University of Aberdeen
Internal Teaching Review (ITR)

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
Panel Visit: Wednesday 6 and Thursday 7 November 2024

INTRODUCTION

1.1   The Internal Teaching Review (ITR) of the School of Education was carried out under the University's published process and procedures for ITR which are available here: https://www.abdn.ac.uk/staffnet/teaching/internal-teaching-review-6112.php.

1.2   The School was asked to submit a streamlined Critical Analysis document which addressed the following key areas:

(i) School context: to include student numbers, demographics and outcomes; highlight any areas of teaching and learning practices that are specific to the School and a summary of the School's response to the previous ITR
(ii) Positive aspects of the School's teaching and learning: to include examples of positive practice and particular strengths of the School as well as how this good practice is shared both within the School and beyond
(iii) Challenges that have been encountered in the School's teaching and learning provision: to include potential areas identified for improvement and an action plan for how they might be addressed – or whether these were issues for discussion at the ITR
(iv) Future plans: to include areas for development in the next few years, e.g. new course/programme developments, partnerships proposed

1.3   The ITR Panel was comprised of:

Professor Jason Bohan   Chair
                             Dean for Student Support & Experience
Dr Will Barras   School of Language, Literature, Music & Visual Culture
                             Quality Assurance Committee
Dr Jacqui Hutchison   School of Psychology
                             Quality Assurance Committee
Miles Rothoerl   Vice-President for Education, Students' Union
Lorna Dawson   External Subject Specialist, University of Strathclyde
Norrie McKay   External Subject Specialist, University of Strathclyde
Carrie McLennan   External Subject Specialist, University of Dundee
Liam Dyker   Clerk, Academic Services

1.4   The Panel considered the documentation provided by the School, by way of an evidence-based Critical Analysis (CA) as detailed in section 1.2. In addition, prior to the virtual visit to the School, members of the Panel were provided with access to the School's Quality Assurance (QA) repository, containing the School's annual monitoring materials (Annual Course and Annual Programme Reviews (ACR and APR)), Course Feedback Forms, minutes from meetings of Staff-Student Liaison Committees (SSLC), and External Examiner Reports (EERs), as well as the minutes from various School Committees. Consideration of this documentation, along with the School's submitted CA, enabled the Panel to identify key themes for further exploration.

1.5   The Panel conducted a visit to the School, where they met with a range of staff and students at all levels. For staff, this included (i) School Leadership team, (ii) Discipline and Programme Leads, (iii) academic colleagues, and (iv) professional and support colleagues. For students, this included a range of students on programmes across all departments within the School at all levels (undergraduate, postgraduate taught and research), particularly in relation to Initial Teacher Education (ITE), but also for early years, postgraduate and professional learning, and counselling.

1.6   The themes for focused discussion agreed with the School prior to and during the visit were:
(i)   **Structure and Staffing**, including staff support and progression
(ii)   **Teaching, Learning and Assessment**, including education strategy, future school direction, student engagement and feedback, inclusivity, and external partners
(iii)   **Student Experience**
(iv)   **Student Support and Equality, Diversity & Inclusion (EDI)**, including student voice

1.7   This report is split into three sections:
(i)   Part A gives the overall impressions of the teaching provision within the School, formed from the whole ITR process;
(ii)   Part B covers the outcome of various meetings with staff and students, focusing on a small number of themes as outlined above. It also details the Pedagogic Partnership Session, which involved more free-form discussion; and
(iii)   Part C details the School action plan which will form the basis of the annual follow-up reports.

PART A: OVERALL IMPRESSIONS

2.1   Overall, the Panel was very impressed by the School's approach to teaching, learning and assessment, particularly in relation to the high-quality student support and experience that is offered. The Panel commended the School in respect of the sense of community and School culture, aspects of assessment and feedback processes, including authentic assessments, and the level of ambition with limited resources. In particular, the work related to rubrics for assessment and feedback purposes was identified as positive, as were the example of clarifying the academic line management roles. Further, the Panel commended the excellent facilities on offer to the School, noting the wide range of rooms and physical resources which help to deliver an excellent student experience and staff working conditions within Macrobert, and excellent facilities developed in the Bounds supporting Counselling delivery. Additionally, the facilities support a collegiate and collaborative environment.

