

# UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

## Academic Standards Committee

A meeting of the **Academic Standards Committee** will be held on **Friday 27 May 2022** at **9.30 am** in the **Senate Room**.

Mrs R Cole  
Clerk to Committee  
Ruth.Cole@glasgow.ac.uk

### AGENDA

Only items listed under Sections A and B will be discussed. At the beginning of the meeting members will be given the opportunity to request that any items listed under Section C be included in the Committee's discussion.

**1. Minute of the Meeting held on Friday 25 March 2022** [ASC 21/53](#)

**2. Matters Arising**

2.1 *College of Social Sciences - Outstanding Report for Annual Monitoring (ASC/2021/36.1.2) – Advice concerning resignation of external examiners/Information regarding delay to ASBS report submission*

2.2 *Course Approval, Contact Hours and Blended Learning (ASC/2021/37)*

2.3 *Periodic Subject Review: Key Dates 2021-22 (ASC/2021/42)*

**3. Convener's Business**

**Section A: Items for Discussion**

**4. Annual Monitoring**

4.1 *PGT College Annual Monitoring Summaries for 2020-21*

4.1.1 *College of Social Sciences - ASBS*

[ASC 21/54](#)

**5. Periodic Subject Review: Responses to Recommendations**

5.1 *Urban Studies*

[ASC 21/55](#)

**Section B: Items for Formal Approval**

**6. Items Referred from The Glasgow School of Art**

6.1 *Revised Academic Policies: Academic Framework, Code of Assessment and Code of Appeals* [ASC 21/56](#)

6.2 *Periodic Review Report of the School of Design* [ASC 21/57](#)

**7. Item Referred from Scotland's Rural College**

7.1 *Validation of MRes Zoonoses & Epidemiology of Animal Infectious Diseases* [ASC 21/58](#)

**8. Item Referred from Edinburgh Theological Seminary**

8.1 *New Member of ETS Staff for Approval as an Associate University Lecturer* [ASC 21/59](#)

<b>Section C: Items for Noting or Information</b>
---

**9. Items Referred from The Glasgow School of Art**

9.1 *School of Simulation & Visualisation – Final Update on the Periodic Review Action Plan* [ASC 21/60](#)

9.2 *New/Amended Programmes*

Following in-principle approval at ASC in March and May 2021 the following have been validated by GSA, effective from September 2022:

BDes Design for Health & Wellbeing (New)

MDes Design Innovation Suite (Major Amendments)

MDes Design Innovation & Future Heritage (New)

MDes Innovation & Circular Economy (New)

BDes/MEDes Product Design (Major Amendments)

**10. Periodic Subject Review – Full Review Reports**

10.1 *Theatre, Film & TV Studies and Centre for Cultural Policy Research* [ASC 21/61](#)

**11. Dates for Next Session**

Friday 30 September 2022

Friday 25 November 2022

Friday 27 January 2023

Friday 24 March 2023

Friday 26 May 2023

**12. Any Other Business**

**13. Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Academic Standards Committee will be held on **Friday 30 September 2022** at **9.30am**.

**University of Glasgow**  
**Academic Standards Committee**

**Revised Minute of Meeting held on Friday 25 March 2022 at 9:30 AM via Zoom**

**Present:**

Professor Marc Alexander, Dr Donald Ballance, Ms Helen Butcher, Professor Neil Evans (Convener), Dr Angus Ferguson, Dr Kelum Gamage, Professor Joe Gray, Dr Eamon McCarthy, Professor Douglas MacGregor, Dr Willie Miller, Professor Anna Morgan-Thomas, Professor Jill Morrison, Mr Niall Rogerson

**In Attendance:**

Ms Ruth Cole, Dr Alison Parrett (for item ASC/2021/36.1.1)

**Apologies:**

Professor Wendy Anderson (vice Dr Paul Castro), Mr David Bennion, Ms Jane Broad, Ms Mia Clarke, Dr Robert Doherty, Professor Moira Fischbacher-Smith, Professor Ann Gow, Dr Sarah Honeychurch, Professor Niall MacFarlane, Ms Anna Phelan

**ASC/2021/33 Minute of the Meeting held on Friday 28 January 2022**

The minutes were approved.

**ASC/2021/34 Matters Arising***ASC/2021/34.1 Convener's Business – PGT Dissertations Working Group (ASC/2021/25)*

The Convener reported that the first meeting of the working group took place in early March. Discussions focused on the variety of approaches already adopted in relation to the project/dissertation across the University. The group was scheduled to report to EdPSC in May 2022. No proposals had yet been drawn up so, given that the approval process for changes for next academic session was already underway, it was not realistic that any significant changes could be introduced onto PGT programmes for next session.

