

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

Academic Regulations Committee - Friday 25 February 2005

**Departmental Programmes of Teaching, Learning and Assessment
Review of Initial Teacher Education - Friday 19 November 2004**

Mrs Alison Spurway, Clerk to the Review Panel

March 2005

Review Panel:

Professor Christopher Morris (Convener)	Vice Principal (Arts, Social Sciences and Education)
Mrs Irene Howell (External Assessor)	Associate Dean for Teaching and Learning, School of Education, University of Paisley
Professor Pamela Munn (External Assessor)	Head of School, The Moray House School of Education, University of Edinburgh
Professor James McKillop (Member of Cognate Department)	Head of Undergraduate School of Medicine,
Professor Michael French (Senate Assessor on Court)	Professor of Economic and Social History
Dr Robert Matthew (Teaching and Learning Service)	Director, Teaching and Learning Service
Mrs Alison Spurway (Clerk to the Panel)	Senior Administrative Officer, Senate Office

A. Introduction

1. The Initial Teacher Education (ITE) programmes under review in November 2004 were offered by the Faculty of Education which was created in 1999 following the merger of St Andrew's College of Education (the National Catholic College of Education) with the University of Glasgow. The ITE programmes were essentially provided by the Departments of Curriculum Studies, Educational Studies and Religious Education in the Faculty of Education with additional provision by Departments in the Faculty of Arts, the Faculty of Engineering and the Faculty of Social Sciences.
2. The Scottish Higher Education Funding Council had assessed the provision of Teacher Education during session 1994-95 and had awarded St Andrew's College a HIGHLY SATISFACTORY rating. Education as a unit of assessment was awarded a 4 rating in the Research Assessment Exercise in 2001.
3. The Associate Dean for ITE had co-ordinated the preparation of the Self-Evaluation Report (SER) in consultation with the Programme Leaders, Heads of Department, the Deputy Dean, students and other members of the Faculty. The SER demonstrated reflective practice but was at times over critical and defensive. The report would have been strengthened if examples of good

practice had been included and, where assertions were made concerning provision, reference had been made to the evidence to support the assertion in the documentation. The documentation had been provided in accordance with the University's requirements for the Review of Departmental Programmes of Teaching, Learning and Assessment.

4. The Review Panel met with the Dean, Dr Hirek Kwiatkowski, the Deputy Dean with responsibility for Quality Assurance, Professor Eric Wilkinson, the Associate Dean with responsibility for ITE, Ms Maureen Farrell and the Heads of the Departments of Curriculum Studies, Educational Studies and Religious Education, respectively Mr Brian Templeton, Dr Christine Forde and Dr R Davis. Subsequently, the Panel met with Key Staff including Programme Leaders and with 5 probationary members of staff, 3 Associate Tutors and approximately 15 undergraduate students and approximately 10 postgraduate students drawn from the majority of ITE programmes offered by the Departments.
5. The Review Panel considered the following range of ITE provision offered by the Departments under review:

Bachelor of Education (BEd) with Honours in Primary Education

Bachelor of Technical Education with Honours

Bachelor of Technology Studies with Honours

- Technology and a Designated Subject
- Technology with a Designated Subject
- General Technology

Master of Arts in Religious and Philosophical Education with Secondary Teaching Qualification

Postgraduate Certificate in Education (Primary)/(Secondary)

✕Bachelor of Education (Music) with Honours

✕This degree programme was delivered jointly by the University of Glasgow and the Royal Scottish Academy of Music and Drama (RSAMD) and was awarded by the RSAMD. A Joint Course Management Committee with membership from both institutions had responsibility for monitoring the quality of provision.

6. The Review Panel did not have an opportunity to meet with students on the Postgraduate Certificate in Religious Education with Additional Teaching Qualification or the Certificate in Religious Education by Distance Learning. Although some documentation had been provided on these programmes, it was noted that there was no feedback from students and that there was no appointed External Examiner for the CREDL programme. No reference was made to either of the programmes during the discussions with the Panel. The extent to which they were reviewed in a meaningful sense was therefore limited. It was stated in the Self Evaluation Report that the ATQRE programme had been reviewed in 2002 and changes had been introduced at that time. The CREDL programme was currently under review. The Review Panel **recommended** that the six month report to the Academic Regulations Committee which follows a Departmental Review, should confirm that the review of the Certificate in Religious Education by Distance Learning was complete and that an External Examiner had been appointed.

7. The General Teaching Council of Scotland (GTCS) was scheduled to visit the Faculty of Education during session 2004-05 to endorse the accreditation of the ITE programmes. The Review Panel made a number of recommendations to be undertaken as a matter of urgency with the aim of assisting the Faculty to prepare for this visit.

