for the general Bachelor of Divinity to be completed in 2 years by graduates with suitable prior learning credits. The Panel **recommends** that the Subject continue to consider the academic and financial aspects concomitant with the anticipated Church of Scotland tender, and that they consult with the School and College where appropriate during the process.

4.1.2 The SER highlighted that, whilst the Subject do not plan to exclude the teaching of other religious traditions, the strategic vision was to prioritise the monotheistic traditions and their interrelations. At the meeting with the Head of Subject it was noted that the Subject's continued dual pathway offering of both Theology/Christian Studies and Religious Studies, and the continued Divinity profile at an Ancient University, are part of what makes Glasgow's offering distinctive in Scotland. The Panel **commends** the Subject for developing a clear strategy for future priorities which has sought the engagement of relevant stakeholders.

4.1.3 The Panel noted the recently introduced Master of Theology (MTh) in Ministry, Theology and Practice, launched in 2019/20 in partnership with Dr Williams' Trust in London, and the MTh in Church History and Theology which is due to be launched in 2020/21 in partnership with Stellenbosch University in South Africa, which demonstrate an acknowledgment of a gap in Postgraduate provision and evidence an innovative way of addressing this by utilising external networks to develop collaborations, for which the Panel **commends** the subject.

5. Enhancing the Student Experience

Admissions - Undergraduate

5.1.1 The SER highlighted that Undergraduate admission levels over the past four years have been largely stable but hadn't benefited from the levels of growth experienced by other subjects, which was noted in the meeting with the Head of Subject as being reflective of the sector more widely. The meeting with the Head

of Subject also highlighted the methods that the Subject aim to employ to reverse this, including better utilisation of Alumni to highlight the different career pathways available to Theology and Religious Studies graduates, as well as a strategic outreach plan which is being developed to enable the Subject to utilise connections within local schools to promote the Subject as an option to pupils whilst they are undertaking Highers. The Panel acknowledge these plans and **recommend** that the Subject consider whether there is a wider market which can be utilised to support and develop Undergraduate recruitment.

Admissions - Postgraduate

5.1.2 Admissions to Postgraduate Taught Provision programme have been small since the last review, at which time it was recommended that the Subject progress the re-development of PGT provision. The MTh in Literature, Theology and Culture was introduced in 2014/15 and closed effective from 2019/20 due to a disconnect between its content and the expertise and research interests of Subject staff. The impact of amendments to Postgraduate provision [outlined in 4.1.3] has been to reduce the total number of Postgraduate Admissions in comparison to 2017 and 2018. The SER notes that Postgraduate recruitment has been drawn primarily from Scotland and RUK, and that the Subject's lack of international students is markedly out of step with comparable institutions. The Panel acknowledge the steps which have been taken to address this and that the Subject's intention is for new MTh programmes which will come onstream over the next 2 academic years to address this.

Short courses

5.1.3 The Panel heard from the Head of Subject on efforts to engage with students from a widening participation background, with the Subject's primary means of recruitment in this area being their offering via Short Courses which, at present, consists of one course. The SER noted that further courses are being developed in cooperation with the Presbytery of Glasgow, and that the financial support which this relationship has generated has enabled the creation of a Grade 6 post in Pastoral Studies within the Subject. The Panel acknowledged the positive CPD opportunities that this will potentially develop, where students may be able to take the first year of MA or BD via Short Courses, and encourage the Subject to ensure that there is clarity as to the delineation of responsibilities between them and External Relations with regards to the delivery and administration of these courses.

5.2 Retention and Success

Progression and Retention

5.2.1 The SER and documentation highlighted that Theology and Religious Studies has good progression of students from 1st year into 2nd year and that this continues from year 2 to 3, and that progression rates are comparable with the School of Critical Studies and College of Arts. The retention of students is monitored at a College rather than a subject level, but the SER highlighted that retention is healthy and that the Subject continues to recruit new students in years 1 and 2.

5.2.2 Around 27% of students have been awarded a first-class honours classification over the past four academic years, with about 59% being awarded a 2:1 classification. The Panel felt that this profile was in keeping with wider University trends and noted that classifications are routinely confirmed by external examiners.

