

School: Moray House School of Education and Sport
Academic year: 2022/3
Author: Deborah Holt (dholt)
Contributors:
Status: In Progress



THE UNIVERSITY
of EDINBURGH

Authors

1. Report written by (include contributors):

Dr Deborah Holt, (DQAE) Dr Sam Fawkner, (DHoS) Dr Andrew Horrell, (DL&T) Dr Lindsey Horner, (CAL), Dr Pete Evans, (PGT Director), Rachel O'Neill, (Disability Contact), Dr John Kelly, (PGR Director), Dr Ann MacDonald, (DUGS/UGSPT) Dr Katie Cebula, (PGSPT) Dr Murray Craig, Dr Kuang-Hsu Chiang, Dr Paul Kelly & Dr Graham Baker (SQAE members),

Areas for reflection

1. Please report on progress with actions planned in last year's report (see Aide Memoire from Academic Services).

Staffing

The staffing plan seems to be having a gradual positive impact as there were fewer concerns raised about staffing, and the detrimental impact on teaching of staffing issues has been less frequent. We have moved away from having a staff on GH contracts as Course Organisers, although this does happen occasionally.

Strengths:

Praise for engaging, passionate tutors/lecturers permeates student feedback.

Students also value the expertise and specialisms of their tutors and the varied, interactive, relevant engaging nature of their classes.

Students recognise that they are well supported and appreciate their Programme Director/Course Organiser/teaching team's efforts to build community, address concerns and worries, provide social events.

Staff comment on supportive colleagues and value and appreciate the support they get from the Learning and Teaching Directorate and Deputy Head of School.

Outstanding areas of concern for ongoing monitoring and development:

PGT numbers continue to increase but numbers of staff employed on Research and Teaching contracts are not increasing in line with this, meaning that a significant percentage of PGT students are not taught by research active lecturers.

There is still progress to be made on building staffing resilience so that there is capacity for last minute increase in student numbers or staff illness.

Staff wellbeing is one of the major causes of staffing disruptions to teaching and learning. The new HoS has staff wellbeing as a priority, but it is likely to take time for changes to be implemented and have impact on teaching and learning.

Consideration needs to be given to the provision and support for staff with a disability so that both academic and professional services staff equally have appropriate accommodations for their disabilities

There is a staffing shortage within our professional services team, most specifically the Teaching Office, and this has had a detrimental impact on the student experience, as well as increasing academic staff workload and reducing staff morale. There is a rapid turnover of TO staff, in part, but not solely, due to the cost of living crisis. Everyone subsequently has more work to do than their workload allocation and the quality can suffer which is reflected in student feedback on programme/course organisation and communication.

Assessment & Feedback

More detail relating to this target is covered elsewhere in this report. To summarise:

Steady action has been made towards achieving each of the School's Assessment Feedback strategy aims/tasks which sought to build staff capacity, student skills and understanding and to develop resources and, through the PWS sessions and Team amongst other ways, to create, a space for sharing what works well or in which to discuss problems/challenges in a constructive way.

Work has been done throughout the School to develop students' academic literacy (see next paragraph) and their ability to understand and engage with feedback.

Over the coming year, it will be important to monitor the new ACL's role in this, as previously PTs have had a prominent role in helping students engage with and understand feedback.

A growing number of course organisers have developed grade related criteria and rubrics that they discuss with students towards the beginning of a course to develop an increased understanding of course expectations, approaches to assessment in students and to begin ongoing dialogue about the learning and assessment process.

Also discussed later, there are still some courses and programmes that need particular development, but these have been identified and support is planned.

Support has been available on demand from the DQAE who has led bespoke programme level training sessions or one to one support. For example, carrying out quality feedback audits of a specific course assessment. Strengths and development needs (including a support plan) are identified through these audits. Audit reports with all identifiers removed are available as a resource for any course or programme team to use for their own assessment and feedback development.

The L&T directorate course organiser training also assists staff with their role in A&F- with the main challenge being that some of the staff/teams who most need the training, do not attend either because they do not have enough time (a contributing factor to their delayed development in this area) or because they do not think they need to,

We continue to gather student voice in this area to inform ongoing development.

Specific questions in the course monitoring forms for course organisers also help School leadership monitor actions, progress and staff understanding in relation to A&F.

The UG IPR commended the School on its work in this area, particularly the quality feedback checklists, audits and support processes for staff and the use of GRC rubrics shared with students and used for marking. External Examiners have also praised specific approaches to assessment and feedback.

