

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

Academic Standards Committee - Friday 6 October 2006

**Departmental Programmes of Teaching, Learning and Assessment:
Report of the Review of the Faculty of Medicine Graduate School
held on 15 May 2006**

Marjory Wright, Clerk to the Review Panel

October 2006

Panel Members:

Professor John Coggins	Vice-Principal (Life Sciences, Medicine and Veterinary Medicine [Convener])
Dr Heather Wallace	University of Aberdeen (External Subject Specialist)
Dr Jane Robinson	Member of Cognate Department (Veterinary Medicine)
Professor David Bennett	Senate Assessor on Court
Professor Bob Matthew	Teaching and Learning Centre
Ms Kat Borrowdale	Students' Representative Council (Observer)
Mr Henk van Klaveren	Students' Representative Council (Observer)
Mrs Marjory Wright	Senate Office

A. Introduction

- A.1 The Faculty of Medicine Graduate School was established in Session 2001-02 and has responsibility for all aspects of recruitment, regulation and monitoring of postgraduate taught programmes and the management of research degrees. This review is concerned only with the postgraduate taught programmes. The administrative office of the Graduate School is located in the Wolfson Medical School Building and the delivery of postgraduate taught programmes is co-ordinated within the relevant Divisions in the Faculty of Medicine.
- A.2 The Graduate Education Committee is responsible for monitoring the quality, enhancement and provision of postgraduate certificates, diplomas and degrees by taught courses (including Continuing Professional Development).
- A.3 The current review is the first review of taught postgraduate provision in Medicine to have been undertaken.
- A.4 The Review Panel considered the following range of provision offered by the Graduate School:
- MSc (Med Sci) in Applied Neuropsychology or Clinical Neuropsychology
 - MSc (Med Sci) in Clinical Pharmacology
 - MSc (Med Sci) in Clinical Physics

- MSc (Med Sci) in Forensic Medicine*
- MSc (Med Sci) in Human Nutrition or Clinical Nutrition
- MSc (Med Sci) in Medical Genetics
- Master of Community Care*
- Master of Primary Care
- Master of Public Health
- Doctorate in Clinical Psychology

* indicates that the programme has been withdrawn although continuing students remain

- A.5 The Graduate School had provided a Self-Evaluation Report (SER) and supporting documentation in accordance with the University's requirements for the Review of Departmental Programmes of Teaching Learning and Assessment. The SER had been prepared by the Convener of the Graduate Education Committee and the Graduate School Administrator, with individual input from the Head of the Graduate School and 10 programme co-ordinators. Programme co-ordinators had seen the final version of the report and had been encouraged to share it with postgraduate taught students. Key staff advised the Review Panel that they had found the preparation of the SER to be a useful process. They had been involved in the production of sections of the report at programme level and had seen how it had been pulled together at the Graduate Education Committee. Most felt that the SER was an extremely coherent document, given the very diverse programmes that it covered. The Review Panel found the SER helpful but felt that it lacked evidence of deep reflection. Some of the accompanying documentation was of a high standard, in particular that of the MSc (Med Sci) in Medical Genetics.
- A.6 The Review Panel met with Professor David Barlow, Executive Dean of the Faculty of Medicine, Professor J L Reid, Head of the Graduate School, Professor C Edwards, Convener of the Graduate Education Committee, Miss Tania Sprott, Graduate School Administrator and with 20 members of staff who had specific roles in the management, delivery and support of the curricula. The latter included programme co-ordinators or their representatives, probationary staff, administrators, a Head of Division, the Senior IT Manager, a teaching facilitator and a research technologist. The Panel also met with 18 postgraduate taught students, a number of whom were also course representatives.
- A.7 The Review Panel identified a common set of topics to discuss with the postgraduate taught students. Thereafter, the students were divided into three groups, each of which was facilitated by two members of the Panel. Each group contained a similar mix of students and all students engaged well in the discussion.

