It is a condition of the University’s partnership agreements that partnerships and collaborations must submit an Annual Report to the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC). This report enables the institution to ensure effective oversight of all collaborative activity. Reports will detail student performance and attainment, any updates on a previous year’s report, quality assurance and enhancement, student experience, appeals and complaints and future plans. Actions identified should be logged and tracked via the Action Plan (appended to the report). The report should be a collaborative effort between all relevant Schools involved, management staff, and the respective partners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership/Collaboration Name</th>
<th>TOTALENERGIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Partnership (e.g. Joint Institute, delivery partner, franchise)</td>
<td>INDUSTRY COURSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Report</td>
<td>30/11/2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation that stakeholders in relevant Schools have been consulted on this report</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUMMARY OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE

Please use this section to summarise the performance of students undertaking courses and programmes governed by this partnership during the last academic year. This should include registrations, pass/fail distributions, and progression/withdrawal information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort: Insert Year / Programme / Level</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Withdrawal/Deferral</th>
<th>Pass/Fail Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PGR PhD students</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A Not assessed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort: Insert UG or Programme</th>
<th>Degree Classification</th>
<th>Students 21-22</th>
<th>Students 20-21</th>
<th>Students 19-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insert UG or Programme</td>
<td>1st Class Hons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Class Hons (1st Division)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Class Hons (2nd Division)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd Class Hons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No award granted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort: Insert PGT or Programme</th>
<th>Degree Classification</th>
<th>Students 21-22</th>
<th>Students 20-21</th>
<th>Students 19-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insert PGT or Programme</td>
<td>With Distinction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With Commendation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No award granted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**UPDATE ON PREVIOUS YEAR’S REPORT**

Please use this section to provide an update on any actions identified in the previous year’s annual report. This should include progress made to address any issues highlighted in the report, as well as providing a general update on any amendments made since the publication of the previous report. If this is your first report, please ignore this section.

The course was delivered to a group of Postgraduate students this year as part of their Centre for Doctoral Training (CDT) experience. It was given as an elective (optional) course and consisted of a series of lectures delivered in all-day powerpoint lecture style.

**QUALITY ASSURANCE MATTERS AND GOOD PRACTICE**

Please use this section to detail any matters related to quality and standards within the provision of the partner or collaborator. This should identify any issues related to policy or procedures, as well as innovative or good practice demonstrated by the partnership.

The material was of the pre-requisite standard, but the participants felt there was an over-reliance on powerpoint as a medium for delivery

**STUDENT EXPERIENCE**

Please use this section to provide detail on the student learning experience, including induction programmes, study support, mechanisms for collating student feedback, access to learning materials etc.

Please see feedback – accompanying this report

**APPEALS AND COMPLAINTS**

Please use this section to detail any academic appeals and complaints that have been received by the provider since the last report was submitted. This should give an indication of the nature of the issue and the outcomes reached.

Not applicable as the course was not assessed

**FUTURE PLANS**

Please use this section to provide detail on any planned changes to the courses/programmes governed by the partnership, and any amendments to the partnership itself (e.g. admission numbers, fees etc).

We will seek to re-run the module as a non-assessed elective subject to TotalEnergies having the appetite to do so.

**AREAS OF QUALITY ENHANCEMENT**

Please use this section to detail any areas of quality enhancement identified within the scope of the partnership.

We will use the feedback forms as the basis for feedback to the TotalEnergies Profesoriate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGN</th>
<th>JOHN RICHARD UNDERHILL</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st December 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please submit this report to collaborative@abdn.ac.uk to be submitted to the Quality Assurance Committee for consideration and approval.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership/Collaboration Name</th>
<th>Date of Report</th>
<th>Issue Identified / Requiring Action</th>
<th>Proposed Actions / Resolutions</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Responsible Person(s)</th>
<th>Evaluation Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14 students attended, 10 responses (71% return rate)

Did this course meet your training objectives?
10 responses

- 80% Yes
- 20% No

Please provide additional comments if you wish

- A very poor course. I learnt nothing.
- The course content matched my expectations and the list provided in advance.
- The training objectives were unclear. It was largely a repeat of the Subsurface Context for GeoEnergy Transition therefore if the objective was to give us an overview of climate change and the different element of the energy transition, then it met those objectives.
- I don't feel that the objectives of the course were really explicitly laid out. It would have been good to have less focus on the mechanics of (for example) renewables, and more focus on the economics of the net-zero strategy. It was not to be helped that the lecturer was ill, but I found the group work that occurred as a result was the most valuable part of the week - lots of sharing of ideas and debate.