Academic conduct

As identified in the last year's report, the School has taken a supportive and preventive approach, to help our students to understand what good academic conduct is and what constitutes academic misconduct. The school-wide measures which were put in place include the following:

All courses now provide links to IAD information on good academic conduct and have a section in Learn sites.

AM and good academic literacy are discussed in tutorials/workshops with signposting/referral to ELE Library or IAD courses/resources where needed.

Academic literacies is embedded into many UG programmes.

Further measures were taken in some courses and programmes. For example:

The SAMO has visited students to talk about good academic practice and how to avoid SAMO referrals.

The CAMO letter ('our expectations for your academic writing') was circulated.

A trial Turnitin submission was set up for the students and was used as a way to discuss plagiarism and good academic conduct

Assignment exemplars were removed where students were found to be copying these heavily. If exemplars are used, students are taught how to engage with them as a model without copying or plagiarising in any way

We do not yet have the CAMO referral numbers for this year so cannot tell to what extent these measures have decreased referrals. Similarly, the MAB makes it hard to see whether standards have risen.

WP EDI

The new school Director of EDI has implemented a range of strategies, consultations and is developing strategic plans for EDI at all levels in the School. It will take time for these to have impact. A range of approaches have been embedded into courses to ensure that diversity is recognised and accommodated. This varies from course to course depending on student demographic. We made a huge effort to cater for learner difference and diversity by giving students experience of different methods and approaches. Equality and diversity issues were also incorporated into courses in order to foster both critical and transformative practitioners, especially through considering critical pedagogies for social justice in relation to the students' own context of teaching and learning. There is still significant work to be done in raising teaching staff awareness of their responsibilities to support and include all students and their knowledge and skills in meeting these responsibilities, particularly in relation to WP students, where there are still ongoing discussions about how much can be shared with course teams.

We continue to work towards increased diversity and, on one programme alone, we have secured large amounts of funding (total of ~£1,200,000) for scholarships for students from several African countries for the next several years to meet the School's internationalisation priorities. We have recruited actively in underserved locales and can now attest to having ~60 countries represented on the programme. But on-campus PGT provision remains highly dependent overall on students from a single country. Strategies to address this are being actively developed.

Analysis of progression and awards data suggests that in 2022/3 care experienced students and those with a disability had less favourable progression outcomes, and care experienced students and mature students were less likely to achieve a higher classification award. However, the impact of MAB on these statistics is unknown but likely to be significant. Particularly as there was a greater impact from IA on some of our WP programmes than on our teacher education programmes where staff are often in a different union. The data does highlight the need for continuing close scrutiny of the performance of individual groups and a need to maintain and increase the support and provision for all groups of students. There is no discernible difference between other groups (e.g. male/vs female; domicile etc.). Please see further general WP analysis below.

2. Please use this free text space as an opportunity for general reflection on the past year or issues specific to the School/Deanery which are not addressed elsewhere in the report

Undergraduate Award and Progression:

At the end of the academic year 2022/2023, 33% of students graduating with an honours degree from MHSES were awarded a First Class honours. As noted last year, there was a large increase in firsts awarded by MHSES between 2019/20 and 2020/21 which was thought to be attributable to all the mitigating measures given to Boards during the Covid years, and in particular the discounting of courses affected for classification purposes. In 2021/22 the number of firsts awarded fell back to pre- Covid levels. However, in July 2023 we see an increase from 24% last year to 33% this year. This was most notable in the Applied Sports Science programme which saw an increase from 26% to 42%, however this is more in-line with pre-Covid levels for this programme (last year the number of firsts was low for this programme). M.A. Physical Education has also seen an increase from last year from 15% achieving firsts in 21/22 to 22% in 22/23. This brings this programme up to a higher level of firsts than the pre-Covid years. It may be that again, mitigating measures, this time associated with UCU strike action and the Marking and Assessment Boycott, allowed for the discounting of course marks and the elevation of overall averages. The numbers of students successfully receiving 11.2e from Special Circumstances claims, allowing Boards to disregard unfavourable marks for classification purposes, might also have some bearing.

Data is not available on the portal for Sports and Recreation Management nor for either of the MA Primary Education with Gaelic programmes, presumably because numbers are too small to be statistically significant, but it is assumed that this data is included in the averages for the School. Our remaining honours programme, M.A. Learning in Communities is relatively new and has not yet had a cohort complete to year 4.

We will continue to look closely at our awards year on year.

