

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 1 October 2021

Report of Periodic Subject Review of Urban Studies held on 25 and 26 May 2021

Review Panel

Convener	Professor Jill Morrison
External Subject Specialist, University of Edinburgh	Professor Alison Koslowski
Student Representative Council (SRC)	Mr Kevin Leomo
Cognate Member	Professor Kathleen Riach
Elected Member from the University Court	Professor Kirsteen McCue
Academic and Digital Development (ADD), Academic Services	Dr Janis Davidson
Clerk	Mrs Lesley Fielding, Academic Services (Senate Office)

1. Outcome

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

2. Summary and Context

- 2.1 The Subject of Urban Studies is one of five Subjects within the School of Social and Political Sciences in the College of Social Sciences which is one of four colleges within the University. The previous Urban Studies Periodic Subject Review (PSR) was undertaken in March 2015. The Panel was satisfied with the information provided by the School and noted the significant progress made on recommendations from the previous PSR.
- 2.2 The Convener confirmed the Panel had no authority for allocating resources however the expectation is that solutions to some of the recommendations in this report will be provided in collaboration with key University central professional support services as required and may have wider resource implications.
- 2.3 The Convener confirmed the PSR was taking place in the context of the Global Pandemic which had resulted in teaching and learning moving online and staff and students working remotely. This was the first year of fully online PSRs being undertaken by the University. While the focus of the review was on progress made since the previous PSR in 2015, the PSR was heavily influenced by the impact of Covid restrictions on the student and staff experiences of the last twelve months.

Staff and Student Participation

- 2.4 The Panel met staff from across the Subject including those in leadership roles, key academic roles, early career staff, tutors, graduate teaching assistants, professional and support staff with responsibilities for the programmes delivered in Glasgow and Nankai. The Panel met with undergraduate and postgraduate students. Comments

made by staff and students were supportive and constructive and demonstrated that the culture within the Subject was innovative, inclusive and supportive.

School Preparation for PSR

2.5 The Reflective Analysis was drafted and co-ordinated by the Head of Subject and a small team consisting of staff and students.

Student and Staff Numbers and Profile

2.6 The Reflective Analysis confirmed that overall, most programmes had doubled in numbers and total numbers had quadrupled in six years. It detailed the impact this had on workloads, space and resources. Urban Studies does not have FTE information at Subject level as it is not a useful metric for Urban Studies due to:

- the level of service teaching undertaken for wider School and College courses, especially in quantitative methods
- an exceptionally high level of research buy-out
- the Subject's research and impact work expanded and intensified dramatically over the review period
- Between 2014 and 2021, 70-100% of R&T lecturers have held research grants.
- In April 2021, R&T staff line managed 20.5 FTE of research staff.
- The Subject having 3 major externally-funded research centres with R&T staff line managing.

2.7 In 2020/21, 952 students were studying programmes led by Urban Studies, 578 UG and 374 PG.

2.8 In addition to the Subject's own students, Urban Studies provides quantitative research methods training for a further 312 students (198 UG, 85 PGT and 29 PGR) on programmes based in other parts of the School and College.

2.9 Urban Studies has 11.7 FTE of TLS staff: 1 professor, 4 lecturers and 8 tutors. 23 FTE of R&T staff: 12 professors, 7 senior lecturers and 5 lecturers.

2.10 The Panel noted the diversity of the staff and student profile which was inclusive with respect to age, gender, race, disability and background and were confident the Subject Area demonstrated a transparent commitment to the University Equality & Diversity Strategy.

3. OVERVIEW

3.1 Strategy for Development

The Panel **commends** the Subject on the significant progress made against the recommendations from the previous PSR in 2015. The Subject has delivered a coherent and integrated curriculum that builds on the research excellence available in the Subject.

