

University of Aberdeen
Internal Teaching Review (ITR)

SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING
Panel Visit: 18 and 19 March 2025

INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Internal Teaching Review (ITR) of the School of Engineering 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:

Michelle Pinard	Chair School of Biological Sciences University Education Committee
Lois Gall	School of Medicine, Medical Science and Nutrition Quality Assurance Committee
Piotr Niewiadomski	School of Geosciences Quality Assurance Committee
Miles Rothoerl	Vice-President for Education, AUSA Quality Assurance Committee
Ityona Amber	External Subject Specialist, Robert Gordon University
Nazila Fough	External Subject Specialist, Robert Gordon University
Christopher Miller	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 1.2. In addition, prior to the 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.
- 1.6 The themes for focused discussion agreed with the School prior to and during the visit were:
 - (i) **School Structure**, particularly in terms of the impact of the loss of both academic and support staff; How the School has restructured both its undergraduate and postgraduate programme offerings because of this loss, as well as the impact these changes have had on workloads and the quality of teaching provision.
 - (ii) **Assessment**, specifically addressing the significant changes that the School have made to the way assessments are carried out, in light of recent low pass rates and retention rates, and how both students and staff have responded to these changes.
 - (iii) **Learning and Student Experience**, pertaining to the opportunities for student voice within the School and how the School intends to approach teaching and learning experiences considering recent NSS scores. The discussion also centred around the student's transition from year two into Junior Honours, which remains a challenge for the School.
 - (iv) **Alignment with Aberdeen 2040**, reflecting upon the development of internationality within the School and any impacts this may have; Interdisciplinarity of the School's programme offerings; the School's consideration of sustainability and its progress in implementing EDI and university strategies on Decolonising the Curriculum.
- 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 The panel was impressed by the School's implementation of structural changes in relation to staffing, staff roles, programme offerings as well as programme and course structure. The School handled this plethora of changes extremely well. Despite the increase in workload, academic staff showed positive responses to changes made.

- 2.2 Changes made to increase teaching efficiency proved to be another area of strength. Having MSc (Campus and Online), MEng and Online Short Course students within same class has created a diverse learning environment which the students appreciated. The School is also working to increase efficiency in operations for structural changes such as monitoring and extension policy implementation.
- 2.3 The initiation of zero credit mandatory introductory online courses for postgraduate students has proved to be a success. Staff found that these courses have ensured less teaching duplication, whilst acting as a method to ensure early online engagement. Students also expressed appreciation for these courses. January start students as well as mature students felt that these courses helped them get quickly up to speed with the academic standards expected of them.
- 2.4 The Panel found that the School clearly cares for and supports its students. Students overall felt well supported in terms of administration, supervision and teaching. The panel was impressed with the School's support for student societies, which was considered to be outstanding in relation to other schools. Students were also positive regarding the type of support they received from programme leads. Academic staff, particularly programme leads, emphasised how they would try to assist students with issues both academic in nature and otherwise.
- 2.5 Discussions with Academic staff identified a number of strategies being implemented by the School in order to improve online learning and engagement, despite panel concerns over a recently expanded online postgraduate catalogue.
- 2.6 The School is aligned with the Aberdeen 2040 strategic plan. It has interdisciplinary course offerings, as well as group design projects comprised of students from different engineering disciplines. The School's international footprint from both students and staff alike is vast. The partnership with Harbin appears to be working well from the Chinese students' perspective and the School is on track with university expectations for Decolonising the Curriculum.
- 2.7 The changes made to the School's assessments have been viewed positively by students. Coursework appears to be preferred compared with examinations and students expressed a desire for the School to continue to diversify assessment. The level four project being split into three distinct assessments was also praised by both academic staff and students.

