University of Glasgow

Follow-up Report to the Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR)

September 2020

Preface

One year after publication of their ELIR Outcome and Technical Reports, institutions are asked to submit a Follow-up Report to QAA Scotland. These reports are also submitted to the Scottish Funding Council. Follow-up Reports are written in the institution's own words and require to be endorsed by the institution's Governing Body prior to publication on the QAA website. Guidance on the content and structure is provided by QAA Scotland.

Institutions are asked to focus on the action they have taken since the review and to include an indication of the effectiveness of that action. ELIR reports highlight positive practice as well as areas for development, and institutions are encouraged to comment on key areas of activity relating to good practice that they have prioritised since the ELIR.

Follow-up Reports are discussed with institutions as part of the ELIR annual discussion meetings.

University of Glasgow

Court: 30 September 2020

2019 Enhancement-Led Institutional Review (ELIR 4) - Follow Up Report – July 2020

Ms Helen Butcher, Senate Office

Introduction

The University's latest ELIR was held in early 2019 by the Quality Assurance Agency Scotland (QAAS) within the Scottish Quality Enhancement Framework's fourth ELIR cycle. There were six recommendations for the University noted in the ELIR outcome and the Technical Report was published in July 2019.

The focus of the Follow-up report will be on the University's reflection and response to the recommendations which has taken place though various strands of activity. Information on developments associated with the commendations made in the ELIR outcome will also be provided.

Progress in responding to Recommendations

In early March 2020 a report was compiled for the University providing an update on progress in responding to the ELIR recommendations; this identified activity to date and also outlined next steps. Very shortly after this, there was significant disruption to the University's normal activity in delivery of learning, teaching and assessment, and in strategic and policy development due to the Covid-19 pandemic. Our focus across the institution was to prioritise a rapid response to the challenges of national lockdown and requirements for social/physical distancing on campus both before and after lockdown. Since March 2020, working with the Students' Representative Council (SRC), the University has had to prioritise the following activity in order to preserve the quality of the student experience and to respond appropriately and compassionately to the far-reaching consequences of the pandemic:

- Ensure completion of delivery of learning and teaching for academic year 2019-20 by offering online/remote tuition;
- Ensure completion of assessment for the academic year 2019-20 by transferring on campus examinations to online assessment. A total of 40,711 exam incidents (individual sittings) scheduled for the 2020 April/May assessment diet were offered online instead of on campus. [In order to manage such a significant transition, priority was given to postgraduate students, and all honours and final year students at undergraduate level meaning that many first and second year student assessments for the diet were cancelled unless subject to professional requirements];
- Introduction of revised assessment and degree regulations in order to recognise the disruption caused by the pandemic (including the disruption to first and second year assessments). The main element being the introduction of a comprehensive No Detriment Policy to be applied to assessments taken during academic year 2019-20.
- Preparation for academic year 2020-21 prioritising safety for all members of the University community: conversion of academic delivery to a blend of online/remote and face to face delivery with capacity to transfer fully to online delivery in case of further lockdown. Re-structuring of the academic year to allow staggered starts for

postgraduate taught degree programmes to meet student demand, particularly the international student cohort.
- Revision to quality assurance arrangements in the context of the pandemic and the need to rapidly revise delivery of learning, teaching, and assessment.

As a result, other activity has been severely compromised in the meantime; this has also affected planned development in response to the ELIR recommendations. The following outlines the current status in our reflection and response to the six recommendations.

Recommendation 1
Feedback on assessment – Ensure that staff communicate consistently to students where the stated institutional policy expectations relating to marking turnaround time will not be met. This is in the context of the University carrying out a range of positive work to improve its assessment practice. Refer to paragraphs 53 - 58 of Technical Report.

Activity to date:

This recommendation has been fed into the World Changing Glasgow Assessment & Feedback Transformation Project (AFTP). Separately, the scoping work in the Project has also identified the need for clear information on all aspects of assessment timelines, including feedback schedules and communications for students, as a key user requirement. This is also recognised best practice in the sector. The AFTP will therefore build this requirement into its policy and system developments. One of the key outputs anticipated from the Project is a new assessment management facility, which it is anticipated will include assessment and feedback timeline management within its processes and will thus provide a consistent approach for the University in assessment feedback communications with students.