B. Overall aims of the Department's provision

1. The Departments of Curriculum Studies, Educational Studies and Religious Education offered a range of ITE programmes approved by the Scottish Executive Education Department (SEED) and accredited by the GTCS as programmes leading to a teaching qualification in the UK. The BED, PGCE (Primary), PGCE (Secondary) and Certificate in Religious Education by Distance Learning (CREDL) programmes aimed specifically to provide training in the ethos of Catholic education and provided an additional qualification, the Catholic Teacher's Certificate. Catholic students, who successfully completed the religious education component of other programmes and who undertook school experience in Catholic schools, could fulfil the requirements for the award of the Catholic Teacher's Certificate without additional assessment. The University of Glasgow was the only HEI in Scotland providing the CREDL qualification which had to be undertaken as an additional qualification by individuals who were studying or who had studied ITE programmes in other HEIs and who wished to teach religious education in Catholic schools.
2. The departments had a good history of producing well-qualified and confident teachers for denominational and non-denominational schools in Scotland. There was evidence that the departments were fully aware of the "Standard for Initial Teacher Education in Scotland" defined in terms of benchmark statements developed by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education and in addition, had prepared Programme Specifications for each degree or diploma programme. Satisfactory opportunities were provided for acquiring, developing and assessing the practical skills required of a teacher in the classroom consistent with the benchmark statements. Aims and Intended Learning Outcomes were presented in student handbooks and in the course documentation and these were provided to the School Partners. There was a clear link between the Intended Learning Outcomes and the assessments.
3. Recruitment to the programmes had exceeded the stated SHEFC targets. The Review Panel commended this significant achievement given the increase in the targets set by SHEFC. The number of male applicants for primary education and the number of applicants from ethnic minorities to all programmes however, remained low, a problem that was common to all ITE, programmes in the UK.
4. Departments used a range of learning and teaching approaches. Students felt well supported. Course information and documentation for the undergraduate programmes and the PGCE programmes was extensive.
5. External Examiners' reports indicated general satisfaction with the standards achieved.

C. Undergraduate and Taught-Postgraduate Provision

C.1 Aim

1. The Self Evaluation Report referred to the aim of cultivating a "risk-taking" approach to teaching, defined as a willingness to divert from a pre-planned lesson and attempt new approaches to delivery, if this seemed appropriate. Although the students who met with the Review Panel were not conversant with the term "risk-taking", they expressed the view that they were well supported in developing innovative teaching plans within a context of critical self-evaluation.
2. The Postgraduate Certificates in Education (Primary) and (Secondary) were currently delivered at Levels 9 and 10 of the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF), the level of a Graduate Diploma. The Review Panel was informed that the Faculty intended to propose to Senate during session 2004-05, that the programmes should be offered as 120 credits at Level 10 and that, rather than converting the programmes to a Masters level, the programmes should be entitled Professional Graduate Diploma in Education (PGDE).. The Review Panel commended the revision of the current PGCE programmes to bring them into line with the Scottish Qualifications Framework and to ensure that the level of provision was consistent with other HEIs in Scotland.
3. The Review Panel noted that the Faculty was engaged in reviewing all ITE programmes to ensure that they related satisfactorily to the benchmark statements and to the requirements of the General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS).
4. The Review Panel noted and approved the Programme Specifications which had been prepared based on the benchmarks. The Review Panel **recommended** that Programme Specifications should be provided electronically to students and Partnership Schools to ensure more effective dissemination.
5. Programmes were offered jointly by the Departments of Curriculum Studies, Educational Studies and Religious Education with the aim of integrating theory and practice. The Faculty was confident that the joint departmental approach enhanced the quality of provision.

C.2 Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs)

1. The Review Panel discussed with the Programme Leaders whether the aim to develop reflective and independent teachers was compromised by the intensity of structured teaching that took place when students were not on school placement but were based in the St Andrews building. Alternatives to the didactic approach were explored with the staff including the problem-based approach which was the basis of the new medical curriculum. The Review Panel **recommended** that the Faculty work in consultation with other Faculties responsible for vocational training to share good practice in teaching professional skills and competencies.
2. The Review Panel discussed with the PGCE Programme Leaders the Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) of the PGCE programmes currently provided at Levels 9 and 10 of the SCQF and sought to elicit whether the graduate nature of the programmes was reflected in the ILOs. The Panel **recommended** that the ILOs for the revised PGCE (Primary) and PGCE (Secondary) programmes should be reviewed in order to ensure that these were consistent with Level 10 of the SCQF.

3. The Associate Tutors informed the Review Panel that they felt that their experience as former Head Teachers was valued. They had been provided with excellent opportunities to contribute to programme development and to become involved in all aspects of the Faculty's work including placements. The Panel commended the involvement of field professionals in the development and provision of ITE programmes.