Strategy and Resources

3.1.1 The Panel **commends** the School for maintaining its reputation and integrity despite the challenges associated with the significant increase in student numbers. It noted that its national and international reputation continues to attract a high level of applicants which aligns with the University strategy for growth in particular disciplinary areas. The Panel noted, from the Reflective Analysis and staff, the challenges presented by the ongoing growth in student numbers which was outwith the School and Subject's control and not part of their strategy. This growth affected the School's ability to plan and had a detrimental impact on the Subject's practice of small group and specialist teaching as required on accredited programmes. The Head of School

indicated that the School required an improved quality of management information in order to plan and manage the workload model. The Panel **recommends** the School and Subject review their strategy for growth, in collaboration with External Relations, to enable them to have greater control over how they grow. This will also allow them to address the issues related to the impact of increased numbers of students on small group teaching.”

- 3.1.2 The Panel noted the concerns of the School and Subject staff regarding the University’s revised English language requirements which had lowered the level of English fluency required from applicants to study at Glasgow. This had impacted substantially on the Subject with some international students lacking the appropriate level of English language competency to undertake their studies successfully. Inadequacy of conversational English among some students impacted on their ability to fully engage in the small group learning. The Panel **recommends** that the School and Subject collaborate with colleagues responsible for Admissions within External Relations on the standard of English of international students and to establish the appropriate definition of the terms ‘borderline’ and ‘marginal’. These terms are used during the admissions process to signal that, in those cases where there was any doubt over the applicants suitability or language competence, the Subject wishes to be involved in the decision-making pre-admission.
- 3.1.3 The Panel noted the exceptional challenges over the past year particularly with regard to January intakes of postgraduate taught students which resulted in a 12 month teaching period for staff. While it is anticipated this situation would not be repeated, it would not be easy to address this under the Workload Model (WLM) in the short term and the considerable strain the extended teaching period has on staff should be recognised. The Panel welcomed the detailed WLM used within the School and Subject and was pleased to note the College plans to undertake a review in due course. The Panel noted some challenges arising from the WLM and identified issues relating to additional work for accreditation processes, lack of time for innovation and teaching preparation for staff, including Early Career staff and Tutors. There was a perception of a lack of parity between Undergraduate and Postgraduate programmes in terms of the WLM. The Head of Subject was noted to have very high line management responsibilities with an inadequate system for delegation of these. The Panel **recommends** that the Subject, School and College review the current Workload Model to identify current inequities and ensure a productive way forward, ensuring clear communication with staff surrounding how the model is operationalised”. As currently phrased, it is not clear what the benchmark is for or what it might do, so this perhaps needs to be rephrased by someone more familiar with the review/subject
- 3.1.4 From discussion with all staff, it was evident that the accreditation processes place a substantial burden on all involved. The Panel **recommends** that the Subject ensures that sufficient time is formally allocated within the WLM for all staff involved in the accreditation process.

Staff and Student Accommodation

- 3.1.5 It was evident that, to maintain their excellent standard of teaching, the Subject required appropriate specialist teaching accommodation. As outlined previously, the substantial increase of student numbers had impacted on the availability of teaching accommodation which met the Subject’s teaching style and the specific requirements of accredited bodies. The Panel **recommends** the School and Subject conduct strategic discussions with University Estates and Administration to resolve the recurring challenges of incompatible accommodation for small group teaching, particularly in relation to Postgraduate Taught programmes and the specialist requirements of postgraduate students and accrediting bodies.

3.1.6 It was noted that the issue of disabled access identified in the previous PSR of Urban Studies in 2015 remained an unresolved issue. In view of the legislative implications as outlined in the Equalities Act 2010, the Panel **recommends** that disabled access to accommodation both for staff and students is reviewed to see if there is any remedy possible for the problem.

Early Career Research Staff

3.1.7 The Early Career Research Staff confirmed they received mentoring, although this tended to be of a more informal nature. The PGCAP was found to be helpful in terms of reflection on teaching, however, the switch to online was seen as detrimental to development. There was a mixed response to the ECDP with ECR staff advising that lack of spaces on seminars and training was problematic. The Panel noted that the ECR staff considered the WLM contained insufficient time for creative pedagogical innovation. This was raised in item 3.1.3.