*ASC/2021/34.2 Annual Monitoring College of Social Sciences (PG) (ASC/2021/26.1.1)*

At the January 2022 meeting of ASC it was noted that the College of Social Sciences PG report was incomplete in relation to temporary changes made to courses outwith the normal course approval process. Senate Office was in dialogue with Dr Doherty to complete the documentation.

**ASC/2021/35 Convener's Business**

There was no Convener's Business.

**ASC/2021/36 Annual Monitoring***ASC/2021/36.1 PGT College Annual Monitoring Summaries for 2020-21**ASC/2021/36.1.1 College of Medical, Veterinary & Life Sciences*

Dr Alison Parrett introduced the MVLS Annual Monitoring Summary, noting that some issues were common across the clusters while some were more specific. Students had adapted well to online learning and staff had worked hard to encourage engagement and participation. Some of the amended teaching approaches which worked well would be retained whereas components such as site/clinical visits and practical sessions would revert to in-person delivery. The College had run two staggered cohorts through the academic

session and this had had many knock-on effects, creating additional pressure on staff. There were two issues most frequently commented on in reports. Firstly there were concerns around the poor English language skills of some of the students, with knock-on effects for poor engagement and participation, and high numbers of plagiarism referrals. This was a concern that had been reported through other College reports and it was noted that the situation was likely to have been exacerbated in 2020-21 by international students being based in their home country and therefore missing out on immersion in English language. Secondly, there were concerns regarding student mental health, associated with remote learning and new forms of assessment, and contributing to heavy use of good cause, extension requests and fitness to study. The introduction of Student Support Officers had been successful but increasing this provision would be welcomed. Many staff reported feeling insufficiently prepared to respond to the various support needs being presented by students.

Members discussed changing patterns of assessment, typically with end of course exams carrying less weight and more coursework being set during the semester. While the move away from high stakes assessment was being encouraged by the University, other problems were created when students had increasing numbers of assessment submissions due, often with deadlines in close succession. Many areas across the University had seen very large numbers of extension requests. It was felt that some students were increasingly focusing on teaching that was directly relevant to coursework assessments, at the expense of other parts of the course. The issues were more complex where the curriculum was flexible, meaning that it was not easy to take an overview of what students were being asked to complete by way of both formative and summative assessment across the semester. These were issues that were being taken forward through the Learning & Teaching Strategy.

ASC received the overview of the MVLS PG Annual Monitoring Summary, prepared by the Senate Office, and confirmed that the themes identified were an accurate reflection of the issues raised by the College as having worked well and those requiring University attention.

What worked well:

- Student engagement
- Student performance
- Student feedback
- Flexibility and adaptability of staff
- Student Support

Themes for University attention:

- University Policy
- University Systems
- Admissions – English Language Requirements
- Student Welfare
- Online exams
- Student Conduct

The Senate Office would seek updates and responses from the relevant sources to these University-wide matters.

**Action: Senate Office**

*ASC/2021/36.1.2 College of Social Sciences - Outstanding Report for Annual Monitoring*

It was noted that the Adam Smith Business School Annual Monitoring Summary was still outstanding and was now expected to be received at the May 2022 meeting of ASC. The delay had been reported to be associated with a number of difficulties, including problems with retaining and recruiting external examiners, particularly in Economics where three

examiners had had to be found at short notice, resulting in deferral of publication of results for semester 1. Other delays were reported in connection with industrial action and an external examiner resigning due to excessive workload.

Members expressed concern that publication of results had been deferred and there was a discussion around both the reasons for problems having arisen particularly in the last session (two student intakes, rising student numbers) and the need for clarity over the external examiner's role: as programmes moved away from high stakes end of course exams, assessment was tending to be split across a greater number of components. ASC noted that where a course had several components of assessment it was acceptable for the external examiner to comment in advance on a sample rather than on every component.

Professor Morrison noted that in cases where, for unavoidable reasons, an external examiner was not available for an exam board, students should not be disadvantaged by delay to the ratification of results. How this was managed would depend on the circumstances in each case. In the context of on-going industrial action, a question was raised about possible external examiner resignations before the May/June 2022 exam boards. Currently this was not expected to be a significant issue. Ms Butcher advised that external examiners now had a three-month notice period in their contract, so it was hoped that the number of exam boards affected would be small. It was agreed that advice should be issued to staff on what to do where resignations were received.

**Action: Senate Office.**

It was also agreed that ASBS should be asked for more detail on the issues that had impacted on Annual Monitoring reporting, with a view to offering support to address the difficulties.

**Action: Senate Office**

#### *ASC/2021/36.1.3 College of Social Sciences – Outstanding Reports, School of Education.*

ASC received a report identifying four programmes in the School of Education for which no documentation had been provided for annual monitoring. Non-compliance presented risks to the operation of the Academic Quality Framework and potential consequences in terms of the University being able to demonstrate adherence to academic standards. Dr McCarthy and Mr Rogerson, Quality Officers for Arts and MVLS, stated that, in their experience, compliance with the process in their Colleges was good and that where, rarely, submissions were not complete, the School L&T convener generally had insight into the issues and was able to report fully.

