UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

Academic Standards Committee – Summer Powers 2018

Periodic Subject Review: Review of School of Modern Languages & Cultures held on 3 May 2018

Jane McAllister, Clerk to the Review Panel

Review Panel:

Professor Moira Fischbacher-Smith	Assistant Vice Principal (Learning & Teaching) Panel Convener
Professor Nigel Harkness	Newcastle University, External Subject Specialist
Professor Carl Goodyear	Senate Assessor on Court
Mr Scott Kirby	Student member
Dr Sheila Kidd	School of Humanities (Celtic & Gaelic), Cognate member
Dr Amanda Sykes	Learning Enhancement and Academic Development Service (LEADS)
Ms Jane McAllister	Senate Office and Clerk to the Panel
Ms Elisa Chirico	Senate Office, Observer

1. Introduction

1.1 The School of Modern Languages and Cultures is based in the College of Arts. It operates a unitary organisational structure providing teaching in 7 subjects. There are no formal divisions or management appointments at subject level; this structure aims to promote an integrated school approach to the design and delivery of the degree programmes. The most significant structural development since the last PSR in 2012-13 is the full integration of the former Language Centre into the School.

1.2 At undergraduate level, the School offers MA Hons provision in Comparative Literature, French, German, Italian, Portuguese, Russian and Spanish. Postgraduate Taught provision consists of 3 programmes: MLitt Comparative Literature, MSc Translation Studies and MSc Translation Studies (Nankai). The School also provides a range of credit-bearing courses in Chinese, Czech, Polish and Catalan. An institution-wide language programme in Modern Foreign Languages offers credit-bearing courses for International Mobility and other specific purposes. English for Academic Study[1] (EAS) activities include credit-bearing and non-credit-bearing pre-sessional and in-sessional courses for international students, as well as an online course in Teaching English for Academic Purposes (TEAP).

1.3 Preparation of the School of Modern Languages and Cultures Self Evaluation Report (SER) was led by Dr Jackie Clarke (outgoing Learning & Teaching Convener) with support from a core team of colleagues: Dr Eanna O'Ceallachain, Dr Sheila Dickson, and Ms Kirsty Gowling-Afchain. The document was subject to a series of staff and student consultations. The School made significant efforts to include all groups of staff

---

[1] The School uses the terminology "English for Academic Study". This is equivalent to "English for Academic Purposes" (EAP)

and to ensure all views were represented. Student consultations were organised via a Moodle Feedback Activity and focus groups.

1.4   The Review Panel met with Professor Vicente Perez De Leon, Head of School, Dr Jackie Clarke, outgoing Learning & Teaching Convener, Dr Sheila Dickson, School Quality Officer during the period of the review and incoming Learning & Teaching Convener, and a large group of staff representing all languages, EAS and administrative staff. The Panel met separately with early career staff, Native Language Teachers/Graduate Teaching Assistants, 16 Undergraduate students and 8 Postgraduate taught students.

1.5   The Review was originally scheduled for 1 & 2 March but was postponed due to severe winter weather. The School is congratulated for maintaining focus on the process and for retaining the engagement of staff and students approaching the end of the semester.

2.   Context

2.1   Staff

The School has approximately 129 staff delivering 90 FTE. The main categories are as follows:

Category	Headcount	FTE
Professor	6	4.3
Senior Lecturer	10	9.70
Lecturer	29	26.43
Lecturer (EAS)	10	9.00
Tutor (EAS)	10	8.90
Tutor (extended workforce)	11	2.50
Native Language Teacher	9	4.63
Graduate Teaching Assistant	18	2.71
MPA[2] staff	18	15.06

The staff:student ratio for 2017-18 is 1:19.

2.2   Students

Student numbers for 2017-18 are summarised as follows:

Student numbers by year of programme			Form of Study		
			class enrolment	other	
UG	Year 1	949	686	Visiting	91
				Erasmus In	117
				Exchange In	55
				total	263
	Year 2	652	652		
	Year 3	116	115	Work Placement	1
				Erasmus Out	34

---

[2] Management, Professional, Administrative

				Exchange Out	8
				Language Year Out	87
				total	130
	Year 4	156	156		
	Year 5	137	137		
PGT	Year 1	234	234		
	Year 2	4	4		

2.3 Range of Provision under Review

Undergraduate

- Master of Arts – Comparative Literature (joint honours)
- Master of Arts – Languages
  - o Single honours – French, German, Italian, Spanish
  - o Joint honours – French, German, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, Russian

Postgraduate

- Master of Letters (T)(Arts) Comparative Literature
- Master of Letters (T)(Arts) Modern Languages and Culture (no longer running)
- Master of Science (Arts) Translation Studies: Translation & Professional Practice

3. Review Outcomes

3.1 The Review Panel was impressed by the School's strong commitment to Learning and Teaching which was demonstrated by the staff through the energy they devoted to development of their provision and their desire to engage in scholarship activity.