Advising

5.2.3 The student focus group and staff survey provided feedback on the experiences of the Advisor of Studies system, and the availability of support more widely for students within the Subject. The Panel heard about the approach taken at UG level, where advising in the College of Arts is managed centrally by the Arts Advising team, although due to the specific regulations of the Bachelor of Divinity/Bachelor of Divinity (Ministry) a level of special provision is provided to Theology and Religious Studies. The UG students with whom the Panel met highlighted the strong level of commitment shown by Subject staff to supporting students, as well as their openness and availability to discuss issues. The Panel noted the challenges experienced by Subject staff in signposting students to relevant support services and highlighted the Student Support & Wellbeing project of the World-Changing Glasgow Transformation, whose work intends to increase staff and student awareness of appropriate support that is available.

International Students

5.2.4 The SER and supporting documents highlighted that the Subject has a consistent, but small, presence of international UG students, with the total number ranging from 1 to 4 in the period since the last review.

Internationalisation

5.2.5 In the meeting with the Head of Subject, the Panel heard further details on a proposal for an agreement with Yale Divinity School, which if approved would facilitate an undergraduate exchange for 1 FTE annually.

5.3 Equality and Diversity

5.3.1 The SER noted that Subject Area Meetings have considered best practice for the advanced provision of materials on course Moodle sites, but the staff survey and the Panel meeting with academic staff sought to highlight the correlation between attendance, engagement, and performance, and the concerns that the availability of course materials in advance of the teaching event might act as a disincentive to attendance. The Panel also heard from UG students on this topic, who highlighted their disappointment that teaching materials were not always made available in advance of lectures. The Panel **recommends** that the Subject take measures to ensure that they adhere to the Accessible and Inclusive Learning Policy, which requires teaching materials that support learning to be made available one working day in advance of the teaching event to which they relate.

5.3.2 The Panel heard from the UG students with whom they met on their experiences of lecture recording, and whether this was utilised within the Subject, with the

students reporting that it wasn't offered consistently at levels 1 and 2 and that some students undertook to record lectures themselves. At Honours level, the students agreed that the nature of teaching, where lectures are set up more like seminars and see a greater level of interaction between staff and student, has implications for the practicality and benefit of recording.

5.3.3 The Panel was impressed by the Subject's policy in relation to students who have been assessed by the Disability Service as requiring proofreading services, with an automatic five-day extension for coursework deadlines being granted to ensure that students are not inadvertently penalised whilst they await proofreading feedback. The Panel **commends** the subject's efforts in this area.

5.4 Supporting Students in their Learning

Induction

5.4.1 The meetings with academic staff and students expanded upon the information that was provided in the SER on the Subject's efforts to support induction, which included an event in Freshers Week to introduce the dual pathways and range of courses available, as well as a tour of facilities, a calendar of key dates and annual "honours taster" session. The Panel noted that this was an example of good practice in the field of student induction for which the Panel **commend** the Subject.

Transition

5.4.2 The Panel heard from staff and students on the measures taken by the Subject to support their transition from years 1 and 2 to honours, which includes presentations from course convenors on what their courses entail. The students with whom the Panel met were not aware of the pre-honours handbook but did highlight the inclusive nature of the Subject more widely when considering their induction to the University and transition during their studies.

5.5 Student Engagement

Graduate attributes

5.5.1 The SER and meetings with staff highlighted a wide range of provision for students to develop their graduate attributes and employability, both as part of the curriculum and outside of the classroom. The Subject's redesign of formative and summative assessments to allow for better alignment with the demonstrable attainment of Graduate Attributes has seen the utilisation of methods such as reflective journaling and the design of wiki-pages and information boards, and the UG students with whom the Panel met agreed that a wide range of assessment methods were employed, and that the continuous engagement and weekly reflections were helpful to their learning. The Panel **commends** the Subjects for their efforts in this area.