Tutors

3.1.8 The Panel was pleased to note from the Head of School that the tutor contract and role was under review by the School Management Team. The role of tutor had been introduced in 2017 and the Subject recruited fixed-term post-doctoral Tutors who were line managed by the Head of Subject. From discussions it was evident that some of the tutors were dissatisfied with their current role, citing a perceived lack of awareness and clarity of their position among staff which was exacerbated by the ambiguous and misleading post title. The Panel discerned further issues regarding workload levels and the need for additional support in view of the student facing aspect of this role. The Panel supports the School's plans to review the role of Tutor, and **recommends** the School considers in the review, the role of Tutor together with the post title.

Graduate Teaching Assistants

3.1.9 The Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) interviewed were generally positive about their experience, however, there was a division of opinion regarding the manageability of workloads, particularly with regard to the time allotted for administrative work. Concern was expressed over the level of support provided for new GTAs particularly during the transition to online, where resources for GTA's upskilling surrounding teaching on Teams or Zoom had not been provided. The Panel **recommends** the Subject develop more formal mechanisms to ensure Subject oversight of GTAs' workload and wider activities including mentoring, upskilling and training and support for new appointees. The new GTA Code will be useful in this context.

Good Practice

3.1.10 The Panel noted the instances of the Subject's good practice evident from the Reflective Analysis. However, while this was circulated through regular Learning & Teaching forums and a shared Teams site, the Panel considered there could be more effective networks for sharing good practice, for example disseminating the dialogic feedback more widely. The Panel **recommends** that the Subject explore how good practice could be more widely disseminated and embedded throughout the Subject and School through the establishment of a short-life working group.

4. LEARNING, TEACHING AND ENHANCEMENT

4.1 The Panel noted from the Reflective Analysis, the Subject's continued development of their learning and teaching and use of the current pandemic as an opportunity to learn from the various challenges encountered. The Subject was noted to have engaged fully with the immediate demands brought about by the pandemic through development and improvement of learning and teaching remotely and online. The Panel would encourage the Subject to embed these best practices going forward. The

Panel **commends** the Subject for staff success in the School of Social & Political Sciences Teaching as evidenced by Teaching Excellence Awards, University Students' Representative Council Teaching Award for Innovation and the College of Social Sciences Teaching Excellence award.

Strategic Development for Learning and Teaching

- 4.2 The Panel was impressed with the collegial and supportive culture evident within the Subject. The challenges of the pandemic had been offset by the introduction of fortnightly WhatsApp/Teams meetings for staff including Tutors and GTAs, that were perceived as very helpful. However, since the cessation of these meetings, staff felt less involved. The Panel **recommends** that the School and Subject continue to support the collegial culture within the Subject to ensure it is maintained going forward as this would enhance the staff experience.
- 4.3 The Panel noted the Subject's strategic approach centred around active and student-centred learning which aligned well with the University's Learning & Teaching Strategy. The Panel **recommends** the School/Subject leadership consider ways of continuing to embed teaching and learning culture (student-centred learning, impact-led teaching etc) across the subject.
- 4.4 Staff conveyed that the dissemination of teaching information was not as fluid as it could be. The Panel **recommends** that the Subject reviews the current procedures for disseminating information and consultation processes with staff.

Curriculum Review and Development

- 4.5 The Panel **commends** the Subject on the level of thought and planning given to developing and enhancing the curriculum. The range of courses, diversification of teaching delivery and research-rich teaching provision were very clear and impressive. It particularly noted and commended the focus on Impact Led Teaching. There was a notable sense of progression and aspiration to develop further and to be flexible to the changes and fast moving technologies that might be used now and in the future. The Professional Accreditation processes contributed to a culture of reflection and continual refinement of the curriculum across the Subject.
- 4.6 From the Reflective Analysis and discussions with the Head of Subject the Panel noted the work to decolonise the curriculum with the inclusion of race and ethnicity in the undergraduate programme with gender analysis, age, sex, disability and race being taught in some areas.
- 4.7 The Subject's commitment to developing student staff partnerships in working to help inform new curricula was evident from the documentation. It was suggested that there could be consideration of alignment between the two subjects in joint degrees.

