

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

Academic Standards Committee - Friday 25 May 2007

**Departmental Programmes of Teaching, Learning and Assessment:
Responses to the Recommendations arising from the Review of the
School of Business and Management held on 3 March 2006**

Ms Helen Clegg, Clerk to the Review Panel

April 2007

Conclusions

The Panel concluded that the School's provision was of a high quality overall, and in particular wished to commend the School on the following points:

- its retention of such a high level of commitment in times of extremely rapid change
- its appointment of a Convener of Postgraduate Student Affairs. It was hoped that this post would become more visible to students and that part of its remit would be the identification of new overseas markets in order to bring about diversity in the student body

Recommendations

The recommendations interspersed in the preceding report, and summarised below, are made in the spirit of encouragement in order to enhance the already high standards of the School of Business & Management. The recommendations have been cross-referenced to the corresponding sections of the report, and are ranked in order of priority.

Recommendation 1.

The Panel **recommended** that the issues surrounding the lack of appropriate teaching accommodation be forwarded to the Vice-Principal (Teaching and Learning) the Dean and the Head of Estates and Buildings for consideration (Paragraph 10.2.1)

**Action : Head of School; Vice-Principal (Teaching and Learning); Dean of LBSS;
Head of Estates & Buildings**

Response: Dean and Head of School

Successful meetings were held with representatives from Central Room Bookings to accommodate the MSc Management students in the WILT. However problems still remain in relation to room sizes and configuration. Rooms with an apparently appropriate capacity often have poor ventilation and are therefore not suitable for two-hour seminars. There are insufficient large lecture spaces with adequately sized breakout rooms. This issue impinges equally on the developing Executive Education portfolio which typically requires high quality smaller tutorial rooms for whole days, a

requirement which faces problems in terms of the absolute number of suitable rooms and the mismatch with the University's normal timetabling arrangements. Additionally, the requirements of Glasgow International College have emerged as a potential source of difficulty in terms of securing ongoing access to facilities such as the WILT for the MSc Management programme. These issues have been brought to the attention of the Director of Estates and Buildings and the Head of CRB, as well as the VP(T&L) but solutions are constrained by the lack of appropriate accommodation.

Response: Vice Principal (Learning and Teaching), Head of Estates and Buildings

This action is being followed up by the Vice Principal (Learning and Teaching) and Head of Estates and Building. An update is expected shortly.

Recommendation 2.

The Panel **recommended** that the issues surrounding the lack of appropriate teaching technology be forwarded to the Vice-Principal (Teaching and Learning) and the Head of Estates and Buildings for consideration (Paragraph 10.2.2)

Action : Head of School; Vice-Principal(Teaching and Learning); Dean of LBSS; Head of Estates & Buildings

Response: Dean and Head of School

The teaching technology equipment has been upgraded in CRB rooms. However, as highlighted in the Faculty QAEO PG report, there are still problems relating to poor and inadequately maintained equipment, and a lack of e-learning resources and easy web access in teaching rooms. A clear example is the provision of wireless internet access in the School's main lecture theatre, where the recently installed system is only capable of supporting 15 connections in a lecture theatre accommodating 75, rendering the installation redundant for many classes where there is close integration of lecture and Moodle based material and activities. These problems have been highlighted to the Vice-Principal (Teaching and Learning) and the Director of Estates and Buildings.

Response: Vice Principal (Learning and Teaching), Head of Estates and Buildings

This action is being followed up by the Vice Principal (Learning and Teaching) and Head of Estates and Building. An update is expected shortly.

Recommendation 3.

The Panel **recommended** that the School give further thought to ways in which timeous feedback, particularly during the Level 2 course, in the initial transition to Level 3 and for Masters level students, could be provided. This should involve a full review of the assessment scheme for Level 2 in order to ensure that the assessment scheme facilitates and tests student learning effectively (Paragraph 7.2)

Action : Head of School

Response

As part of the MA review undertaken in 2006/7 academic year Level 1 and 2 of the MA programme have been restructured. This has involved splitting the organisational behaviour focused Level 1 A and 1B with the revised 1B being positioned as a Level 2 course, marketing (currently part of Level 2) being redesigned and expanded as the new Level 1B, strategy (currently part of Level 2) being redesigned and transferred to Level

3, and Operations & Finance (currently part of Level 2) being redesigned and expanded as part of the new Level 2. Accompanying this restructuring of the pre-honours programme, the assessment arrangements have been changed with the new Level 2 being assessed through coursework as well as exam, instead of the current reliance on exam only assessment. This will facilitate not only more robust assessment of student performance, but more significantly improved feedback to students over the revised Level 2, thereby supporting students in making the transition to the honours programme.

In respect of the Masters programmes, the redesign of the MBA programme has consciously addressed the requirement to ensure rapid and high quality student feedback, while the scheduling of assessment on the MSc Management programme, specifically in the first semester core, has been reviewed and adjusted to provide feedback on performance at the earliest opportunity possible. Additionally the School Office has proposed new systems to improve the speed of assessment marking and associated provision of student feedback with these being piloted during the coming academic year.