In the meantime, there is ongoing activity in some Colleges and Schools in the use of Assessment & Feedback Calendars which support students in the tracking of assessment submissions and feedback. They are actively pursuing the development of a standardised approach - linked into the wider AFTP – in the hope that short-term gains can be identified, and where that proves to be the case, a Calendar will be rolled out in advance of some of the wider systems and practice changes.

The former SRC Vice-President Education (now SRC President) has also undertaken some focus group work with students with the aim of improving students' understanding of the University's policy on marking turnaround which is intended to help improve understanding and accurate expectations around feedback timelines among the student body. This work has targeted students in two subjects which had scored less well in the NSS ranking on assessment and feedback. Unfortunately, some focus groups were disrupted by the Covid-19 pandemic. Parallel focus groups were also held with staff in the same subjects to see where student and staff opinion differed, with the intent of highlighting differences in expectations and allowing improvements to be made in these areas. The focus group responses have been presented to the subjects and it has been suggested to them that further work could be undertaken to enhance assessment and feedback through application to the University's Learning & Teaching Development Fund (LTDF) Student-Staff Partnership Scheme.

Next steps:

It is anticipated that full implementation of the recommendation will be achieved through the outputs of the AFTP, and therefore further updates and detail will be

provided as the Project progresses and decisions are taken in the selection and implementation of a new curriculum management facility for the University. This will take place during a later phase of the project when the specific elements around assessment management are implemented in the new system. Following revision to priorities as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic, this work is now scheduled to commence in autumn 2021. The University is, however, accelerating some investments in online exams and marking, plus the creation of a student portal to view assessment and assessment grades, that will support to some extent our efforts to meet the desired marking turnaround times and these will be piloted during session 2020-21. Thus while timelines have been affected by the pandemic, some of the transformation work is continuing in the meantime.

Recommendation 2
Advising for postgraduate taught students – In view of differing models operating across the colleges, make certain that arrangements in place for advising postgraduate taught students are communicated clearly to students, in particular, identifying each student's designated advisor/advisory team at an early stage as well as outlining the advisor role and responsibilities. Refer to paragraph 78 of Technical Report.

Activity to date:

PGT Advising procedures are under review in a number of areas, for example in the College of Arts a new Arts Advising Manager is being appointed and the Undergraduate advising team will be expanded to include support for PGT students allowing College-wide co-ordination of PGT advising; in the College of Social Sciences there are two new dedicated advising posts in the Adam Smith Business School which are PGT focussed. In addition, new Student Support Officer Roles generated from the Student & Academic Services Directorate have been introduced in a number of areas of the University e.g. the Schools of Computing Science, and Interdisciplinary Studies, and these will have an impact on PGT advising as they are designed to provide first line support to UG and PGT students with signposting to specialist services including academic advisers, ensuring that students receive seamless support when they need it. There is also good established practice in other areas, for example within the College of Science and Engineering each School has at least one Senior Advisor (larger Schools have more) and some schools have Advising concentrated in a subset of staff, while others spread the load across all staff.

Next steps:

Some co-ordination activity is required to link into local PGT advising systems to ensure that in all models, the process includes clear information to students, from the outset, on the advisory support available to them, including contact details for their designated advisor/advisory team. This is particularly the case where students study across Schools and Colleges whilst undertaking their PGT programme. The Chief Advisers of Studies Committee (CASC) is a forum which meets at least three times per session and will take an overview of this activity.

Given the evolving but varied approach to PGT student support and advising, the University recognises the need to conduct some analysis and evaluation of the impact of the revised arrangements, for example the introduction of the Student Support Officer roles.

Recommendation 3

Annual monitoring of the postgraduate research student experience – Ensure that the postgraduate research student experience is monitored systematically, in a manner equivalent to the University's taught provision. This should enable the University to have an overview of the totality of the postgraduate research student experience including student progression, student feedback, and student engagement with training and research skills provision. See paragraphs 117 and 148 of the Technical Report.