3.2 The Panel would congratulate the School and its staff in having been able to maintain the variety of languages on offer in addition to the programmes in Comparative Literature and Translation Studies. The Panel noted that the staff expressed particular pride in this achievement. The School has made good progress in bringing the different language teams together under the School banner and continues to work towards embedding this success through improving consistency in policy and practice. The Panel also noted particularly good teamwork between the academic and administrative staff groups.

3.3 The Panel's impression of the School during its visit confirmed the SER statement that the review period has seen the development of an increasingly vibrant learning and teaching culture in SMLC. The integration of the former Language Centre and its staff was noted as having played an important part in this development by bringing specialist expertise in language teaching that complements teaching on culture and research in the rest of the School.

3.4 The Panel were impressed by the students with whom they met who demonstrated great enthusiasm for modern languages as a subject area and the opportunities offered by the School to work in partnership to improve provision. Students described the School and its staff as approachable and helpful. They reported good experiences when support from staff had been required. They were aware of teaching being research-led, highlighting Comparative Literature courses, and appreciated being able to gain a sense of the lecturers' passion for the subject. The PGT students who met with the Panel also welcomed the flexibility and willingness of staff to adapt content to

support individual interests expressed by students. The Panel considered the positive feedback from students to be confirmation of the attitudes expressed by the staff they met who regarded providing quality support for students and developing good relationships with the student community as priority.

3.5 The Panel wishes to support the School in improving its ability to build sustainable provision. In the Panel's view, the School has many good practices and developments that would benefit from being set out in a comprehensive strategy document. The Panel welcomed the School's existing strategic aims to contribute to the University's internationalisation agenda through encouraging and supporting the expansion of language in other disciplines. The Panel also supports the School's ambitions to raise the importance of language at the University and to offer languages to all students.

The following paragraphs detail the key points discussed during the review visit along with commendations recognising good practices and recommendations on areas where the Review Panel identified scope for improvement. Commendations and recommendations are made to support the School 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

The Review Panel recommends that the School articulates its strategic priorities in a clear School Strategic Plan in order to derive the full benefit from current and planned collective activities and effort and to maximise progress in relation to learning and teaching.

4.1 The Panel discussed strategic direction with the Head of School, whom they noted had been in post for less than one year (Aug 2017). The Head of School articulated the School's intention to contribute to the University's strategic internationalisation agenda through a dynamic approach to encouraging and supporting the expansion of languages in other disciplines. There had been cross School reflection on the current position and encouragement to look to the future but a final position had not yet been reached.

4.2 The Panel considered that there were many good practices and elements of development across the School that would benefit from being co-ordinated into a School Strategy to focus effort. There was a sense that improvements were being made in a reactive way, often in response to strategic direction from University and College as described in the SER, but without attention to ensuring current strengths would be preserved or full consideration of areas not being addressed.

4.3 The Panel suggested discussion of priorities should seek to establish an agreed school position on various points. These include, but are not limited to, integration of learning and teaching policy and practice across the School to further embed the unified structure from the student perspective, an agreed approach to joint programmes overseas e.g. Nankai, and an agreed approach to priority setting around developments such as blended and online learning [see paragraph 7.1.10]. There should also be consideration of consistency of approach in areas such workload, sabbatical leave and early career support.

5. Structure

The Review Panel commends the collective success of the School and its staff in forming a unified School from separate units. While there is still work to do in terms of individual procedures, much progress has been made establishing a strong community ethos.

5.1 The Panel noted from the previous PSR report that the School had been formed from separate departments in 2003 and that, by the 2013 Review, much progress had been made in terms of harmonisation. The Panel was pleased that the School continued to give attention to this, for example, the role of School Language Co-ordinator had been created to lead and co-ordinate School-wide development. A School-wide Forum had been established which took the form of workshop based events where individuals could share their experiences of new practices and methods to encourage cross language connections and the dissemination of good practice. The Panel recognised that the School had been much more successful in establishing its unified culture and structure than other schools formed at the restructuring of the University in 2010. While it was acknowledged that the common focus on Language and Culture meant that the constituent parts were perhaps more cognate than in other schools, the Panel welcomed the insights into how this had been achieved and congratulated the School's success.