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

3.1 School Structure

- 3.1.1 School management explained that they had undertaken a large restructure of Postgraduate programme offerings between the 2023/24 and 2024/25 academic years, resulting in 70 changes from June to August, with 26 courses being withdrawn. Changes to academic staffing, student enrolment numbers and the sector's current financial challenges influenced these changes. The MSc in Transport & Mobility programme was

removed due to low student numbers. A few foundational/introductory taught courses were repackaged as zero-credit mandatory online courses, to remove duplication of teaching towards both September and January cohorts. These changes were generally considered by both academic and support staff to be positive ones. Academic staff felt that the online short courses had achieved their purpose in reducing workloads, whilst ensuring that students received the appropriate teaching of fundamentals. The zero credit courses were also considered as an early method of enabling student engagement, particularly for online students; an area where the School had previously struggled. PGT students also praised the zero credit courses, emphasising that they provided a baseline for the minimum requirements for their progression.

- 3.1.2 The panel noted that the programme restructure bore little impact upon lab technician workloads. Both academic and support staff felt they were offered little to no input into the decisions made. It was also staff opinion that student numbers were the main driving force behind any changes that School management had made. It was also identified that Lab technicians had no representative on the School Education Committee. The panel highlighted this as something which the School should consider to ensure that lab technicians could appropriately voice any concerns.
- 3.1.3 Staffing shortages continued to negatively impact the School at all levels. In the 2024-25 academic year, the School had lost an equivalent of eleven full-time members of teaching staff, alongside technical and admin staff, due to various factors. Across all levels, concerns were raised about staff workload. Academic staff noted that they continued to attempt to maintain high academic standards in teaching but the increase in workload had made this more difficult. Technical staff highlighted troubles over operating with only seventeen members, with electrical workshops being flagged as a particular area of concern. The School also recognised the difficulties that staff losses had caused to academic research. Staff shortages also created issues in balancing workloads when preparing for accreditation for several programmes within the School. Despite major difficulties, the School explained that their accreditation working group had begun working on reaccreditation in 2026.
- 3.1.4 Despite the ongoing workload challenges, support staff felt supported by School management. Administrative staff appreciated that the School operated in a way that avoided micromanagement, allowing for staff to take initiative over their own workloads. Support staff also valued receiving the opportunities to undertake away days, even in cases where they were staff-led. Technical staff praised the School for ensuring they had the necessary equipment for teaching, especially for undergraduate programmes. However, staff noted that they would potentially struggle to support any new requirements due to financial constraints.
- 3.1.5 Whilst it was highlighted that the School did provide support and opportunities for development within roles, school administration and lab technicians struggled to find opportunities to progress their careers. Aside from the increase in workload causing staff to have less free time for development, positions opening on higher grades for support staff were often seen as scarce and unobtainable without significant backing from other more senior members of staff.
- 3.1.6 The School informed the panel that while their postgraduate research students were spread across all disciplines, the majority of their PhD students were mostly focused on

energy related research and AI. When asked how the School managed supervision workloads with this imbalance, it was explained that each PhD student was assigned a mentor for non-technical issues, separate from their supervisor. Through discussions with research students, it was noted that the frequency of contact with their mentor varied, with some students feeling that they did not require to meet with their mentors.