5.5.2 The student focus group highlighted that students out with the Bachelor of Divinity pathway were not clear on the ways in which the skills being developed from their studies could be employed outside of the classroom, and the Panel heard that UG students felt more could be done to highlight potential career

options available for those on the MA pathway. The Panel note (5.1.1) the methods that the Subject aim to employ to increase UG recruitment, including better utilisation of Alumni to highlight the different career pathways available to Theology and Religious Studies graduates, and encourage the Subject to further embed the connections between graduate attributes and employability beyond the recruitment stage so that students are cognisant of them as they progress during their studies.

Social community

5.5.3 The SER and meetings with staff and students highlighted the Subject's results in the National Student Survey, which have seen them achieve a 100% overall satisfaction rating in all but one year in the period since the last review, and the Panel **commends** the continued performance in this area. The Panel identified that the NSS scores haven't reached these levels across the board and encouraged the Subject to address the three areas acknowledged in the SER as requiring further attention, namely *Learning Opportunities*, *Learning Resources and Learning Community*. In both the meetings with UG students and academic staff, the Panel heard the definition of *Learning Community* within the NSS is unclear and that the comparatively low scores are surprising, with students and staff highlighting both the social events employed by the Subject to strengthen the sense of community, which include a weekly coffee morning and annual Christmas lunch, as well as the resources for Learning in Teaching in 4 The Square, as important elements of what was reported to be a strong sense of community.

5.6 Effectiveness of feedback mechanisms

5.6.1 The SER noted the measures taken by the Subject to obtain feedback from students, including student representation at monthly Subject Area meetings consulting representatives on all matters that are not reserved business, and the Staff-Student Liaison Committee (SSLC) meetings which take place at the end of the semester. The Panel commented that there may be more benefit in the meetings taking place mid-way through the semester to allow for potential changes to be made that would benefit the current student cohort. The UG students with whom the Panel met highlighted that SSLC meetings do now take place mid-semester, which was acknowledged by the Panel as **good practice**. It was highlighted by the UG students that student representatives may benefit from additional support to ensure that they're aware of what is expected of them during the SSLC meetings, and the Panel encourage the Subject to assess whether any amendments are required to their induction.

5.6.2 The SER and meetings with students and staff highlighted the approach taken by the subject to obtain student feedback via the EvaSys form, with summary and response documents produced and made available via Moodle within three weeks for each course when there are more than three responses received. The UG students felt that that the summary response documents were of benefit, as they closed the feedback loop and provided a response and rationale for why something can't be changed if it was raised as an issue. However, the response rates to EvaSys surveys were raised by both staff and students as problematic, with the UG students highlighting their timing as a possible reason for lack of student engagement as they are circulated at a time when exam preparation is

prioritised. The Panel note the Subject's proposals to allocate in-class time for the purpose of both allowing representatives to meet with the whole class in advance of the SSLC, and to complete the EvaSys survey, and the Panel encourage them to explore this further to ensure that feedback is received and is representative of a broad spectrum of student opinion.

6. Enhancement in Learning and Teaching

6.1 Learning and Teaching

Study abroad

6.1.1 The relatively low numbers of students undertaking study abroad opportunities (1 student in session 2019/20) was highlighted in the SER, with the Subject outlining possible explanations including other work or caring commitments required from students and the diversity of choice within the Subject's established Erasmus partners. The Panel heard how collaboration with one of these partners, the University of Mainz, has developed beyond a traditional study abroad/exchange relationship, with a course on The Reformation being jointly delivered between the institutions incorporating shared sessions over videoconference, joint presentations and a three-day residential school in Germany. The Panel recognised the benefit of this collaboration and encourage the Subject to assess how to offer such opportunities at a reasonable and sustainable level across the curriculum.

Placement Learning

6.1.2 The Panel heard in the meetings with the Head of Subject and staff on developments which were being driven by the College of Arts to allow greater opportunities for students to undertake placement-based dissertations, which had previously been limited to the Bachelor of Divinity pathway. The SER noted that an MoU is being developed with the Iona Community to provide a resilient framework for providing student opportunities, which would pair students with members working in advocacy, political lobbying, social and community work, development work or ministry. The students with whom the Panel met were enthusiastic about the potential for placement-based dissertations, and the Panel encourage the Subject to assess when the Iona Community relationship will be made available for the benefit of future cohorts.