5.2 Whilst acknowledging this progress, it was also the case that the unified structure was not as clearly established from the perspective of the students. The Undergraduate students who met with the Panel were aware that the School promoted its unified structure, however, they were also very aware of the separation between languages. This was not regarded as an issue by the students who suggested that it was necessary to accept the fundamental differences between the languages and their associated cultures. Indeed, they considered that they would continue to identify strongly with the particular languages they were studying. Staff expressed the view that it was useful when students highlighted differences as it prompted reflection and an opportunity to explain the reasoning behind different approaches or to address them where issues were raised.

Management structures

The Review Panel recommends that the School review its management structure with a view to sharing responsibilities while maintaining the benefits of the unified structure.

5.3 The Panel noted from the staff survey that there was some lack of clarity regarding line management. Officially, the Head of School had line management responsibility for all staff but clearly that was not workable given the number of staff involved. The Head of School agreed and reported that he had the matter under consideration but needed more time in his role before deciding what the best line management structure would be. He was concerned that the wrong move could damage the unified structure of the School.

5.4 The staff who met with the Panel reported that academic roles in the School were difficult to map onto the standard University School structures particularly with there being no subject level management. They were unanimously supportive of the School as a coherent unit and considered that the unified structure had been good for academic collaboration but saw a need for some kind of sub-structure to spread the responsibility for driving forward work currently sitting with key individuals such as the Learning and Teaching Convener.

5.5 The Panel agreed that the unified structure and strong sense of collegiality across the School was important and should be maintained but also formed the view that there was a significant amount of, perhaps unnecessary, activity "to make things work" where there was a poor fit with the standard university models/structures and

processes. All parties agreed that there must be detailed consultation with all stakeholders before any change was initiated.

English for Academic Study – Administrative Support

> The Review Panel recommends that the School discuss what support might be offered centrally for the administration of pre-sessional and other English for Academic Study courses with the recently restructured Student and Academic Services.

5.6 The Panel noted the dual role of English for Academic Study (EAS) in providing pre-sessional and in-sessional courses to the wider university community. It was agreed that the School's provision in EAS made a significant contribution to supporting international students across the University. As the pre-sessional courses were the first experience of the University of Glasgow for many students, it was important that they were effective, well organised and supported. However, the Panel noted that the timing of some of the courses meant that support from University Services had not been available and that the administrative burden of processes, such as registration, had had to be taken on by the School. The Panel regards this as less than ideal and encourages the School to investigate what alternative or additional support might be accessed from the recently restructured Student and Academic Services.

6. Enhancing the Student Experience

Student Engagement

6.1 The undergraduate students who met with the Panel acknowledged that mechanisms to provide feedback on their courses were in place. While responses to evaluations/feedback were usually provided, there was room for improvement with regard to closing the feedback loop.

6.2 The students who met with the Panel showed great willingness to be part of the design of their programmes. The sense that staff were listening and responding to their ideas reinforced this. This is a strength that the School should continue to develop.

Equality and Diversity

> The Review Panel commends the School's Gender Neutral Language Policy.

6.3 The Panel was impressed by the School's work on introducing gender neutral language across its documents, noting the additional achievement of doing this in several languages. The staff who met with the Panel reported that a student had raised the issue and that staff had found the challenge interesting. The development of the policy had also provided an additional learning opportunity through the students' involvement in the work and the wider discussion it prompted.

6.4 The SER explained that "the policy provides a framework for both discussion and application of new linguistic forms such as gender-neutral pronouns in the language classroom". The School is actively seeking feedback from staff and students on how the policy might be further developed, recognising that it is an important and current theme in language evolution and equality. The next step under consideration would be an audit of the range of authors that students are exposed to during their programmes

to determine whether there any issues need to be addressed around equality of representation.

Graduate Attributes

> The Review Panel commends the School for its continuing efforts to re-energise its specialised careers provision, using alumni and other strategies to demonstrate the variety of careers that are open to graduates of modern languages.

6.5 The Panel noted that the School held an SMLC Careers Week each year to encourage students' awareness of the full range of career routes open to students with expertise in languages. CV writing and Job search activities were being incorporated into courses across all the languages to ensure that all students had access.

6.6 The Panel also noted the School's willingness to respond to feedback received from students that generic careers events had not met their needs. The PGT students who met with the Panel reported that a Careers Adviser had attended one of their classes and had tailored her material to the needs of language students. The PGT students were aware that they would have access to the careers service up to two years post-graduation and were most reassured by this. They confirmed that they had been provided with advice and practice opportunities for writing job and other applications.

