Formal Recommendation (1)	**Oversight of postgraduate research students (PGRs) who teach** - develop more effective oversight of the training and support provided at school level to PGRs who teach. The University has put in place clear guidance regarding the mandatory generic teaching training provided to PGR students, but schools are responsible for overseeing teaching and marking activity, and students report a variable experience in terms of the provision of guidance, support and workload management.
Extract from technical report	The PGR students met by the ELIR team all confirmed that they had undertaken the University's training programme. However, they reported variable experiences in the support and guidance provided by their schools for their teaching and marking activities and associated workloads. The University is recommended to develop more effective oversight of the training and support provided at school level to PGRs who teach to ensure a more consistent experience in terms of the provision of guidance, support and workload management (para 70).
What needs to be done	Collate information on the current situation (survey, form, or email): ref to Policy - Schools: what support do you offer (what works well, what does not) - PGR Tutors: as above but in terms of what they receive Raise awareness of Policy ' PGRs who Teach' - Include in new DoT induction programme. - Raise at annual CEED meetings with Schools. - Discuss at Learning & Teaching Committee. Share best practice - CEED to set up a sharing of best practice event and/or sharing of resources online or some other format. Work needs to align with the PGR Tutor Working Group (led by Christian Harding) [surveys, comms etc] Consider how to make this as light touch as possible for DoTs given current workload situation.
Owner	**Postgraduate Working Group** (Lead: Heather McKiggan-Fee, CEED)
Evaluating outcome	Standing agenda item for each University-led review of learning and teaching. Regular feedback from students via PGR tutor forum and SSCCs.

Formal Recommendation (2)	Engagement with staff development - continue developing and implementing systems to monitor staff engagement with mandatory areas of training and support, such as academic induction. The University should also **implement the system currently under development by Organisational and Staff Development Services to monitor the completion of all required training for staff, in particular postgraduate research supervisor training** (paras 68, 107, 116).
What needs to be done	PG Supervisor Training - New QlikView dashboard for mandatory training is now active and will provide data and institutional oversight of number of staff who have completed supervisor training - Perform audit of all current supervisors to identify who has not undertaken the training. - Put in place additional face-to-face training to address any backlog. - Review whether any research funders require additional/different refresher training timescales. - Each section of PGR supervisor training recorded separately and uploaded on Moodle (end Aug 21)

	Other required Training - Provide update on implementation of new system: including details of whether system monitors attendance at online courses such as *Diversity in the Workplace* and *Unconscious Bias.*
Owner	**Postgraduate Working Group** (Lead: Rikard Jalkebro, OSDS)
Evaluating outcome	Test QlikView for accuracy and completeness of data and reports. Evaluate the Moodle resource: continuously update/revise with new material/resources (OSDS). Upload each section of PGR Supervisor Training on Moodle via Panopto to monitor who has viewed the recording and whether they have watched the whole recording.

Formal Recommendation (3)	**Student access to external examiner reports** - ensure that all students have easy access to external examiner reports for their programme of study by the end of academic year 2020-21 (para 141).
What needs to be done	Worked completed early in October 2020.
Owner	**Assessment Working Group** (Lead: Karen Murphy, Quality & Policy Office)
Evaluating outcome	n/a

Formal Recommendation (4)	**External examiner engagement in degree classifications** - implement, from 2020-21, the University's intended approach to sharing a final analysis of degree classification with external examiners and asking them to reflect on the distribution patterns when submitting their final reports (para 140).
What needs to be done	Work already underway. UG Classification pilot undertaken with three Schools in April – feedback will inform what information and accompanyhing narrative we ask Schools to send to Externals. Undertake similar pilot for PGT classifications early summer 21. Include details of new process in annual letter to External Examiners issued by Proctor in May. Check with Planning what breakdown of Classification data is currently sent to Schools (following UG pilot, a School requested breakdown of classifications by gender, disability etc)
Owner	**Assessment Working Group** (Lead: Karen Murphy, Quality & Policy Office)
Evaluating outcome	Review feedback received from Externals via the Annual Reports. Depending on feedback, consider whether any actions are required.