3.2 Assessment and Feedback

- 3.2.1 The panel noted that failure rates for several courses exceeded twenty percent in the 2023-2024 academic year. The School perceived that current student cohorts were weaker at in-person exams compared to previous years. The School also found that at Undergraduate level there were too many high weighted exams occurring simultaneously, with four deadlines in the May diet alone. In general, the School felt that they were over assessing students. All one-hundred percent exams were removed, with courses receiving at least one coursework element. Students praised this change, noting that having a coursework assignment allowed them to engage with their course more thoroughly and relieved some of the stress over the final exam. Undergraduate students from the partnership with the Harbin Engineering University, who were completing their degrees at the University of Aberdeen, also preferred these changes in comparison to their home university's one-hundred percent exam approach. Similarly, PGT students found the diversity of assessment to be more appealing, particularly to those who already had industry experience.
- 3.2.2 Students informed the panel that they still struggled with eighty percent weighted exams, particularly when they had multiple high-weighted exams around the same time. Students felt that coursework was being undervalued in terms of assessment weighting, with the volume of work that was required to successfully complete their coursework elements being often higher than for their exams. The panel also observed that that while efforts were made to timetable assessments and exams appropriately, many undergraduate students still felt that there were too many exams close together; with some undertaking two highly weighted exams on the same day. Students at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels felt that they would benefit if assessments were more focused on industry. The School understood that whilst these changes were a step in the right direction, work was still ongoing to streamline course assessment and weighting.
- 3.2.3 The panel was concerned with the high number of fail rates for MSc online programmes. Staff felt that the main reason for this was the number of no paper awards given to mainly Scottish Government funded individuals. It was the School's belief that many of these students were only interested in accessing the learning materials provided by the University. As these individuals were being sponsored, they had no incentive to complete the courses. Academic staff also noted that there were several students on these funded courses who did not have the required academic experience. The School believed that pass rates would improve as the Scottish Government no longer offered funding for these courses. Despite this change, the number of entrants remained similar for the 2024-2025 academic year. The School also stated that for the current academic year, online students were outperforming on-campus students in some instances.
- 3.2.4 The School informed the panel of a significant change to both the placement and composition of final projects for year four undergraduate students. Projects were moved

to occur only in the second term. Previously, projects were spread across both terms. The project contents were split into three sections: a five-thousand-word report, an interview and a poster presentation.

- 3.2.5 The School recognised that project allocation was not handled quickly enough and underlined that their intention moving forward would be to ensure that allocation was done prior to term two. Although the change was considered a positive one, students expressed dissatisfaction with this delay as they felt that the allocation not being completed in the first term (alongside a now shortened second term), meant that lab work felt somewhat rushed. This view was shared by both lab technicians and administrative staff, whose workload in the second term had significantly increased due to the move. This contrasted with the views held by academic staff, who felt that the move would be beneficial for lab technician workloads, due to students being asked to now work around technical staff time.
- 3.2.6 Both administrative and support staff highlighted that ethical approval and risk assessments also caused a significant delay to some projects. Students noted that the semester, as a result, felt compressed and voiced a desire to return to longer terms with reading weeks. Students did, however, approve of the structural changes. They considered the interview and poster elements as an excellent opportunity to develop skills that may become relevant when seeking graduate employment. Academic staff felt that it was not yet possible to measure the effectiveness of the changes as they had not yet finished the second term, and this was the new project layout's inaugural year. The shorter paper was seen to provide an opportunity for more concise effective communication. The only negative highlighted by academic staff was in relation to project supervision, with civil engineering and petroleum engineering staff having higher supervision loads due to staff/student ratios. Support staff felt that they had no input into the decision to move the project fully into the second term, stating that they would have preferred for projects to remain as they were previously. PGT students who commenced their studies in January also noted that having their project within their second term (University Term 3) did make them feel that they were at a learning disadvantage.
- 3.2.7 A strength highlighted during the review was the School's approach to group-based assessments. Academic staff explained that marks were allocated individually, with lecturers observing students interacting during each class, asking questions of work progression and keeping a record of what students are doing as they go. Staff would identify groups that are struggling and provide forms for both self-evaluation and peer assessment. They would also ask students to clearly identify who has contributed to the work. Final grades would reflect all of this. Postgraduate taught students praised group assessment, noting that they would use a system called buddy check to ensure mutual contribution. Students also appreciated that peer reviews were done individually and anonymously.
- 3.2.5 The School observed that the growing misuse of AI was a major concern. Elements of assessment were designed to ensure that students had no opportunity to use AI and could prove to markers that they understood topics. When asked if the School had provided clear guidance on the use of AI in assessments, students generally had mixed reactions. Postgraduate students felt that there were clear descriptors of expectations from assignments. They explained that for some courses there are opportunities to disclose how much students use AI within report-based assignments; asking them to

state clearly what they used it for. Undergraduate students appeared to be less certain of the expectations for AI use in assessment. They indicated that instructions on the responsible use of AI in assessments varied between different courses or lecturers.