Enhanced Technology and working remotely

- 4.8 The Panel was satisfied with the Subject's proactive approach to adopting technology and noted from the Reflective Analysis that technology had been identified as a key area for improvement. The students confirmed that IT support had been satisfactory.
- 4.9 The Panel noted the Subject's use of MS Teams to encourage peer feedback within courses and the Panel would **encourage** the Subject to consider ways to further embed this alongside the other interactive tools across the programme.
- 4.10 The Panel had learned from discussion with staff and students some of the challenges arising from the different facets of Moodle. Students found the variety of different Moodle templates used across Subjects, Schools and Colleges could cause confusion. The Panel **recommends** that the Subject consult with central University IT services and LEADS to consider a uniform template for Moodle set-up where possible.

Internationalisation and Study Abroad

4.11 The Panel noted the exchange agreements the Subject had in place with various institutions and appreciated the impact that the pandemic had on outgoing opportunities for home students. The Panel was pleased to note the Subject's ongoing efforts to coordinate plans across the University to utilise opportunities such as the opportunity for the International Real Estate PG students to partake in a credit bearing 'Asian Cities' fieldtrip.

Assessment and Feedback

4.12 The Panel was pleased to note the range of innovative summative and formative assessment offered, including examples of blogs, briefing notes and the 'active participation' grade. These are examples of good practice and provide students with valuable skills in writing for different audiences.

4.13 The Panel was pleased to note the practice of peer review however, at the meeting with the undergraduate students, some issues were identified. Students highlighted a lack of feedback from other students and the need for clearer guidance as key issues. The Panel **encourages** the Subject to provide students with additional guidance on the peer review process.

4.14 While overall, the students at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels were satisfied with feedback, there were some instances where the process was less proficient, particularly in terms of the content of feedback and, in some cases, turnaround times. The Panel **suggests** that the Subject provide guidance to staff regarding the importance of providing sufficient and timely feedback and may wish to consider a feedback template..

External Engagement

4.15 The Panel **commends** the Subject on the distinguished and prestigious aspect of its professional accreditation of Postgraduate Taught provision. It was evident to the Panel that this was a demanding accreditation cycle in terms of regular and routine evaluation by specially comprised boards.

4.16 The Panel discerned from staff the onerous nature of these accreditation reviews and that the WLM allowance for such duties was inadequate. The Panel welcomed the Head of Subject's assurances that staff were reimbursed time-wise for preparation for accredited bodies, however, has made a recommendation with regard to the WLM element of this process at item 3.1.3.

Graduate Attributes

4.17 The Panel **commends** the Subject on its approach to graduate attributes noting the guest lecturers and strong links with industry and alumni. While Undergraduate students were extremely positive regarding the quality of the guest lecturers, the postgraduate students' experience was reported as being more uneven. The Panel **recommends** that the Subject consider how to ensure that alumni and industry engagement within the curriculum is of sufficiently high quality alongside how this can be more systematically and successfully leveraged across UG and PG programmes.

4.18 The Panel **commends** the Subject Area for the quality of its teaching as evidenced from the high number of awards received including the UK-wide Social Policy Association Outstanding Teaching Award for excellence and innovation. Internal course evaluations and staff-student liaison meetings also reiterate this positive feedback on their excellence in student experience, pedagogical practice and learning technology innovation. Recognition of excellence in teaching is also reflected in their strong and improved performance in University league tables.

NSS Scores

- 4.19 The Panel **commends** the Subject on their continuing excellence in NSS results. The success of the UG programme has been reflected in consecutive NSS surveys since the last review period, achieving 100 percent in 2019 and the Subject topped UK NSS Social Policy ranking in 2019. The Subject's unprecedented result of meeting the University KPI of over 75 percent for assessment and feedback was commended by the University's Principal/Vice-Chancellor.

5. The Student Voice

Responding to student feedback

- 5.1 The Panel noted the various processes in place to obtain student feedback formally and informally at Undergraduate level. The Panel noted from the Reflective Analysis a gap in the knowledge of PGT satisfaction due to the PTES either not being conducted or having very low response rates. In view of the uncertainty of the University's engagement with the PTES, the Panel would **encourage** the Subject to consider what could potentially be done to communicate with PGTs the importance of providing feedback by alternative routes.
- 5.2 From discussions with students, the Panel learned there was a lack of awareness regarding the student rep role. The Panel would **encourage** the Subject to look at additional methods to raise student awareness of (and create effective communication surrounding) the student rep role and purpose.

