

**UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW**

**Academic Regulations Committee - Friday 27 May 2005**

**Departmental Programmes of Teaching, Learning and Assessment  
Report of the Review of the Department of Psychology held on  
Friday 11 March 2005**

**Ms Alison Walker, Clerk to the Review Panel**

**May 2005**

**Review Panel:**

Professor Robin Leake (Convener)	Vice Principal (Physical Sciences and Engineering)
Dr Judi Ellis	External Subject Specialist, University of Reading
Professor Koen Lamberts	External Subject Specialist, University of Warwick
Mr John McColl	Reader, Statistics, and Vice Dean (Undergraduate), Faculty of Information and Mathematical Sciences
Professor John Briggs	Senate Assessor on Court, and Professor of Geography
Dr Vicky Gunn	Teaching and Learning Service
Ms Elaine Shearer (Clerk)	Senior Administrative Officer, Senate Office
Ms Alison Walker (Clerk)	Administrative Officer, Senate Office

**A. Introduction**

- A.1 The Department of Psychology was awarded an EXCELLENT rating by the SHEFC Teaching Quality Assessment in 1998, and a 5\* research rating in the 2001 Research Assessment Exercise (RAE). The Department had also received commendations from the British Psychological Society (BPS) in their recent (2004) review.
- A.2 While the Department was located within the Faculty of Information and Mathematical Sciences, its programmes were offered to students from the Faculty of Arts, the Faculty of Social Sciences, and the Faculties of Science.
- A.3 The Department's Self-Evaluation Report (SER) was commended by the Panel for its quality and level of reflection.
- A.4 The Review Panel met with the Dean, Professor David Fearn, the Head of Department, Professor Philippe Schyns, and the Director of Teaching, Professor Paddy O'Donnell. The Panel also met with Key Staff, two probationary members of staff, the two MSc tutors, 16 Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) and hourly-paid staff, 7 taught postgraduate students, and 22 undergraduate students drawn from all levels of the Department's provision.
- A.5 The Review Panel considered the following range of provision offered by the Department:

- a) M.A. Honours in Psychology (Single, Joint and Principal Honours for students in the Faculty of Arts)
- b) M.A. (SocSci) Honours in Psychology (Single and Joint Honours for students in the Faculty of Social Sciences)
- c) B.Sc. Honours in Psychology (for students in the Faculties of Science)
- d) B.Sc. Honours in Psychology and Statistics (for students in the Faculties of Science)
- e) B.Sc. Honours in Physiology and Psychology (for students in the Faculties of Science)
- f) B.Sc. Honours in Psychology and Computing Science (for students in the Faculties of Science)
- g) B.Sc. Designated Degree in Psychological Studies (for students in the Faculties of Science)
- h) M.Sc. in Research Methods of Psychological Sciences
- i) M.Sc. in Research Methods of Psycholinguistics

## **B. Overall aims of the Department's provision**

- B.1 The Review Panel noted that the Department's aims were closely aligned with the requirements of the BPS to prepare Honours graduates for their Graduate Basis for Registration (GBR). This was clearly important to undergraduate students, and one of the main reasons for choosing Glasgow to study Psychology.
- B.2 From the SER and discussions throughout the Review day, it was clear that one of the main aims was to provide learning in a research led environment. The Panel was pleased to note that the Department was undertaking international research in perception, language, cognitive neuropsychology and brain imaging research. The researchers involved in these areas were able to provide current knowledge to students, which might not have been widely available in literature for some time.
- B.3 The Panel considered the Department's overall aims to be appropriate, and identified no major areas of concern.

## **C. Undergraduate and Taught-Postgraduate Provision**

### *C.1 Aims*

- C.1.1 The Review Panel noted from the SER that the Department's teaching is guided both by the subject benchmark statements, and by the requirements of the BPS, which specifies the "core" areas of the curriculum.
- C.1.2 The Panel considered that the Department's aims were appropriate and identified no major concerns.

### *C.2 Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs)*

- C.2.1 It was noted from the SER that, according to the curriculum requirements for BPS recognition, the Department's undergraduate ILOs focused on the progressive development of knowledge and skills throughout the programme.
- C.2.2 The Panel considered the range of ILOs appropriate to each level of provision, and identified no major areas of concern.