Consideration of this recommendation sits in a wider context of development activity we are undertaking to improve systematically our understanding of the PGR experience. We are commencing more detailed scrutiny of the data from the Postgraduate Research Student Experience Survey (PRES) and have carried out development to enable better local review of data in the four Graduate Schools. An enhanced approach has also been developed for the provision of detailed data for each School and Research Institute and to support the production of REF Environment Statements; these data are being used to drive activity and highlight good practice. In addition, we have commenced a wholesale review of our PGR governance arrangements, including consideration of data and systems, with support being provided by the University's World Changing Glasgow Transformation team.

Activity to date:

Specific to this recommendation we have looked at current activity which is in place to monitor the PGR experience with a view to finding ways to gain a holistic oversight across the University. Current monitoring is conducted by the Deans of Graduate Studies (DoGS) Committee which takes an overview of matters relating to the PGR student experience and receives reports on a range of activity including:

- PRES outcomes: held every two years
- Demographic data for each Graduate School
- Graduate School Reviews (reports of internal reviews held on a three-yearly cycle)
- Analysis of centrally provided PGR student training for personal and professional development
- Feedback on themes and actions identified at the 'townhall' style meetings held once or twice per year for all staff and students with an interest in PGR

Further sources of feedback are also being pursued including:

i) a report on PGR student complaints identifying any trends from complaints received over the past year; and,

ii) the development of the Annual Progress Reviews workflow to be managed through MyCampus with the facility for students to comment on their experience, and also provide responses to set questions such as the frequency of supervision meetings.

Next steps:

A revised approach to annual reporting of PGR activity has been agreed. Information on the various activities which cover review and analysis of the PGR student experience will be brought together in an annual report which includes an overview for the University and identifies key themes, areas of good practice, and areas of development where actions have been identified which will lead to an enhancement of the student experience. The report will be agreed by the DoGS Committee and then submitted to the Student Experience Committee to provide an overview of the PGR student experience at University level and

allow the opportunity for alignment of any overlapping themes and actions relating to the student experience at both PGR and taught programme levels.

This new approach will be introduced in the forthcoming academic year and an annual report looking back on 2019-20 will be prepared for submission to the Student Experience Committee in November 2020.

There will also be further steps taken to strengthen links between PGR student representative feedback and the DoGS committee. The SRC President Elect has prioritised the PGR experience and PGR representation in his manifesto, so an emphasis on a more developed partnership approach working with the DoGS is anticipated. A mapping exercise has been completed by each of the Graduate Schools to provide an overview of the PGR Representation structures already in place. This highlighted areas of good practice which will inform future activity in identifying a preferred structure for PGR student representation. The SRC have held further discussions with each of the Graduate School Managers, and further meetings are planned with Directors of Postgraduate Research in Schools and Research Institutes, who work more closely with PGR students, and PGR Representatives themselves. These future meetings will provide greater insight into the role of PGR representatives and how this can be better supported and utilised by staff and students.

To improve oversight of and responsiveness to the PGR experience, the Vice Principal Research, took a paper to the Senor Management Group on 21st July 2020 seeking approval to introduce changes relating to all aspects noted here, and to PGR governance. The proposals – which address the issues raised in the ELIR – were approved for implementation in Session 2020-21.

Recommendation 4
Review of student-facing professional services – establish a systematic and timely mechanism to review the contribution of the professional support services to the quality of the student experience.

The Vice Principal (Learning & Teaching) has been in discussion with the Chief Operating Officer & University Secretary to consider the most appropriate approach to reviewing student-facing services. Following research to identify approaches taken by comparator institutions the University proposes to fulfil this recommendation by means of the approach described below.

Context

As noted in section123 of the ELIR Technical Report, the University has operated a system of cyclical reviews of individual service units since 2006 and this was suspended over the last two years during the restructuring of all services into eight large directorates. The value of the service by service approach has been reconsidered with a view to adopting an alternative model as a number of limitations were identified in relation to the original structure of periodic review, including: (i) the fixed nature of the cycle did not necessarily coincide with developments affecting the service concerned; ii) support functions that were considered not to be operating optimally might be delivered by more than one service unit and therefore review of problematic issues could be fragmented and not as efficient or well-targeted as they might be. Additionally, the six-year duration of the cycle increasingly does not match the pace, scale and nature of change to which the University has to respond. In practice, substantial and broad changes to student-facing services have been made much more frequently.