Curriculum Design

6.1.3 The SER reported on recent changes which have been made to the curriculum at Levels 1 and 2 to ensure a resilience in provision and allow the Subject to continue its dual pathway offering for the study of both Theology/Christian Studies and Religious Studies, which was influenced by the Subject's strategic decision to prioritise the monotheistic traditions. The Panel noted the large number of courses available at Honours level, which was reported in the SER as being reflective of the Subject's diverse range of research expertise, and also discussed the challenges associated with this in the meeting with the Head of Subject. The Panel **recommends** that the Subject work with the School and College to ensure that staff workloads are resilient to the planned future growth in Postgraduate Taught provision, whilst at the same time assessing whether the

number of UG honours courses offered needs further reduction, balancing diversity of choice, student numbers, and the constraints on staff time.

Approach to Intended Learning Outcomes

6.1.4 The SER reported that Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) for UG programmes were informed by QAA Subject Benchmark Statements, and that ILOs are constructed across courses to work together to provide educational pathways that help to develop Graduate Attributes. The Panel commented on the coherence and comprehensiveness of the programme ILOs, but questioned how individual course ILOs and assessment criteria map onto these - in the meeting with the UG students, it was reported that feedback was received at an individual course level rather than on the programme as a whole. The UG students with whom the Panel met confirmed that they were aware of the purpose of ILOs and that these were regularly referred to by academic staff, for example at the beginning of lectures for some courses and during revision lectures, with some courses' handbooks also being provided in lectures.

6.1.5 It was reported that the ILOs for the Bachelor of Divinity are substantially the same as those for the MA, but that there are a small number of distinctive ILOs which reflect the vocational nature of the programme and its emphasis on the Christian religion.

Technology Enhanced Learning and Teaching

6.1.6 The Panel heard from staff that the continued use of paper-marking was partly the result of second marking and moderation requirements, but more significantly the result of staff who suffered from back pain or poor eyesight and for whom the electronic marking and return of work was problematic. It was noted in the meeting with the Head of School that work had been undertaken at a School level to provide support and training on the use of online marking, and that this continues to be available – the Panel **recommend** that the Subject ensure staff are aware of and utilise such opportunities so that students experience a consistent approach in the return of coursework.

6.2 Assessment and Feedback

Engagement with the Code of Assessment and Assessment policy

6.2.1 It was noted in the SER that the Subject include extracts from the Code of Assessment in programme module pages, with the marking scale and grade descriptors highlighted to students via a variety of methods. The attention given to providing clear guidelines on referencing and introducing students to marking conventions at a very early stage in each course were acknowledged by the Panel as positive and **good practice**.

Feedback on Assessment

6.2.2 The SER and supporting documentation highlighted that the Subject's NSS scores on the timeliness of feedback received is higher than University of Glasgow and Russell Group averages. The Panel heard from UG students on their experience of feedback received during their studies, with the students noting that whilst there was an opportunity to schedule an appointment with academic staff during their office hours to further discuss feedback, the written

content can be generic and that they would be prepared to wait longer for feedback if it contained more detailed information which could be applied to future coursework, provided it was still available in sufficient time before the next summative piece. The Panel enquired as to how the students defined feedback, and whether they felt they could utilise the information that they received in the context of seminars and tutorials in the same way that they did feedback received following the submission of summative or formative coursework. The students highlighted that their interpretation of feedback is something which is written down. The Panel encourage the Subject to help reinforce the benefit of informal feedback and assess whether this this can be integrated with existing reflective practices.