2.2   Communication across the School was generally highlighted as positive, with the School Leadership team appearing to embody a positive culture across all areas. The Panel felt that the School structure was clear, embedded and resulted in a clear chain of command. The collaboration between departments was highlighted, in particular the desire to ensure counselling was integrated into the School. The role of professional service staff was commended for their support for school activities, especially in the rapid reorganisation of roles in response to staffing changes within the school. The Panel received feedback that workloads were high for both academic and administrative

colleagues. In some areas, feedback was received that it was unclear where support could be sought both within the School and in professional services departments.

2.3 The School's approach to supporting students and the student voice was commended by the Panel. Evidence heard during the review outlined the desire across the School to nurture students, and to provide the best possible student experience on their programmes. The impression was that the School valued and seemed actively interested in the student voice, which in turn has created an environment where students feel able to bring feedback to staff. The Panel appreciated the closure of the feedback loop to students, with You Said, We Did initiatives, though some feedback from students suggested this could be more consistent across all programmes.

2.4 The Panel was impressed by the School's approach to equality, diversity and inclusion, noting the prayer room and neurodiversity café. The links to widening access were highlighted, particularly in relation to the development of Initial Teacher Education (ITE) MA STEM subjects programmes, which will target further education students, and the online access courses.

PART B: QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ENHANCEMENT; OUTCOMES OF DISCUSSIONS WITH STAFF AND THE PEDAGOGIC PARTNERSHIP SESSION

3.1 Structure and Staffing

3.1.1 The School highlighted that the departmental structure was working well and embedded in the work of the School. School Leadership noted that the introduction of the departmental structure was to ensure effective information sharing. School Leadership and academic staff highlighted the work undertaken to integrate the Mental Health & Wellbeing department into the School; the Mental Health & Education Research interest group was highlighted in this regard. Academic staff highlighted the opportunities to work across departments and programmes. Additionally, academic staff highlighted that the support structure was clear and cohesive (e.g. Programme Leads, Heads of Department, School Leadership), while administrative staff noted that in some areas, it was unclear where support should be sought. The review of the Academic Line Manager (ALM) role and Teaching & Learning Handbook were highlighted in this regard. Generally, staff felt that support provided by School Leadership was fantastic.

3.1.2 The collaborative School Executive was highlighted, as was the effective communication between Executive, departments and wider School staff. Generally, communication was highlighted as effective, noting that appropriate governance structures (e.g. School Executive, School Education Committee, School Professional Services meetings) allowed for collaboration and communication. Administrative staff advised of monthly meetings which take place to review processes and allow for information sharing. The on-campus presence was highlighted by all staff to be helpful in building a positive School culture and enabling effective communication.

3.1.3 School Leadership colleagues highlighted the ambitions to recruit new research staff under the departmental structure, however, some areas are challenging to recruit to. Additional challenges were advised related to the University-wide pause on recruitment. The School highlighted various research interest groups (e.g. Teacher Preparation, Critical Theory) which encouraged staff to work collaboratively and find common research interests. Academic staff highlighted that time available to undertake research

was limited due to the reduction in staffing and prioritisation of teaching and student support. Academic staff noted that, due to the structure of the academic year, teaching was front-loaded and as a result, there were blocks while students were on placement which could be utilised for research and scholarship. The support for research was noted, including ALMs, experienced scholarship or research staff, and writing retreats, for example.

3.1.4   Workload was identified by staff at all levels as an issue, noting the lack of capacity within the system if absence were to arise, for both academic and administrative staff. Staff highlighted that the quality of the student experience has been prioritised and as a result, has not suffered as a consequence; student feedback confirms this. Academic staff suggested that the current standards of delivery cannot continue to be met without additional staffing. For the PGDE Secondary programme, if a colleague is absent, it might result in a subject area not being taught due to the nature of the programme. School Leadership suggested that a review of the course and programme portfolio was required to identify core areas for efficiencies within and across programmes. Additionally, two additional posts were highlighted to reduce the burden of workload; in ITE and in counselling respectively. In some courses, the capacity for a lead tutor and second tutor built in was noted. Additionally, changes to course structures and groups made a small impact on the contact time required for staff. School Leadership noted that a review of workload has taken place since the last review and that another is ongoing. The Panel heard that the workload model had been adjusted to account for additional hours for course coordination, second marking, school visits, for example. The impact of the Voluntary Severance (VS) scheme on the number of Teaching & Research staff on postgraduate research supervision was highlighted; noting some arrangements required reconfiguration as a result of staffing changes. Further, flexible working arrangements were commended by the Panel.