Area for Enhancement (1)	Postgraduate representatives…felt that the training [provided by CEED and the Students' Association] was more appropriate for undergraduates in terms of the information provided and the approaches to activities such as surveying student groups. The University may wish to consider providing **more focused training for the postgraduate representatives** (para 20).
What needs to be done	Review training for PGT and PGR student representatives Responsibility for content and delivery (currently Students' Association). Content, timing and mode of delivery. Specific requirements for PG Convenor, PG Execs, PG reps studying remotely etc. Seek views from current PG student reps and Schools. Link up with the current SA review of student representation.

Owner	**Postgraduate Working Group** (Lead: Cat Wilson, CEED and Caroline McWilliams, PG Convener)
Evaluating outcome	Annual end of year review of training with student representatives.

Area for Enhancement (2)	Students…expressed concern about the University's plans for the expansion of student numbers in light of the existing challenges for the **recruitment of sufficient numbers of counsellors** (para 45).
What needs to be done	Continued call for additional counsellors, increased services generally and quicker wait times to be considered as part of the Student Services University-led Review of Learning in Teaching in AY 21/22 (*still tbc with the Director of Student Services*) Meetings are now held prior to most URLTs to 'set the scene' for the review and identify particular areas of focus where there is likely to be greatest benefit to the School/Unit.
Owner	**Academic Monitoring Group** (Lead: Lara Meischke, Student Services)
Evaluating outcome	Through the URLT.

Area for Enhancement (3)	There is **no institutional directive regarding the return-time for individual assessments**, other than the guidance that: 'feedback should, whenever possible, be delivered in time for students to benefit from it in their next assignment'. Academic staff…confirmed that, whilst there was no overarching policy specifying turnround times, students were informed in advance of the return dates and that work was returned prior to submission of the next assignment (para 48).
What needs to be done	Revisit University Policy on 'Feedback on Assessment'. Consider whether an institutional policy is required on feedback return time for individual assessments. Consider the University position in relation to feedback on exams. Provide guidance on different and new methods of feedback (tie in with Digital Assessment project). Link in and revisit the 'Making Feedback work for You' Moodle course. Target: discussion paper to Oct21 LTC.
Owner	**Assessment Working Group** (Lead: Gerald Prescott, Chair)
Evaluating outcome	Standing item on SSCC agendas; follow up at URLTs and MEQs.

Area for Enhancement (4)	Postgraduate tutors can obtain **Associate Fellowship of the HEA** through taking the two modules 'Introduction to University Teaching'…None of the PGR students met by the team, who engage in teaching, were aware of this **route to recognition**, which may reflect an area for further signposting (para 71).
What needs to be done	Modules have not been accredited by Advance HE since 2017. CEED offers support to individuals who want to make applications for fellowship. - Raise awareness of this support: how and where can this be done. - Consider capacity issues: is 1:1 support feasible if demand increases (workshops already offered: consider other options eg training more staff to provide individual feedback on applications). Work needs to align with the PGR Tutor Working Group (led by Christian Harding) [surveys, comms etc]
Owner	**Postgraduate Working Group** (Lead: Heather McKiggan-Fee, CEED)
Evaluating outcome	Comparison of take up figures: now v end of S1/S2. End of S1 and S2 check with PGR tutors whether they're aware of support available.

Area for Enhancement (5)	**Peer observation** is a requirement for research postgraduate students who teach. However, engagement by staff more generally is inconsistent across schools with no evidence of systematic monitoring. The team encourages the University to consider ways to encourage **greater awareness and engagement with the scheme** (para 101).
What needs to be done	Raise awareness of benefits. - Find out how many Schools currently use peer observation (or similar method) and ask for feedback on what works well and its benefits as a developmental tool (peer observation is not mandatory for staff). - Clarify how peer observation links up with mentoring scheme for new academic staff. - Check whether peer observation is mentioned during new staff induction. - Summarise findings, create presence on a university webpage and share with Schools.
Owner	**Academic Monitoring Group:** (Lead: Rikard Jalkebro, OSDS and Heather McKiggan-Fee, CEED)
Evaluating outcome	Include as standing agenda item in University-led reviews of learning and teaching in order to identify usage, examples of best practice and feed this back to CEED and OSDS.