6.7 The Undergraduate students who met with the Panel perceived that careers events were aimed at Senior Honours students and suggested that these should be available for all students and could be conducted in the target language. There was agreement that careers events or discussions should be less focused on language teaching and should recognise the many skills acquired in the study of languages. The undergraduate students also reported that there had been no general discussion of further study options but good support had been provided when staff were approached directly. The Panel suggests that promotion of PGT programmes and other further study options could usefully be included in the School's careers/employability activities.

6.8 The SER reported that gaps in staffing since 2015 had made it difficult to maintain the full range of events offered by the School in previous years. Nevertheless, it was evident that the School was attending to graduate attributes and careers information and the Panel encourages the School to continue to develop this area. It was suggested that LEADS could assist by capturing video of events to maximise their value by making them available for ongoing use.

7. Enhancement in Learning and Teaching

7.1 Learning and Teaching

Residence Abroad

> The Review Panel recommends that the School review the support it provides for students, including Joint Honours students, undertaking a period of residence abroad, before departure, during the stay and on return. Full consultation with students should be central to informing enhancement in this area.

7.1.1 The Panel noted from the SER that the School had identified support for residence abroad as a priority for further enhancement and had carried out some student consultation to gather views. Two specific areas requiring attention had been identified by the School: support for those seeking independent work placements abroad and support in dealing with difficulties that might arise while abroad. The Panel

discussed the residence abroad experience with the group of undergraduate students who attended the review. The students were unanimous in their view that it was a valuable, though very challenging experience.

7.1.2 During discussion it became apparent that there was some variation in the students' perception of support provided by each of the language areas. Students studying Portuguese reported that they had felt very well supported. They had had contact with returning students before they left and had attended a general briefing event in first year. Other students would have welcomed additional peer to peer support/mentoring and information specific to their individual situation such as clear criteria for suitable work placements. The students would also have been reassured by opportunities to check in with the School during the period they were away.

7.1.3 The School notes in the SER that the language year abroad plays an important role in developing the attributes of resourcefulness, confidence and adaptability in students who participate in the experience. In preparation, students engage in independent guided investigation of a range of placement types. One of the options is to undertake a work placement which can be organised independently by the student themselves. The undergraduate students who met with Panel felt this was an extremely challenging option and that the challenge of travelling and living aboard was enough for most. The School was aware that students would appreciate more systematic support with organising work placements however this would be difficult to put in place without additional resource.

7.1.4 The Panel concluded that there was scope for improving the support provided for residence abroad in terms of communications, maintaining contact, peer support and risk assessment. The Panel and the students agreed that they should not be "hand-held" but were concerned that the School must be able to exercise its duty of care effectively and to ensure students had ready access to help and reassurance when and if required.

7.1.5 Additionally, the Panel heard that the third term aboard for Joint Honours students was particularly stressful to fit around work commitments and there were issues around finding accommodation for part of the session. The Panel suggests that the School include specific consideration of the experience of Joint Honours students as part of this recommendation [see paragraph 7.2.5].

Intended Learning Outcomes and their communication via Moodle

> The Review Panel recommends that the School ensures that all course Moodles apply the new "Moodle Minimum" standards and works towards all course Moodles being as consistent as possible with its best examples in the terms of the materials provided and the format.

7.1.6 In discussion of Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs), the undergraduate students who met with the Panel confirmed that they were aware of the purpose of ILOs and had been able to find and understand those that related to their courses. They were less convinced that students actively engaged with ILOs and used them throughout the year. The Panel reminds the School that ILOs should be part of induction, should be placed prominently and in a consistent location on all course Moodles. Students should be reminded to consult the ILOs prior to assessments.

7.1.7 Further to the communication of ILOs, the undergraduate students who met with the Panel reported that there were other inconsistencies in course Moodles. The majority were considered helpful but a small number stood out in contrast that were not regularly updated and thought to be disorganised. The students favoured Moodles where materials were made available in advance, reading lists were up to date, and ILOs were clearly placed. The Panel noted that there was reliance on Moodle for

provision of material within the School and concluded that inconsistencies could have an impact on learning and should, therefore, be addressed.

7.1.8 The Panel noted that the School had developed a Moodle checklist prior to the introduction of the 'Moodle Minimum' guidelines from the SRC and was actively encouraging staff to consider presentation of their Moodle sites. The School agreed that some further harmonisation might be useful to facilitate navigation in light of student feedback requesting some form of introduction to using Moodle for new students.

Technology Enhanced Learning and Teaching

> The Review Panel recommends that the School seek to address technical issues affecting the use of TRADOS Software and consider extending provision for intermediate and advanced users.