It was agreed that retrospective submissions would not be required from the four noted programmes in the School of Education but that the School and College Quality Officers should focus on ensuring that the process was fully completed in future sessions.

**Action: Senate Office**

#### **ASC/2021/37 Course Approval, Contact Hours and Blended Learning**

ASC received a paper from Professor Morgan-Thomas questioning the impact of recent developments in online and blended learning on the definition of contact hours in teaching, and the knock-on effects of this for teaching delivery, course information and guidance for students and staff.

Comments on the paper had been received from Professor Fischbacher-Smith who had advised that the issues fell under the Learning & Teaching Committee's remit rather than ASC's and that they would be taken forward through the Curriculum Change workstream of the Learning & Teaching Strategy once it was underway.

Professor Morgan-Thomas noted two main concerns, student expectations and experience: that there should be certain basic understanding of terms, and that these should be reflected accurately on course and programme specifications. There was a risk of the University being found to have misrepresented what it was offering to students if there was inconsistency.

It was noted that this was a challenging area as many areas were still in flux in terms of what their teaching would comprise in future sessions. Some areas wished to resume pre-pandemic levels of face-to-face teaching whereas others had found there were benefits associated with more mixed delivery. The content of forms in PIP was to some extent determined by external forces. It was agreed that enquiries should be made to establish whether QAA would be reviewing definitions around contact hours in the near future as this would affect the University's approach.

**Action: Senate Office**

Professor Fischbacher-Smith had noted that text boxes on the PIP forms (e.g. in the timetable section) could be used for narrative around the basic terms and to provide key information such as the proportion of teaching overall that would be in person and the proportion that would be online. It was also noted that there were wider repercussions arising from the terminology that was adopted, e.g. under the new Recording of Teaching Policy, teaching defined as a 'lecture' would be recorded whereas that defined as a 'seminar' would not. Once work had been taken forward in relation to appropriate terminology, amendments would be made in the PIP templates. In the meantime guidance should be added to the programme and course approval webpages to encourage the use of free text boxes to provide further clarification.

**Action: Senate Office**

It was agreed that a note of ASC's discussion would be forwarded to Professor Fischbacher-Smith.

**Action: Clerk**

### **ASC/2021/38 Item Referred from The Glasgow School of Art**

#### *ASC/2021/38.1 Common Academic Framework for Taught Degrees (Draft)*

ASC received the draft Common Academic Framework for Taught Degree Awards, which had been referred for discussion and comment. ASC noted that GSA was in the process of reviewing many aspects of its taught delivery. Reference was made in the paperwork to the revised GSA Code of Assessment and this would be brought to ASC for approval in May 2022.

The Common Academic Framework for Taught Degree Awards aimed to:

- Set out the principles for the design of academic programmes and awards.
- Establish a shared understanding of academic terminologies, internal and external regulations, and frameworks that underpin GSA academic programmes and awards.
- Ensure consistency of student experience through the design of programmes and courses.
- Provide a framework and guidance for the design and development of new programmes and courses, and encourage ongoing enhancement of existing programmes and courses.

ASC welcomed the opportunity to comment and commended GSA on the scale of the review and the wide consultation process being undertaken.

The following points were noted:

- Section 3.6: Each semester would comprise 15 weeks, made up of 10 weeks of teaching, one week of independent study and one week of preparation for assessment. Clarity on what the remaining three weeks comprised would be helpful.
- Section 4.6: It was noted that courses of 80 credits were permitted in the final year of an honours degree, which was higher than was permitted at Glasgow. The covering commentary gave some of the background, indicating the strong tradition of in-depth and self-directed enquiry for final year students at GSA. The proposed maximum of 80 credits was a reduction from the current maximum of 100 credits. Where large courses were to continue to be used, GSA was putting in place arrangements to ensure that students were appropriately supported, e.g. through formative assessment. This was to be welcomed.

These and a number of other minor points would be relayed to GSA.

**Action: Academic Collaborations Office**

### **ASC/2021/39 Periodic Subject Review Update Reports**

#### *ASC/2021/39.1 Economic & Social History*

ASC received the response from ESH regarding how information about the Advisor of Study role and student support more widely had been disseminated to students. The various forms of support, including a new College Student Support and Wellbeing Service, had been advertised through a number of different channels. Sample publicity materials from the Student Support Officers were provided, listing the various forms of support available and the topics on which advice could be given.

Ms Clarke had forwarded a note from the SRC Advice Centre expressing concern that money issues and accommodation were on the list of topics: these were both complex areas for which the Advice Centre had staff who had been trained to give specialist advice. It was also noted in relation to money advice that where this became debt advice, advisors were required to be registered and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority.