Staff Student Partnerships

- 5.3 The Panel was satisfied that the Subject had an effective, collaborative and transparent approach to working in partnership with the student body. This was evidenced in the development of new programmes and the learning and teaching strategy, particularly in relation to marking criteria and assessment.

6. Supporting Student Wellbeing

- 6.1 The Panel was satisfied that the Subject was fully engaged with supporting student wellbeing through various methods including the peer support scheme and the introduction of student-facing social media channels on Twitter and Instagram, although this was somewhat uneven and would benefit from further development. Notable examples were the provision of staff holding information sessions during the exceptional circumstances of the pandemic and the practice of staff continuing Zoom calls after the official lecture had ended, allowing for informal discussion and support for students.

Adviser of Studies

- 6.2 From the Panel's discussions with the undergraduate students, it emerged that most students had little or no contact with their Adviser of Studies. The Panel acknowledged the challenges of engaging students in this process and also the lack of control the Subject had over this issue, as Advisers are allocated at School level. The Panel **recommends** that the School/Subject review the Advising System to enhance visibility of the formal elements of, and improve engagement with the Advisory System, particularly the first meeting with Advisers of Studies.
- 6.3 The Panel noted the concerns of both students and staff regarding the allocation of Advisers of Studies with Subject advising staff rarely being allocated an Urban Studies student. This would appear to disadvantage all concerned with students from other subjects being assigned an adviser unfamiliar with the academic content of their programme. In addition, Urban Studies students assigned Advisers of Studies from other disciplines had sought advice from the Subject staff, thereby creating additional

workloads. The Panel **recommends** that the College review the allocation of advisers to ensure that Social and Public Policy students are allocated an adviser from Urban Studies where possible.

Student community

- 6.4 The Panel noted the various initiatives to support students including induction and social events. While it was obvious that the Subject has endeavoured to maintain a sense of community during the past year, both undergraduate and postgraduate students expressed a sense of isolation and disconnect. The Panel **encourages** the Subject to consider initiatives and resources to further develop the sense of student community, including the continuing support/promotion of the Social and Public Policy Society to support students to feel more 'at home' in Glasgow, particularly postgraduate taught students.

Retention and Progression

- 6.5 From discussion with staff, the Panel noted that many first year students took Urban Studies as a second or third subject, but the issue of student retention on the programme in Urban Studies was less transparent due to a lack of data about whether Urban Studies was their first choice or not. From the Reflective Analysis, the Panel noted that students moving from Level 1 to Level 2 Social and Public Policy indicate that progression had remained fairly consistent, ranging from 55% to 64%.

7. Collaborative Provision

7.1 Strategy

- 7.1.1 Since the PSR review in 2015, the Subject had commenced delivery of the joint Graduate School degree with Nankai University and that numbers had risen substantially from 11 in 2015 to 49 in 2021. The Reflective Analysis noted that there had been some issues identified with delivery and a change of convenership and that a joint working group has recently been proposed to review existing and address future teaching content of the programme. While noting the overall success of the programme, the Panel considered that it would be timely for the Subject to review progress to date. The Panel **recommends** that the Subject undertake a review of their strategic direction and reflect on how to progress future collaborations and to encourage current staff collaboration between Nankai and GU for postgraduate taught provision.
- 7.1.2 The Panel noted from discussion with GU staff that teaching in China was no longer optional and was a requirement in all new teaching contracts. It is **recommended** that the Subject and School consider the staffing strategy for Nankai to introduce flexibility and a blended approach to teaching.

Workload Model

- 7.2 The Panel **recommends** that the workload model for Nankai teaching staff is reviewed to incorporate time for staff to reflect on teaching methods and to recognise the additional pressures on GU and visiting Nankai staff arising from these visits.

Student Community

- 7.3 It is **recommended** that the Subject should ensure conversational English classes are in the pre sessional sessions for visiting Nankai students.