### C.3 *Assessment*

- C.3.1 The Review Panel noted the progressive broadening of assessment methods used throughout the Honours programme, and felt that this allowed for variety in the testing of the ILOs for each stage of the curriculum.
- C.3.2 From the meeting with the MSc tutors, the Panel was impressed with the range of assessment methods employed in the MSc programme, which included a professional skills portfolio and mock grant proposals alongside more conventional methods such as examinations and essays. It was clear that these tested a wide variety of skills, and prepared students for the practical application of acquired skills in higher level research.
- C.3.3 The SER included discussion of the University's Code of Assessment and how it had been applied within the Department. This was relevant in the Panel's discussions regarding the lack of A grades awarded in Levels 1 and 2 (*Paragraph D.3 – D.6*).

#### Designated Degree

- C.3.4 The Panel had expressed some concerns over the limited range of assessment methods used in the Level 3 Psychological Studies course, which led non-Honours students in the Faculties of Science to the award of the BSc Designated Degree in Psychological Studies. This led to wider discussion of the Designated Degree as a whole.
- C.3.5 It was noted in the meeting with the Head of Department and Director of Teaching that, while it was vital to have the Designated Degree available as an exit point for those students unable to enter Honours but still wishing to complete a Psychology degree, it was also important to realise that many employers no longer employ graduates without an Honours degree. It was noted, in light of this, that the University **should consider** the implications of the teaching of Designated Degrees across all Honours subjects. It was agreed to refer this to the Vice Principal (Learning & Teaching).
- C.3.6 It was made clear that students undertaking a BSc Designated Degree in Psychological Studies were often of a different calibre to students undertaking similar degrees in other subjects (*Paragraph C.5.10*), and were therefore an unusual group, which might be open to more innovative methods of teaching, learning and assessment.
- C.3.7 It was felt by the Panel that while much of the Honours programme was imaginative in this regard, this had not been exploited in the Level 3 Psychological Studies course, and that an opportunity was there to be explored.
- C.3.8 While it was noted that the Department was in the process of reviewing the content of the Level 3 Psychological Studies course, the Panel **invited** the Department to review their Level 3 non-Honours provision in terms of teaching, learning and assessment methods, and noted that it might be appropriate to approach the Teaching and Learning Service (TLS) for assistance in this.

### C.4 *Curriculum Design and Content*

#### Professional Skills

- C.4.1 It was noted from discussions with the student representatives from all Levels that the Professional Skills training provided by the Department was very highly regarded. It was clear that students present appreciated the opportunity to link their skills to applied situations, and that this would be useful both in a career using Psychology and in other careers outwith the discipline.

#### Teaching Management Group

- C.4.2 The SER included discussion of the role played by the Department's Teaching Management Group (TMG). The Panel was pleased to observe the work this group undertook with regard to teaching and curriculum issues at all levels.
- C.4.3 The Panel did however note that certain members of the TMG had very limited roles and attended meetings only intermittently. The Panel therefore **recommended** that the Department review the membership of the TMG, with a view to allowing more junior members of staff to become involved in this pivotal departmental activity.

#### Level 1

- C.4.4 In the meeting with undergraduate students, the Panel was informed that while Level 2 laboratory practicals took place in class groups throughout the session, Level 1 classes were based around drop-in sessions and self-study. These students noted that they appreciated the more personal nature of the Level 2 classes and expressed the wish that this could be extended to the Level 1 classes. It was noted from meetings with key staff that this would be difficult to achieve throughout the year, given the large number of students involved, and the limits of laboratory space and curriculum time. In light of this, the Panel **recommended** that the Department consider introducing one of the laboratory exercises as a class group exercise in each of the Level 1 courses.

#### Level 2

- C.4.5 Undergraduate students met by the Panel also expressed concern over the frequency of tutorials in Level 2. These were being held fortnightly, and while it was understood that other mechanisms were in place for contacting staff for assistance, students present felt that weekly tutorials would be more helpful in allowing any issues coming up immediately after a tutorial took place to be addressed within a sufficient period of time. The Panel therefore **recommended** that the Department consider increasing the frequency of Level 2 tutorials.

#### Honours

- C.4.6 The SER noted the Department's focus on research led teaching at all levels in the curriculum.
- C.4.7 The Panel expressed some concerns over the range of Level 4 options, and, in particular, that basing the courses solely around the current research interests of staff in the Department might not allow students to fully explore all areas of the subject.
- C.4.8 There was also concern that the numbers of students taking these options ranged from 8 to 104 (with a potential complement of 120). This pointed to potential difficulties both in terms of teaching such large numbers of students, and for students learning in such a large group at Level 4.
- C.4.9 Students met by the Panel had expressed a wish for more Applied Psychology to be taught at Level 4, and in light of this, the Panel **recommended** that the Department consider expanding its range of Level 4 provision to include more applied options. This would hopefully also take pressure off the more popular options currently available, to allow for smaller teaching groups. The Panel noted that there were some potential difficulties with implementing this recommendation, as a result of the number of current vacancies in the Department (*Paragraph C.6.6*). Therefore, it was suggested that this might be achieved by 'buying in' teaching time from outwith the University, by approaching former students now practising professionally, or offering Honorary appointments to other professional practitioners in the relevant fields.

