

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 18 November 2011

Reports to be Received during 2011-12 and Proposed ASC Reviewers

Ms H Butcher, Clerk to the Committee

Monitoring internal subject review (Periodic Subject Review) falls under Academic Standards Committee's remit as part of its overall responsibility of assuring and enhancing the quality of the University's taught educational provision and the maintenance of standards. In particular, ASC's task is "receiving review reports, identifying issues or recommendations requiring action in other areas of the University and monitoring responses to actions or recommending further action as necessary". This is interpreted as the fulfilling of a monitoring/audit function by ASC.

Each year ASC receives the following reports relating to the PSR process:

- Reports of Reviews held in the session (Full Review Reports, approved by the Panel Convener, containing recommended actions arising from the Review);
- 12 Month Update Reports – a standard report on progress with actions/recommendations;
- Updates on Progress with Recommendations – ad hoc reports, normally requested by the Panel Convener or ASC, where updates are considered necessary after the first normal 12 month update;
- Annual overview of recommendations – compiled by the Senate Office;
- Annual overview of good practice and key strengths identified in Reviews – compiled by the Senate Office.

In order to spread the work load in reviewing PSR reports submitted to ASC, academic members of the Committee are each allocated a number of subject areas annually. Members are asked to consider reports for their allocated subjects when they are submitted to the Committee. Each subject area will be allocated two ASC members. Guidance on the process of reviewing the reports is given below. The annual overview reports should be considered by all members. The aim of the overview of recommendations is to identify any themes or issues that may require attention at College or University level.

Allocation for 2011-12

The following allocation of ASC members to PSR reports is proposed for 2011-12. Where possible, there is continuity between previous review of full reports and subsequent updates.

Full Review Reports 2011-12

Department	Expected Date of Submission to ASC	Reviewers
School of Life Sciences	February 2012	Tom Guthrie Allison Orr
Management	May 2012	Bob Hill Vassiliki Kolocotroni
School of Education	May 2012	Vince Bissell Barbara Burns
School of Law	May 2012	Phil Cotton Kevin O'Dell
School of Physics & Astronomy	May 2012	Neil Evans Allison Orr
School of Medicine – U/G	May 2012	Mike Carroll Karen Renaud
School of Medicine – P/G	Summer Powers 2012	Carole Hough Bill Stewart

12-Month Update Reports 2010-11

Department	Expected Date of Submission to ASC	Reviewers
Central & East European Studies	May 2012	Vince Bissell Bob Hill
Music	May 2012	Phil Cotton Bill Stewart
School of Chemistry	May 2012	Neil Evans Barbara Burns
School of Psychology	May 2012	Karen Renaud Carole Hough
Electronics & Electrical Engineering	October 2012	Mike Carroll Vassiliki Kolocotroni
School of Life Sciences	February 2012	Tom Guthrie Allison Orr

Further Updates on Progress with Recommendations

Department	Expected Date of Submission to ASC	Reviewers
History of Art	October 2011	Phil Cotton Bill Stewart

Economics	November 2011	Mike Carroll David Watt
Urban Studies	November 2011	Mike Carroll Phil Cotton

The Role of the ASC Reviewer

When PSR reports in their allocated subject area are submitted to ASC; ASC Reviewers should check the report to see whether it contains any issues or recommendations (typically those which will enhance the quality of the University's taught provision) which would relate to other areas of the University and therefore may need wider dissemination. Update reports should be considered in order to confirm the PSR Panel Convener's view that there have been appropriate responses to the recommendations by the School or other body to whom the recommendation has been directed. In some cases there may be a need for further updates or reports to be made – this will usually have been identified by the Convener before the report is submitted to ASC. At least one of the two ASC Reviewers should advise the Committee in the event that there are issues arising from the report pertinent to the ASC role in this process. (Members who are unable to attend should provide any comments they may have in writing to the Clerk who will also pass these on to the convener and second reviewer).

ASC is also required to monitor the effectiveness of the internal subject review process itself by considering and recommending "changes to procedures for internal subject review as necessary." Therefore, if a PSR report raises any concerns about the overall review process, this should also be drawn to the attention of the Committee, and preferably to the attention of the Clerk and Convener in advance of the meeting.