6.3 Resources for Learning and Teaching (staffing and physical)

Learning and Teaching Space

- 6.3.1 The SER and meetings with academic staff highlight access issues with the Subject's primary accommodation in 4 The Square which can only be accessed via a staircase, meaning students with mobility issues are not able to make use of the range of facilities contained within. The facilities include a dedicated IT suite, the Robert Carroll library on Level 4, and Seminar Rooms which are provisioned with additional technology to facilitate collaborative international teaching. In the meeting with the Head of Subject, the Panel heard that academic staff attempt to mitigate these access issues by arranging individual meetings with students in other University buildings such as 1 The Square and that, although the numbers within the subject are small, the situation is not ideal.
- 6.3.2 The Panel heard of the issues experienced by staff and students in the distribution of teaching events across the campus. There was a recognition and acknowledgement amongst all parties that the size of the University estate and demand on space means that it would not always be possible to group consecutive teaching events together in the same venue, to do so might ensure a more efficient use of resource and staff/student time.

Staffing

- 6.3.3 The supporting documentation highlighted that there was no workload model in place for the School of Critical Studies, although the Panel did note the comments made during the meeting with academic staff that the increase in the number of students presenting with mental health or related conditions in recent academic years has led to an increase in staff workload.
- 6.3.4 In the meeting with the Head of Subject, the Panel heard that the salaries of 3 Tutors employed by the Subject with an FTE of 1.55 were paid via endowments, and that their future employment was therefore uncertain - the Panel encourage the Subject and the School to continue to identify appropriate funding streams for these staff.

6.4 Engaging and Supporting Staff

Early career support

- 6.4.1 The SER noted that all Early Career Staff are assigned a mentor and participate in the Early Career Development Programme (ECDP), and the Panel met with

Early Career Staff to discuss their experience with this programme. There was a general agreement that it had not lived up to their expectations in many respects as, although there are opportunities for support and mentoring, the annual Performance & Development Review (PDR) requirements were onerous and had a detrimental impact on staff ability to undertake research. The Panel also received feedback from staff who had participated in the PGCert in Academic Practice (PGCAP), from which one member withdrew due to workload pressures - the Panel encourage the Subject to ensure that staff receive appropriate levels of support whilst undertaking the PGCert.

Graduate Teaching Assistants

6.4.2 It was noted in the SER and supporting documentation the Subject currently employ 5 Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs), but that the provision of GTA work on Level 1 and 2 courses remains uncertain as that going forward seminars may be delivered by regularly contracted staff. The GTAs with whom the Panel met acknowledged the training that was provided, both by the University and subject-specific inductions for each course, but highlighted that additional practical training would be welcome before they take up their roles and highlighted that they currently receive no formal feedback from colleagues and were unaware of any teaching observation or shadowing offered through the Subject or School. The Panel also heard that for the majority of GTA staff, their contracts only cover teaching and not marking assignments, although they would be keen to have the option to undertake marking. The Panel **recommends** that the Subject consider the impact on staff workloads of removing the requirement for GTA seminar teaching at Levels 1 and 2, and that efforts be made to provide any existing or future GTAs with a level of peer assessment and feedback on their teaching performance.

7. Academic Standards

7.1.1 The Review Panel considered that the Subject 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.

7.1.2 The SER noted that all work at Honours level which contributed more than 20% to a course's overall assessment is double marked, placing a heavy workload on staff, and that Theology and Religious Studies are the only subject within the School of Critical Studies that continue to undertake this practice. In the meetings with the Head of Subject and Academic Staff the Panel questioned the benefits of double-marking at honours level and whether there were any intentions to end this, and it was confirmed in the meeting with the Head of School and Dean of Learning and Teaching that 2019/20 would be the final academic year in which the practice would be undertaken.

7.1.3 In respect of the new PGT provision which is anticipated to be launched in the 2020/21 and 2021/22 academic years, the Panel **recommend** that appropriate quality assurance mechanisms be developed to ensure that these new programmes are included in the Subject's Quality Enhancement review cycle which was implemented following the Subject's previous review in 2014.

Currency and Validity of Programmes

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

8. Collaborative provision

8.1.1 The Panel noted that the collaboration with the Dr Williams' Trust to deliver the part-time MTh in Ministry, Theology and Practice was in its first year of operation, and heard in the meeting with the Head of Subject that 3 members of academic staff from the Subject teach 1 day per month in London as part of this collaboration. The Panel acknowledged that the collaborative MTh is a positive development for the Subject and encourage them to keep the arrangements under review and where possible utilise any best practice they identify for the benefit of the MTh in Church History and Theology which is due to be launched in 2020/21 in partnership with Stellenbosch University.