These comments would be passed back to the College.

**Action: Senate Office**

#### *ASC/2021/39.2 School of Veterinary Medicine*

In relation to Recommendation 6, ASC had requested an update on work that had been agreed to be taken forward regarding enrolments that fell outwith standard semester times and the roll-over of timetabling at Garscube. The updated response indicated that the Rapid Response team at WCG had been wound up and the work had as yet not been assigned to a new team. It was agreed that ASC should again ask for an update so as to be assured that the work would be allocated appropriately and taken forward.

### **ASC/2021/40 Update Report from Academic Regulations Sub-Committee**

ASC received an update from ARSC on a number of matters relating to Good Cause including the development of overview diagrams explaining the different kinds of Good Cause claim (extensions, missed assessment and affected performance) and information on the handling of claims involving highly sensitive circumstances. These would be finalised after discussion with Student Services and the SRC. It had also been agreed that more guidance on the management of Good Cause claims would be developed. This would promote consistency of student experience in different parts of the University. It was noted that a User Group was being set up to focus on the processing of claims in the Good Cause system in MyCampus, to include representation from all Colleges and from ARSC.

A sub-group of ARSC would also be developing guidance on the assessment of placements. This did not relate to clinical/teaching placements, which had long established assessment processes, but more to placements on a broader range of courses, particularly where students might be going into organisations that had limited experience of hosting and assessing students.

### **ASC/2021/41 Items Referred from Scotland's Rural College**

#### *ASC/2021/41.1 Request to Delay Revalidation of Horticulture and Landscape Programmes*

ASC agreed to approve a request to delay the revalidation of the Horticulture and Landscape degree programmes by one session until 2023/24. SRUC was currently developing a curriculum review process which might have implications for revalidation. Also it was noted that the pilot of HNC Horticulture programme could have a bearing on the revalidation.

#### *ASC/2021/41.2 Validation of BSc (Hons) Animal Welfare Science and BSc (Hons) Equine Science & Management*

ASC received the report and programme responses relating to the validation event that took place at SRUC on 3 November 2021. This was found to be a thorough set of documentation with clearly set out requirements and responses.

ASC agreed to approve the validation of the BSc (Honours) Animal Welfare Science programme, as a four-year degree utilising the existing Year 1 and 2 of the BSc (Honours) Applied Animal Science degree. The programme would be offered from SRUC's Edinburgh campus and would run from September 2022 for a period of six years.

ASC agreed to approve the validation of the BSc (Honours) Equine Science & Management programme as a top-up to the existing year 1 and 2 HND Equine Science programme. The programme would be offered from SRUC's Oatridge campus and would run from September 2022 for a period of six years.

### **ASC/2021/42 Periodic Subject Review: Key Dates 2021-22**

ASC received an updated schedule of Key Dates for the Periodic Subject Reviews taking place during the remainder of 2021-22. It was noted that the Classics review had been deferred due to industrial action, so the revised dates would be notified once the review had been rescheduled.

### **ASC/2021/43 Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Academic Standards Committee will be held on **Friday 27 May 2022 at 9.30am** in the **Senate Room, Main Building**. Members agreed that the meeting would go ahead in person.

In relation to meetings being scheduled for the 2022-23 session, members agreed that meeting rooms should be requested. Arrangements would be reviewed nearer the time but the view was that there might be a mix of in-person and online meetings through the session.



University of Glasgow

**Academic Standards Committee – Friday 27 May 2022**

**Postgraduate College Annual Monitoring Summary 2020-21 –  
College of Social Sciences: Adam Smith Business School**

**Cover Sheet**

**Mr Robert Doherty, College Quality & Enhancement Officer**

**Brief Description of the Paper**

This paper contains a summary of the Annual Monitoring Reports from the Adam Smith Business School.

**Action Requested**

ASC is asked to consider the issues raised in the report covering postgraduate provision in the Adam Smith Business School in 2020-21.

**Recommended Person/s responsible for taking the action(s) forward**

Actions identified separately.

**Resource Implications (where appropriate)**

As appropriate.

**Timescale for Implementation (where appropriate)**

As appropriate.

**Equality Implications (where appropriate)**

None.



The aim of Annual Monitoring is to maintain quality and improve provision through identifying action that can be taken to improve future student experience. In the context of the COVID-19 pandemic annual monitoring will proceed with a significantly reduced area of focus in terms of reporting requirements.

The streamlined approach adopted for the last annual monitoring round will be continued for the review of provision 2020-21. Schools will therefore again collate feedback on courses based around reflection on two key areas: i) the student experience and ii) student performance.