*C.5 Student Recruitment, Support and Progression*

C.5.1 The Review Panel was pleased to note the high level of support from the Department described by students at all levels of provision. It was clear that this played an important role in achieving good results from the students, and in retaining those able to do so through to Honours, and onwards to postgraduate study.

Students' perceptions of Psychology

C.5.2 In the meetings with students and staff, the Panel noted a discrepancy between Level 1 students' expectations of Psychology as a subject, and the reality of studying the subject at undergraduate level. It was noted by some that Higher Psychology at school was not an adequate preparation for the scientific nature of the subject, and the breadth of topics studied in Level 1.

C.5.3 It was considered that this issue needed to be addressed before the students applied to study Psychology, and also on commencement of Level 1 Psychology, and that there were several mechanisms that could assist with this.

C.5.4 At the departmental level, the Panel therefore **recommended** that a description of the nature of undergraduate Psychology be included in promotional literature for prospective students, such as the Undergraduate Prospectus, Programme Specifications, and on the departmental website. It was also noted that increased interaction with relevant school staff would be helpful in this regard.

C.5.5 At the Faculty level, the Panel **recommended** that the Faculty Recruitment Committee give consideration to the issue, and examine ways of addressing it.

C.5.6 At the University level, the Panel **recommended** that the Student Recruitment & Admissions Service (SRAS) be fully briefed on this also in order that a clear view could be given to potential students prior to their application to the University.

C.5.7 Once students had been accepted to study Psychology, and had arrived at the University, the Panel **recommended** that the Department emphasise the differences from the subject as studied at school in introductory lectures and in the Level 1 class handbook, and make clear the expectations on students both in the Level 1 year, and throughout their degree.

Progression to Honours

C.5.8 The SER included discussion of the current demographics of undergraduate Psychology students, whereby in Levels 1 and 2 a maximum class size of 600 and 300 respectively had been set by Senate. These students were distributed across the three Faculties offering degrees in Psychology. It was noted that there was significant pressure for students in Level 2 to gain entry to the Honours class, the size of which had recently been increased to an approximate limit of 120 students, and it was expected that this limit would be revisited in the near future.

C.5.9 The Panel noted that the Department had clearly made significant efforts to communicate at every opportunity the requirements on students who wished to continue to Honours level study of Psychology. New students were defined as Potential Honours Psychology (PHP) students, if they applied, were offered and accepted a place to study with a Psychology UCAS code. This was the only group of students eligible for progression to Honours. This requirement, along with grades required in Level 1 and 2 courses, was clearly stated in class handbooks, and other departmental documentation.

C.5.10 The Panel was impressed by the high calibre of Psychology Honours students, and the high number of First Class Honours degrees achieved. It was noted, however, that the current system often led to numbers of students in the Faculties of Science completing a BSc Designated Degree in Psychological Studies, when they would have been

strong candidates for Honours in other subjects. It was felt that the system often forced these students into such a situation because of the late stage at which a decision regarding Honours was made. The Panel therefore **recommended** that the Department consider making the decision on which students would be eligible for Honours at an earlier stage, e.g. end of Level 1. This might then assist students who did not achieve entry to Psychology Honours to explore other options for Honours study.