Area for Enhancement (6)	The review team…recognises the need to clarify the roles of, and **interaction between CEED, CHER and SALTI** (para 108).
What needs to be done	By start of S1 next academic year, CEED website will have one banner which will pull into one place all of the current CEED and SALTI activities. It will highlight educational development support through a programme of activities: Community of Practice (HIVE); Academic Fora; Funding Opportunities; Workshops. CEED and CHER are separate but have close working practices. Consider ways of publishing new conflated set of offerings.
Owner	**Education Delivery Group** (Lead: Cat Wilson, CEED)
Evaluating outcome	tbc

Area for Enhancement (7)	The review team noted **variability in the MEQ response rates** (para 125).
What needs to be done	Identify the Schools with consistently lower than average response rates, then - DoEd to ask relevant School Presidents to work with the Director of Teaching to find ways of increasing response rates. - Ensure that School Presidents' role in encouraging students to complete the MEQs is part of the School President training. - Circulate examples of how Schools can secure higher response rates (via the MEQ Guidance for Staff and Students). - For Schools with lower than average response rates, discuss at University-led review of L&T.
Owner	**Academic Monitoring Group**: (Lead Karen Murphy, Quality & Policy Office)
Evaluating outcome	Review of response rates by AMG each semester.

Area for Enhancement (8)	Following the introduction of the new **Quality Code, the University carried out a comprehensive mapping exercise**… and is aware of areas where further development is required, for instance around assessment and appeals, as well as where there is full alignment. It intends to undertake such an exercise each year which will be monitored by the ESMG (para 135).

What needs to be done	Undertake an annual light touch mapping of current practices to the UK Quality Code identifying any gaps or areas where our practices may be out of alignment with the Expectations, Core and Common Practices. Undertake in late S1 AY 21/22. Report back to AMG.
Owner	**Academic Monitoring Group**: (Lead Ros Campbell, Quality & Policy Office)
Evaluating outcome	n/a

Area for Enhancement (9)	There is on-going work around the **renewal of [collaborative] agreements** and the framework to support them and ensuring the **timely signing of memoranda of agreement** (para 159).
What needs to be done	The Stage 5 Collaborative Review process now established. In S1 AY 20/21 this was successfully trialled with a review of a programme within the School of Management. Negotiating agreements tends to be a long process but the Stage 5 review 12 months in advance allow us more time to review effectively and renew with confidence.
Owner	**AMG Collaborations & Partnerships**: (Lead Sam Lister, Global Office)
Evaluating outcome	Periodic updates to AMG Collaborations & Partnerships.

Area for Enhancement (10)	The University has a programme of work underway to **enhance the experience of students on collaborative programmes**, including the development of new websites, provision of information, an expansion to the joint programme with the College of William and Mary, a fresh approach to transition between institutions and careers development (para 162).
What needs to be done	There is now consolidated pre-departure information and events for all cohorts. New travel webpage has been launched which supports some of the logistics around transitions. New webpages for our collaborative programmes are now live. Global Office is reviewing new ways of engaging with collaborative cohorts broadly e.g., shared events; opportunities for virtual collaboration with cohorts and partner institutions.
Owner	**AMG Collaborations & Partnerships**: (Lead Sam Lister, Global Office)
Evaluating outcome	Periodic updates to AMG Collaborations & Partnerships.

Area for Enhancement (11)	The University…is aware of the areas where further development [in terms of the oversight of collaborative provision] is required, for example the **remit and structure of Joint Committees**, and is taking appropriate action (para 163).
What needs to be done	New terms of reference for Joint Committees and also Academic Co-ordinators have been approved. New collaborative programmes will follow the agreed Joint Committees approach by default. Global Office is working with existing programmes to establish whether any changes to Joint Committees are necessary. New remit for AMG Collabs & Partnerships has been approved which meets twice per year.
Owner	**AMG Collaborations & Partnerships**: (Lead Sam Lister, Global Office)
Evaluating outcome	Periodic updates to AMG Collaborations & Partnerships.

Approved by Education Strategy Management Group (12 April 2021)