How well did the course improve your technical understanding of the topics covered?
10 responses

- 50% No change
- 30% Moderately
- 20% Significantly
Would you recommend this course to other cohorts?
10 responses

- Yes: 70%
- No: 30%

Please use this space to provide comments that will assist future students taking this course
5 responses

- This course needs drastic changes before I’d sign future students up for it.
- I would recommend this course because of its comprehensive content, however I would advise it should be more engaging if it is to be undertaken by the next cohorts.
- I think in the future, only the Subsurface Context for GeoEnergy Transition course should be run. While the group exercise we did for the course with Christian was interesting, the teaching content covered the same ground but in a less effective way.
- Topics were covered extensively but the all-day lecture style with very little student input did not appeal to me.
- Certainly expect to take lots of notes - very informative but you have to take initiative to mould the course to your needs

How would you rate the course overall?
10 responses

- Poor: 10%
- Fair: 10%
- Good: 20%
- Excellent: 20%
- Exceptional: 40%
Please use this space to provide comments on the strengths and weaknesses of individual tutors if relevant 6 responses

- 8 hours of Death By PowerPoint
- Very poor engagement from the person giving the course. He made no effort to get to know the PhD-ers and/or our research topics. Therefore he had no idea what our backgrounds were, what our level of knowledge on the topics were, or what topics would be of interest to us to learn. When PhD-ers tried to engage, he’d answer quickly and carry on with the slides, he did not allow for any discussion.
- Christian was very nice and clearly very knowledgeable, but I wish he left some space for questions and that there were less plots in the ppt - at some point it became quite difficult to distinguish between them, let alone remember their content.
- Unfortunately I think it was the same content as our previous course but presented in a less engaging manner. It would be really good if the tutor got to know us before starting his lectures - I don’t believe he knew anybody’s name and certainly not their project area of focus. I also think there was a bit of a communication barrier at times - when people asked questions, it often took our french-speaking colleague to explain and even then questions went ignored more than once.
- Seemed very knowledgeable but needed more tasks/student input instead of just lectures.
Climate Change & Energy Transition, TotalEnergies Professorial Associates, 1 - 4th November 2022

14 students attended, 10 responses (71% return rate)

How would you rate the course presentation slide pack?
10 responses

- 10% Poor
- 20% Fair
- 30% Good
- 30% Excellent
- 10% Exceptional

Are there parts of the course which should be revised? E.g. topics added or removed, additional exercise/teaching material to be provided
7 responses

- Less reading from PowerPoint slides, more interactive exercises
- All of it.
- I think there could be some space for discussion - all discussion came from the questions some people asked, but I think some specific questions discussed in groups would have benefited the course flow, especially because the assigned presentations seemed quite engaging.
- If this course continues to be provided alongside the Subsurface Context course, there needs to be different content. Perhaps the focus could be on applying our previous learnings with exercises and discussion rather than lectures.
- No I think all the topics covered were useful
- Already mentioned in previous comments.
- Definitely more interactive!

Course venues, format and administration

Quality of Accommodation
10 responses

- 0 (0%) 1
- 3 (30%) 2
- 1 (10%) 3
- 4 (40%) 4
- 2 (20%) 5
Everyone’s rooms had problems! My heater did not work and flashed a light consistently, including throughout the night. Breakfast was poor quality and the room was too small for that many people needing to eat at the same time. Several mornings there was no room for me at breakfast.

The venue was very close to the train station which helped with travel back.

The accommodation was very basic and not very pleasant, food was pretty poor. Also a long way from the training centre.