C.3 Assessment

1. The SER referred to "a very strong focus on formative assessment in all ITE programmes" but few examples were provided either in the SER or in the documentation. The Review Panel **recommended** that documentation provided for the accreditation visit by the GTCS should contain a variety of examples of formative assessment.
2. Students regarded the self-reflective journal of practice as a useful tool for monitoring individual progress. The Review Panel, while recognising the workload implications for staff, commended the regular feedback provided by the journal.
3. The cross-departmental delivery of the programmes was intended to provide integration of theory but the Faculty had not yet adopted an integrated approach to assessment. The Review Panel **recommended** that an integrated approach to assessment should be developed and the number of individual departmental assignments reduced.
4. The Review Panel noted that where apparently anomalous grades were presented, there was a process of viva for determining the final grade. The Review Panel **recommended** that documentation provided for the accreditation visit by the GTCS should contain information concerning the viva as a method of assessment.
5. The Review Panel noted that a review of the MA in Religious and Philosophical Education was currently being carried out. Students on that programme expressed concern that, in some instances, the form of assessment did not appear to be appropriate for the credit level of the course within the programme. The Review Panel **recommended** that the relationship between the assessment and the number of credits awarded for components of the MA programme should be scrutinised by the responsible department, and the Course Co-ordinator should clarify the matter with the Clerk to the Review Panel.
6. The students on the BEd (Music) programme informed the Review Panel that the two institutions, the University and the Royal Academy, appeared to operate independently with regard to the timing of assignments and examinations. They referred to particular difficulties arising in Year 2. The Review Panel **recommended** that the Joint Course Management Committee for the BEd (Music) should be asked to review the timetable of assignments and examinations to ensure compatibility.
7. The Review Panel was informed that Schedule A of the University Code of Assessment was not easy to apply when assessing ITE programmes. In the first place the criteria for the award of a classified Honours degrees did not take account of the GTCS requirement that a candidate must have achieved an overall "A" grade in School Experience from Year 2 in order to qualify with a first class Honours. Secondly, a number of External Examiners had stated that the provision of 9 levels of unsatisfactory was excessive.

Partnership Schools and some External Examiners had also expressed criticism of Schedule B for assessing School Experience. Many schools and other Faculties of Education in Scotland preferred to assess on the basis of pass, fail and merit rather than the six grades provided by Schedule B. The national "Entry Profile" (the formal document providing entry to the teaching profession) required only pass/fail. Discussion with Key Staff revealed differing views within the three Departments over the requirement to grade school experience.

The Panel encouraged the Faculty to be assertive with regard to the distinctive professional requirements of assessment of ITE. In this context the Review Panel **strongly recommended** that the Faculty should consult other Faculties with vocational programmes to determine whether the problems experienced with the application of Schedules A and B were common to all.

C.4 Curriculum Design and Content

1. Both Undergraduate students and students on the PGCE programmes informed the Review Panel that the approach adopted by staff to the integration of theory and practice varied in relation to different subject areas. The students acknowledged the importance of the theory underpinning teaching practice. They regarded however, the unwillingness of some staff to "teach how to teach" as inappropriate. It was clear that some students felt ill prepared for classroom teaching although the Review Panel recognised that some students had completed a very short period of school experience at the time of the visit. The Review Panel **recommended** that the three departments should engage together more systematically to share experience and to identify areas of good practice in the process of preparing students for school experience.
2. The students suggested that greater assistance was required to ensure that IT skills were developed at a level appropriate for the subject specialty. The practice across the Faculty ranged from what students considered excellent to that which they considered inappropriate. The Review Panel **recommended** that mechanisms should be developed to share good practice in the development of IT skills across subject specialties and across departments.
3. The students on both PGCE and the undergraduate programmes informed the Review Panel that the workloads were not unreasonable although it was acknowledged that where two subject specialties for the PGCE (Secondary) were being studied, this increased the workload substantially.
4. The students on the BTech Ed programmes informed the Review Panel that the practical skills training provided by Cardonald College was on occasion identical to training provided by the Faculty of Engineering. The Review Panel **recommended** that the work currently underway to co-ordinate skills training provided by the Faculty and by Cardonald College, should be continued.
5. Students on the MA programme informed the Review Panel that advice on the options available to them had been inadequate and on occasion had been provided after optional courses had commenced. The Review Panel **recommended** that, where a programme offered options as distinct from a totally prescribed curriculum, a process should be put in place to ensure that students had appropriate advice prior to the beginning of the session or the semester.