In addition, information on locally approved blanket course changes will be linked into the annual monitoring process. School Annual Monitoring Summaries (SAMS) will include commentary on temporary course changes introduced in 2020-21 to adjust to the pandemic along with plans for continuation or further development of such changes in the delivery planned for 2021-22. Schools will need to report on their reflection on the impact of these changes on the student experience and opportunities for continuing any identified enhancements in the future design of learning, teaching and assessment.

The commentary on course changes will be collated in the College Annual Monitoring Summaries.

For session 2020-21 this abridged form should be used to record Annual Monitoring Activity. Its purpose is to capture a focused and concise evaluation (or a reflective summary). In undertaking annual monitoring, online meetings should take place to support reflection, reporting and development planning towards enhancement and the maintenance of academic standards.

This form should be used to report Annual Monitoring at both course/Subject level and School level (SAMS).

In preparation for annual monitoring, staff should reflect on provision (including all collaborative provision, where applicable) informed by relevant sources of evidence, including:

- |                              |                          |  |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| Course Feedback              | Student Performance Data | Staff Feedback                           |
| External Examiners' Comments | Student Survey Data      | Staff-Student Liaison Committee meetings |

College	College of Social Sciences		
School/Subject/Discipline (as appropriate)	Adam Smith Business School		
Provision covered	Unit of Learning	Represented by	Input received [at meeting (M)/via form (F)]
	<b>Accounting &amp; Finance</b> Corp Govern & Accntblty, MSc Int Acc & Financial Mgmt., MAcc Int Corp Banking & Finance, MSc Int Financial Analysis, MSc International Finance, MFin  <b>Economics</b> Asset Pricing & Investment, MSc Fin Forecast & Investment, MSc	A wide range of academic staff across all of the programmes under review. An interim and final review	Programme Review Meetings were carried out either individually or as a group depending on the organisation of teaching on the programmes. This is to meet the Assurance

	<p>Financial Economics, MSc  Financial Risk Management, MSc  Investment Bank &amp; Finance, MSc  Investment Fund Mgmt., MSc  Quantitative Finance, MSc  Development Studies, MSc  Economics, Bank &amp; Finance, MSc  Economic Development, MSc  Environ &amp; Sustainable Dev, MSc  Finance &amp; Econ Dev, MSc  Data Analytics for Economics and Finance, MSc  Economics, MRes</p> <p><b>Management</b>  Finance and Management, MSc  International Business, MSc  International HRM &amp; Dev, MSc  Int Strategic Marketing, MSc  Management, MSc  Enterprise &amp; Bus Growth, MSc  Management &amp; Int Finance, MSc  Management &amp; HR, MSc  Management, MRes  Marketing, MSc (Online)  Business Administration, MBA</p>	meeting was held with individual participants noted on each of the forms.	of Learning criteria set by one of our accrediting bodies, AACSB. Individual forms are available for each programme if required.
Collaborative Provision covered	<p>Master of Global Business, MGB  Int Mgt &amp; Design Innovation, MSc  Mgt &amp; Sustainable Tourism, MSc  Biotechnology &amp; Mgt, MSc  Health Services Management, MSc  Critical Care, Leadership &amp; Mgt, MSc  Public Policy &amp; Management, MSc  Global Economy, MSc  Creative Industries &amp; Cultural Policy, MSc  Media Management, MSc  Geomatics &amp; Management, MSc.  Aerospace Engineering &amp; Management, MSc  Mechanical Engineering &amp; Management, MSc  Civil Engineering &amp; Management, MSc  Electrical &amp; Electronic Engineering &amp; Management, MSc</p>		

**In the context of the extraordinary circumstances of this academic year, please reflect on Student Experience and Student Performance.** (Please take particular account of course evaluations, data on student performance and the reports of external examiners).

What is working well?

Due to covid, all courses were successfully moved to online format according to the Online and blended teaching and learning framework. Overall, it was praised both by students in the course evaluations and by the external examiners.

All courses were designed to ensure they provide accessibility, flexibility and opportunity to interact. There were several types of teaching and learning methods used which include Moodle forums, discussion groups, guest lectures, case studies, and interactive small group sessions.

Following the university's emphasis on low stake assessment, several courses in various programmes moved away from high-stake assessment. The courses provided more opportunities for feedback in terms of the number and type of assessments.

On the Management programmes there was an increase in the numbers of distinctions being awarded. Colleagues wondered if this was because these students were a 'self-selecting' group who had enrolled during a time of restrictions to further their education and hence had applied more effort to study.

What needs work?

Although the move to low stakes assessment worked well for some courses, in some courses students still reported feeling overwhelmed with the amount of assessment. This has been reviewed and adjusted for these courses in academic year 2021 to 2022.

There are a significantly higher number of students who were reported to the Senate for potential plagiarism, and many were penalised. This could be due to the nature of assessment being all online. There is a greater need in an online environment to make students familiar with good academic writing practice and what constitutes plagiarism.