Accommodation was nice.

The hotel was in a great location and the rooms were very ... roomy. However it wasn't very clean (suspect patches of sick on the carpet), the shower pressure wasn't great and didn't drain properly at any point. I wouldn't rush back, but would know what to expect if we needed to go for CDT purposes again (and would pack something to clean).

Overall quality of catering at training venue

Please use this space to provide comments and suggestions

- I was fed meat as a vegetarian. Seriously not cool, food is worse than poor, -10
- Snacks at the conference were lovely. Vegetarian dinner at the conference was too small. Lunches at the training were ok, there was not enough vegetarian food (quantity-wise).
- The food was fine.
- Food was very good.
- My only comment is that no special dietary requirements to the caterer seemed to equate to eating mainly meat in everything. The food was fine on the whole, but i’d have been grateful for more in the way of salady/veggie things.
- Food was a bit hit and miss - could’ve done with something a bit more substantial.
Please comment on the administrative support provided by the CDT
10 responses

- Poor
- Fair
- Good
- Excellent

70%
10%
20%

Please use this space to provide comments and suggestions
4 responses

- Lorna was always there to answer our questions and any other queries.
- Good communication beforehand about arrangements / timings and expectations for us, especially with the threat of train strikes. However, it seems unnecessary for Lorna to spend every day in the course with us - it starts to feel like we're being kept an eye on. I understand it may be useful for her to make introductions in the first instance, but remaining with us the whole time creates an atmosphere of distrust.
- Everyone helpful, especially Lorna.
- Lorna is brilliant at what she does and nothing is too much trouble. We are in good hands :)

General comments/suggestions

Please use this space to provide any additional comments and suggestions not covered above
3 responses

- I think this course would be more useful if it was more engaging. At the very least it was a great opportunity to meet the other PhD students in my cohort.
- Enjoyed it but need more practical activities and not just lectures.
- The highlight was definitely the interactive group projects, and exploring how each of us would change global/ national policies to help hit the 1.5 degree target.
The feedback from the students was provided to the presenters, who reviewed the material and agreed to take the main points into account when revamping the course for any future presentation.

The committee’s request to gain a better understanding of actions to improve the course and maintain academic standards of quality assurance, we reverted to the original feedback forms to do a deeper dive and it was noted that:

- 50% of the course thought its delivery was good, excellent or exceptional;
- 70% would recommend it to others;
- 80% of the participants said that it had moderately or significantly improved their knowledge;
- The majority (60%) of the participants viewed the presentation style as good or exceptional;
- 90% of the class rated the technical content and knowledge of the presenter;
- 60% also rated the slide pack material as good, excellent or exceptional;
- 90% of the delegates thought the course administration was exceptional;

In light of the generally very positive, if somewhat polarised, views that were given in the feedback, the following actions were recommended to improve the course and its delivery and shared with the presenters:

- A need for the objectives of the course to be more clearly laid out at the outset and the intended learning outcomes documented.
- It is clear that some participants were reluctant attendees and in future there course content should be shared well in advance so that students can make an informed
callas to whether they wish to attend it as an elective module to ensure that those with a genuine and keen interest in learning about the practical and pragmatic delivery of net zero emission targets join.

- In response to specific feedback, it was agreed that there would be less focus on the mechanics of renewable technologies, and more emphasis given to the economics of the net-zero strategy, something that is becoming a key issue in the UK and elsewhere right now.

- As the participants found the group work to be the most valuable part of the week with lots of sharing of ideas and debate, it was proposed that a re-balance and move away from a powerpoint-heavy presentation style to more engaged experiences primarily through inclusion of more practical exercises would be undertaken.

- We are grateful for the opportunity the course provides for our students to gain valuable experience from practitioners who have applied and practical experience of the Energy Transition. So, as mentioned previously, we will seek to re-run the module as a non-assessed elective for our Postgraduate communities, subject to TotalEnergies having the appetite to do so. The presenter has been in touch to confirm his willingness to do so.

Professor John Underhill
University Director for Energy Transition