### *C.6 The Effectiveness of Provision*

#### Learning and Teaching

- C.6.1 The Review Panel considered that the supporting documentation for the Review indicated good practices in teaching, learning and assessment. It was also considered that the high number of First Class Honours achieved was indicative of the effectiveness of the Department's provision.
- C.6.2 The Department was commended for the high level of support given to all students throughout their studies, and the achievement of British Psychological Society (BPS) accreditation for the MA and BSc Honours programmes, and Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) accreditation for the MSc programmes. The students met by the Panel considered these accreditations important in giving value to the qualifications in the current employment market, and for furthering their careers after achieving the qualifications.
- C.6.3 The Panel noted from the SER that an important goal was 'encouraging independent study'. This was noted as being achieved by various means, e.g. essay writing and use of web resources in Levels 1 and 2, and through the critical reviews undertaken in Level 3. It was also noted that the research projects undertaken in the Honours years encouraged the development of independent research skills. The Department noted that student progress in this regard could be seen from the improvement in grades awarded and the decrease in staff support required in the later exercises of these types.
- C.6.4 Undergraduate students met by the Panel also noted that because of the large class sizes in Levels 1 and 2, close one to one support was not available. It was noted that because of difficulties in knowing what was required (*Paragraph C.5.7*), and not receiving the quality of feedback they had expected (*Paragraph F.1*), students found that they experienced a steep learning curve, having to be self-disciplined and undertake a great deal of independent study. However, this was not seen by Honours students met by the Panel as detrimental, but as beneficial, in that by the time they reached Honours they were better prepared for the more independent styles of learning used.

#### Resources

- C.6.5 The Panel was able to view laboratory and lecture facilities on the Review day, both in Hillhead Street and in the Boyd Orr building, and was impressed with the facilities and accommodation available. It was noted that recent funding had provided for further expansion of the Hillhead Street site to allow all Honours tutorial and project work to be delivered on a single site.
- C.6.6 The Panel noted from the SER and discussions with staff that staffing levels in the Department were not currently ideal. It could be seen that, while Staff-Student Ratios (SSRs) had improved in recent years, there were several vacancies in the Department at both Professorial and non-Professorial levels. It was however noted that with further funding being allocated to the Department, this situation was improving, and that the Department would hope to fill the vacancies within the next few years.

## **D. The Maintenance and Enhancement of Standards of Awards**

- D.1 The Review Panel considered that the Department had good Quality Assurance procedures in place, although the published documentation only appeared to cover undergraduate provision.
- D.2 The Panel expressed some concern over an apparent lack of evidence of the procedures in place to deal with Annual Course Monitoring Reports (ACMRs) and comments from both students and External Examiners. Staff assured the Panel that all comments were dealt with appropriately.

Grades awarded in Levels 1 and 2

- D.3 One of the Department's main concerns, clear to the Panel from the SER and comments on ACMRs, was the lack of A grades awarded to students in Levels 1 and 2. This was discussed in meetings with the Head of Department and Director of Teaching, key staff, and undergraduate students. Several of the students expressed a degree of frustration that more study time could be spent on Psychology, almost to the neglect of other subjects studied, and yet higher grades were more easily achieved in those other subjects.
- D.4 It was noted by the Department that one of the causes of this might be related to the BPS requirements for all core curriculum areas to be passed at all levels. The system did not allow the student to bypass weaker areas and focus on stronger ones, thereby leading to a situation where a majority of good grades could be brought down by one single lower grade.
- D.5 The Panel observed that this situation was in apparent contrast to the grades awarded in Honours, where a large number of First Class Honours were achieved. The Department reported that this was in large part due to the fact that it was easier to award A1 grades in Honours, especially for Projects and Critical Reviews. It was also noted that because of the selection process for entry into Honours, the majority of students were already very good, and likely to produce a higher standard of work than the majority at Levels 1 and 2. The fact that there was also an element of choice in the Honours curriculum, allowing students to focus Level 4 options on interests and stronger areas, might also play a role in this difference.
- D.6 The Panel noted that the Department had already begun to explore this issue, and how it might be resolved. There was evidence that the modularisation of the Level 1 and 2 courses, begun in the 2003-04 session, had achieved a minimal improvement in this. The Panel therefore **recommended** that further consideration be given to how this issue might be resolved. There was evidence to suggest that higher grades were achieved when assessments were carried out via continuous assessment rather than unseen examination, and measures discussed included the possibility of assessing harder parts of the curriculum by coursework rather than examination. It was also suggested that a second marker might be used, who would work to a specific remit with this issue in mind.
- D.7 It was also noted that the forthcoming addition of two bands to the A grade in the University's Code of Assessment marking scale might allow for more flexibility in the award of these grades.

## **E. The Maintenance and Assurance of Quality**

- E.1 The Review Panel noted from the SER that staff training played an important role in the Department.
- E.2 It was apparent to the Panel that the Department provided a high level of support to their Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs). It was regarded as impressive that all of

the GTAs with whom the Panel met had received training from the Department in addition to that provided by the TLS. The GTAs themselves also noted that the departmental training had been very helpful in identifying areas specific to their role in the Department.