In staff programme review meetings, student engagement was noted to be one of the most common concerns. Specifically, students would keep their cameras and mics off and will not participate in the discussion.

Staff highlighted concerns regarding time period for technical exams of 24 hours. This is especially problematic for Accounting & Finance and Economics.

**In the context of the extraordinary circumstances of this academic year, and any anticipated requirements and challenges in 2021-22, please reflect on any themes or issues that you wish to report to the responsible level of the University.**

(Check with your School or College Quality Officer if advice is needed on which is the most appropriate level)

**School**

There is a need for the School to arrange various workshops and training sessions for upskilling staff to develop high quality teaching and learning resources specifically if the University plans to continue with a blended learning approach.

Lack of diversity or concentration of students from one country continues to be an issue.

More resources should be dedicated for organising field trips within the UK.

The growing number of international students and large class sizes affect teaching quality and student learning experience. Policies should be developed to possibly split the course if the class size is too big. Resources should be dedicated for this. Economics noted that they could deal with high student numbers if the structure of the programmes is correct. A review will take place to look at course offerings and in particular the core and elective courses with the aim to offer more courses so that the numbers per course decrease.

There have been administrative challenges delivering the course. This stems from a high turnover of administrators allocated to the programme (and lack of institutional memory) and what appears to a lack of capacity at times. This occasionally impacts on student experience. Note – this comment is in no way a reflection on the actual administration team, who have been excellent in very challenging circumstances.

Extra staff for supervision of projects/dissertations is going to be required for many of the programmes.

The International Business programme have requested more tailored/specific career information for IB student internship and job hunting.

Requests were made to better publicise external speakers. This information should also be better communicated within programme teams so that a range of different backgrounds can be covered. Themed discussions were also suggested.

Better signposting for students on the range of Professional Services available to them.

Number of GTA/adjunct staff needs to be increased to meet demand for tutorial classes.

### **College**

The Financial Technology programme has benefited from working with other schools in college (Law) and see value extending this relationship to offer additional electives. The link is fragile now, so finding ways to deepen links would be valuable.

Extra marketing support is requested, especially by the smaller niche programmes like IHRMD where more effort should be made in attracting the home and EU market.

Costing of programmes and targeted scholarships may help to diversify student cohorts and students from other geographies.

The MBA noted their appreciation of the College's marking and scholarship funding support for the programme. This is enabling the programme to strengthen the diversity of the cohort.

English language proficiency continues to be a problem. We need to be confident of student language proficiency before admission to the programme. Communications with Glasgow International College need to be improved and GIC needs to ensure students are qualified appropriately before admission to the programme. The Dean of Learning and Teaching is aware of the need to review the contract and incentivise GIC to deliver a more international student base.

### **University**

Requests made by several of the programmes on improvements to the Admissions process. The number of students continues to increase every year which further intensifies the room booking and student engagement issues. e.g., Financial Technology programme unexpectedly received a 90% increase in student numbers which has significantly challenged the programmes' ability to delivery on the pedagogical approach. Students are also dissatisfied with very large classes. Raising target number every year could seriously affect staff and students' satisfaction, besides creating issues related to room booking, timetabling, allocation of GTAs etc. Steps should be taken to recruit on target rather than to exceed target, or resources should be increased in line with larger student cohorts.

Realistic targets are needed for students' number which is sustainable without compromising the quality of our teaching and resources. Programme leaders feel that conversations should now be around setting 'caps' with backing from College.

The double cohort has put untold strain and pressure on the staff and systems that run and support the programme. A dual intake should not be considered again unless there is a significant increase in resources available to the programme and the systems are in place to administer the arrangement.

The make-up of the student cohort continues to be an issue, as well as associated problems with English language proficiency.

Extra learning technologist assistance required on certain courses to improve pedagogy, specifically in relation to the online Marketing degree.

Academics noted that online teaching when on-campus is less reliable than when teaching from their homes. This generates frustration among academics and students. It seems that eduroam does not have the required capacity or there are other IT issues the university needs to address.

**In the context of the extraordinary circumstances of this academic year, please reflect on the impact of the course changes in 2020-21 on the student experience and opportunities for continuing any identified enhancements in the future design of learning, teaching and assessment.**

**What is working well?**

Students really like the blended/hybrid approach to teaching that have been implemented over the pandemic and the teaching materials that have been designed by course co-ordinators. They like the short videos that introduce and further explain concepts, and the fact that they can be played repeatedly to reinforce learning.

**What needs work?**

Some colleagues have argued that more advanced technical controls are needed to be developed by university with respect to the online exams to reduce a potential for cheating and plagiarism. There is a concern that our marks are less reliable than before and, if online exam continue to be implemented, then this issue must be addressed.