B. Overall aims of the Department's provision

- B.1 The strategic aims of the Faculty of Medicine Graduate School as regards taught postgraduate provision were clearly stated in the SER.
- B.2 Discussions with students revealed that they were not aware of the role and purpose of the Graduate School in the provision of taught postgraduate education. Discussions with staff revealed that they found the Graduate School to be very helpful and efficient in the areas that it currently engaged in, but these did not extend to course content and delivery. There was a feeling that the main focus of the Graduate School was training research students. With regard to postgraduate taught provision, staff saw the Graduate School's role as being to support them

administratively and to assist them with difficulties. The Review Panel **recommends** that the Graduate School urgently reappraises its role in relation to the provision of postgraduate taught education and seeks the Faculty's assistance in promoting the benefits of an integrated approach to taught postgraduate provision.

- B.3 The Review Panel felt strongly that the Graduate School should be perceived as a forum for the exchange of good practice. In the early stages of its inception, the Graduate School had concentrated on introducing robust procedures and policies for research students and, more recently, had focussed more of its efforts on improving communications and good practice across postgraduate taught programmes and had introduced an annual meeting for Programme Co-ordinators. The annual meeting served as an effective forum for sharing information and good practice and for providing training on key issues. The Panel **recommends** that, in addition to the annual meeting for Programme Co-ordinators, the Graduate School considers facilitating scheduled meetings of each of the "Families of Degrees" (see C.4.6) on at least two occasions per year to provide programme teams with a wider platform to discuss common issues and to share good practice.
- B.4 The Review Panel also strongly **recommends** that the Faculty reviews its resource allocation model to ensure that the expanding role of the Graduate School is taken fully into account.

C. Postgraduate Provision

C.1 Aims

- C.1.1 The SER clearly set out the aims of the Graduate School's postgraduate taught provision. The Review Panel found the aims of the postgraduate teaching to be both relevant and appropriate.

C.2 Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs)

- C.2.1 The Review Panel noted that the Graduate School was gradually moving towards establishing programme specifications and that all but two of its postgraduate taught programmes now had a programme specification in which intended learning outcomes were stated. The remaining programmes would comply with the new postgraduate template by Session 2007-08.
- C.2.2 The Review Panel found the standard of programme specifications to be variable and suggests that there would be merit in identifying and sharing good examples of programme specifications, such as that of the MSc (Med Sci) in Medical Genetics, which clearly relates ILOs to the aims of teaching.

C.3 Assessment

- C.3.1 The Review Panel found that there was a wide range of assessment methods within the programmes considered by the review. Some of these had been devised in consideration of the required competencies of the professional bodies.
- C.3.2 The Review Panel noted that the majority of postgraduate taught programmes offered by the Graduate School would implement the University Code of Assessment with effect from Session 2006-07. Two programmes (MSc (Med Sci) in Clinical Pharmacology, MSc (Med Sci) in Clinical Physics) which were undergoing extensive revision had been allowed an exemption for one

year but would be expected to implement the Code of Assessment fully in Session 2007-08.

- C.3.3 Some staff had concerns about moving to a modular system because they felt that international students could be disadvantaged by having to undergo summative assessment at an earlier stage in the academic year. Others, who had already moved to a modular system, assured their colleagues that this was not the case and the Graduate School confirmed that it actively encouraged formative assessment at the early stages of the programme. There is no requirement within the modularised structure of the Postgraduate Taught Generic Regulation for summative assessment to be held at an earlier stage in the academic year and the Review Panel felt that this information should be reiterated to Programme teams to avoid any risk of misunderstanding.