- E.3 Probationary staff also noted the Department's high level of support throughout the probationary period, through both the New Lecturer and Teacher Programme (NLTP) and departmental mentors. During the probationary period, staff had benefited from two sessions of observation of their teaching, one each by the TLS and the Department. The probationers felt that a further session of observation would be helpful to allow further improvement. The Panel therefore **recommended** consideration of this to the TLS.
- E.4 The Panel did have some concern over the procedures in place for ensuring quality of lectures. It was noted that student feedback was relied upon in this area, and it was felt that there might be opportunity for the introduction of a peer observation scheme for teaching staff in the department. The Panel therefore **recommended** that the Department consider introducing such a system.
- E.5 The SER drew attention to the low attendance of students at Staff-Student Liaison Committee (SSLC) meetings. The Panel expressed concern over this, and discussed the matter with the Head of Department and Director of Teaching. It was noted that the Teaching Co-ordinator for Levels 1 and 2 operated an 'open-door' policy, which meant that the majority of issues were dealt with without the need for them to be brought before the SSLC. It was also considered that these meetings were not a priority for students. The Panel noted the Department's awareness of this issue, and their efforts in encouraging students to take part more actively.

## **F. Enhancing the Student Learning Experience**

- F.1 The Review Panel was informed by key staff that Level 1 students were arriving at University with a different level of basic skills than previously. It was also noted from discussions with both groups that staff and students had different expectations regarding feedback on formative work, and that students were often unhappy at the variation in the extent of staff comments received. Some students noted that feedback did not necessarily assist them in identifying what was particularly good about their work or how to improve their work in practical terms. The Department did acknowledge that more could be done to address this lack of skills, which had previously been taken for granted. The Panel therefore **recommended** that the Department examine how best to improve this situation, in conjunction with the Faculty's Effective Learning Adviser.
- F.2 The Panel commended the Department on the Research Assistant and Postgraduate (RA PG) seminars that took place on a weekly basis. The taught postgraduate students met by the Panel were enthusiastic about these, as it allowed them to get feedback from their peers on the research they were undertaking, as well as allowing them to get an early insight into being a PhD student.
- F.3 The Panel was impressed at the high usage of the department's web portal. The undergraduate students met by the Panel mentioned it as a central information point that was also used widely as a forum for students and as a means for contacting staff.

### Peer Assisted Learning (PAL)

- F.4 The SER discussed the introduction of a Peer Assisted Learning (PAL) scheme in the 2003-04 session. This involved student 'facilitators' organising weekly group meetings for undergraduate students on a given course. The facilitators would have



taken these courses previously, and therefore had an inside knowledge of the student learning perspective which was not available to members of staff.

- F.5 It was acknowledged that this scheme had proved a great success in the Honours years, but that numbers could be increased in Levels 1 and 2. This was discussed when the Panel met with undergraduate students, who noted that, while it was highly beneficial, they sometimes felt that too many students were taking part in each group to allow for full involvement.
- F.6 Staff met by the Panel noted that many of the difficulties of the PAL scheme were down to limitations of curriculum time, and the coordination of this both for students and facilitators. While appreciating these limitations, the Panel **recommended** that the Department offer more PAL sessions, to allow more students to benefit from the scheme.
- F.7 The Panel also noted from the SER the Department's experimental use of electronic handsets as a means to obtain feedback from students. This was not however explored at the review.

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

### *Key Strengths*

The Review Panel was impressed with the overall provision of the Department, and the manner in which the provision encourages and produces strong, highly capable students, at all levels of the curriculum.

In particular, the Department is commended:

- for its aim to provide learning within a research led environment;
- on the high level of support given to students at all levels of provision;
- on the Professional Skills training provided to students;
- on the wide range of assessment methods used in the MSc programmes;
- for the work of the Teaching Management Group (TMG) on the curriculum and related issues in the Department;
- for the high level of support given to Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) and probationary staff;
- for the integration of the web based portal into the daily running of the Department, and the wide usage of this by students;
- on the Research Assistant and Postgraduate (RA PG) seminars, and the way this provides a forum for new researchers to receive peer feedback on their work;
- on the successful implementation of the Peer Assisted Learning (PAL) scheme.

### *Areas to be Improved or Enhanced in relation to Learning and Teaching*

While the Review Panel had no major concerns regarding the Department's provision in relation to Learning and Teaching, the following areas were identified for improvement or enhancement:

- A more imaginative approach to learning, teaching and assessment within the BSc Designated Degree in Psychology.
- Incorporating class group laboratory work into the Level 1 curriculum.

- Increasing the frequency of tutorials in the Level 2 curriculum.
- Expanding the options available to Level 4 students, both to increase the choice for students, but also to reduce the currently large class sizes.