7.1.9 The SER reported that the MSc Translation Studies was strongly focussed on professional skills. As part of this, students had the opportunity to gain a qualification in SDL Trados computer-assisted translation software which is widely used in the translation industry. The PGT students who met with the Panel and who had experienced this, welcomed it. They noted it was a short course and that they would have appreciated follow up opportunities at intermediate or advanced level. The PGT students also reported that recurring technical problems had disrupted teaching.

Blended and Online Learning

7.1.10 The School had identified Blended and Online Learning development as an area for future work but acknowledged that significant investment was needed. There had been uneven interest in adoption so far which was attributed to different cultures in the different languages areas. At the time of the Review visit, the School had received funding from the University's BOLD initiative and had created TEAP Online aimed at teachers of English around the world. This was a free standing, income generating course which also provided an opportunity to develop expertise in blended and online learning. The Panel was pleased that the staff, GTAs and NLTs that they met were interested in blended learning and digital technologies and agreed that there was scope for the School to do more. The Panel also noted that staff were unclear about the relative priority that blended and online provision had in the School strategy and concluded that reprioritisation would be required for additional effort to be directed to more of this work. [See paragraphs 4.1-3]

7.2 Assessment and Feedback

Range of Assessment Methods

> The Review Panel commends the wide range of assessment activities used by the School, including many formative opportunities.

7.2.1 The Panel noted from the SER that the School has been consciously diversifying the range of assessment methods used in its programmes since 2014. Assessment methods currently in use include, for example: audio/video comprehension and summary exercises; grammar and vocabulary exercises; composition and translation; and Moodle quizzes. Spoken language is assessed by short oral presentations; short passages read aloud for pronunciation; topic-led discussion; summary and discussion of press articles; role-play and small group discussion. The Panel was impressed by the School's focus on providing students with opportunities for formative assessment

which also facilitated its aim to provide consistent, quality feedback to students (see also paragraph 7.2.6).

7.2.2 The choice of assessment method used in each course is devolved to the Course Convener and, while the Panel agree this was a sensible approach, students reported that each language area had a different range of speaking/writing assessment tasks. It was reported that a review of Honours Language Assessment had been initiated to address issues including this. The Review was specific to honours language assessment and would look at the tasks being used and endeavour to achieve a balance across junior and senior honours years. It would ensure a variety of tasks were available to choose from in order that students could develop and demonstrate different skills and strengths. The Language Co-ordinator was holding focus groups and surveys to obtain student input. The Panel encouraged the Honours Review team also to consider how assessment at Level 1 and 2 prepared the students for success in these honours assessment tasks.

7.2.3 The PGT students who met with the Panel agreed that there was a good range of assessments and agreed that these were appropriate for their courses. The SER reported that the assessment patterns for both PGT programmes were purposefully designed to allow staged development of skills and formative feedback. The PGT students did point out, however, that the assessment for one course was 100% on an essay. They subsequently confirmed that various preparation tasks had been required in advance of submitting this piece of work, including essay plans and progress reviews. Overall, the PGT students enjoyed the variety of assessment and the different structures of assessment in each course.

7.2.4 The Panel noted from the SER that there was close co-operation between the subject areas to arrange the timing of assessments to stagger dates for those studying in two languages. The School takes an overview of proposed submission dates and endeavours to balance the assessment load for students. The School has also demonstrated flexibility in the setting of deadlines for assessment in response to student feedback.

7.2.5 A further issue under discussion in the School relating to assessment is the spread of assessment between Junior and Senior Honours. Currently there is no assessment of language competence in Junior Honours for reasons of fairness and equal opportunity for Joint Honours students of two languages who do not spend a period of residence in a country of their second language until the end of Junior Honours. The School acknowledges student concerns regarding the pressure this puts on their Senior Honours year and is considering alternative arrangements.

Feedback on Assessment

> The Review Panel commends the School's approach to formative assessment and the promptness with which feedback is returned enabling students to make effective use of it.

7.2.6 The Panel noted from the SER that the School's approach to formative assessment provides regular opportunities for students to receive feedback. There is a one week turnaround on formative language work at non-honours and general feedback on common errors is given in class, either verbally or as printed handout. An online feedback system has been introduced for oral exams which streamlines the process and allows timely return. The SER describes a number of other enhancements to feedback processes that aim to promote good practice and consistent quality of feedback. The SER also quotes praise for the School's feedback from External Examiners and from students. These improvements can be seen in the School's NSS scores for the assessment and feedback questions but the Panel recognises that it can

take some time for these gains to be consolidated against annual fluctuations and to be reflected in improved overall satisfaction scores.