Approach now operating

In consequence, the University has developed an approach to monitoring service unit performance that involves a range of mechanisms, which are noted below. These activities conform to the key operating principles of the SFC guidance on Internally-led Review approach and thus involve:

- Significant student involvement, both in oversight and as sources of information on service quality
- An evidence-based approach, using a range of data sources and including external benchmarking
- External expertise through the involvement of 'critical friends'
- Processes of reflection in the context of institutional strategies, with reporting and follow-up and systematic oversight through the governance structure
- A clear focus on service enhancement

Specific activities undertaken include:

- Monitoring of performance – benchmarked against a range of comparators
- Internal audit programme (cross-cutting, thematic and shaped by strategic priorities). Recent examples have included student mental health support, student feedback, admissions and safeguarding.
- Thematic reviews – eg, an externally-led review of disability and counselling/psychological student support
- Initiatives (that typically cut across both central services and support provided in our Schools) in pursuit of delivery of the University Strategic Plan and, notably, the Learning & Teaching Strategy.
- Reorganisation of all University services in 2017 and continuing more local restructurings
- Retention of individual unit reviews where appropriate

In addition, the University has embarked on a large-scale strategic transformational change programme – World-changing Glasgow (WCG). This programme includes a range of projects of varying dimensions intended to improve the student and staff experience. Large transformation projects that impact directly and significantly on the student experience include: Assessment and Feedback; Forecasting and Enrolment; and the Professional Services Transformation project. The WCG programme is supported by a specifically recruited team of project managers and colleagues seconded from across the University. Projects are evidence-based, self-evaluative and systematically include student involvement in their oversight.

Other inputs to the evidence base for monitoring and reviewing service provision include all-student and all-staff satisfaction surveys and systematic learning from complaints.

For the remainder of 2020, review will activity will focus on support for disabled students, and further details of our plans to operationalise reviews from September 2021 will be developed during the autumn once the new appointment of Deputy Secretary & Director of Planning has been made. We will therefore provide an update to QAA during Semester 1 with further details of the proposed activity for 2021-22 and beyond.

Governance of service review

The governance of the approach to student-facing service review involves appropriate externality in decision-making and a network of checks and balances. Service provision is

mainly overseen by the Professional Services Group (PSG), chaired by the University Chief Operating Officer and comprising the Executive Directors of service areas and the four College Directors of Professional Services. PSG will therefore set the agenda for review activity which focuses on the quality of the student experience in the delivery of services. On an annual basis PSG will determine the priorities for review, identifying themes and specific areas for review, as well as the nature of review activities to be undertaken each academic year and will receive output reports on these which will also be shared with the Student Experience Committee.

PSG is accountable to the University Senior Management Group, which itself is accountable to the University Court and supports the academic activity of the University, in this working with Senate. SMG members convene the main committees of Senate, including Education Policy and Strategy. The Student Experience Committee is co-convened by the Chief Operating Officer and President of the Students' Representative Council and reports to Court as well as Senate. SMG also systematically receives internal audit reports and directly commissions service review activity. The World-changing Glasgow programme includes individual project boards which report to an overall Executive Board convened by the Senior Vice-Principal which itself reports to Court.

Annual Report to the Scottish Funding Council

For the purposes of annual reporting to the Funding Council, the University would propose to provide reports from service and thematic reviews, relevant outputs from activity carried out under the Learning & Teaching Strategy and reports on relevant outcomes from WCG projects.

It is the view of the University that the approach to service review which has been developed is faithful to the principles of ILR and the Quality Enhancement Framework more widely as well as principles of good governance. It provides the level of flexibility necessary to maintain service development while ensuring there is comprehensive reflection on effectiveness.

Recommendation 5

External examiner reports – Make external examiners' reports accessible to students in order to give them the opportunity to engage in discussion and consideration of this element of the assessment process.

Activity to date:

External Examiner reports have been published online since 2012-13 and have been available to students. However, it is accepted that the reports are not particularly easy to locate, so the following steps have been taken to improve the accessibility of this information for students.