C.5 Student Recruitment, Support and Provision

1. The Self Evaluation Report stated that recruitment to all ITE programmes, except the MA in Religious and Philosophical Education, had exceeded the targets set by the Scottish Higher Education Funding Council. The Panel commended the Departments on this achievement given the significant increase in the size of target intakes over 10 years. The Panel was particularly impressed by the calibre of the students whom they met. They were enthusiastic about their studies and engaged in the review process. This supported the assertion in the SER that despite the increase in the intake, the standard of applicant admitted to the programmes remained high.
2. The Review Panel commended the "Access to Primary Education Project" which had commenced in 2002 under the auspices of the Widening Participation Service. In common with other HEIs however, the Faculty continued to experience difficulty in recruiting male students to the Primary Education programmes and in recruiting members of ethnic minorities to all programmes. The Review Panel **recommended** that a strategy should be developed for attracting more applications from ethnic minorities and male applicants particularly to Primary Education programmes.
3. Students on all programmes expressed appreciation of the supportive ethos within the Faculty but those on the PGCE programmes stated that they had not always been informed when venues for lectures had changed or were cancelled. There were difficulties in contacting tutors particularly while on school experience placements. Students wished regular scheduled contact with tutors. The use of web-based noticeboards was effective when provided. The Review Panel **recommended** that electronic notice-boards including those which were web-based such as Moodle, should be introduced as a matter of urgency.
4. The Review Panel discussed with the Dean and his senior colleagues, the nature of the partnerships with schools. A shortage of school placements throughout Scotland had occurred due to the increase in the number of ITE students. The McCrone Report had recommended the introduction of mentoring of probationary teachers in schools and this additional task had exacerbated the difficulty in identifying school experience placements for student teachers. As there was no statutory requirement on schools to provide placements to student teachers, the University's contractual obligation to provide school experience was jeopardised. Historically, the School Experience Office had successfully placed every student although, in the recent past, with increased numbers, it had not been possible to provide some PGCE students with the 2 weeks "Induction School Experience" in September. The Programme Leaders acknowledged that students who had been deprived of this placement had felt considerably disadvantaged.

Not only had schools exercised their right to refuse to provide a placement, on a small number of occasions, placements had been terminated because difficulties had arisen. This exposed the Faculty to complaints which were difficult to manage given that the Faculty had no jurisdiction over staff in Partnership Schools.

The Panel was informed that at times students were placed in schools which were not ideal for the purposes of initial teaching experience. The only remedial action that the Faculty could take was to provide the students with additional support.

The Panel was aware that every Faculty of Education in Scotland experienced a shortage of placements. It was noted that the recent introduction of Local Authority Placement Co-ordinators had partially relieved the situation.

The Panel **recommended** that the Faculty of Education, in collaboration with the other Scottish Universities providing ITE programmes, perhaps under the auspices of the Scottish Teacher Education Committee, should develop a Memorandum of Understanding with Partnership Schools as a matter of urgency. Consideration should also be given to granting Honorary University appointments to key individuals in Partnership Schools as a means of formalising the relationship with the University.

5. Students on the PGCE programmes referred to the fact that in some schools, students were asked to observe practice while in others they were immediately required to manage a class without the presence of the classroom teacher even on a first placement. The Review Panel **recommended** that specific guidance concerning the appropriate proportion of time allocated to each of observation, supported practice and unsupported practice should be given to Partnership Schools and students prior to the first placement.
6. The students informed the Review Panel that the quality and availability of IT equipment in the schools varied making it difficult to plan lessons incorporating ICT.
7. The Review Panel discussed with Senior Staff the retention figures across all ITE programmes. The cohort information provided by the Faculty Office indicated a higher "drop-out" rate for the BEd Music (60% in 2003) and the MA in Religious and Philosophical Education (57% from Year 1 to Year 2 in 2004) than the average in the University (26%). This was attributed in part to students transferring to other programmes of study or taking time out for financial reasons. The raw data provided by the Planning Office was considered to be misleading in that it failed to track students who later returned to study after a break. The Panel **recommended** that immediate action should be taken to obtain accurate data on retention for the accreditation visit by the General Teaching Council of Scotland.

C.6 The Effectiveness of Provision

6.1 Learning and Teaching

1. The Review Panel noted that, in the SER and in discussion with the staff, there was a lack of clarity regarding the respective roles of Programme Leaders and Heads of ITE Departments. This had been alleviated to some extent by the appointment in session 2004-05 of an Associate Dean with responsibility for ITE but issues remained with regard to line management. The Associate Dean for ITE expressed the view that when she represented the Faculty at an external event she was not entirely confident that she was authorised to speak on behalf of the three Heads of ITE Departments. Staff acknowledged that the lack of clarity with regard to the various roles, to some extent compromised the effective provision of learning and teaching. The Panel **recommended** that the managerial role of the Associate Dean should be reinforced, the effectiveness of the new managerial structure for ITE should be monitored and the respective roles of the Programme Leaders and Heads of ITE Departments reviewed to ensure that they were complementary and not conflicting.
2. The Review Panel noted that students were provided with a series of handbooks for some programmes and that in general, course documentation was extensive, at times repetitive and in some instances inconsistent and

contradictory. The Panel **recommended** that the content of handbooks and course documentation should be reviewed to avoid repetition, inconsistencies and contradictions and that greater use should be made of electronic systems for disseminating information, including links to University policies and procedures on the Senate Office websites.