C.4 Curriculum Design and Content

- C.4.1 The Review Panel recognised that postgraduate taught provision in the Faculty of Medicine Graduate School was undergoing significant change as a result of the University's decision to introduce a standard postgraduate template with effect from Session 2006-07. The introduction of the template had presented an opportunity to reflect on and restructure programmes. In some cases it had been a logistical challenge to match the teaching to the new modular structure. Staff were alert to the challenges that the changes would present to NHS colleagues who contributed to their programmes and peer support would be provided.
- C.4.2 A close connection existed with employers in a number of subjects since many students were in professional employment whilst undertaking their chosen programme. This link ensured that employers' needs were taken account of in curriculum design. Many of the programmes also benefited from NHS funded places.
- C.4.3 The Review Panel noted from the SER that new programmes were designed in consultation with prospective employers of graduate students. This was recognised as an essential area of preliminary planning, necessary to ensure that viable, in-demand, programmes are generated and that they produce graduates with excellent employment prospects within their chosen discipline.
- C.4.4 All postgraduate taught programmes held regular teaching team meetings although some appeared to do this more effectively than others. The Review Panel learned that the Doctorate in Clinical Psychology was also supported by a Programme Strategy Committee, which included University and NHS staff, and representatives from amongst the trainees and from NHS Education for Scotland.
- C.4.6 The Review Panel explored the potential for the sharing of generic courses, which could have benefits in terms of the effective use of resources. The programmes currently on offer were very diverse and academic staff felt that there was very little that could be delivered generically at present. However, the Panel was pleased to learn that the Graduate School was looking into setting up "Families of Degrees" (eg community-based, clinical-based), which would create opportunities for sharing core and specialist courses. The Panel welcomed this initiative and the potential benefits that it could bring.
- C.4.7 The Review Panel had noted variability in the size and credit value of courses across different programmes but was assured that this would be addressed

through the standardisation of credit value for similar sized courses within "Families of Degrees".

- C.4.8 The Review Panel found that the Graduate School utilised the opportunity of sharing courses with Honours or equivalent courses to a limited extent. For example, Human Nutrition had some sharing with Level 4 Nutrition and Clinical Pharmacology encouraged new students to attend the 5-week MBChB Year 3 Student Selected Module (SSM) in Clinical Pharmacology. The Panel found these examples to be a good use of joint resource and encourages the Graduate School to explore actively other ways of utilising existing provision, both within the Faculty and by collaboration with the IBLs undergraduate school. The Review Panel also **recommends** that the University actively encourages and facilitates the sharing of Honours and Postgraduate Taught courses, both within and across Faculties.
- C.4.9 The Review Panel explored the Graduate School's plans for Continuing Professional Development (CPD) provision. The Graduate School was aware of the developments at NHS Education for Scotland (NES) in relation to promoting CPD. It had been looking at CPD opportunities very seriously in the past year and was in the process of developing a strategy to make it more able to respond to NES bids. Staff advised the Panel that there were opportunities for adapting established NHS courses to meet CPD needs. The Review Panel **recommends** that high priority be given to the implementation of a CPD strategy to make the Graduate School more able to respond to NES bids.

C.5 Student Recruitment, Support and Progression

- C.5.1 The Panel learned from the SER that the Graduate School planned to expand postgraduate student numbers but could not further dilute the Teaching Unit of Resource, which meant that new programmes must target specifically the international market or charge fully-costed fees to home and EU students. The Graduate School felt that the latter would prove difficult in competitive markets.
- C.5.2 Plans were in hand to introduce three new programmes in the near future - the MSc (Med Sci) in Sport and Exercise Medicine, the MSc (Clin Sci) and the Master of Medical Research.
- C.5.3 Postgraduate recruitment was healthy and staff believed that the mix of home and international students from a wide range of cultural backgrounds provided a stimulating learning environment for students.
- C.5.4 For some Programme Co-ordinators, it was a matter of great concern that they did not know until the last minute whether or not international applicants who had accepted places would arrive. This created a number of difficulties in relation to planning and also for providing effective pre-sessional support to such students. The Graduate School had introduced a fee deposit on a trial basis in an attempt to address this problem and would monitor its effectiveness.
- C.5.5 The MSc (Med Sci) in Medical Genetics and the MSc (Med Sci) in Human Nutrition were particularly successful in attracting international students. In the case of Medical Genetics this was, in part, due to a member of staff keeping in regular contact with graduates, which led to recruitment opportunities as a result of the personal recommendation of previous students.