- 3.2.6 The panel was informed by students that some lecturers allowed them to bring cheat sheets into exams. Students showed appreciation for these but requested that they be more standardised across courses. Academic staff clarified that the design and application of the cheat sheets varied for each course as per the course coordinators preferences, with some opting to not include them. Students viewed these sheets as a learning tool and hoped that any standardisation would potentially provide them with greater clarity in their exam preparations.

3.3 Learning and Student Experience

- 3.3.1 The School should be praised for providing opportunities to listen to their students. They detailed their introduction of interim course feedback forms in addition to end of year feedback forms. The School also runs their student/staff liaison committees as small group discussion forums in an attempt to enhance relationship building between staff and students. However, the School felt that students were being given too many surveys across the university. Whilst the School does certainly encourage the provision of opportunities for students to provide feedback, it was noted that not all lecturers allow for an appropriate amount of time to fill out the forms, if at all. Students also noted that there were inconsistencies between different lecturers in closing feedback loops. The panel felt that the School should consider a more informal approach to midterm course feedback by way of discussion, as well as ensuring that all lecturers were engaging in feedback processes consistently.
- 3.3.2 Initially the panel expressed concern regarding the provision of support to students enrolling in the School's now rapidly expanded Postgraduate taught online courses. The panel was pleased to find that the School was managing this well. The School assigned two PGT admin assistants who act as a main point of contact or would sign-post as appropriate. Online access students could also contact Student Support via email, which is monitored Monday to Friday. Students also have an online forum if they feel they require support or adjustments. Academic staff also engaged with online students through several media, including discussion boards, formative assessments and meetings. Academic staff also explained that online students were informed of expectations for engagement levels at the beginning of their courses.
- 3.3.3 On campus students gave the panel the impression that the School was supportive. Both postgraduate and undergraduate students stated that programme coordinators were their first point of contact for issues both academic and otherwise. Academic staff clearly showed care towards the wellbeing of their students, stating that while they were not required to show this level of support, they wanted to help their students as much as possible. Staff did, however, highlight that if they had a lot of students, this could have workload implications. Despite this concern, staff were positive towards the situation. There was also an overall impression amongst students that the School would be on hand to support them should anything occur. Academic staff are assigned to undergraduate students in the form of personal tutors, but this was viewed as inconsistent by some students. Students felt that they were well supported during their lab sessions, noting

that the lab technicians were always on hand to assist them. Regarding PhD students, the panel noted that they also felt supported. Academic staff also explained that they tried to have weekly meetings with their PhD students and assist them when needed. Finally, the panel observed that the School of Engineering engaged with student societies to an impressive extent when compared to other Schools.

- 3.3.4 The Careers advisor for Engineering noted that the School had excellent graduate outcome data. Many graduates were successful in receiving both jobs and internships. Students at both postgraduate and undergraduate level expressed a desire for more industry related course content. They felt that having a degree was no longer enough to be noticed by employers and hoped the university would consider implementing placement years. Undergraduate students considered it unfair that some students were successful in finding placements whilst others are not, as they felt it was crucial to see real working examples of how their knowledge was being applied within industry. An example of a positive learning experience given was the dam trip organised for civil engineering students. Although these concerns were raised, the Careers Adviser felt that the School was expanding its engagement with employers.
- 3.3.5 An area for improvement identified was the School's recent NSS scores. Despite strong performances in prior NSS years (with the School previously having some programmes at number one in the UK, as well as several top fifteen placings), there were a low number of positive responses received for the 2023-2024 academic year. The School clarified that the courses which received negative NSS results had since undergone structural and personnel changes. School management referenced an ongoing NSS action plan, however, academic and administration staff seemed unaware of this.
- 3.3.6 An area of concern highlighted both in the documentation and review discussions was that students were struggling to deal with the transition from year two to honours level. This was also notable through a higher failure rate and an overall lowering of grades within year three. Students stated that the jump in difficulty was very noticeable, expressing gratitude towards some lecturers who had begun increasing the intensity of their year two courses to help prepare students for honours level. Academic staff felt that the structure of the first two years of learning could be altered to include more design-based challenges, which currently was mainly prevalent in honours year courses. Staff felt that students were struggling with the shift from understanding to application of knowledge.