7.2.7 The PGT students who met with the Panel described the School's feedback system as providing useful feedback more promptly than other schools that they had experienced. The feedback was thorough, and staff were willing to discuss their comments and provide advice on improving. There was some understandable variation depending on the type of assessment, but this was not considered problematic.

Feedback Action Tracker

> The Review Panel commends the School's work, in partnership with students, in introducing a Feedback Action Tracker to encourage students to actively engage with feedback.

7.2.8 The SER reported that the School had developed a Feedback Action Tracker for students to complete in order to encourage them to identify key areas for improving their performance and to engage more actively with feedback by recording how they intended to act on it. The School had initially introduced this for students working on dissertations to record their reflection between supervision meetings. There had since been a limited roll out to the Beginners French class to test the usefulness of the tracker form in language courses between assessments. The staff who met with the Panel reported that feedback from students on the Tracker indicated that they were very happy with the form. Conversations with students about its development and how it should be embedded would continue. The Panel praised the School's approach to involving students in the co-creation of the Feedback Action Tracker.

7.3 Resources for Learning and Teaching (staffing and physical)

Access to Learning Materials

> The Review Panel recommends that the School, in consultation with the University Library, review resources available to the School's PGT community to ensure all students are able to access relevant material at the appropriate time in their programme.

7.3.1 The PGT Students who met with the Panel reported that they had experienced difficulty in accessing some 'in-demand' texts and that the University Library would only request second copies where no online option was available. They pointed out that some students found using online sources for extended periods to be problematic. The PGT students explained to the Panel that, in response to feedback, some course leaders had recommended alternative sources via Moodle or other online method and that some had provided extra exercises which were useful, such as watching music, videos and documentaries for practice. The PGT students reported that the different approaches used by course co-ordinators could make it difficult to manage their study as they had to vary their study methods for each course. The Panel suggests that the School consider whether some consistency might be usefully applied to ensure that the necessary material is accessible to all students when required.

7.4 Engaging and Supporting Staff

Promotion for Grade 6 Teaching Staff

> The Review Panel recommends that the University develops guidance on the promotion pathways to enable Grade 6 teaching staff to progress their careers. In addition, the School

should consider whether other reported barriers to promotion are a matter of workload or are more systemic, requiring change in the School's structures or approaches.

7.4.1 The Panel noted that staff involved in English for Academic Study (EAS) provision were exclusively LTS track with a majority being employed at Grade 6. The Panel heard that the use of Grade 6 appointments in these roles was historical and related to the previous structure and position of the Language Centre. Having no precedent to guide the establishment of an academic unit from a service department, the School was proceeding with the aim to fully integrate the staff by moving them onto mainstream academic contracts where possible. The School pointed out that Grade 6 LTS staff were not represented in the job family profiles and therefore clear promotion pathways were not set out. The Panel agreed with the School that these colleagues had a great deal of expertise in language teaching practice to contribute and should have access to promotion.

7.4.2 The Head of School further informed the Panel that those teaching on non-credit bearing provision had a higher teaching load and thus had less time to engage in the scholarship required to open up promotion prospects. There was an additional issue for EAS staff whose teaching commitments continued throughout the year denying them the space to engage in scholarship over the summer break as those teaching on mainstream undergraduate programmes would be able to. The Panel asks the School to consider whether these barriers are a matter of workload or are more systemic, requiring change in the School's structures or approaches.

Workload Model

The Review Panel recommends that the School, in consultation with College, ensure that their operation of the Workload Model is as effective as possible and is fully transparent to staff.

7.4.3 The staff who met with the Panel expressed the view that the College Workload Model did not work well for them. They explained that the mode of teaching in languages was very intensive, especially at lower levels, and that they found that their loads were not fully recognised. The College Workload Model allocated notional workload hours based on student FTE with a lecture hour attracting significantly greater workload than a seminar or language class. This did not seem to capture effectively the load involved in delivering subjects with small classes and intensive delivery, such as languages. The additional workload involved in managing larger teaching teams and the scale up in marking were also not thought to be fully accounted for. Staff noted that if they were not able to fully express their roles, it would be difficult to make a case for additional staff.

7.4.4 In the Early Career Staff/English for Academic Study (EAS) staff meeting, staff reported that they felt supported in their teaching but had little or no space for scholarship or research. It was reported that there was a 10% allocation in the workload model for scholarship compared to 30% for research. Staff felt that it was not possible to produce output of the quality required for promotion in this proportion of time. The Panel reported to the Head of School on the inequities in the workload model as perceived by staff, and suggested that the School management open up discussion of the workload model with staff. Effort should be made to either demonstrate the model's suitability or to address the discrepancies. The Head of School acknowledged that staff were unhappy with the workload model and reported that he was working to resolve the issues and to ensure the model was as transparent as possible. He agreed to hold meetings with the staff on each programme.