- C.5.6 As far as recruitment literature was concerned, students felt that brochures on the individual programmes should include information about job prospects for Masters graduates, and they would welcome examples of employment profiles of previous graduates. Some international students had found the recruitment literature for the Master of Public Health slightly misleading as it had not indicated how Scottish-based the programme was. Whilst they had enjoyed the programme, they would have preferred their learning to have had a more international perspective that could be applied on their return to their home country. The Review Panel encourages the Graduate School to review its promotional literature.
- C.5.7 International students found the International Office to be very supportive and said that the availability of secure University accommodation was also important to them when selecting a University.
- C.5.8 Students generally felt well supported. They were fairly satisfied with feedback on their studies although in certain cases, where there was only one essay per course, students said that they did not have the opportunity to be re-assessed after obtaining feedback. The Review Panel found that the quality and quantity of feedback appeared to vary between programmes but commended the programmes that handled this aspect well. The Panel **recommends** that the Graduate School gives consideration to providing generic guidance to promote efficient and effective feedback and to encourage consistency across programmes.
- C.5.9 Some of the international students advised the Review Panel that they had concerns about being assessed by essays since they lacked essay-writing skills. They told the Panel that they would have liked an induction course, which included study skills and writing skills. The Panel suggests that this particular issue be addressed through liaison with the Faculty's Effective Learning Adviser.
- C.5.10 The Panel noted that many of the programmes already provided induction activities, and heard that consideration was also being given to introducing an induction week, which might include an introduction to Scottish culture. The Panel welcomed this initiative and encourages the Graduate School to consider including an introduction to the Scottish National Health Service in any induction programme planned for international students.
- C.5.11 The Graduate School's Postgraduate Progress Committee meets bi-annually to consider all students in breach of progress regulations. It also ensures parity of practice across all programmes. The Review Panel commends this practice. The Graduate School plans to review the Progress Committee's remit following the introduction of the new postgraduate template in Session 2006-07.

C.6 *The Effectiveness of Provision*

- C.6.1 The Graduate School monitors the effectiveness of learning and provision in its programmes through its annual review process.
- C.6.2 The Review Panel commends the quality of teaching provision throughout the Graduate School. Students praised both University and NHS staff equally in this regard and, on average, rated 80% of the teaching to be of good or excellent quality. The Panel compliments the Programme Co-ordinators and their teams on this achievement.

- C.6.3 The students who met with the Panel were enjoying the experience of studying at the University of Glasgow. Many had chosen the University of Glasgow because of its good reputation.
- C.6.4 Most students found their studies rigorous, challenging and intensive but also enjoyable. They had a strong affinity with their programme and Division, but barely acknowledged the existence of the Graduate School and had little knowledge of its role.
- C.6.5 The students were disappointed that they did not have out-of- hours access to the facilities of the Wolfson Medical School Building. They felt this to be extremely important, particularly since some of the buildings associated with their programmes were not open in the evening. Academic staff concurred with this sentiment and felt strongly that 24-hour access to the Study Landscape and its networked computers could enhance the learning opportunities for postgraduate taught students. The opportunity for students to integrate with students from other disciplines could also promote a sense of belonging to a larger academic community and the proximity of the Study Landscape to the Graduate School office might encourage students to engage more fruitfully with the Graduate School. Whilst acknowledging that issues of capacity, security and supervision would require to be addressed, the Review Panel nevertheless **recommends** that consideration be given to permitting controlled 24-hour access to the Study Landscape to postgraduate taught students.
- C.6.6 The Review Panel met with three members of probationary staff, one of whom was also a Programme Co-ordinator. The Panel was impressed with their enthusiasm and commitment and noted that they were largely satisfied with the support that they received, and felt comfortable in their roles. However, the Panel was concerned to hear that there was a lack of clarity about the role of their mentor or the frequency of contact that probationary staff should expect from him/her. The Panel **recommends** that the Faculty (and Heads of Division) as a whole address the adequacy of support that mentors offer to probationary staff across all aspects of provision.
- C.6.7 Many of the staff that met with the Review Panel had concerns about the level of IT support provided for the Faculty's off-campus computing clusters. Students advised the Panel of a particular problem in the cluster at Yorkhill Hospital, which had occurred during a problem-based learning project, and which had taken two weeks to fix. The Review Panel was concerned to hear that, following recent IT staff departures, only two members of staff remained to support the Faculty's centrally maintained computing clusters. In addition, some of the clusters that served postgraduate taught programmes belonged to Divisions that did not have IT support staff. The Review Panel strongly **recommends** that the Faculty review the staffing resource required to provide adequate IT support to its centrally supported computing clusters and clarify where responsibility lies for supporting Divisional computing clusters.
- C.6.8 The absence of a Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) denied the Graduate School's programmes the opportunity of engaging in online discussion with students and introducing online evaluation facilities. The use of Moodle was not widespread within the Faculty, although some programmes were using it. The Review Panel agreed that this was an important issue that required to be addressed as a matter of urgency. The Panel **recommends** that the Faculty explore the possibility of providing the Graduate School with sufficient resources to introduce and support a VLE. The Panel also **recommends** that