1. Awareness raising of the External Examiner reports on the Student Representation toolkit which was introduced in September 2019. This includes links to the External Examiner reports in the section entitled 'Taking the Extra Step' which guides student representatives to the various sources of information available to them. It notes that External Examiner reports make suggestions for improvement which Schools will take forward and are therefore a useful resource for student representatives to use when engaging with their School.

2. The webpage which provides access to the External Examiner reports has been revised to include some explanatory text on the role and purpose of External Examiners in terms of quality assurance and enhancement to aid students' understanding of how their work relates to the student experience.
3. There has been dialogue with the University web team to consider the possibility of linking the External Examiner report information at a high level on the University's 'My Glasgow Students' webpages, and while an appropriate permanent location was not found within this space, there will be a link to the External Examiner Reports on the My Glasgow Students website during examination periods when student-facing exam communications are online to ensure increased visibility. Additional links have also been inserted from the general Assessment pages on the Senate Office website.

Next steps:

As part of a wider initiative in web design, there will be further development of the webpages for Academic Services and the Senate Office to offer improved accessibility of information. This will identify information aimed at staff, students and other stakeholders and will also present information in a more coherent way to allow improved searching where users can find information on the basis of subject or topic rather than by association to the particular University unit responsible for the content.

There will be further activity to remind Schools systematically of the need to report on actions and improvements arising from External Examiner reports and to ensure that students are kept in this loop, for example through dialogue at Student-Staff Liaison Committees. This will also align to our planned development of the annual monitoring process.

Some wider work has been identified to review the current reporting process with a view to improving the collection and summarising of information provided by External Examiners in order to get a better understanding of the enhancement activity arising from External Examiner feedback and to improve dissemination of this information throughout the University, including to our students. Progress with this development has been impacted by priorities associated with the Covid-19 pandemic, and collation of External Examiners reports for session 2019-20 will include some focus on the impact of the pandemic and the University's response such as the move the online examinations and the No Detriment Policy.

Recommendation 6
Analysis of exam board decisions on discretion – Develop a systematic way of monitoring and analysing the use of discretion by examination boards in order to have a clear view of the effectiveness of these arrangements and to have clearer and more detailed information about the consistency with which this aspect of the assessment regulations is applied across the University.

Activity to date:

Implementation of this recommendation would require significant development of central systems to allow uniform capture of data on decisions made for students whose final overall Grade Point Average (GPA) for their award falls within the zone of discretion. Extensive system changes relating to assessment are already anticipated through the work of the World Changing Glasgow Assessment & Feedback Transformation Project (AFTP), and the design of these will be informed by this recommendation. However, given the scale of the

Assessment & Feedback Transformation Project, changes will not be implemented in the short-term.

Separately, the University decided to review its regulatory policy on the use of discretion in the award of degree classifications. In November 2019 the Academic Standards Committee agreed to take forward a University-wide consultation on the operation of discretion and rounding in the calculation of degree awards (minute ref: ASC/2019/20), and this consultation was rolled out with initial responses received in March 2020. The consultation sought views on taking an alternative approach in removing the current zones of discretion for final GPA scores and introducing hard borderlines instead, which could lead to a decision to remove discretion entirely. Although initial timescales for the review anticipated that some in-principle decisions would be made before the end of the current academic session (June 2020), this was disrupted by the re-prioritisation of activity in managing the Covid-19 pandemic and therefore this regulatory development work will be resumed as we proceed into the next academic session. However, in the context of Covid-19 through the No Detriment Policy there was a temporary adjustment to the application of discretion for 2019-20 as described in Appendix 5 of that policy. In the context of the revised approach to assessment overall in the No Detriment policy it was agreed that students with a final GPA between .5 and .9 in the zones of discretion would be automatically moved to the higher classification; and those between .1 and .4 cases could be referred to the Clerk of Senate for a decision on promotion. Such referrals were invited for cases where a student's particular profile of assessment indicated that they had not particularly benefitted from the application of the No Detriment Policy and, under normal circumstances, would have met the School's criteria for promotion to the higher classification.