6.2 Resources and their Deployment

Staffing resources

1. The Review Panel explored with several members of staff their understanding of the term "scholarship" in the context of educational studies and the way for instance in which the pursuit of scholarship in educational theory might differ from research into educational theory. The Panel **recommended** that members of the Faculty should further develop the concept of scholarship as it applied to educational studies.
2. The Review Panel discussed with Key Staff whether the increase in student numbers would impact on the capacity of University Lecturers and Senior Lecturers to undertake research if the present teaching load was retained. The Review Panel commended the Faculty for making immediate use of the relatively new category of appointment, University Teacher and University Senior Teacher. It was noted however, that a number of University Lecturers and Senior Lecturers appeared to be undertaking roles more appropriate for University Teachers. The Panel **recommended** that workload models should be applied in each ITE Department to ensure that the research time of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers was protected and that adequate opportunity to pursue scholarship was provided to University Teachers and University Senior Teachers.
3. The Review Panel discussed with Probationary Staff the relevance to staff with extensive teaching experience in the school sector, of the New Lecturer's Programme provided by the Teaching and Learning Service. Some concern was expressed regarding the length of the probationary period. It was noted that recruitment of staff with relevant school experience was difficult given the current pay structures. The Panel **recommended** that information should be provided to relevant staff in the Faculty concerning the possibility of reducing the standard probationary period if the agreed objectives were achieved earlier.
4. The Probationary Staff expressed satisfaction with the process of mentoring which worked well on an informal basis. The Induction Pack provided by the Faculty had been helpful as a source of information on the Faculty and the University. The Review Panel **recommended** that mentors should shift from ad hoc arrangements and adopt a more structured and formal approach to mentoring Probationary Staff.
5. The Faculty Administrators informed the Review Panel that the increase in student numbers had enabled the Faculty to release funding for additional administrative appointments in the Faculty Office, the ITE School Experience Office and in the Department of Educational Studies. The Panel **recommended** that the current provision of administrative support for the ITE programmes should be carefully monitored in the light of changing requirements particularly in terms of numbers of students.
6. The Faculty Secretary was in the process of examining the way in which medical student clinical placements were managed in order to establish whether an equivalent system for managing school experience placements

could be introduced. The Review Panel commended this investigation as an example of sharing good practice.

Teaching resources

7. At the meeting with Key Staff, the Review Panel was informed that considerable progress had been made in developing a closer relationship with the school sector by means of secondment of school staff to the Faculty, the appointment of Associate Tutors and regular consultation with ten Head Teachers of Nursery Schools.
8. The Review Panel explored with staff the extent and nature of the relationship of subject specialists with the "home" department. In some instances the relationship was close and productive. The introduction of the Chartered Teachers Qualification, the development of concurrent subject/teaching degrees and the promotion of Continuing Professional Development all provided incentives for collaborative projects with other Faculties. The Panel **recommended** that the Faculty should foster close working relationships with subject departments particularly in the Faculties of Science to the mutual benefit of the wider University, the Faculty and the teaching profession.

Learning Resources

9. The Review Panel was informed that problems associated with availability of rooms, with Central Room Bookings and with Media Services equipment continued to occur although some progress had been made in the current session.
10. The restrictions imposed by Health and Safety regulations had severely limited the display facilities in the public areas of the St Andrews building. The Review Panel **recommended** that the Faculty should discuss with the University Safety Officer and Estates and Buildings the provision of better display facilities and thereby reflect the environment of a teaching institution.
11. The students on the BTech Ed programme informed the Review Panel that although facilities for modelling were good at Cardonald College, it would be preferable if arrangements could be made to provide equivalent facilities on the Gilmorehill Campus. The Review Panel **recommended** that the Faculty should continue to pursue the provision of space for modelling either in the St Andrews Building or elsewhere on the Gilmorehill Campus and should confirm that the problems reported in the Self Evaluation Report relating to out of date information in the CRB system and to double-booking of rooms had been resolved.
12. The students referred to the fact that there was no guidance provided on how to establish what resources would be available in schools to assist with lesson planning and that photocopying facilities for A3 sheets in the St Andrews building were inadequate. The Review Panel considered that these were matters which were more appropriate for discussion at a Staff/Student Liaison Committee (See E5).

D. The Maintenance and Enhancement of Standards and Awards

1. The Review Panel noted that a new committee structure had been introduced in session 2004-05 to improve the process of monitoring the quality of the ITE programmes. The Panel was informed that adequate mechanisms existed to consider recommendations from External Examiners but by the end of the review, the Panel still remained unclear about the nature of these mechanisms. The Panel **recommended** that prior to the accreditation visit by the GTCS, a flow chart should be produced illustrating the mechanisms for reviewing programmes and taking account of the recommendations of External

Examiners and that the Faculty should satisfy itself that the mechanisms were effective.

2. Staff informed the Review Panel that the Performance Indicators provided by the Planning Office were not particularly helpful in the process of comparing grade profiles and degree classifications across the Faculty or externally. The Panel **recommended** that the Associate Dean should discuss with the Planning Office the specific requirements of the ITE departments and how the Performance Indicators might better reflect these.