Please list all courses that have been approved at local level i.e. temporary course changes to adjust to the Covid-19 pandemic (an appendix is acceptable)

**Additional matters**

Please highlight any additional matters that you wish to raise from this year's Annual Monitoring cycle

University of Glasgow

**Academic Standards Committee – Friday 27 May 2022**

**Responses to Recommendations Arising from Periodic Subject  
Review of the School of Urban Studies held on 25 and 26 May 2021**

**Cover Sheet**

**Ms Lesley Fielding, Senate Office**

**Brief Description of the Paper**

Under Summer Powers, Academic Standards Committee received the Report of the Periodic Subject Review of the School of Urban Studies. The recommendations contained within the report were approved for onward transmission to those identified for action. This report details the responses and the progress made to date in implementing the recommendations. The Convener considers that, while the School has identified appropriate actions, some of the responses were rather vague and a number of actions had not commenced to date, i.e. Recommendations 13, 14 and 19.

**Action Requested**

Academic Standards Committee is asked to consider the adequacy of the responses and the progress made.

**Recommended Person/s responsible for taking the action(s) forward**

As identified in the report.

**Resource Implications (where appropriate)**

No direct resource implications have been identified

**Timescale for Implementation (where appropriate)**

As outlined

**Equality Implications (where appropriate)**

No specific implications identified.

## University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee: 27 May 2022

## Responses to Report of Periodic Subject Review of Urban Studies 25 &amp; 26 May 2021

	Thematic Activity (Section 1 - Strategy for Development)	Shared enhancement benefits	For the attention of:
1.	<p><b>Strategy for Growth</b> The Panel <b>recommends</b> the School and Subject review their strategy for growth, in collaboration with External Relations, to enable them to have greater control over how they grow. This will also allow them to address the issues related to the impact of increased numbers of students on small group teaching.</p> <p>Ref: Section 3 para 3.1.1</p> <p>The Panel <b>recommends</b> that the School and Subject collaborate with colleagues responsible for Admissions within External Relations on the standard of English of international students and to establish the appropriate definition of the terms borderline and marginal. These terms are used during the admissions process to signal that, in those cases where there was any doubt over the applicants' suitability or language competence, the Subject wishes to be involved in the decision-making pre-admission.</p> <p>Ref: Section 3 para 3.1.2</p>	<p>This should enable the School and Subject area to manage and plan for new intakes ensuring acceptable staffing levels.</p> <p>This would ensure that the School would have candidates with the appropriate level of English to thrive in the programmes</p>	<p>Head of School Head of School Administration</p> <p>Head of External Relations</p> <p>Head of College Head of College Finance</p>



**Joint Response College/School/Subject:**

This work is ongoing via the monthly Admissions Management Group with ER and soon-to-commence meetings with Income Growth Board.

On English Language requirements we are undertaking a benchmarking exercise and liaising with ER to develop a recommendation paper to bring forward to School LTC.

**Response: Vice Principal – External Relations**

Awaited.

<b>2.</b>	<b>Workload Allocation Model (WAM)</b> The Panel <b>recommends</b> that the Subject, School and College review the current Workload Model to identify current inequities and ensure a productive way forward, ensuring clear communication with staff surrounding how the model is operationalised”.  Ref: Section 3 para 3.1.3  The Panel <b>recommends</b> that the Subject ensures that sufficient time is allocated within the WLM for all staff involved in the accreditation process. Ref: Section 3 para 3.1.4	A review of the WLM would facilitate equity in staff workloads with time identified for innovation.	Head of Subject, Head of School Head of College
-----------	---	---	---

**Joint Response:**

The WLM Review Group reported to School Exec in April 2022 and recommendations regarding increasing allocation for accreditation to 40 from 27 hours are being taken forward.

Additional changes to increase allocations for teaching and assessment have also been made. This will hopefully support improvements to student feedback

The school WAM handbook will be revised to improve transparency and information about implementation. Staff will have access to the WAM template.

<b>3.</b>	<b>Teaching Accommodation</b> The Panel <b>recommends</b> the School and Subject conduct strategic discussions with	This would improve the student experience and alleviate the pressures on the Subject by ensuring appropriate	Head of School Head of Subject
-----------	--	--	-----------------------------------

	<p>University Estates and Administration to resolve the recurring challenges of incompatible accommodation for small group teaching, particularly in relation to Postgraduate Taught programmes and the specialist requirements of postgraduate students and accrediting bodies. Ref: Section 3, para 3.1.5</p> <p><sup>1</sup>In view of the legislative implications as outlined in the Equalities Act 2010, the Panel <b>recommends</b> that disabled access to accommodation both for staff and students is reviewed to see if there is any remedy possible for the problem. Ref: Section 3 para 3.1.6</p>	<p>accommodation is provided, including as necessary to meet the specification of accrediting bodies.</p> <p>This issue was identified in the PSR in 2015. An update should be provided early in session 2021.</p>	<p>Director of Strategy, Performance and Transformation, Estates and Administration</p> <p>Executive Director, Estates</p>
--	--	--	--

**Response – School/Subject:**

Discussions ongoing with Ian Campbell to gather further details on School needs and planning to repurpose space will ensue.