8 Good Practice

- 8.1 Range of innovative summative and formative assessment offered.
- 8.2 Student centred curriculum/ Impact informed curricula/active learning.

- 8.3 Move to online teaching and use of multiple new technologies.
- 8.4 Graduate Attributes – guest lecturers and strong links with industry.

9. Commendations

- 9.1 The Panel **commends** the Subject on the significant progress made against the recommendations made from the previous PSR in 2015.
- 9.2 The Panel **commends** the School for maintaining its reputation and integrity despite the challenges associated with the significant increase in student numbers and noted that its national and international reputation continues to attract a high level of applicants which aligns with the University strategy for growth in particular disciplinary areas.
- 9.3 The Panel **commends** the Subject on the level of thought and planning given to developing and enhancing the curriculum. The range of courses, diversification of teaching delivery and research rich teaching provision were very clear and impressive. It particularly noted and commended the focus on Impact Led Teaching. There was a notable sense of progression and aspiration to develop further and to be flexible to the changes and fast moving technologies that might be used now and in the future.
- 9.4 The Panel **commends** the Subject on its strategy and approach to Learning & Teaching including impact informed, student centred, active learning which was widespread across programmes in the Subject.
- 9.5 The Panel **commends** the Subject on the distinguished and prestigious aspect of its professional accreditation Postgraduate Taught provision. It was evident to the Panel that this was a demanding accreditation cycle in terms of regular and routine evaluation by specially comprised boards.
- 9.6 The Panel **commends** the Subject on its approach to graduate attributes noting the guest lecturers and strong links with industry and alumni.
- 9.7 The Panel **commends** the Subject Area for the quality of its teaching as evidenced from the high number of awards received including the UK-wide *Social Policy Association* Outstanding Teaching Award for excellence and innovation. Internal course evaluations and staff-student liaison meetings also reiterate this positive feedback on their excellence in student experience, pedagogical practice and learning technology innovation. Recognition of their excellence in teaching is also reflected in their strong and improved performance in University league tables.
- 9.8 The Panel **commends** the Subject on their continuing excellence in NSS results.

10. Recommendations for Enhancement

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

	Thematic Activity (Section 1 - Strategy for Development)	Shared enhancement benefits	For the attention of the Subject	For information
1.	<p>Strategy for Growth The Panel recommends the School and Subject review their strategy for growth, in collaboration with External Relations, to enable them to have greater control over how they grow. This will also allow them to address the issues related to the impact of increased numbers of students on small group teaching. Ref: Section 3 para 3.1.1</p> <p>The Panel recommends that the School and Subject collaborate with colleagues responsible for Admissions within External Relations on the standard of English of international students and to establish the appropriate definition of the terms borderline and marginal. These terms are used during the admissions process to signal that, in those cases where there was any doubt over the applicants' suitability or language competence, the Subject wishes to be involved in the decision-making pre-admission. Ref: Section 3 para 3.1.2</p>	<p>This should enable the School and Subject area to manage and plan for new intakes ensuring acceptable staffing levels.</p> <p>This would ensure that the School would have candidates with the appropriate level of English to thrive in the programmes</p>	<p>Head of School Head of School Administration Head of External Relations Head of College Head of College Finance</p>	
2.	<p>Workload Allocation Model (WAM) The Panel recommends that the Subject, School and College review the current Workload Model to identify current inequities and ensure a productive way forward, ensuring clear communication with staff surrounding how the model is operationalised". As currently phrased, it is not clear what the benchmark is for or what</p>	<p>A review of the WLM would facilitate equity in staff workloads with time identified for innovation.</p>	<p>Head of Subject, Head of School Head of College</p>	