7.4.5 Separately, staff highlighted very limited opportunity for sabbatical and research leave where programmes relied on a small number of staff, eg MLitt Comparative Literature which has been managed by 2 members of staff since 2004. Planned research leave should be incorporated into discussions on workload modelling.

Early career support

> The Review Panel recommends that Central/College Human Resources, with reference to the Learning Enhancement and Academic Development Service where it relates to the PGCAP, should review the process for recognition of prior experience in the requirements for the Early Career Development Programme participation. The Panel suggests that this work begin in the School of Modern Languages and Cultures with a view to developing a University-wide process.

7.4.6 The Panel met with a number of early career staff and discussed their experience of the University's Early Career Development Programme (ECDP). There was general agreement that they had looked forward to the opportunity to participate when they were appointed but it had not lived up to their expectations in some respects. Examples were given such as mentoring which would have been welcomed but had not happened. Formal allocation of time to complete the programme had been offered by the School but had been difficult to take in practise, particularly in small areas that did not have resources or staff numbers to cover teaching. The Panel was concerned that some of the group did not appear to have been aware of the entitlement to time or that PGCAP participation should be included in the workload model. The Panel discussed the ECDP with the Head of School and was pleased to hear that the School was committed to supporting early career staff. The Panel encouraged the School management to communicate that message to all staff and to ensure that early career staff were actually able to benefit from any workload allowances offered.

7.4.7 The Panel also heard that some individuals had been required to participate in ECDP despite having in excess of 5 years experience as an academic in other institutions. The Panel agreed that the programme could have less value in such cases and that there should be a process by which prior experience might be taken into account. The Panel's view was that any exceptions should be agreed on an individual basis and only on request of the individual concerned.

Graduate Teaching Assistants/Native Language Teachers

7.4.8 The GTAs/NLTs who met with the Panel confirmed that they had attended compulsory training and were generally well supported by the School. They would welcome more opportunities for shadowing and peer observation to learn from experienced colleagues. Staff encouraged GTAs to participate in the Recognising Excellent Teaching (RET) Programme offered through LEADS but noted that this had an adverse impact on lecturers by reducing the availability of GTAs/NLTs. Staff who met with the Panel confirmed that hourly paid staff were not paid to attend CPD sessions and that, while some did attend, there was a general view that it would become more common if funds were available to pay for the time. The School subsequently informed the Panel that there was some budgetary provision for hourly-paid staff to participate CPD and to be recompensed for their time but it was accepted that the communication of its availability could be improved.

> The Panel recommends that the School review the contractual arrangements for GTAs and NLTs with reference to the University's extended workforce policy[3]

---

[3] https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/humanresources/mgrs-admin/extended/

7.4.9 The Panel heard from some of the GTAs and NLTs that they met, that they were not officially contracted during the summer to do marking but that they continued to carry out this work, claiming payment in October when they were re-activated on HR systems. As well as the personal inconvenience, the interruption to length of service was damaging to career progression and prevented access to the pay increments that would give some recognition to more experienced individuals. The SER at paragraph 7.1.7 expresses the intention to reduce "the School's reliance on hourly paid staff". The GTAs and Native Language Teachers (NLTs) who met with the Panel were, understandably somewhat concerned by this. The Panel understood the School's aim was to move towards more secure contracts and suggests some clarification and reassurance on this point should be given by the School. The Convener of the Panel reported that the University Human Resources Team was currently reviewing the GTA contract with a view to addressing these points. The outcome of that work should be helpful for the School and the School was encouraged to work with HR on this issue.

8.   Academic Standards

8.1   The Review Panel considered that the School had a variety of robust and effective procedures in place which ensure that the School was engaged in a continual process of self-reflection and self-evaluation with regard to academic and pedagogical practice.

8.2   The Review Panel established from the Self-Evaluation Report and the supporting documents that the School was operating effective quality enhancement processes in line with University policy and practice.

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

9.   Collaborative provision

9.1   In September 2017, the School launched the MSc Translation Studies: Translation and Professional Practice (Glasgow-Nankai). The programme operates within the framework of the Glasgow-Nankai Joint Graduate School (JGS) and aims to increase and internationalise the School's PG recruitment, and contribute to the University's goal of growing the delivery of sustainable high quality TNE through the JGS.