Next steps:

Given the revised arrangements in 2019-20 associated with the Covid-19 pandemic, all students achieving a GPA between .5 and .9 in the zones of discretion will be automatically promoted for the remainder of the 2019-20 assessment cycle and all other cases of degree classification uplift will be recorded centrally given the requirement for approval by the Clerk of Senate. The application of discretion will therefore be monitored, and analysed through input to the ongoing policy review as noted below.

The policy review on the use of discretion will be resumed in academic session 2020-21 and will take into account the temporary revision to discretion arrangements invoked under the No Detriment Policy. If the conclusion of the review is to retain any form of discretion in our assessment regulations there will be two actions:

1) For the shorter-term: consider interim measures to allow the monitoring of application of discretion by Examination Boards which are likely to involve an element of manual reporting from Schools to Colleges and the University.
2) For the medium-term: submit a development request to the AFTP to ensure appropriate system development to allow data capture and reporting on discretionary decisions to allow oversight and analysis of this regulatory process.

Commentary on Commendations

The University was pleased to receive six commendations in the ELIR outcome and can provide the following updates on these areas of activity.

1 Student engagement and partnership - *a strong and productive relationship with the Students' Representative Council is evident, and the University has taken positive steps to engage the wider student body, both on formal committees and in the range of strategic*

projects underway. Students are clear that their contributions are valued and acted upon.

Our strong connection with the SRC was a real asset during the extremely challenging period in Semester 2 when the University was required to rapidly close down the campus in response to the national lockdown caused by the Covid-19 pandemic. This is illustrated through the following:

- The University worked closely with the SRC during lockdown to ensure appropriate support and communications with students during a period of great uncertainty. The rapid developments required to assessment delivery and policy were taken forward with substantial input from SRC representatives who were members of the our Covid-Ops Group which met several times a week to plan and implement delivery of assessment of these changes. The SRC officers also provided advice on key communications for students as these were drafted such as videos explaining the no-detriment policy and the way in which the GPA baseline calculations would operate.

- Student interns were employed and trained to support our 24-hour IT Helpdesk desk during the spring exam period. The 30 strong student intern team provided support rostered on 8 or 10 hour shifts, supporting students through 30-70 exams per day. The students provided excellent support, working in their own time zones and had phenomenal communication skills, reassuring students in a stressful situation. The Helpdesk was considered a huge success.

2 Strategic approach to widening access - *the University has a long-established strategic approach to widening access which it continues to develop through its engagement with a wide variety of stakeholders. Data and sector benchmarks are used effectively to underpin and inform the University's work in this area, which is helping students to succeed. Through its research-informed approach, the University is influencing the wider sector, for example, the University's 2016 Impact for Access Report includes findings which have informed Scottish Funding Council policy.*

The University has continued to make progress in this key area, working with the Scottish Government, Scottish Funding Council and Fair Access Commissioner to fulfil the aims of the Scottish Government's Commission on Widening Access (CoWA), which cited much of our work as sector-leading best practice. University staff are actively participating in several of the workstreams and working groups overseeing implementation of the CoWA recommendations, such as the Fair Access Framework, the formation of a national framework of bridging programmes and continued development of contextualised admissions and guaranteed offers to target groups.

We continue to increase and meet our Outcome Agreement targets for recruitment of residents of SIMD20 and SIMD40 postcode areas and those with care experience. To achieve this, we have further strengthened engagement in two key areas:
a) with school pupils and college learners, expanding our WP programmes to work with targeted pupils in all 161 west of Scotland secondary schools; and
b) with FE College partners, maintaining entrants via Access courses, but enhancing this with a newly created HNC Articulation Programme to increase direct entry routes to year 2 at Glasgow.

For professional degrees we have built on the success of our pre-medicine foundation year Glasgow Access Programme (GAP) in recruiting those from the most deprived SIMD20 postcode with increased funded places for GAP (from 20-25) and the University also won the award for Widening Access Initiative of the Year at the Herald HE awards.

Our contribution to the research and evidence base for widening access has continued, for example, with the publication of the final report of the Blueprint for Fairness in the Glasgow Region Project. This was a joint project involving west of Scotland universities, colleges and Glasgow City Council. The University provided 50% of the research team and membership of the steering group.