Analysis of UG WP students' achievement over time of high classification- i.e., Second class Division 1 or 1st class degree:

In terms of achievement, 71% of Widening Participation (WP) students undertaking an UG degree at Moray House School of Education & Sport (MHSES) achieved a high classification this academic session (2022/23). This percentage is consistent with the number of high classifications achieved by WP students at MHSES since 2018/19 (discounting both 2019/20 and 2020/21 where the figures may have been skewed by Covid-19 mitigations). However, the percentage for WP students is markedly lower than that reported for non-WP students awarded a high classification (87%), this session (2022/23). Given a similar discrepancy between WP and non-WP students was observed last year (2021/22), further consideration of mechanisms across MHSES that might support WP students to achieve a high classification may be warranted. Comparing the percentage of high classifications achieved by WP MHSES students with WP students across the College (CAHSS) and wider University, perhaps strengthens the case for further promotion of the mechanisms and support available at MHSES. Since 2018/19, the percentage of high classifications awarded to WP students at MHSES each year (2020/21 notwithstanding), has been markedly lower than the figure for WP students across CAHSS and the wider University (CSE and MVM). This figure may be influenced by the high number of WP students within MHSES.

A closer inspection of the degree classifications for WP students indicates an increasing trend in the number of 1st class degrees achieved at MHSES since 2018/19. It is pleasing to report a marked increase in 1st class awards this session (2022/23) i.e., 31% (up 13% from 2021/22), and it might be MHSES wishes to monitor this percentage over subsequent academic sessions to see if this percentage is maintained. It is worth noting the increased percentage of 1st class degrees is offset by a decidedly lower percentage of Second-class Division 1 degrees being awarded this session (40%). It is also worth acknowledging this percentage is lower than it has been previously over the last 5 years and might warrant closer inspection in the future if this trend continues.

UG WP students' progression

In terms of the progression of Undergraduate WP students at MHSES, the percentage for the 2022/23 session (76%) shows a marked decrease from the previous four years (the percentage has been 90%+ since 2018/19). It would be worth revisiting the progression percentages of MHSES WP students at the end of the forthcoming 2023/24 session to see if this decrease is an emerging trend. However, despite the decrease in percentage of WP students progressing this session (2022/23), it is worth noting that the discrepancy between MHSES WP and non-WP students is slight i.e., 76% and 81% respectively. Furthermore, it is also worth acknowledging the progression percentage for MHSES WP students is greater than the same percentages reported across the College (CAHSS) and the wider University, not only this session, but for the previous four years i.e., since 2018/19.

Analysis of PGT achievement and progression

Achievement: The overall percentage of PGT students achieving a high degree classification this year has fallen from 64 to 53%. This is 5% lower than the lowest percentage in recent years of 58% in 2018/2019. It is highly likely that the industrial action has contributed to this reduction in higher classifications at PGT level but the School will investigate the reasons behind this over the coming months. Looking at specific groups within the PGT cohort. PGT students over 25 years old on entry, those domiciled in Scotland and the rest of the UK and white PGT students were more likely to achieve a higher classification. All other groups are consistent with the School average. The relative performance of PGT groups is similar to that of 2021/2022.

Progression: The percentage of PGT students with a favourable progression outcome was 94% which is broadly in line with previous years. The 4 year average between 2018/19 and 2021/22 is 98%. At 87%, there was a lower than School average percentage of PGT students with a disability achieving a favourable progression decision. Otherwise there was no significant difference between groups.

QA platform for Course Monitoring and Student Voice Surveys

Last year we sought University or CAHSS assistance with a new platform for our QA processes. Members of the School QA committee taking this forward, PK and GB, met with RS (from Sharepoint Solutions Service, UoE) to discuss the migration of Course Monitoring and Student Voice Surveys to Sharepoint. It was confirmed this is feasible for academic year 23/24 and will help with data protection and the ability to link to Programme and Course data. The QAE Committee will provide relevant information on permissions for viewing data (Students, Course Organisers, PDs, QAE Committee/Director) and this will be an ongoing action for the QAE Administrative Support. PK and GB will brief the incoming QAE Director. It was noted in the August QAE meeting that Equality, Diversity and Inclusion responses in Course Monitoring can be highly variable. Links to relevant EDI resources and MHSES support can be embedded within the new Course Monitoring form. It is hoped that the new platform will help raise visibility of student voice in particular and make it easier for student voice to be gathered and shared with relevant programme teams and University committees.