3.4 Alignment with Aberdeen 2040

- 3.4.1 Overall, the panel felt that the School was indeed aligned with the University's Aberdeen 2040 strategic plan. In terms of internationalisation, the School commented on having both a multinational staff and student body. Across its eighteen PGT programmes, the School noted that they had government sponsored students from Nigeria and Azerbaijan, as well as students from across the world. The School also has the aforementioned partnership with the Harbin Engineering University, where the Chinese students would complete one year of their degrees in Aberdeen.
- 3.4.2 School management reported concerns of English language issues impacting upon student's academic performances. However, both support and academic staff noted that whilst this could become problematic, students' English skills were usually of an appropriate academic level. Any students who were struggling would normally be able to

fix any issues if they were to engage with the language School. Harbin students felt that the language barrier can be challenging. However, they felt that overall, studying at the University of Aberdeen had improved their ability to communicate with people of different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Support staff noted that lab work, ethics and risk assessments could all present challenges for students from a different cultural background. Students also felt that despite an internationally varied staff body, teaching was similar in terms of points of delivery. The diverse and international composition of the academic staff was noted and appreciated by many students. However, students felt that it would enhance the learning experience by knowing more about the staff teaching them; for example, if, as part of the course introduction, the staff teaching were to introduce their own educational background, research and experience

- 3.4.3 Staff and Students agreed that the School's programme offerings were interdisciplinary in structure. As with many undergraduate degrees, sub-honours students can undertake elective courses from different Schools as part of their overall credits. Students also agreed that the subject matter for engineering courses in first and second year were multidisciplinary. PGT students praised the structure of their group projects, which had teams of students from different engineering backgrounds working together. The focus of the work was on the project itself, rather than on the student's individual backgrounds. Students felt that they were learning from one another during these group projects and that the nature of the tasks allowed them to play to their individual academic strengths. Even though the School explained that their recent restructure had eliminated some course choices in year four, they felt that the changes made were positive. To save on teaching resources, courses which overlapped with other Schools were now taught by those Schools, such as having two petroleum engineering courses taught by the School of Geoscience. Many of the School's UG and PGT programmes have prescribed courses from out with Engineering and there is an offering of either joint honours (Electronic and Software Engineering, delivered with NCS) and interdisciplinary MSc programmes (e.g. Energy Transition, Decommissioning and Robotics and AI).
- 3.4.4 Sustainability was imbedded within both research and taught programmes. There was also an element of sustainability within the School's accreditations. The School explained that there was ongoing research-led teaching on sustainability. Staff said that sustainability was contained within course materials, such as the recycling of materials. Academic staff also included exam questions on sustainability. Students appeared to be firmly aware of sustainability aspects within their courses and mentioned that there was also a specific sustainability course in their third year.
- 3.4.5 The School considered itself to be on track with university expectations regarding Decolonising the Curriculum. The School lead for Decolonising the Curriculum explained that the School was currently reviewing its teachings, with changes expected to be made for the next academic year. The panel noted that the School's intention was try to open the minds of their students through a greater variety of international case studies and examples in their coursework. Students also expressed an interest in seeing more examples of Decolonisation within their courses, as they were not actually aware of the work that the School was doing in this regard.
- 3.4.6 For their Athena Swan accreditation, a lot of time was spent on discussing equality, diversity and inclusion within the School. Issues were identified through surveys, as well as actions needed for improvements in these areas. It was identified that bullying and