3.1.5   Administrative staff advised that, frequently, work is being undertaken outside of their grades to support the workload of the team. Additionally, administrative staff highlighted that support for new programmes (e.g. DCouns, MSci) will be challenging with current staffing levels. Staff commented that some activities have not been able to happen with the current staffing levels, e.g. Athena SWAN support, newsletter, marketing activities. Additionally, administrative staff reported that workload is increased where any changes are not properly communicated; this was highlighted by new programmes approved by PMC and QAC, which the administrative team were unaware of. It was noted that administrative staff need to be included in planning meetings to ensure that administrative support can be fully resourced. Administrative staff also noted that career progression was limited (and in some areas, non-existent) due to the make-up of the administrative team; progression was only possible if vacancies arose. The support provided by School Leadership was commended, e.g. funding for staff to undertake additional CPD or a degree. Administrative staff spoke very highly of the approachability of School Leadership if any issues arose.

3.1.6   Issues with processes or systems were highlighted by administrative staff. In particular, the MyAberdeen roll-over and international admissions processes were highlighted, noting the significant workload impacts on staff as a result of external factors (e.g. central professional services departments). Administrative staff also reported on the need for input into programme set-up from an administration point of view, as this would allow support for administrative resourcing. Administrative staff highlighted their experience in supporting academic staff in their roles and suggested their input to setting up new

programmes was essential earlier in the planning process. Some staff commented on a lack of clarity regarding where support can be sought, particularly in relation to other areas of the University. Staff noted the lack of time to be able to review their roles, and determine which work is critical, what can be paused, stopped or changed.

3.1.7 Wellbeing of staff was highlighted in both positive and negative terms. Administrative staff advised of 'Welfare Check Fridays', where those staff on campus checked-in on Fridays for a chat, but also provided the opportunity to raise any issues that had arisen; for which, the Panel commended this. School Leadership advised that wellbeing is a concern for staff given the persistently high workloads, noting the need for better work-life balance.

3.2 Teaching, Learning and Assessment

3.2.1 The School was commended for their approach to teaching, learning and assessment. The Panel commended the School's Teaching and Learning Handbook, which was also appreciated by staff. Staff highlighted the development of authentic assessments, which connect the assessment to practice. Academic staff commented on the opportunities to create space within the School to develop these assessments, with the aim to collate a set of principles which can underpin the experience going forward. Staff suggested that assessments could be showcased to students, ensuring that students know how they will be used in an authentic context. Staff noted that the variety of assessments is prioritised to give students the opportunity to showcase their learning, while taking into account the diversity of learners. In that regard, students at all levels appreciated the diversity of assessments, e.g. videos, drama, PowerPoint presentations, essays, and that the assessment was always relevant to each course, making use of both theory and practice. Some students commended the authentic assessments, noting a particular example of providing a presentation to a parent which was effective. Students expressed some concerns with novel high-stakes assessments where they did not feel that appropriate scaffolding had been provided prior to the assessment, but noted the academic staff were very responsive and supportive. Additionally, an example was provided by undergraduate students in relation to a scrapbook assessment which lacked clarity and for which students would have appreciated further guidance. The opportunity to discuss their research was valued by postgraduate research students.

3.2.2 In relation to volume of assessments, the School highlighted that continuous assessment has always been a feature of the School's programmes. Staff highlighted that the PGDE Primary and Secondary programmes had recently undergone the TESTA programme, which had improved weightings and numbers of assessments in each course. Students highlighted that staff are receptive to student feedback in this regard and made changes to the diversity and timing of assessments as a result of student feedback. The process by which assessment descriptors are published to students was highlighted. Academic staff noted that peer assessment has been introduced to give students the opportunity to mark each other's work, which in turn will be relevant to their professional careers. In the same way, the use of microteaching, where students design and deliver sessions, was commended. Student feedback reflected positively on the microteaching aspects. In relation to generative artificial intelligence (GenAI), staff reported that many assessments require students to reflect on their own practice which is not as susceptible to tools such as ChatGPT as other programmes might be. Staff reflected that the use of GenAI will be reviewed within programmes.