E. The Maintenance of Assurance of Quality

1. The Review Panel noted that the quality and quantity of information contained in the Annual Course Monitoring Reports (ACMR) varied considerably thereby complicating the process of ensuring consistency of standards across the degree programmes or comparing retention rates. The Panel referred the Faculty to the Senate Office website which contained guidance on the design of ACMRs. The Panel **recommended** that the structure and content of ACMR forms should be reviewed as a matter of urgency to ensure that the forms were standardised and met the requirements of the Faculty with regard to monitoring progress, standards and such matters as retention.
2. In order to comply with what was understood to be University policy with regard to the composition of Boards of Examiners, the Programme Leaders had arranged Departmental Boards rather than Programme Boards in the summer of 2004. The Self Evaluation Report stated that this had prevented the External Examiners for a programme from meeting as a group. The Panel referred the Faculty to the Senate Office website which contained guidance on the composition of Boards of Examiners. The Review Panel **recommended** that External Examiners should be invited to attend all meetings of the Board(s) of Examiners which in some instances might be departmentally based (eg courses provided exclusively by Professional Studies or Curriculum Studies or Religious Education) and in other instances would be programme based. Where the whole programme was being assessed such as for classification of Honours, all External Examiners involved in the final assessment should be invited.
3. The Review Panel noted that the reports of some External Examiners referred to late appointments and consequent difficulties in attending the meeting of the Board of Examiners. The University's criteria for the appointment of an External Examiner (a minimum of 7 years of experience of assessment in a Higher Education Institution) prevented the Faculty from appointing Field Professionals (appropriately qualified individuals within the school sector). The Panel **recommended** that, as in other professional Faculties, discretion should be exercised by the Senate Office in the application of the criteria for the appointment of External Examiners in recognition of the distinctive character of professional programmes such as ITE.
4. The Review Panel received examples of student feedback forms. There was considerable variation in the questions asked and in the majority of cases no evidence of analysis of the returns was provided. The Review Panel was informed that the University was currently considering improved methods of obtaining student feedback including electronic systems. While acknowledging the differing requirements of aspects of the programmes, the Panel nevertheless **strongly recommended** that a standard core within feedback forms should be devised for the evaluation of the student learning experience on all ITE programmes. In addition, it was recommended that analysis of the data and

recommendations arising from the analysis should be a standard agenda item on the new Undergraduate Committee.

5. The Review Panel noted that students on the PGCE programmes had interesting and valuable opinions on the quality of provision but no opportunity to feed these back until later in the session as the first meeting of the Staff/Student Liaison Committee had not yet been set up. In view of the relatively short time in which these students were in the Faculty it was considered important to obtain their views at an earlier stage. Some of the students interviewed appeared uncertain regarding the process for appointing class representatives. The Panel **recommended** that arrangements should be put in place to ensure that a student representative for every year of each programme was appointed and the names of the representative provided on the website. The nature of student representation on the new Undergraduate Committee should be determined. Meetings of Staff/Student Liaison Committees for each programme should be arranged as a matter of urgency. In future sessions the first meeting of the Committees should take place within the first 8 weeks of the session.

F. Enhancing the Student Learning Experience

1. The Review Panel discussed with Senior Staff and with Key Staff their perception of the role of the Faculty in the wider University community. The view which emerged was that the University had failed to recognise the value of a Faculty of Education and as a consequence, the opportunity to provide leadership and good practice in the application and evaluation of educational theory within the University community had not yet been fully seized. The Panel **recommended** that the ITE departments should adopt a more assertive role in the development of innovative teaching methods throughout the University community.
2. The Review Panel noted that the Student Learning Service had historically provided workshops for BEd and BTechEd students which had been structured in collaboration with ITE staff to link with the programme of study. Workshops of this nature did not appear to be offered to students on other ITE programmes. The Panel **recommended** that the Faculty should highlight the benefits of these workshops for all students in the Faculty and should, in addition, work with the Student Learning Service to develop further this support of learning.
3. The Review Panel noted that the University procedure for determining whether a student was fit to practise required the development of a Code of Professional Conduct and Fitness to Practise. The Panel **recommended** that a Code of Professional Conduct and Fitness to Practise should be developed and arrangements made for all students on ITE programmes to be provided with a copy of the Code.
4. The Review Panel noted that the SER referred to participation by some staff in the Learning and Teaching Support Network but it was not clear what enhancements would be introduced arising from this.
5. The Review Panel noted that there had been limited involvement in the process of bidding for the Learning and Teaching Development Fund. The ITE Departments could benefit from this Fund.

G. Summary of Key Strengths

The Review Panel congratulated the Departments responsible for the delivery of the ITE programmes, on the work which had been undertaken since the last SHEFC review in session 1994-95 when HIGHLY SATISFACTORY had been awarded. The Departments had adjusted their practice and procedures to bring these into line with the University and had produced well-qualified confident teachers. Standards had been maintained despite the disruption caused by the move from the Bearsden site and problems with the St Andrews Building, particularly during the beginning of session 2003-04.