harassment was slightly higher than University average. Support staff detailed that new teams were formed to attempt to discover the reasons behind this. Despite this, students believe that the School is inclusive for them in terms of assimilation, cultural difference and religion. Staff did note that the recent restructuring did raise some concerns over inclusivity, particularly regarding the new interview style examination for student's final projects and whether this was accommodative for all students. However, staff felt that they would need to see the results of the first cohorts to undertake the new project assessments prior to making any changes.

3.5 Pedagogic Partnership Discussion

- 3.5.1 The pedagogic partnership discussion supported many of the key issues identified during the focused meetings. In addition, the group highlighted several additional points for consideration, which can be found in Appendix A. The School is invited to consider this appendix to help inform future practice. Student comments are highlighted in orange and luminous yellow and staff comments in pale yellow, with related responses given.
- 3.5.2 There was agreement between staff and students on many of the issues discussed. Both parties felt that the PGR mentoring system and personal tutor system employed by the School worked well but were underused. It was agreed that more awareness should be made not just via emails but also via lectures to encourage student engagement. It was also agreed that the online learning tools for both staff and students were effective. Both parties also agreed that the School could improve its industry engagements in order to increase employability and post graduate support. It was also agreed that the School could improve class representative visibility through collaboration between the reps and lecturers. While both students and staff agreed that there was an impressive range of societies, students requested that the School make more of an effort to advertise these societies. Staff were concerned with the accommodation of online assessments due to the School changing internal rules over certain online question types. Students agreed with this, as they wished for continuity in their assessments to understand what is expected of them in online exams. It was noted that while both parties did feel that designated student social spaces were great, such as a common room, staff highlighted that they had none of their own. Finally, both parties agreed that the School needed to address the difficulty gap between year two and three, with students noting that they had difficulty in taking years one and two seriously to better prepare for honours level.
- 3.5.3 Staff and students had different experiences in relation to examinations. Students felt that exams were too difficult due to the timing required to complete them. Staff felt that exams should remain challenging to prepare students to be good engineers. However, both parties agreed that the issue students were facing were not with the individual exams but the shortened timetable, which many felt was causing a strain on student performance within exams. Students also wished for an end to having to undertake two exams in one day, with the staff generally agreeing that they try to avoid this as much as possible. Whilst staff felt that they were responsive to feedback, students slightly disagreed noting that the level of feedback responsiveness was subjective to each lecturer. Finally, staff and students disagreed on the reasoning behind lower student engagement. Staff felt that students were not always taking advantage of the learning opportunities available to them. On the other hand, students felt that a lack of engagement was partly due to the teaching style of some lecturers, indicating that more practical examples brought to lessons would improve engagement.

PART C: SCHOOL ACTION PLAN

4.1 Continue to enhance the student experience by:

- (i) Closing of feedback loops require more consistency, particularly for the end of courses. It may also be worth placing a greater emphasis on informal feedback mechanisms.
- (ii) Invest time into thinking about methods to try to reduce the difficulty gap between years two and three, considering staff and student suggestions around the restructuring of year two.
- (iii) Continuing to develop School partnerships with industrial bodies and ensure that course offerings are industry relevant where possible across all undergraduate programmes.
- (iv) Further diversifying the types of exams that students undertake whilst reevaluating the weighting assigned to course work.

4.2 Continue to improve upon the School's structural changes by:

- (i) Addressing challenges in moving the fourth-year projects to the second semester in relation to risk assessments and lab set ups, assigning projects in a timely manner.
- (ii) Allowing technicians to feed into the changes to timetables and courses by electing a representative to the School's Education Committee.