9.2   The Head of School noted that there had been high expectations of recruitment to the joint degree programme with Nankai and that actual performance had been disappointing. There were currently 9 students enrolled. The School was continuing to work on improving recruitment but found that running the programme was heavily bureaucratic and diverting administration resources away from local programmes. The Head of School expressed concerns regarding future sustainability, suggesting that contributing language elements to other existing programmes at Nankai might be a way to continue the School's involvement.

Appendix 1 Summary of Commendations and Recommendations

Commendations

The Review Panel commends the School of Modern Languages and Cultures on the following, which are listed **in order of appearance** in this report:

Commendation 1

The Review Panel commends the collective success of the School and its staff in forming a unified School from separate units. While there is still work to do in terms of individual procedures, much progress has been made establishing a strong community ethos. [Paragraph 5.1-2]

Commendation 2

The Review Panel commends the School's Gender Neutral Language Policy. [Paragraph 6.3-4]

Commendation 3

The Review Panel commends the School for its continuing efforts to re-energise its specialised careers provision, using alumni and other strategies to demonstrate the variety of careers that are open to graduates of modern languages. [Paragraph 6.5-8]

Commendation 4

The Review Panel commends the wide range of assessment activities used by the School, including many formative opportunities. [Paragraph 7.2.1-5]

Commendation 5

The Review Panel commends the School's approach to formative assessment and the promptness with which feedback is returned enabling students to make effective use of it. [Paragraph 7.2.6-7]

Commendation 6

The Review Panel commends the School's work, in partnership with students, in introducing a Feedback Action Tracker to encourage students to actively engage with feedback. [Paragraph 7.2.8]

Recommendations

The following recommendations have been made to support the School of Modern Languages and Cultures 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**.

Strategy

Recommendation 1

The Review Panel recommends that the School articulates its strategic priorities in a clear School Strategic Plan in order to derive the full benefit from current and planned collective activities and effort and to maximise progress in relation to learning and teaching. [paragraph 4.1-3]

For the attention of: Head of School

Management

Recommendation 2

The Review Panel recommends that the School review its management structure with a view to sharing responsibilities while maintaining the benefits of the unified structure. [paragraph 5.3-4]

For the attention of: Head of School

Recommendation 3

The Review Panel recommends that the School discuss what support might be offered centrally for the administration of pre-sessional and other English for Academic Study courses with the recently restructured Student and Academic Services. [paragraph 5.6]

For the attention of: Head of School and Head of English for Academic Study
For information: Executive Director of Student and Academic Services

Student support

Recommendation 4

The Review Panel recommends that the School review the support it provides for students, including Joint Honours students, undertaking a period of residence abroad, before departure, during the stay and on return. Full consultation with students should be central to informing enhancement in this area. [paragraph 7.1.1-5]

For the attention of: Head of School and Director of Learning & Teaching

Recommendation 5

The Review Panel recommends that the School ensures that all course Moodles apply the new "Moodle Minimum" standards and works towards all course Moodles being as consistent as possible with its best examples in the terms of the materials provided and the format. [paragraph 7.1.6-8]

For the attention of: Head of School and Director of Learning & Teaching

Recommendation 6

The Review Panel recommends that the School seek to address technical issues affecting the use of TRADOS Software and consider extending provision for intermediate and advanced users. [paragraph 7.1.9]

For the attention of: Head of School

Recommendation 7

The Review Panel recommends that the School, in consultation with the University Library, review resources available to the School's PGT community to ensure all students are able to access relevant material at the appropriate time in their programme. [paragraph 7.3.1]

For the attention of: Head of School
For information: University Librarian

Staff support

Recommendation 8

The Review Panel recommends that the University develops guidance on the promotion pathways to enable Grade 6 teaching staff to progress their careers. In addition, the School should consider whether other reported barriers to promotion are

a matter of workload or are more systemic, requiring change in the School's structures or approaches. [paragraph 7.4.1-2]

For the attention of: Convener of Recognising Excellence in Teaching Working Group/ Head of School
For information: Director of Human Resources

Recommendation 9

The Review Panel recommends that the School, in consultation with College, ensure that their operation of the Workload Model is as effective as possible and is fully transparent to staff. [paragraph 7.4.3-5]

For the attention of: Head of School
For information: Head of School Administration and Head of College HR

Recommendation 10

The Review Panel recommends Central/College Human Resources, with reference to the Learning Enhancement and Academic Development Service where it relates to the PGCAP, should review the process for recognition of prior experience in the requirements for the Early Career Development Programme participation. The Panel suggests that this work begin in the School of Modern Languages and Cultures with a view to developing a University-wide process. [paragraph 7.4.6-7]

For the attention of: Director of Human Resources
For information: Director of Learning Enhancement and Academic Development Service