	<p>it might do, so this perhaps needs to be rephrased by someone more familiar with the review/subject</p> <p>Ref: Section 3 para 3.1.3</p> <p>The Panel recommends that the Subject ensures that sufficient time is allocated within the WLM for all staff involved in the accreditation process.</p> <p>Ref: Section 3 para 3.1.4</p>			
3.	<p>Teaching Accommodation</p> <p>The Panel recommends the School and Subject conduct strategic discussions with University Estates and Administration to resolve the recurring challenges of incompatible accommodation for small group teaching, particularly in relation to Postgraduate Taught programmes and the specialist requirements of postgraduate students and accrediting bodies.</p> <p>Ref: Section 3, para 3.1.5</p> <p>¹In view of the legislative implications as outlined in the Equalities Act 2010, the Panel recommends that disabled access to accommodation both for staff and students is reviewed to see if there is any remedy possible for the problem.</p> <p>Ref: Section 3 para 3.1.6</p>	<p>This would improve the student experience and alleviate the pressures on the Subject by ensuring appropriate accommodation is provided, including as necessary to meet the specification of accrediting bodies.</p> <p>This issue was identified in the PSR in 2015. An update should be provided early in session 2021.</p>	<p>Head of School Head of Subject Director of Strategy, Performance and Transformation, Estates and Administration</p> <p>Director, Estates</p>	<p>Head of Subject Head of School</p>

¹ The second item under Recommendation 3 has been amended as requested by Academic Standards Committee and has been agreed by the PSR Panel Convener

4.	<p>Tutors The Panel supports the School's plans to review the role and recommends the School considers in the review, the role of Tutor together with the post title.</p> <p>Ref: Section 3 para 3.1.8</p>	This would clarify the role of tutors and would provide support for their student-facing role.	Head of School	Head of Subject
5.	<p>Graduate Teaching Assistants The Panel recommends the Subject develop more formal mechanisms to ensure Subject oversight of GTAs' workload and wider activities including mentoring, upskilling and training and support for new appointees. The new GTA Code will be useful in this context.</p> <p>Ref: Section 3 para 3.1.9</p>	Subject oversight will create parity of experience for the GTAs and will provide the Subject with an opportunity to monitor workloads. Additionally, assigned mentors will encourage confidence in new GTAs.	Head of Subject	
6.	<p>Good Practice The Panel recommends that the Subject explore how good practice could be more widely disseminated and embedded throughout the Subject and School through the establishment of a short-life working group.</p> <p>Ref: Section 3, para 3.1.10</p>	The Curricula would benefit from more even dissemination of good practice to all staff.	Head of Subject	
	Thematic Activity (Section 2 - Learning and Teaching Enhancement)	Shared Enhancement Benefits	For the attention of	For Information
7.	<p>Staff Community The Panel recommends that the School and Subject continue to support the collegial culture within the Subject to ensure it is maintained</p>	This will enhance the staff experience	Head of School Head of Subject	

	going forward as this would enhance the staff experience. Ref: Section 4, para 4.2			
8.	Teaching and Learning The Panel recommends the School/Subject leadership consider ways of continuing to embed teaching and learning culture (student centred learning, impact led teaching etc) across the subject. Ref: Section 4 para 4.3	This will enhance the student experience and also the staff experience.	Head of Subject	
9.	Communication The Panel recommends that the Subject review the current procedures for disseminating information and consultation processes with staff. Ref: Section 4 para 4.4	This will enhance staff experience and ensure that all staff are involved in good practice initiatives.	Head of Subject	
10.	The Panel noted the Subject's use of MS Teams to encourage peer feedback within courses and the Panel would encourage the Subject to consider ways to further embed this alongside the other interactive tools across the programme. Ref: Section 4, para 4.9 The Panel encourages the Subject to provide students with additional guidance on the peer review process. Ref: Section 4, para 4.13	This would enrich the value of the peer review process for students	Head of Subject Head of School Head of Subject Deans of Learning & Teaching	