In particular, the Review Panel commended the ITE Departments on the following achievements:

1. The revision of the current PGCE programmes which would bring these programmes into line with the Scottish Qualifications Framework and ensure that the level of provision was consistent with other HEIs in Scotland.
2. The fact that students felt well supported and understood "risk-taking" in terms of being encouraged to try innovative techniques. (*Paragraph C1.1*)
3. The extent to which Field Professionals as Associate Tutors were valued and provided with opportunities to assist in the development of ITE programmes. (*Paragraph C2.3*)
4. The introduction of a self-reflective journal which was useful as a means of monitoring individual student progress (*Paragraph C3.2*)
5. The success in meeting the higher admission targets set for Initial Teacher Education by SHEFC (*Paragraph C5.1*)
6. The "Access to Primary Education " project. (*Paragraph C5.2*)
7. The introduction of the relatively new appointments of "University Teacher" and "University Senior Teacher". (*Paragraph C6.2*)
8. The extent to which the Faculty was developing good working relationships with colleagues throughout the University particularly in relation to sharing good practice. (*Paragraph C6.2. 6*)

H. Conclusions and Recommendations

The recommendations interspersed in the preceding report are summarised below. The recommendations have been cross-referenced to the paragraphs in the text of the report and are presented in order of priority within each category.

Recommendation 1

The Panel **recommends** the development of an action plan **prior to the accreditation visit of the GTCS** in order to address the following issues:

- H1.1 Documentation provided for the accreditation visit by the GTCS should contain a variety of examples of formative assessment. (*Paragraph C3.1*)
- H1.2 A flow chart should be produced illustrating the mechanisms for reviewing programmes and taking account of the recommendations of External Examiners and that the Faculty should satisfy itself that the mechanisms were effective (*Paragraph D.1*).

- H1.3 The structure and content of ACMR forms should be reviewed as a matter of urgency to ensure that the forms were standardised and met the requirements of the Faculty with regard to monitoring progress, standards and such matters as retention (*Paragraph E1*)
- H1.4 The content of handbooks and course documentation should be reviewed to avoid repetition, inconsistencies and contradictions and greater use should be made of electronic systems for disseminating information including links to University policies and procedures on Senate Office websites (*Paragraph C6.1.2*)
- H1.5 The Associate Dean should discuss with the Planning Office the specific requirements of the ITE departments and how the Performance Indicators might better reflect these (*Paragraph D.2*).
- H1.6 Immediate action should be taken to obtain accurate data on retention (*Paragraph C5.7*).
- H1.7 A strategy should be developed for attracting more applications from ethnic minorities and male applicants particularly to Primary Education programmes (*Paragraph C5.2*)
- H1.8 Documentation provided for the accreditation visit by the GTCS should contain information concerning the viva as a method of assessment (*Paragraph C3.4*).

Recommendation 2

The Panel **recommends** the following actions **in support of staff** in the ITE Departments:

- H2.1 Workload models should be applied in each ITE Department to ensure that the research time of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers was protected and that adequate opportunity to pursue scholarship was provided to University Teachers and University Senior Teachers. (*Paragraph C6.2.2*)
- H2.2 The managerial role of the Associate Dean should be reinforced, the effectiveness of the new managerial structure for ITE should be monitored and the respective roles of the Programme Leaders and Heads of ITE Departments reviewed to ensure that they were complementary and not conflicting (*Paragraph C6.1.1*).
- H2.3 Members of the Faculty should further develop the concept of scholarship as it applied to educational studies. (*Paragraph C6.2.1*)
- H2.4 Mentors should shift from ad hoc arrangements and adopt a more structured and formal approach to mentoring Probationary Staff to a more structured approach (*Paragraph C6.2.4*).
- H2.5 Information should be provided to relevant staff in the Faculty concerning the possibility of reducing the standard probationary period if the agreed objectives were achieved earlier (*Paragraph C6.2.3*).
- H2.6 The Faculty should foster close working relationships with subject departments particularly in the Faculties of Science to the mutual benefit of the wider University and the Faculty (*Paragraph C6.2.8*).
- H2.7 The ITE departments should adopt a more assertive role in the development of innovative teaching methods throughout the University community (*Paragraph F1*)

- H2.8 The Faculty should discuss with the University Safety Officer and Estates and Buildings the provision of better display facilities and thereby reflect the environment of a teaching institution. (*Paragraph C6.2.10*).
- H2.9 The current provision of administrative support for the ITE programmes should be carefully monitored in the light of changing requirements particularly in terms of numbers of students.