3. Please provide a specific reflection on postgraduate research (PGR) provision.

Monitoring student progress

The primary (structural) mechanism for monitoring students' progress is the Annual Review. All students – part-time, full-time and all years – need to have an annual review and evidence sufficient development in order to progress. First year students (2nd year if part-time) need to have a Progression Board as part of their Annual Review. All other students still have to have an Annual Review but not the Progression Board. The number of students requiring repeat reviews is extremely low and so is the number of students who change programme to another programme. (Specific figures are not immediately available but we're working on addressing this). In terms of monitoring student progress, the Ars are supported by:

Ongoing supervision

supervisors have access to updated training resources (noted below) and students have access to up-to-date information on Sharepoint regarding availability and processes relating to concessions, making changes to supervision teams, student support and wellbeing.

College send School lists of incomplete 'engagement' (i.e. attendance) monitoring/recording and we follow up with supervisors to ensure they are:

- a. Meeting student
- b. Completing the online records to reflect these meetings.

PGR Training (for students)

Implemented new Thematic Hub system whereby each TH provides 2-3 (some more) student-focused PGR training and development sessions per year.

IAD provide excellent support in offering numerous and varied support sessions. School (PGR Office) offer 2-3 generic/process-related sessions that are not Hub-specific.

Supervisor Support (formerly supervisor training)

We have re-named supervisor training “supervisor support” to more accurately reflect the work being done with highly skilled and experienced colleagues.

In-person sessions have largely been replaced by online video presentations and powerpoints which are available throughout the year on the PGR Sharepoint pages. These are being updated further in August 2023. These enable colleagues to access resources as and when they require. We recognise that there are benefits to having some interactive sessions too and we have scheduled some online live group sessions. It is hoped that with more explicit advertising of these that colleagues will participate in them in the new year. We are adopting a hybrid approach to enable online and in-person activities.

Community Building

We have developed regular (monthly) student-focused coffee meet-ups. These are arranged according to two main categories of meet-up:

1. Entirely social (non-academic) and often involve quizzes, dancing, and other appropriate social activity.
2. Semi-academic involving first 30 mins (or so) talk/chat around PGR-related theme (VIVA prep; concessions; student support, etc.).

At the time of writing, progression/retention and award data is not available.

4. What has worked well this past year?

Support for students: Academic and pastoral support for students at course, programme and whole School level was recognised as a strength of our provision by students and staff. Contributors to quality support include:

A whole school student experience and support strategy with fortnightly meetings of the strategy group.

Academic and support staff commitment to student support and wellbeing.

The recent appointment of a student support and wellbeing lecturer with a key role to lead peer support in the School.

Regular, high quality training, including recent ASIST

A strong escalation and enhanced support system

Proactive senior PTs and a dedicated student support team.

Partnership with Place2Be continues to provide a reflective space and opportunity for our teacher education students to develop the knowledge, understanding and skills that can be applied in the classroom to identify and support child and adolescent mental health, wellbeing, and resilience. It also provides a unique space to reflect on their own mental well-being.

Rich curriculum: On courses across all programmes in the school there is a mixture of theory and practice within interactive, dialogic teaching. Course content is enriched through a wealth of visiting speakers, particularly guests from the relevant profession on our vocational and professional programmes. We have strong partnerships with relevant sectors/professional settings. Students value the opportunity to engage in practical or interactive activities and go on visits to relevant contexts such as schools or related workplaces. A strength of our School is that such enrichment and interactive pedagogy is embedded in courses across the School, providing varied, exciting and relevant learning experiences for students. On one programme this included the Childhood Studies Jamboree which is a mini-conference, which allows for a wider range of methods to be shared by early career researchers and for networking. We had over 50 people attending, and a group of students with staff support helped organise the event. This was valued by students and relatively easy to organise in its half day format. (More detailed examples available if required).

Positive relationships and dialogic teaching: Dialogic teaching and time allocated at the beginning of the year or a course to creating a productive working ethos and building positive relationships with the students resulted in rich dialogic exchanges from the outset. This was done within tutor groups and often also through social community building events at programme level. Students commented on the relaxed atmosphere in some courses and on others the ‘safe space’ created in which they were able to discuss educational issues. (More detailed examples available if required).