Appendix 1 Summary of Commendations and Recommendations

The Review Panel commends the Subject of Theology and Religious Studies on the following, which are listed in order of appearance in this report:

Commendation 1

The reflective and open approach taken by the Subject to the self-evaluation report. [Paragraph 3.1.1]

Commendation 2

A clear strategy for future priorities which has sought the engagement of relevant stakeholders. [Paragraph 4.1.2]

Commendation 3

The Subject's utilisation of internal and external networks to develop collaborations which aim to enhance teaching and internationalisation opportunities. [Paragraph 4.1.3]

Commendation 4

The automatic five-day extension for coursework to accommodate students who have been assessed by the Disability Service as requiring proofreading services. [Paragraph 5.3.3]

Commendation 5

The Subject's efforts to support induction, which included an event in Freshers Week to introduce the dual pathways and range of courses available, as well as a tour of facilities and a calendar of key dates/annual "honours taster" session. [Paragraph 5.4.1]

Commendation 6

Good practice in developing graduate attributes through a variety of methods in teaching and assessment, including placement-based practices and reflective

journaling. [Paragraph 5.5.1]

Commendation 7

The Subject's continued overall satisfaction scores in the National Student Survey, achieving 100% in all but one year in the period since the last review in 2014.

[Paragraph 5.5.3]

Recommendations

The following recommendations have been made to support the Subject 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

Context and Strategy

The panel recommends that the Subject consider the academic and financial aspects concomitant with the anticipated tender from the Church of Scotland for Initial Ministerial Education training partners, and that they consult with the School and College where appropriate during the tender process. [Paragraph 4.1.1]

For the attention of: Head of Subject, Head of School, Head of College

Strategic planning for future growth

Recommendation 2

The panel recommends that the Subject work with the School and College to ensure that staff workloads are resilient to the planned future growth in Postgraduate Taught provision, and assess whether the number of UG honours courses offered is sustainable or needs further reduction. [Paragraph 6.1.3]

For the attention of: Head of Subject, Head of School

Recommendation 3

The Panel notes the strategic outreach plan being developed by the Subject in an attempt to address the lack of growth in undergraduate student numbers. The panel recommends that the Subject consider whether there is a wider market which can be utilised to support Undergraduate recruitment. [Paragraph 5.1.1]

For the attention of: Head of Subject, Head of School

Academic Standards

Recommendation 4

The Panel recommend that appropriate quality assurance mechanisms be developed to ensure that the new Postgraduate Taught programmes are included in the Subject's Quality Enhancement review cycle. [7.1.3]

For the attention of: Head of Subject

Equality and Diversity

Recommendation 5

The panel recommends that the Subject take measures to ensure that they adhere to the University requirement for course material to be populated on Moodle in advance of lectures, in accordance with the Accessible and Inclusive Learning Policy. [Paragraph 5.3.1]

For the attention of: Head of Subject

Technology Enhanced Learning and Teaching

Recommendation 6

The panel recommends that the Subject work with the School of Critical Studies to ensure that online marking is fully utilised, and that Subject staff receive suitable training on relevant systems. [Paragraph 6.1.6]

For the attention of: Head of Subject, Head of School

Graduate Teaching Assistants

Recommendation 7

The Panel **recommends** that the Subject consider the impact on staff workloads of removing the requirement for GTA seminar teaching at Levels 1 and 2, and that efforts be made to provide any existing or future GTAs with a level of peer assessment and feedback on their teaching performance [6.4.2]

For the attention of: Head of Subject

Matters for attention – outside of Subject or School (no response required)

The Panel noted the challenges experienced by Subject staff in signposting students to relevant support services and highlighted the Student Support & Wellbeing project of the World-Changing Glasgow Transformation, whose work intends to increase staff and student awareness of appropriate support that is available. [Paragraph 5.2.3]

For the attention of: Executive Director of Student and Academic Services