the Faculty explore, through the Education Strategy Committee, the possibility of linking the Graduate School with the Undergraduate Medical School system (VALE).

- C.6.9 The Review Panel noted that the VAT status of the British Heart Foundation Glasgow Cardiovascular Research Centre and the Glasgow Biomedical Research Centre buildings precluded taught programme students from entering these new buildings, and thus prevented many of the Research staff who had previously supervised taught postgraduate projects from offering a research project. Academic staff believed this to be a potentially disastrous situation, which could deny students the opportunity of learning from some of the University's finest researchers. The Review Panel understood that the University was already pursuing this matter at a high level but would draw the Graduate School's concerns to the attention of the University.
- C.6.10 Obtaining ethical approval for taught postgraduate projects within a realistic timescale was reported to be an ongoing problem with no easy solution, although improvements to the process appeared to be on the horizon. The efficiency of the processes were variable and, in some cases, staff had taken the decision to seek ethical approval for student projects in advance to meet the timeframe available for project work. Staff found this regrettable since obtaining ethical approval should be part of the student learning process.
- C.6.11 The Review Panel explored the economics of the taught postgraduate programmes. It appeared that the Graduate School was accepting more home/EU students than it had Scottish Funding Council (SFC) funded places for. It was explained that this was historical but that all new programmes were being fully costed and had minimum and maximum intake numbers. However, since 45% of current postgraduate students were from overseas, it was felt that the income generated should more than cover the costs of postgraduate taught education.
- C.6.12 The Review Panel had concerns about whether adequate resources were provided for the effective delivery of the project-related aspects of some of the programmes. Some staff felt that there was a lack of transparency in relation to the allocation of budgets to postgraduate taught programmes. A major concern of both the Panel and of teaching teams was the ability to support appropriate research projects within the available budget. Laboratory-based projects were costly and in some cases, could only be authorised if they could be combined with ongoing research projects. The Review Panel **recommends** that the Faculty consider whether the resources currently allocated to the delivery of postgraduate taught programmes are realistic.
- C.6.13 The Review Panel's findings suggest that there would be merit in reviewing the balance of teaching methods utilised in some of the programmes. As already happens in a number of programmes, extending the range of teaching methods would be generally beneficial.
- C.6.14 The review Panel **recommends** that the Faculty develops a culture which demonstrates its commitment to taught postgraduate education. This should include plans to raise the profile of the Graduate School in relation to taught postgraduate programmes so that all taught postgraduate students identify with the Graduate School.
- C.6.15 The Review Panel found the complex reporting structure within the Faculty difficult to follow and in need of clarification. Scrutiny of the remits and membership of some of the key Committees revealed that the taught

postgraduate side of the Graduate School appeared to be inadequately represented at some levels. The Panel felt that there would be merit in each of the proposed taught postgraduate "Families of Degrees" having representation on the Graduate School Board. Although there was provision for two student representatives on the Graduate School Board, both were research students, and there was no evidence that they also represented the interests of taught postgraduate students. The Review Panel therefore **recommends** that the composition of the Graduate School Board be modified to ensure the effective representation and participation of taught postgraduate students.