3 Approach to promoting equality and diversity - *in collaboration with the Students' Representative Council, the University has a pro-active approach to supporting the diverse needs of its student body. Equality Champions, recruited from the University's Senior Management Group, work effectively in conjunction with the Students' Representative Council and the Equality and Diversity Unit. Good progress is being made with equality outcomes across the University, in particular in the areas of mental health, LGBT and student parents and carers.*

A number of developments have been taken forward since the ELIR event including:

- Rolling out CPD training to staff as part of the internal Learning & Teaching Development Fund (LTDF) project *Embedding LGBT Equality in the Curriculum*.
- Approval of the Content Advice Guidelines for staff, in relation to graphic and/or explicit content in the curriculum.
- The implementation of the Digital Accessibility Guidelines, including purchasing Blackboard Ally, identifying prioritisation areas, awareness raising for staff through demonstrations and training.
- The development of an internal analysis tool to review all stages of the student journey including progression and attainment by protected characteristic groups.
- Working with students to develop and plan an event on Decolonising the Curriculum event – this was due for delivery in March 2020, but was postponed due to Covid-19.
- An analytics model has been developed in partnership between the Equality and Diversity Unit and Planning, Insights and Analysis (formerly Planning and Business Intelligence). Working with the VP Learning & Teaching, this model has focused primarily on developing insights into retention, progression, attainment and use of services across the student population according to a range of protected characteristics. Next steps are to do further work with admissions and to ensure that the insights from this model inform policy decisions taken at our Education, Policy and Strategy Committee (EdPSC).

4 Academic Writing Skills Programme - *building on an initiative from a Learning and Teaching Development Fund project, the University has developed a mandatory institution-wide course which aims to improve the academic writing skills of all taught students. In addition to the benefits expected from the programme itself, its implementation has led to increased student engagement with other academic support provided by the Learning Enhancement and Academic Development Service.*

AWSP has now run as a compulsory element for all incoming undergraduate and postgraduate taught students for two academic years. Student engagement rates have been beyond expectations, with over 96% of students completing the Programme each year. Following the diagnostic test approximately 1,000 students have gone on to participate in face-to-face AWSP classes each year. The programme has also provided a way of routing students onto the open support provision offered by LEADS with student numbers using these facilities increasing year-on-year. LEADS continue to expand, enhance and develop AWSP to meet the changing requirements of incoming students. Following developments to

support students pre-arrival, in particular those with later start dates during session 2020-21, AWSP will be taken earlier than usual by students and this will allow yet earlier identification of potential learning support and the ability for programme leaders to target that support very specifically where it is most needed.

5 Progress towards parity of esteem between teaching and research - *demonstrable progress has been made since the previous ELIR in reviewing and revising the University's career development pathways and promotions criteria for academic staff on its Learning, Teaching and Scholarship career track. In addition, this work has resulted in strengthening the learning and teaching component of its Research and Teaching career track. Through this activity, the University has made considerable progress in promoting the role of teaching and establishing parity of esteem between groups of staff.*

The outcomes of the current promotions round are yet to be completed but early indications are that there have been many successes on the LTS career track with several professorial appointments on the track. In addition, this is the first year in which staff on the R&T track are required to demonstrate Grade 9 in learning and teaching as a minimum, when they are applying for promotion to Grade 10 (professor).

6 Periodic Subject Review survey - *linked to its periodic subject review process, the University has introduced an anonymised survey for all staff within the area being reviewed. The survey allows staff to provide feedback on their experience of teaching, support for University of Glasgow teaching, cultural values associated with teaching and other activities undertaken in the area under review. The staff views are anonymised and communicated directly to the review panel as part of the preparation for the review. The survey draws on practice adopted in an international university network and has been welcomed as a positive initiative by staff and students alike.*

Following the first round of PSR events which included the staff survey, PSR Conveners were asked to review this element of the process. They agreed that the advance survey of staff had added value to subject review, as it allowed them to align the content of the Self-Evaluation Report to staff feedback and helped to inform some of the questions asked during the review. The survey was used again during the 2019-20 round of reviews including in the one subject participating in a pilot of the revised process planned for our fourth cycle of reviews from 2020-21 to 2025-26.