	<p>The Panel suggests that the Subject provide guidance to staff regarding the importance of providing sufficient and timely feedback and may wish to consider the introduction of a feedback template.</p> <p>Ref: Section 4, para 4.14</p>		Head of Subject Deans of Learning & Teaching	
11.	<p>IT The Panel recommends that the Subject consult with central University IT services and LEADS to consider a uniform template for Moodle set-up where possible.</p> <p>Ref: Section 4 para 4.10</p>	This would address the lack of consistency in the Moodle set-up throughout the School to enhance the student experience (students found it confusing).	Head of Subject Head of School Mr Dave Anderson, Director of IT Services Director, LEADS	
12.	<p>Graduate Attributes The Panel recommends that the Subject consider how to ensure that alumni and industry engagement within the curriculum is of sufficiently high quality alongside how this can be more systematically and successfully leveraged across UG and PG programmes</p> <p>Ref: Section 4 para 4.17</p>	Building on the existing links with alumni and industry should enhance the student experience and encourage alumni participation.	Head of Subject	
	Thematic Activity (Section 3 - The Student Voice)	Shared Enhancement Benefits	For the attention of	For information
13.	<p>. In view of the uncertainty of the University's engagement with the PTES, the Panel would encourage the Subject to consider what could potentially be done to communicate with PGTs the importance of providing feedback by alternative routes such as Evasys.</p> <p>Ref: Section 5 para 5.1</p>	This would ensure the PGT students' feedback was noted	Head of School	

14.	<p>Student Representatives The Panel would encourage the Subject to look at additional methods to raise student awareness of the student rep role and purpose. Ref: Section 5 para 5.2</p>	Increased student awareness of the role of student rep should improve the engagement of students and facilitate the resolution of the feedback loop.	Head of Subject	
	<p>Thematic Activity (Section 4 Supporting Student Wellbeing)</p>	<p>Shared Enhancement Benefits</p>	<p>For the attention</p>	<p>For information</p>
15.	<p>Adviser of Studies The Panel recommends that the School/Subject review the Advising System to enhance visibility of the formal elements of, and improve engagement with the Advisory System, particularly the first meeting with Advisers of Studies. Ref Section 6 para 6.2</p> <p>The Panel recommends that the College review the allocation of advisers to ensure that Social and Public Policy students are allocated an adviser from Urban Studies where possible. Ref Section 6 para 6.3</p>	<p>This would complement the work of the Social Sciences administrative advising team through the provision of academic advice to students.</p> <p>This would ensure that Advisers of Studies had a knowledge of the specific academic challenges that Urban Studies students may face.</p>	<p>Head of College College issues – being reviewed</p> <p>Head of College</p>	<p>Head of Subject</p> <p>Head of School Head of Subject</p>
16.	<p>Student Community The Panel encourages the Subject to consider initiatives and resources to further develop the sense of student community, including the continuing support/promotion of the Social and Public Policy Society to support students to feel more ‘at home’ in Glasgow, particularly postgraduate taught students.</p>	This should support students feel more ‘at home’ in Glasgow, particularly for postgraduate PGT who only have a year and particularly upon the emergence from lockdown.	Head of Subject	

	Ref: Section 6 para 6.4			
	Thematic Activity (Section 5 - Collaborative Provision)	Shared Enhancement Benefits	For the attention of the School	For information
17.	<p>Strategy The Panel recommends that the Subject undertake a review of their strategic direction and reflect on how to progress future collaborations and to encourage current staff collaboration between Nankai and GU for postgraduate taught provision.</p> <p>Ref: Section 7 para 7.1.1</p> <p>It is recommended that the Subject and School consider the staffing strategy for Nankai to introduce flexibility and a blended approach to teaching.</p> <p>Ref: Section 7 para 7.1.2</p>	Using experiences of the Nankai collaboration would be beneficial in developing a strategy for current and future collaborations.	<p>Head of Subject Transnational Education Dean</p> <p>Head of Subject Head of School</p>	
18.	<p>Workload Model The Panel recommends that the workload model for Nankai teaching staff is reviewed to incorporate time for staff to reflect on teaching methods and to recognise the additional pressures on GU and visiting Nankai staff arising from these visits.</p> <p>Ref: Section 7 para 7.2</p>	This would encourage staff to build on their current practice and to develop innovative learning and teaching methods.	Head of Subject	
19.	<p>Student Community It is recommended that the Subject should ensure conversational English classes are in the</p>	This provision would aid visiting students to maintain and develop their English language skills, and facilitate their greater assimilation into the community	English for Academic Study Transnational Education Dean	

	pre sessional sessions for visiting Nankai students. Ref: Section 7 para 7.3			
--	---	--	--	--