D The Maintenance and Enhancement of Standards of Awards

D.1 The Review Panel noted that the Graduate School's External Examiners had expressed confidence in its taught postgraduate awards.

D.2 The Review Panel also noted that the accreditation of the following programmes by Professional Bodies or Societies contributed to quality enhancement and provided additional audit and assurance of standards:

- MSc (Med Sci) in Clinical Neuropsychology
- MSc (Med Sci) in Clinical Physics
- Doctorate of Clinical Psychology

The following programmes are also accredited by Professional Bodies or Societies but a regular inspection visit is not part of the accreditation requirements:

- MSc (Med Sci) in Human Nutrition (specialisation in Public Health Nutrition)
- MSc (Med Sci) in Medical Genetics
- Master of Primary Care

E. The Maintenance and Assurance of Quality

E.1 The Review Panel was satisfied that the Graduate School supported policies and procedures to ensure the maintenance and assurance of quality.

E.2 The Graduate School demonstrated good practice in providing new Programme Co-ordinators with a mentor who had experience of the Programme Co-ordinator role.

E.3 Two-thirds of the postgraduate student representatives who met with the Review Panel had attended the Students' Representative Council's Course Representative training. The Panel compliments the Graduate School on this achievement.

E.4 Students were positive about the effectiveness of Staff-Student Liaison Committees (SSLC) and informed the Review Panel that staff paid attention to what they said. However, the Panel found a wide variation in the reporting styles and comprehensiveness of SSLC minutes and was disconcerted to see the superfluous use of individuals' names in some minutes. The Panel **recommends** that the Graduate School develops a policy for the recording and dissemination of SSLC minutes.

E.5 The Review Panel noted that all courses were modified annually on the basis of feedback received. However, given the short duration of postgraduate taught programmes, it was difficult to ensure that students were advised of the changes that had been made to programmes and courses as a result of feedback. The Panel **recommends** that the Graduate School gives consideration to publishing a web-based

record of programme and course changes to inform students of the history and progress of improvements.

- E.6 The Review Panel found considerable variation in the quality of postgraduate programme documentation and commends the MSc (Med Sci) in Medical Genetics documentation as a model worthy of sharing with other programme teams.

F. Enhancing the Student Learning Experience

- F.1 The standard of teaching and learning accommodation in NHS buildings was variable and the Review Panel was provided with photographs depicting examples of cramped and poorly furnished rooms that were currently being utilised for postgraduate teaching. Programme Co-ordinators explained that they had difficulty in obtaining suitable centrally booked accommodation at the times that they required it and that notifications from Central Room Bookings were extremely late, making it very difficult for them to arrange alternative accommodation. They were rarely able to use the teaching accommodation in the Wolfson Medical School Building but felt that the use of these rooms would improve the quality of the learning experience for postgraduate taught students and would also enhance the students' sense of identity within the Graduate School. Some staff were therefore reviewing their teaching timetables to try and take advantage of the times when the teaching accommodation in the Wolfson Medical School Building was not required by the MBChB programme.
- F.2 The Review Panel heard that international students sometimes struggled with terminology and commended a planned initiative to establish a web-based "Glossary of Terms". The Panel appreciates that further research will be required before such a tool can be introduced but encourages its introduction within an early timescale.
- F.3 The SER listed a number of key plans for the enhancement of existing provision. Whilst commending the Graduate School's foresight, the Review Panel **recommends** that it would be helpful to prioritise these plans and assign an appropriate timescale to each.

G. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas to be Improved or Enhanced in relation to Learning and Teaching and Conclusions and Recommendations

Key strengths

- The Review Panel commends the quality of teaching provision throughout the Graduate School.
- A close connection existed with employers in a number of subjects.
- New programmes were designed in consultation with prospective employers of graduate students.
- The Review Panel heard that international students sometimes struggled with terminology and commended a planned initiative to establish a web-based "Glossary of Terms"
- The Graduate School was looking into setting up "Families of Degrees"
- The Graduate School's Postgraduate Progress Committee meets bi-annually to consider all students in breach of progress regulations.

- The Graduate School demonstrated good practice in providing new Programme Co-ordinators with a mentor who had experience of the Programme Co-ordinator role.
- Two-thirds of the postgraduate student representatives who met with the Review Panel had attended the Students' Representative Council's Course Representative training.

Areas to be improved or enhanced

- The Review Panel suggests that there would be merit in identifying and sharing good examples of programme specifications.
- The Review Panel found considerable variation in the quality of postgraduate programme documentation and commends the MSc (Med Sci) in Medical Genetics documentation as a model worthy of sharing with other programme teams.
- The Review Panel's findings suggest that there would be merit in reviewing the balance of teaching methods utilised in some of the programmes.
- The Review Panel encourages the Graduate School to explore actively ways of utilising existing provision, both within the Faculty and in the Faculty of Biomedical and Life Sciences.
- The Review Panel encourages the Graduate School to review its promotional literature.
- The Review Panel encourages the Graduate School to consider including an introduction to the Scottish National Health Service in any induction programme planned for international students.
- The Review Panel felt that there would be merit in each of the proposed taught postgraduate "Families of Degrees" having representation on the Graduate School Board.
- The Committee reporting structure should be clarified and communicated to staff and students.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

The Review Panel commends the Graduate School on the quality of its teaching provision. The Graduate School is also to be complimented on its approach to student representation. The Panel was impressed to find that two-thirds of the student representatives who met with them had attended the SRC Course Representative training.

The Graduate School had prepared an informative Self-Evaluation Report (SER). The production of the SER had been a team effort that had skilfully merged contributions from a diverse range of disciplines into a comprehensive document. Whilst this manner of preparation had not lent itself to deep reflection, it had been an extremely valuable exercise, which had provided Programme Co-ordinators with insight into how other programmes operated and had given the Graduate School an opportunity to evaluate its progress since its establishment 5 years previously, and to identify where it needed to improve.

The Graduate School clearly had a strong research identity, but its role in relation to postgraduate taught provision was less well established and it appeared to be poorly understood. The Review Panel formed the opinion that the Graduate School would benefit from reappraising its role in relation to the provision of postgraduate taught education and to promoting the benefits of an integrated approach to taught postgraduate provision throughout the Faculty.

Postgraduate taught students also lacked a sense of identity within the Graduate School and the Panel felt that it was extremely important that steps be taken to address this.

The Review Panel particularly wishes to draw the University's attention to the Graduate School's concerns in relation to the VAT status of the British Heart Foundation Glasgow Cardiovascular Research Centre and the Glasgow Biomedical Research Centre buildings. Academic staff believed that if the VAT anomaly was not resolved, the restrictions that it imposed could deny students the opportunity of learning from some of the University's finest researchers.

The External Subject Specialist commended the University on the introduction of a University-wide postgraduate template.

Recommendations to the Graduate School

Recommendation 1

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Graduate School urgently reappraises its role in relation to the provision of postgraduate taught education and seeks the Faculty's assistance in promoting the benefits of an integrated approach to taught postgraduate provision. (*Paragraph B.2*)

Action: The Head of the Faculty of Medicine Graduate School

Recommendation 2

The Review Panel **recommends** that high priority be given to the implementation of a CPD strategy to make the Graduate School more able to respond to NES bids. (*Paragraph C.4.9*)

Action: The Head of the Faculty of Medicine Graduate School

Recommendation 3

The Review Panel **recommends** that, in addition to the annual meeting for Programme Co-ordinators, the Graduate School considers facilitating scheduled meetings of "Families of Degrees" (see C.4.6) on at least two or three occasions per year to provide course teams with an opportunity to discuss common issues and share good practice. (*Paragraph B.3*)