4.3 Continue to align with Aberdeen 2040 strategies by:

- (i) Ensuring students are informed of the work that the School is doing for Decolonising the Curriculum and EDI.
- (ii) Highlighting more clearly how sustainability is featured in the curriculum of various courses and programmes and how the School contributes to Aberdeen 2040 on this front.

WHAT IS THE SCHOOL DOING WELL?

TALKS OF EXTERNAL PROFESSIONALS INVITED TO THE SCHOOL

COLLABORATIONS WITH ARCE

Being able to respond to things on feedback is great support in the field (see below)

Int. 4 + 5. Also some working for group projects + computers extended desktops

OFFER THE DEADLINE SUPPORTING OTHER DEPT. TIME

HAVING A PERSONAL TUTOR

While a lot of material, such as your phone, long available, extra videos (extra support) help a lot. especially common issues?

LAUNCH to good + well planned

What the school is doing well?
- providing a supportive environment
- providing a supportive environment
- providing a supportive environment
- providing a supportive environment

Staff need their own common room

Volunteering students to returning & research system on the 1st year - earlier than other students from other schools

Support of many projects for students about the school providing personal circumstances

Exposure to general engineering in the 1st 2 years

No Second year mech design class (3D printing a self crank)

NESCAL Group Assignments are an excellent hands-on exposure to general engineering

Thank You!

(STUDENTS)

University career mentoring course (with industry)

WHAT COULD THE SCHOOL IMPROVE ON?

More Industry Engagement
- increase employability
- meet industrial support

Visible Staff
Office hours
2016-17

Promote our Supportive Culture more

Improve how we work with class representatives

Visibility
- Showcase many activities (Commons, etc.)

More support
1000% agree

SIMPLE
PLAIN
CONCRETE
PRACTICAL
EFFECTIVE

Improve the process of
Interim course feedback

More Support Research
- UG summer positions
- End of PGR grants
- Downside position

Agree

FIXED-PRICE OF
CARS
HELPS WITH HOME-LIFE BUDGETS
BUT AS THE PRICE OF CAR
CANNOT BE MORE, YOU CAN
TURN OFF THE LIGHTS

IMPROVE RATIO
SALES
WORK/LOAD

Improve the follow-up of conversations / communications after Annual reviews. After then, it's difficult to follow on.

Time tabling
- term / room 5.35
- informing students
+10

Assign a line and paragraph
value to teaching and related workload

Support our research
we can support

Lab Practicals
- Some dated equipment
may need updating

Institution find a better way to monitor engagement
+1

Figure out a better way to record attendance for students. With QR code, they can easily put proxy

QR code for working time with us

agree!

Student Section
- Read better / ded space
- Improved visibility

Improve the follow-up of conversations / communications after Annual reviews. After then, it's difficult to follow on.

Meet with class representatives

[illegible]

to a knowledge of the underlying
principles of the language system.

Construction of Channel Signage
Industry Signs are a matter of
signifying with leading
a language within bold type
on a white background
The industry is now a standard
within Canada and is consistent
and completely consistent the signs
should be uniform throughout the
industry and should be

... (organization)
... to educational ...
... (organization) ...
... to ...
... without ...

The following information was
provided by Mark [unclear]
[unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear]
to Mark [unclear] [unclear] [unclear]
[unclear] [unclear] [unclear]

We have several copies of the
relevant materials for [unclear]
[unclear]

- What does a good night's sleep do for you?
- How many hours of sleep do you need?

CONTRACTS

HAND - CROSSING AND
CROSSING THE
PAPER

Crossing the paper

Symptoms

- Loss of Teaching - Some people
- that like to be left.
- School - always -
- Personal letters - Old
- People usually mentioned the
- school for teaching & writing

to be about 1000 ft
from the base of the mountain and
the old - long distance

YARE THE PLACENT
HIDE PLACENT (TODAY)
HELP US BY ENGLAND
MORE!!!
DITTO!!!