3.2.3   Both staff and students highlighted the positive feedback that is provided to students following assessment submission. The use of the rubrics was highlighted and commended by both staff and students; the clarity was appreciated by both groups. Students suggested that feedback was consistently helpful, encourages self-reflection and feeds forward to future assignments, and takes a variety of forms, both written and oral, which was appreciated. Some students also suggested that staff are amenable to discussing feedback provided.

3.2.4   In relation to teaching and learning delivery, the School commented reviews have been undertaken on specific programmes (e.g. counselling) in terms of course content and assessments, partly due to load, but also for staff development. It was suggested that greater review across programmes would be beneficial to identify synergies, (e.g. academic writing skills), to ensure streamlining of resources, particularly in light of workload pressures. Staff suggested that courses are constantly updated to ensure they remain relevant to students and the external environment. Courses are also reviewed to identify better means of delivering content, or by using external parties, such as external partners or guest lectures (e.g. to deliver race equality or LGBTQI+ sessions on ITE programmes).

3.2.5   Placements for ITE programmes were highlighted as an issue at all levels for numerous reasons, including, but not limited to, (i) allocation of placements, (ii) variability of schools for students, (iii) support for students on placement, and (iv) workloads for staff. Staff commented on the strong partnership with local authorities and noted that the Partnership Unit is well-supported from academic staff. The School noted that the process is now manual due to the withdrawal of the placements allocation system. While it is recognised that there is additional workload associated with the manual system, there is increased flexibility in their allocation. Some challenges were noted around social subjects placements. Due to the withdrawal of the system, a longer teaching period at the start of the academic year has resulted, with reading weeks built in to support assessments. Administrative staff noted that, while the process is manageable, if a member of the team were to be absent long-term, it would cause a variety of issues.

3.2.6   Both staff and students recognised that variability of student placements is an issue, with staff highlighting it as a sector-wide issue. Some students reported issues with receptiveness of teachers within schools to have a student teacher, and the hostility of environment in some staff rooms. Some students reported a disparity on what is expected of them in the classroom between partner schools. Other students advised that workload is unmanageable while on placement, noting the variety of paperwork that is required to be completed. Students suggested the opportunity to feedback on placements would be welcome. Staff recognised the challenges associated with placements and suggested that further assessment rubrics or guidance could be provided to partner schools to assist with evaluation. The Panel noted the good practice on the PGDE and MA Primary programmes which included videos provided to supporter teachers detailing the School's expectations and requirements in that week. Feedback from partner schools has been positive in this regard. Staff highlighted the pastoral support that is available to students while on placement, which allows for discussion and to remedy any issues if possible.

3.2.7   In relation to counselling placements, it was noted that some students arrange placements by themselves, whereas others take place at The Bounds. Staff highlighted that the Bounds allows for free counselling, with some opting to take part face-to-face,

and others online. The Bounds allows for students to access clients and make up the required hours as part of their programmes. The Panel noted this to be positive.

3.2.8 The School outlined its plans for future development and recruitment of students. School Leadership highlighted the development of a MA programme for STEM subjects, designed with widening access and articulation from further education institutions in mind. Staff highlighted that the rationale for this development was to provide the opportunity to study for a market that is largely untapped, with target numbers in mind. The School advised that additional workload will be minimal as existing courses will be used at least in programme year 3. Further, staff suggested that the cohort will be distinct and have its own identity. Additionally, the School noted that the School is in a good position to be able to deliver aspects of the University's online strategy.

3.2.9 The School outlined a range of activities ongoing in relation to employability and career progression for students. In particular, academic staff in counselling highlighted the collaborative working with students to support them through the process of becoming a counsellor. It was suggested that counselling graduates are particularly employable due to the market demand. For ITE programmes, academic staff suggested that planning is continuous to ensure the links to the classroom environment. The School suggested that clarity was required in relation to the external benchmarks for students, e.g. QAA subject benchmarks, professional standards, MySkills.

3.3 Student Experience

3.3.1 The Panel heard of the positive culture and sense of community across both staff and student cohorts at all levels: undergraduate, postgraduate taught and research. For staff, the ability to have lunch together and engage informally, for example, was praised. Some staff highlighted the strategies deployed for online engagement, such as polls, discussion boards, which were commended by students. Staff and students commended the in-person and online events which allowed cohorts of students to collaborate and get to know each other. For PGDE Primary, for example, there were days built into the programme during placement which allowed the cohort to come together and provide reassurance and support to their peers. Some students sought the opportunity to collaborate across programmes. For example, the Panel was advised that the PGDE Primary and Secondary, and MA Education programmes have not had joint social events or academic opportunities. Students cited the wide variety of events that were put on by staff, including cooking classes, bake sales, music classes, for example, which has had a positive impact on community building, particularly while students are on placement. Students advised of online or message groups which had helped to build a sense of collegiality, community and have been helpful in sharing ideas. Postgraduate students have valued the opportunity to engage across borders, with students at far corners of the globe engaging in classes and activities.