Recommendation 4.

The Panel **recommended** that steps be taken to improve communication channels between academic staff, the School Office and students in order that information on class content, timetable changes and so on could be received timeously (Paragraph 9.2.3)

Action : Head of School; Dean of LBSS

Joint Response

This session the Department has set up individual class mailing lists to communicate with students through the University e-mail system. They are informed of changes and provided with relevant course information as soon as is practicable. Survey Monkey has just gone live to enable students to provide feedback electronically. There are also 3 staff/student meetings per year for every category of student.

In 2007/08 the department will move to Moodle so that students will have access to outlines of lectures, assignments, discussion fora and timetables. This development is ahead of schedule and for the UG programme will be in place for the start of the coming academic year. Additionally the working arrangements of the School office have been amended to enhance service provision for both UG and PGT students.

Also in 2007/08 the Department will introduce a fixed PGT timetable to meet student expectation of knowing well in advance when every activity is expected to take place throughout the session. However, as there is a danger is that flexibility will be lost if options within streams are restricted according to the capacity of the pre-booked accommodation, this year will be treated as a pilot to inform delivery in 08/09 when the revised MSc programme will be in place.

Recommendation 5.

The Panel **recommended** that the School consider ways of integrating the students on the Local Economic Development programme into the School and enhancing their overall student experience (Paragraph 10.1.1)

Action : Head of School

Response

The Local Economic Development programme is to be discontinued due to declining student demand and the re-orientation of TERU around its core contract research focus. Elements of the programme will be included within the School's new Executive Development portfolio, with the design of this portfolio effectively addressing those areas of the LED programme in respect of student experience which were identified as having weaknesses.

Recommendation 6.

The Panel **recommended** that the School gather student views on entry and exit, in the most appropriate manner, in order to ascertain student expectations, reasons for applying, and whether expectations had been met (Paragraph 5.5)

Action : Head of School

Response

A central part of the MA review was to identify student motivations for undertaking management at Glasgow and identify how the School could best support those students. As a result of the survey undertaken a number of specific developments have been implemented to enhance the distinctiveness of the programme encompassing both structural changes and putting in additional support for students to ensure they felt an integral part of the School community. The redesign of the MBA programme has similarly been informed by extensive input from past and present students, corporate sponsors and other stakeholders to ensure the programme addresses their requirements. Through strengthening the School's links with its alumni, the School is seeking to effectively capture the views of those who have experienced the programmes and integrate their perspectives into the delivery of programmes, and where relevant into the redesign process.

Recommendation 7.

The Panel **recommended** that Faculty and Senate Office consider the effectiveness of existing systems, notably ACMRs and new course approval procedures, for highlighting accommodation requirements and any problems. (Paragraph 10.2.1)

Action : Dean of LBSS; Associate Dean (Business School); Senate Office

Response: Dean and Associate Dean (Business School)

The Faculty revised its QAE systems to ensure that ACMRs are fully discussed at Departmental and Faculty level. Two Quality Assurance and Enhancement Officers – to cover Undergraduate and Postgraduate issues - have now been appointed to introduce good practice in relation to Quality Enhancement, analyse Departmental QAE reports to prepare Faculty reports highlighting good practice, drawing together information about common issues and taking forward issues of concern in newly established fora at Senate/Heads of University Services level.

Response: Director of Senate Office

In Session 2005-06 the Faculty Quality Assurance Officers Group (now Faculty Quality Assurance and Enhancement Officers Group) reviewed the format of the Annual Course Monitoring Report and a revised Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) form was introduced for undergraduate courses, together with a separate AMR form for

postgraduate programmes. Both forms contain a Quality Enhancement section to provide departments with the opportunity to draw relevant matters to the attention of the Faculty and the University. There are two headings in this section which are particularly relevant to the issue that the Review Panel has identified:

- What would you like the University or the Faculty to do to help you enhance the course for students or teaching staff next year?
- Please comment on the provision and suitability of the teaching spaces and equipment used on this course this year (please give specific details of room locations if you are reporting problems and state whether the room is the responsibility of Central Room Bookings or the Department).

Issues identified for the attention of the University in Faculty Annual Monitoring Reports are highlighted to the Academic Standards Committee by means of an Annual Report from the Faculty Quality Assurance and Enhancement Officers Group. The responses to the issues raised are followed up by the Group and outstanding issues are pursued rigorously. In January 2007, the Group met with a representative from Estates and Buildings to receive an update on current initiatives and to discuss outstanding issues, and it is intended that a similar meeting will take place on an annual basis. Unfortunately, the Faculty of Law, Business and Social Sciences was without a Quality Assurance Officer for a time during Session 2005-06 and, as a result of this, the Faculty Annual Monitoring Report, which might have drawn attention to the matter raised in Paragraph 10.2.1, was not submitted last session.

Prepared by: Janet Fleming, Senate Office

Last modified on: Monday 30 April 2007