Areas for Improvement

1. What could have worked better/requires further development?

WP/EDI We need to continue to strengthen and increase our provision and support for EDI and for WP students. This will be carried out through both the EDI committee and the WP strategy group's plans and actions. The WP strategy group will also increase attempts to gather WP student perspective across the School, particularly care experienced and mature students so that we have a clearer idea how to meet their diverse learning and support needs and help them to achieve their potential. Particular attention will be paid to making sure WP students have the support they need within the new student support model. This year the support for disabled students and their achievement and progression of disabled students will also continue to be monitored and prioritised.

Staff wellbeing, support and staffing resilience Staff wellbeing and support for staff with disabilities will remain a priority, so that our whole team (academic and professional services) have the capacity to contribute to a high quality learning experience for students.

Assessment and Feedback Principles

This will be a continued priority over the next year. Through support, further professional development, additional resource (staff time and material resource), we plan to extend and increase the impact of the Assessment and Feedback strategy within the School, with particular support within those programmes that have yet to reach MHSES expectations.

2. Tell us about any barriers or challenges from outwith your School/Deanery.

Support for staff wellbeing from the wider university

Whilst the School seeks to provide support for staff wellbeing, it would be helpful to have resources and support for staff wellbeing at University level.

Workload tariffs: College workload tariffs have an impact on QA as some of the things that should be undertaken by COs there is not time for- eg learning about EDI, WP. There is also insufficient time within WAM models for PDs or programme members to develop much needed enhancements to courses or programmes that need investigation or partnership working.

People and Money Support to rebuild relationships with PGR students, GH staff and suppliers, and their trust in us, both of which were damaged by the inadequacies of the People & Money System. A good starting point would be guarantees that the system is now fit for purpose. Funding for community events would also be beneficial.

Student Voice

1. Please report on the approach and effectiveness of student voice activities in line with the new Student Voice Policy and the move to locally managed course level feedback.

Starting with a challenge and one which will remain a priority next year, is the need to raise student and staff visibility of the new School SV policy, processes, materials and support. High staff workloads and insufficient time allocated to training and development within key roles in the WAM, meant that although information was shared in diverse channels and training was offered, there were still some courses and teams where SV processes and systems were not promoted and staff were unaware of their roles within this. The School worked hard with students, student reps and through student communications channels to raise visibility of processes but there was still quite a low engagement with formal SV processes. However, it is clear from student voice data and QA monitoring, that informal opportunities for students to give regular feedback as part of an ongoing dialogue between tutors/course organisers/programme directors and students are well established, popular and effective in many courses and programmes. This may be a factor contributing to lower engagement than we would like in school wide processes.

A strength of the new policy is that student voice can now feed directly into school strategic planning. Key school teams had access to student voice, for example the estates team, were able to include a question set (key questions with an option for students to answer more) in the school student voice survey This reduced the number of survey requests received by students and increased engagement and student voice in these areas. SSLC minutes from each programme in the school are analysed alongside the two school programme SV surveys, and the key themes are shared with school and programme leadership, relevant teams (for example student support), the whole school at school meetings and with students in the form of infographics displayed around the school. This has helped raised awareness of the value and purpose of Student Voice and we hope it will help us increase engagement and visibility in future.

A further strength continues to be the flexibility of SV opportunity and response at course level, with PDs or COs able to choose a timing, format and question set most appropriate to each course.

Assessment and Feedback

1. Please report on activities to date to align existing practice with the new Assessment and Feedback Principles and Priorities.

This has been a priority in our school, and as indicated above, recognised as a strength in the Undergraduate IPR and in external examiner reports. As ever, there is an inconsistency between these reports and the NSS results but we believe the latter have been influenced somewhat by a specific programme development need. Engagement and quality is not consistent across the School, with some programmes identified as needing specific support and development in this area. Appropriate intervention and support are planned (and underway) for identified programmes. This will take the form of specific support from relevant member of the School Learning & Teaching Directorate as well as through school-wide training for course organisers, Practice Worth Sharing sessions and school exemplars.

Strengths:

Co--construction of course content, discussion of learning outcomes and co-construction of grade related criteria is happening on more courses this year. On these courses, there is more positive feedback from students about assessment and none of the feedback expressing uncertainty about the assessment that has been given by students in previous years.

Within the school, we have a diverse mix of assessment type within and across programmes. Assessments are fit for purpose for the course rationale and learning outcomes and the diversity also accommodates the breadth of need across the school (for example students with schedules of adjustment or specific groups such as WP students).

The use of grade related criteria and rubrics are being used on greater numbers of courses, with plans to increase their use in 2023/2024.