3.3.2 Some students praised the induction programmes for the programmes, in particular the library support, while others commented that further induction activities would be appreciated. Postgraduate research students highlighted that, although they are not present in Aberdeen, they have enjoyed the resources available through the library. Additionally, students highlighted that often, they are unsure of the question that they need to ask in order to obtain support with a particular issue. It was suggested that frequently asked questions (FAQs) might be developed to support this. Further, it was

suggested that a list of acronyms was shared with students or clearly explained in communications.

3.3.3 Academic staff cited the opportunities created for students to provide feedback, both formal and informal, e.g. SSLCs or feedback forms. The You Said, We Did initiatives were highlighted by both staff and students, however, some students suggested that this could be more consistent across programmes. It was noted that, for postgraduate students, time had been built into classes to provide feedback, recognising that it is more challenging to obtain postgraduate student representation. Staff noted that informal feedback provided feeds the next class so students are able to see the feedback enacted. Some students commented that feedback forms had been developed by class representatives to gain feedback on the overall course experience for SSLC meetings. Students advised that they feel listened to. Students noted that, where suggestions are not possible to be implemented, a rationale is always provided by the School as to why not. Overall, the academic staff reported that the School is much more receptive to feedback than in previous years, which was supported by the students.

3.3.4 Students on placements advised that they are aware of the processes for partner Schools to raise issues about students while on placement. Some students highlighted the cause for concern forms which can be completed. Some students cited the positive relationships with their supporter teachers. PGDE Primary students highlighted that if any issues had arisen, they would be able to speak to their supporter teacher. Students also cited their LInC tutor as a source of support if an issue had arisen.

3.3.5 It was reported that tracking of students post-graduation was challenging, as data is not held beyond that of the University's Graduate Outcomes data. Additionally, communication had been received from some Local Authorities that probationer teachers had remained on in permanent positions. Further, academic staff suggested that, in previous years, a list of students on probation was provided to the University by the General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS), but that this has been stopped in recent years. Most of the data available was anecdotal and not formalised. The Careers Service representative advised that careers advice for School of Education students was different to other Schools due to the vocational nature of the programmes in the School. It was suggested that there is a requirement to highlight to students the options available to them for support post-graduation.

3.4 Student Support and Equality, Diversity & Inclusion (EDI)

3.4.1 The School's work in relation to Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) was commended. The School highlighted the work ongoing in relation to the Athena SWAN target to double the proportion of male applicants. Staff noted that outreach activities are ongoing to showcase ITE, for example, at open days. Staff suggested that marketing and recruitment campaigns are one route to target more male applicants. However, it was also suggested that testimonials on the website were important. Work was ongoing with partner schools to allow them a 'taster' of University experience. Some staff highlighted potential barriers were schools themselves, being predominantly female orientated, where staff rooms, for example, might become an intimidating environment. Academic staff also suggested that, in that regard, consideration was also given to groupings of students to ensure adequate support for male students, particularly in a wellbeing and retention aspect.

3.4.2   Support provided by staff was praised by students, and indeed commended by the Panel. Students clearly valued the support of staff, with staff noting additional support mechanisms that had been put in place, such as Year Leads for the MA Education programme. It is clear that students do not feel an impact on their support, despite the staffing and workload challenges. Staff noted that the core value of pastoral support is shared across the School. Staff recognised that the personal tutor system does not work for all students, however, support structures were in place to ensure that there was someone that students felt able to approach for support, (e.g. Year Leads, Course Coordinators, Programme Leads, Personal Tutor, Supervisors). Additionally, staff highlighted the contacts that were available for students at all stages of the course and/or programme, e.g. assessment contact, school experience contact. Further support adopted by staff included FAQs for assessment, assessments with inclusive approaches built in. It is recognised that there is a wide range of student needs, and a one size fits all approach will not work for some students. Some students highlighted the mentoring support which was provided by students in previous years; which students appreciated.