Recommendation 3

The Panel **recommends** the following actions **in support of students** on the ITE programmes:

- H3.1 The Faculty of Education, in collaboration with the other Scottish Universities providing ITE programmes, perhaps under the auspices of the Scottish Teacher Education Committee, should develop a Memorandum of Understanding with Partnership Schools as a matter of urgency. Consideration should also be given to granting Honorary University appointments to key individuals in Partnership Schools as a means of formalising the relationship with the University (*Paragraph C5.4*).
- H3.2 Arrangements should be put in place to ensure that a student representative for every year of each programme was appointed and the names of the representative provided on the website. Student representation on the new Undergraduate Committee should be determined and meetings of Staff/Student Liaison Committees for each programme should be arranged as a matter of urgency. In future the first meeting of the Committees should take place within the first 8 weeks (*Paragraph E5*).
- H3.3 Electronic noticeboards including those which were web-based such as Moodle, should be introduced as a matter of urgency (*Paragraph C5.3*).
- H3.4 A Code of Professional Conduct and Fitness to Practise should be developed and arrangements made for all students on ITE programmes to be provided with a copy of the Code (*Paragraph F4*).
- H3.5 A standard core within feedback forms should be devised for the evaluation of the student learning experience on all ITE programmes. Analysis of the data and recommendations arising from the analysis should be a standard agenda item on the new Undergraduate Committee (*Paragraph E4*).
- H3.6 The three ITE Departments should engage together more systematically to share experience and to identify areas of good practice in the process of preparing students for school experience (*Paragraph C4.1*).
- H3.7 Specific guidance concerning the appropriate proportion of time allocated to each of observation, supported practice and unsupported practice should be given to Partnership Schools and students prior to the first placement (*Paragraph C5.5*).
- H3.8 Where a programme offered options as distinct from a totally prescribed curriculum, a process should be put in place to ensure that students had appropriate advice prior to the beginning of the session (*Paragraph C4.5*).
- H3.9 The Faculty should highlight the benefit of these workshops for all students in the Faculty and should work further with the Student Learning Service to develop further this support of learning. (*Paragraph F2*).

- H3.10 Mechanisms should be developed to share good practice in the development of IT skills across subject specialties and across departments (*Paragraph C4.2*).
- H3.11 The Joint Course Management Committee for the BEd (Music) should be asked to review the timetable of assignments and examinations to ensure compatibility. (*Paragraph C3.6*).
- H3.12 Work currently underway to co-ordinate skills training provided by the Faculty and by Cardonald College should be continued (*Paragraph C4.4*).
- H3.13 The Faculty should continue to pursue the provision of space for modelling either in the St Andrews Building or elsewhere on the Gilmorehill Campus and should confirm that the problems reported in the Self Evaluation Report relating to out of date information on the CRB system and to double-booking of rooms had been resolved. (*Paragraph C6.2.11*)

Recommendation 4

The Panel **recommends** the following actions for **the maintenance and enhancement of standards of awards** on the ITE programmes:

- H4.1 The current Postgraduate Certificate in Education (Primary) and Postgraduate Certificate in Education (Secondary) should be offered as Graduate Diplomas at Level 9 of the SCQF and the title "Professional Graduate Diploma in Education" should be used consistently in material produced by the Faculty (*Paragraph C1.2*)
- H4.2 The Intended Learning Outcomes for the PGCE (Primary) and PGCE (Secondary) programmes should be reviewed in order to ensure that the revised programmes were consistent with Level 10 of the SCQF (*Paragraph C2.2*)
- H4.3 The Faculty should work in consultation with other Faculties responsible for vocational training to share good practice in teaching professional skills and competencies (*Paragraph C2.1*).
- H4.4 Programme Specifications should be provided electronically to students and Partnership Schools to ensure more effective dissemination. (*Paragraph C1.4*)
- H4.5 The "six month" report to the Academic Regulations Committee which follows a Departmental Review, should report on the progress which had been made with the current review of the Certificate in Religious Education by Distance Learning and should confirm that an External Examiner had been appointed for the existing programme (*Paragraph A.6*).

Recommendation 5

The Panel recommends the following actions for **the enhancement of assessment procedures** of the ITE programmes:

- H5.1 External Examiners should be invited to attend all meetings of the Board(s) of Examiners which in some instances might be departmentally based (eg courses provided exclusively by Professional Studies or Curriculum Studies or Religious Education) and in other instances would be programme based. Where the whole programme was being assessed such as for classification of Honours, all External Examiners involved in the final assessment should be invited (*Paragraph E2*).

- H5.2 The Faculty should consult other Faculties responsible for vocational training to determine whether the problems experienced with the application of Schedules A and B were common to all. (*Paragraph C3.7*)
- H5.3 An integrated approach to assessment for the ITE programmes should be developed and the number of individual departmental assignments reduced (*Paragraph C3.3*)
- H5.4 The relationship between the assessment and the number of credits awarded for components of the MA programme should be scrutinised by the responsible Department, and the Course Co-ordinator should clarify the matter with the Clerk to the Review Panel. (*Paragraph C3.5*).
- H5.5 As in other professional Faculties discretion should be exercised by the Senate Office in the application of the criteria for the appointment of External Examiners in recognition of the distinctive character of professional programmes such as ITE (*Paragraph E3*).

Prepared by: Janet Fleming, Senate Office

Last modified on: Wednesday 23 March 2005