There is scaffolding of assessments, as appropriate. These take the form of a formative assessment, in class discussion or Q&A, online resource. Student feedback is considered when trying to get the balance between adequately preparing students for an assessment with the development of shared understanding that requires and over-assessing students.

Whole cohort feedback/feedforward from the previous year is shared with students on courses where relevant.

These are the highlights. Many more strengths have been identified through this year's QA processes.

Student Experience

1. Please report on the effectiveness of student support arrangements in relation to both the Personal Tutor system and the implementation of the new student support model.

In 22/23 we were proactive in seeking to ensure that the quality of Personal Tutoring delivered by our ~160 Personal Tutors remained high in its final year. There were training sessions provided for new and continuing Personal Tutors in Semester 1, continued encouragement for Personal Tutors to undertake centrally provided training, and continued development of resources to support the work of our Personal Tutors (e.g. MHSES Personal Tutor community of practice Teams site; MHSES Personal Tutor Sharepoint Site). We sought to maintain good Personal Tutor: student ratios (91% of Personal Tutors had ≤ 25 tutees). Though the response rate on programme student voice surveys was relatively low, the feedback provided within these on Personal Tutoring was generally very positive (e.g. "Having a Personal Tutor has been a great support for me.") That 33 of our Personal Tutors were nominated by their tutees for the 2023 'Personal Tutor of the Year' EUSA Teaching Award (the highest nomination rate in the university) is testament to the hard work of our Personal Tutors in supporting the academic development and wellbeing of our students, even in this final year. Our approach to personal tutoring and preparations for the new student support model were commended in the recent UG IPR.

We are a phase 2 School, but set up a School Implementation group for the new Student Support model (with representation from academic and professional services staff) and implemented the New Student Support Model across three early adopter programmes in 22/23, alongside preparation for the wider roll out in 23/24. Our implementation group undertook a range of work for the new model, including: developing communications about the new model for our staff and students; creating opportunities for early adopter programme staff to share their practice across the School; gathering feedback on our implementation of the new model (e.g. via Student voice programme surveys and a 4th year UG dissertation on the new model); updating School policies, procedures and role descriptors to fit within the new Student Support Model; adjusting the School governance framework to align with the new model. Some of the [student support model resources](#) which we developed have subsequently been taken up university-wide, and we also contributed to the central project work (e.g. feeding into development of the Senior Tutor role). Other work undertaken in preparation for the new model included the recruitment of an innovative Lecturer post (Student Experience and Wellbeing) to oversee peer support within the School, and development of the Senior Tutor role for 23/24 to include oversight of the School's Academic Cohort Leads.

For the Academic Cohort Lead role we: developed a choice of Cohort Lead models for use in the School, and met with all

Programme teams to agree on a model for each; developed a detailed role descriptor; developed School-wide procedures for Cohort lead recruitment; developed and began implementation of a Cohort Lead training programme; launched a MHSES Academic Cohort Lead 'community of practice' network.

We also took steps to ensure a smooth handover from Personal Tutors to Student Advisers, with a 'New Student Support Model' communications template for Personal Tutors to use with tutees; a MS Form for Personal Tutors to notify the Student Advisers of complex cases; and weekly EUCLID notes online 'writing retreats' in May 2023.

2. Has the industrial action impacted the quality of provision and student experience, and, if so, how this has been mitigated?

The industrial action (both strike days and marking and assessment boycott (MAB)) has impacted student experience, across courses and programmes. Students will have missed lectures, seminars and tutorials through strike days and on some courses the MAB means that results and information was not available to Board of Examiners. The impact of industrial action has been unevenly distributed, with some courses and programmes more affected than others. When compared to some other Schools the level of impact may appear less however, there has been extensive work to respect colleagues' participation in legal strike action, while applying the mitigations available to Boards. Data indicates that where students' provision has been impacted, colleagues have communicated effectively with students and assessments have been appropriately adjusted to account for missed learning due to strike action. We have rigorous processes in the School to record impact, and report this to Exam Boards. Our usual, rigorous approach to moderation has been compromised due to MAB for some courses, but in nearly all cases, appropriate adjustments in line with the temporary amendments to the TARs have been adopted to allow for secure marks to be considered. Where Board of Examiners were compromised due to the absence of external examiners participating in the MAB, the processes approved by APRC were followed and course results were reviewed against previous years and across the cohort. It is important to reflect the work of colleagues in the professional services teams who were able to undertake huge quantities of additional work to gather additional information, keep abreast of a changing context of advice and guidance, and work with APT to support Board processes.