3.4.3   In relation to placements, specifically, the role of various tutors in teaching and on placement were highlighted by staff and students as positive. Students reported that visiting tutors engage with students regularly and always comment on their experiences, providing valuable feedback. MA Education students felt that visiting tutors were supportive and responsive in their communications.

3.4.4   Staff noted that students are coming to University with more diverse and complex needs, and relying on academic staff to provide support. Staff highlighted the support that they provide, while also signposting to University support services. Some staff noted that a conflict often arises between student retention and what is in the best interests of the student, e.g. withdrawal or suspension. Some staff also commented that they were unsure of the services provided by Student Support and how to contact their school representative. It was suggested that the School explores how their student support link person may be better integrated into school processes to support their activities.

3.4.5   The School was noted to have a positive relationship with the student support services, citing School Inclusion Coordinators as a useful point of contact. Some students advised that they were not aware of the student support services provided. It was suggested that better sign-posting might be helpful for students who are not sure what kinds of support they are eligible for. The Student Support representative highlighted that the service is mindful of students who are on placement and as such, may be unable to meet during the normal working hours. As such, it was highlighted that additional support has been provided in the evenings providing students with the opportunity to meet out of hours if necessary. It was suggested that the process by which adjustments on school placements are implemented might be an area which requires review.

3.5   Pedagogic Partnership Discussion

3.5.1   The pedagogic partnership discussion backed up many of the points mentioned during the focused meetings. In addition, the group highlighted several additional points for consideration, which can be found in Appendix A. The School are invited to consider this appendix to help inform future practice. Separate sheets are provided for staff and student responses, with student post-its in yellow and staff post-its in blue and green.

3.5.2 There was agreement between staff and students on many of the issues discussed. Both staff and students agreed that the support provided to students was excellent. Additionally, the support provided in relation to assessments, and in particular, feedback provided to students was helpful. Students felt that there was a good overview of teaching styles which accommodated different learning strategies. Staff felt that feedback was consistent, particularly due to the use of rubrics.

3.5.3 Staff and students had different experiences of some aspects of the connections between teaching, learning and assessment and the placements for ITE students. Students felt that there was a disconnect between the work undertaken in class and the work undertaken on placement. In response, staff noted that classes are designed to introduce tasks or levels of interaction, providing depth in the course structure. Additionally, the links between theory and practice were noted. Further, students sought more opportunities to collaborate with other programmes, rather than in-programme networking, to learn from one another.

3.5.4 Both staff and students also highlighted differing experiences in relation to the perception of workload for staff. Staff highlighted high workloads, particularly while providing support to students at all stages of their studies. In response, students were unaware that staff were burdened with such high workloads. Students advised that they had not noticed a change in the level of support provided to them.

PART C: SCHOOL ACTION PLAN

4.1 Continue to enhance communication and reduce workloads across the School by:

  (i)   continuing to share good practice more widely and systematically across departments and programmes;
  (ii)   continuing to develop lines of communications across departments;
  (iii)   undertaking a review of current processes and workloads for both academic and administrative staff to identify processes might benefit from review, which might be paused or stopped;
  (iv)   clarifying academic and administrative roles, and which duties should be undertaken in each;
  (v)   considering where efficiencies might be saved to create more space within workloads for other activities (such as research/scholarship).

4.2 Aim to enhance the student experience by:

  (i)   considering the development of further guidance to students regarding novel high-stakes assessments, including clear assessment descriptors;
  (ii)   undertaking a review of courses and programmes to identify synergy areas and duplication, which might resolve some issues with workload;
  (iii)   exploring opportunities for different cohorts of students (e.g. on different programmes) to come together whether in an academic or social environment;
  (iv)   enhancing existing strategies to reduce the variability of placements with partner Schools;
  (v)   engaging in discussions (as appropriate) pertaining to a replacement placement system to reduce the burden on staff.

4.3   Enhance the support offered to students by:

(i)   clarifying contacts within the School and central services for support, both academic, pastoral and general;
(ii)   considering adopting strategies for students providing peer support;
(iii)   clarifying the role of academic staff in relation to placement support (i.e. clarification of academic vs pastoral support);
(iv)   considering further integration of central student support services into School structures;
(v)   considering the development of a central resource which outlines the support services provided by the School and other University services, which can be accessed by staff and students.