### *Conclusions*

The Review Panel commended the Department on the overall quality of its provision and the supportive environment fostered for students within the Department. Staff and students met by the Panel were clearly enthusiastic about the Department and its activities, and the Panel considered that future development of the Department would continue to be successful.

The Panel also commended the Department on the high quality of the documentation provided prior to the review, and the level of reflection in the Self Evaluation Report (SER).

### *Recommendations*

#### Recommendation 1:

The Panel **recommends** that the Department give further consideration to possible ways of addressing the lack of A grades awarded in Levels 1 and 2. (*Paragraph D.6*)

**Action:** Head of Department

#### Recommendation 2:

The Panel **recommends** that the Department consider expanding its range of Level 4 provision to include more applied options. (*Paragraph C.4.9*)

**Action:** Head of Department

#### Recommendation 3:

The Panel **recommends** that the Department consider making the decision on which students would be eligible for Honours at an earlier stage, e.g. end of Level 1. (*Paragraph C.5.10*)

**Action:** Head of Department

#### Recommendation 4:

The Panel **recommends** that the Department examine how to address the level of basic skills demonstrated by Level 1 students on entry to the University, in conjunction with the Faculty's Effective Learning Adviser. (*Paragraph F.1*)

**Action:** Head of Department  
Effective Learning Adviser for the Faculties of Science

#### Recommendation 5:

The Panel **recommends** that the Department consider increasing the frequency of Level 2 tutorials. (*Paragraph C.4.5*)

**Action:** Head of Department

#### Recommendation 6:

The Panel **recommends** that the Department consider introducing one of the laboratory exercises as a class group exercise in each of the Level 1 courses. (*Paragraph C.4.4*)

**Action:** Head of Department

Recommendation 7:

The Panel **recommends** that the Department offer more Peer Assisted Learning (PAL) sessions, to allow more students to benefit from the scheme. (*Paragraph F.6*)

**Action:** Head of Department

Recommendation 8:

The Panel **recommends** that the Faculty Recruitment Committee give consideration to the discrepancy between Level 1 students' expectations of Psychology and the reality of studying the subject at undergraduate level, and examine ways of addressing this. (*Paragraph C.5.5*)

**Action:** Faculty Recruitment Committee, Faculty of Information and Mathematical Sciences

Recommendation 9:

The Panel **recommends** that the Department include a description of the nature of undergraduate Psychology in its promotional literature for prospective students, and in increased interaction with relevant school staff. (*Paragraph C.5.4*)

**Action:** Head of Department

Recommendation 10:

The Panel **recommends** that the Student Recruitment & Admissions Service (SRAS) be fully briefed on the nature of Psychology at undergraduate level, in order that a clear view could be given to potential students prior to their application to University. (*Paragraph C.5.6*)

**Action:** Head of Department  
Director, Student Recruitment & Admissions Service

Recommendation 11:

The Panel **recommends** that the Department emphasise the differences between Psychology as studied at school and at undergraduate level in introductory lectures and the Level 1 class handbook, and that the expectations on students both in Level 1 and throughout their degree be made clear. (*Paragraph C.5.7*)

**Action:** Head of Department

Recommendation 12:

The Panel **invites** the Department to review their Level 3 non-Honours provision, with particular regard to teaching, learning and assessment methods, in conjunction with the Teaching and Learning Service (TLS). (*Paragraph C.3.8*)

**Action:** Head of Department  
Director of Teaching and Learning Service

Recommendation 13:

The Panel **recommends** that the University consider the wider implications of the teaching of Designated Degrees across all Honours subjects. (*Paragraph C.3.5*)

**Action:** Vice Principal (Learning & Teaching)

Recommendation 14:

The Panel **recommends** that the Teaching and Learning Service consider introducing a further session of teaching observation for probationary staff within the New Lecturer and Teacher Programme. (*Paragraph E.3*)

**Action:** Director, Teaching and Learning Service

Recommendation 15:

The Panel **recommends** that the Department consider introducing a system of peer observation for teaching staff. (*Paragraph E.4*)

**Action:** Head of Department

Recommendation 16:

The Panel **recommends** that the Department review the membership of the Teaching Management Group (TMG), with a view to allowing more junior members of staff to become involved in this pivotal departmental activity. (*Paragraph C.4.3*)

**Action:** Head of Department

*Prepared by: Janet Fleming, Senate Office*

*Last modified on: Tuesday 17 May 2005*