[illegible]

Concluding Sentence
As a result, I feel that I have to wait for 3-4 weeks for an appointment. This is not helpful since I need to take the exams I fear at the moment to prepare better.

Handwritten text on a yellow sticky note, likely a reminder or note related to the book review.

Organizing Related Incident 44
 Note for the topics we cover in
 class for practical experience
 I had to take the initiative to
 lead our to these programs
 by myself and our team. They had

Handwritten notes on a yellow sticky note, partially obscured by other notes.

Having their own to watch the
the young, including male and female
Some females are heavily drug used
and not allowed to socialize
Individual working position

TO ENHANCE RESEARCH
FOR ADVANCED STUDENTS
(C & MA) SOURCES.

Overall CES Grade!!!

Example: 24 pp 3rd Year - 100%
The class was very
relaxed, so very
few good points. (100% based on the
cell = 15.9)

de placement
(Line R60)

[illegible]

More questions on these →
We have 3 openings in a few
months and I'd do up some
our research topics.

WHAT SHOULD THE SCHOOL STOP?

- a day long sessions on the week with students having homework between days after we don't get homework or have the weekend school sessions which come between days that have more of a long-term focus rather than

What will the school stop?
 - the school is a very busy place and we have a lot of things to do
 - the school is a very busy place and we have a lot of things to do
 - the school is a very busy place and we have a lot of things to do

We use a system of...
 - the school is a very busy place and we have a lot of things to do
 - the school is a very busy place and we have a lot of things to do
 - the school is a very busy place and we have a lot of things to do

OF THE...
 - the school is a very busy place and we have a lot of things to do
 - the school is a very busy place and we have a lot of things to do
 - the school is a very busy place and we have a lot of things to do

Usually don't do...
 - the school is a very busy place and we have a lot of things to do
 - the school is a very busy place and we have a lot of things to do
 - the school is a very busy place and we have a lot of things to do

Exams and...
 - the school is a very busy place and we have a lot of things to do
 - the school is a very busy place and we have a lot of things to do
 - the school is a very busy place and we have a lot of things to do

...
 - the school is a very busy place and we have a lot of things to do
 - the school is a very busy place and we have a lot of things to do
 - the school is a very busy place and we have a lot of things to do

...
 - the school is a very busy place and we have a lot of things to do
 - the school is a very busy place and we have a lot of things to do
 - the school is a very busy place and we have a lot of things to do

THE...
 - the school is a very busy place and we have a lot of things to do
 - the school is a very busy place and we have a lot of things to do
 - the school is a very busy place and we have a lot of things to do

WE AGREE

...
 - the school is a very busy place and we have a lot of things to do
 - the school is a very busy place and we have a lot of things to do
 - the school is a very busy place and we have a lot of things to do

...
 - the school is a very busy place and we have a lot of things to do
 - the school is a very busy place and we have a lot of things to do
 - the school is a very busy place and we have a lot of things to do

- 2 exams on same day should not exist?
 - ex. Chemistry in 2nd year

Agree - time table should be better

Soe's...
 - the school is a very busy place and we have a lot of things to do
 - the school is a very busy place and we have a lot of things to do
 - the school is a very busy place and we have a lot of things to do

(STUDENTS)

WHAT SHOULD THE SCHOOL STOP?

Stop working
on curriculum maps

Stop working
on curriculum maps

Reduce
Admin
workload
by 50%

Stop meeting grade
level performance in
the 1st term and focus
on student achievement
of learning objectives

Stop working
on curriculum maps

Stop working
on curriculum maps

STOP CARRYING A LOAD
ABOUT TEACHERS' WORK
AND STUDENTS' WORK
AND TEACHERS' WORK

Stop doing
supervisory work
(No teaching, No
PDR)

Stop working
on curriculum maps

Stop working
on curriculum maps

Stop changing
school days around
online exams (ie. multiple
choice Qs).

Stop
working on curriculum maps

Stop requesting 1st
papers in October now
(Term 1).