Action: The Head of the Faculty of Medicine Graduate School

Recommendation 4

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Graduate School gives consideration to providing generic guidance to promote efficient and effective feedback and to encourage consistency across programmes. (*Paragraph C.5.8*)

Action: The Head of the Faculty of Medicine Graduate School

Recommendation 5

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Graduate School develops a policy for the recording and dissemination of SSLC minutes. (*Paragraph E.4*)

Action: The Head of the Faculty of Medicine Graduate School

Recommendation 6

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Graduate School gives consideration to publishing a web-based record of programme and course changes to enable students to see the improvements that had been made. (*Paragraph E.5*)

Action: The Head of the Faculty of Medicine Graduate School

Recommendation 7

The Review Panel **recommends** that the composition of the Graduate School Board be modified to ensure the effective representation and participation of taught postgraduate students. (*Paragraph C.6.15*)

Action: The Head of the Faculty of Medicine Graduate School

Recommendation 8

The SER listed a number of key plans for the enhancement of existing provision. Whilst commending the Graduate School's foresight, the Review Panel **recommends** that it would be helpful to prioritise these plans and assign an appropriate timescale to each. (*Paragraph F.3*)

Action: The Head of the Faculty of Medicine Graduate School

Recommendations to the Faculty

Recommendation 9

The Review Panel strongly **recommends** that the Faculty reviews its resource allocation model to ensure that the expanding role of the Graduate School is taken fully into account. (*Paragraph B.4*)

Action: The Executive Dean of the Faculty of Medicine

Recommendation 10

The Review Panel strongly **recommends** that the Faculty review the staffing resource required to provide adequate IT support to its centrally supported computer clusters and clarify where responsibility lies for supporting Divisional computing clusters. (*Paragraph C.6.7*)

Action: The Executive Dean of the Faculty of Medicine

Recommendation 11

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Faculty (and Heads of Division) as a whole address the adequacy of support that mentors offer to probationary staff across all aspects of provision. (*Paragraph C.6.6*)

Action: The Executive Dean of the Faculty of Medicine

Recommendation 12

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Faculty explore the possibility of providing the Graduate School with sufficient resources to introduce and support a VLE. (*Paragraph C.6.8*)

Action: The Executive Dean of the Faculty of Medicine

Recommendation 13

The Review Panel also **recommends** that the Faculty explore, through the Education Strategy Committee, the possibility of linking the Graduate School with the Undergraduate Medical School system (VALE). (*Paragraph C.6.8*)

Action: The Executive Dean of the Faculty of Medicine

Recommendation 14

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Faculty consider whether the resources currently allocated to the delivery of postgraduate taught programmes are realistic. (*Paragraph C.6.12*)

Action: The Executive Dean of the Faculty of Medicine

Recommendation 15

The review Panel **recommends** that the Faculty develops a culture which demonstrates its commitment to taught postgraduate education. This should include plans to raise the profile of the Graduate School in relation to taught postgraduate programmes so that all taught postgraduate students identify with the Graduate School. (*Paragraph C.6.14*).

Action: The Executive Dean of the Faculty of Medicine

Recommendation 16

Whilst acknowledging that issues of capacity, security and supervision would require to be addressed, the Review Panel nevertheless **recommends** that consideration be given to permitting controlled 24-hour access to the Study Landscape to postgraduate taught students. (*Paragraph C.6.5*)

Action: The Executive Dean of the Faculty of Medicine

Recommendations to the University

Recommendation 17

The Review Panel **recommends** that the University actively encourage and facilitate the sharing of Honours and Postgraduate Taught courses, both within and across Faculties. (*Paragraph C.4.8*)

Action: The Vice Principal (Learning & Teaching)

Prepared by: Marjory Wright, Clerk to the Review Panel

Last modified on: Wednesday 11 October 2006