**Response: Executive Director - Estates**

Reading through the report it's not clear to me the exact accessibility issue and it would probably be best I come along to see it. If its ok with you I will ask Aileen to I will establish a time for the lead on our inclusivity matters and I to visit the relevant premises.

**Response: Director of Strategy, Performance and Transformation**

Over the course of the current academic year there has been close collaboration between the academic teaching team in Urban Studies and the central Space Management and Timetabling Team to fully understand the space requirements and options for on campus teaching, the adoption of active learning and the optimum size of teaching groups. This has enhanced awareness and understanding on both sides and resulted in well-developed plans and rooming solutions for the 2022/23 academic year. Providing there are no unforeseen variations (e.g. significantly different student numbers), then I am confident that significant progress and improvement will be achieved in the coming year to ensure appropriate teaching space is secured for the subject.

4.	<p><b>Tutors</b> The Panel supports the School's plans to review the role and <b>recommends</b> the School considers</p>	<p>This would clarify the role of tutors and would provide support for their student-facing role.</p>	<p>Head of School</p>
----	--	---	-----------------------

<sup>1</sup> The second item under Recommendation 3 has been amended as requested by Academic Standards Committee and has been agreed by the PSR Panel Convener

	in the review, the role of Tutor together with the post title. Ref: Section 3 para 3.1.8		
<b>Response:</b>			
The review has concluded and Tutors have been offered new open ended contracts where the work is ongoing. The role of Tutor has also been reframed as Teaching Fellow.			
5.	<b>Graduate Teaching Assistants</b> The Panel <b>recommends</b> the Subject develop more formal mechanisms to ensure Subject oversight of GTAs' workload and wider activities including mentoring, upskilling and training and support for new appointees. The new GTA Code will be useful in this context. Ref: Section 3 para 3.1.9	Subject oversight will create parity of experience for the GTAs and will provide the Subject with an opportunity to monitor workloads. Additionally, assigned mentors will encourage confidence in new GTAs.	Head of Subject
<b>Response:</b>			
The Subject management team agreed to convene a first meeting with GTAs in Spring 2022 to integrate them better into teaching practice and planning. Subsequent meetings, chaired by the UG Director of L&T will be held on a regular basis.			
6.	<b>Good Practice</b> The Panel <b>recommends</b> that the Subject explore how good practice could be more widely disseminated and embedded throughout the Subject and School through the establishment of a short-life working group. Ref: Section 3, para 3.1.10	The Curricula would benefit from more even dissemination of good practice to all staff.	Head of Subject
<b>Response:</b>			
The Subject management team and staff meeting decided to focus the bi-monthly L&T meetings on good practice sharing/learning, with administrative and planning matters to be dealt with at the staff meeting. All teaching staff (incl. Tutors and GTAs) are encouraged to participate in the L&T meetings.			

	<b>Thematic Activity (Section 2 - Learning and Teaching Enhancement)</b>	<b>Shared Enhancement Benefits</b>	<b>For the attention of</b>
7.	<p><b>Staff Community</b> The Panel <b>recommends</b> that the School and Subject continue to support the collegial culture within the Subject to ensure it is maintained going forward as this would enhance the staff experience. Ref: Section 4, para 4.2</p>	This will enhance the staff experience	Head of School Head of Subject
<p><b>Response:</b> Teams channels and lunchtime sessions plus additional mentoring arrangements are being put in place for LTS staff.</p>			
8.	<p><b>Teaching and Learning</b> The Panel <b>recommends</b> the School/Subject leadership consider ways of continuing to embed teaching and learning culture (student centred learning, impact led teaching etc) across the subject. Ref: Section 4 para 4.3</p>	This will enhance the student experience and also the staff experience.	Head of Subject
<p><b>Response:</b> See response to 6 (above). The L&amp;T meeting series acts a forum for information exchange, critical reflection, and development and sharing of L&amp;T innovation. Additionally, part of the Subject away day is devoted to nurturing our L&amp;T culture.</p>			
9.	<p><b>Communication</b> The Panel <b>recommends</b> that the Subject review the current procedures for disseminating information and consultation processes with staff. Ref: Section 4 para 4.4</p>	This will enhance staff experience and ensure that all staff are involved in good practice initiatives.	Head of Subject

**Response:**

See response to 6. The regular Staff meetings (minimum of 6 per year) include a set agenda item on L&T, under which programme planning and delivery issues are discussed. The additional, regular L&T meetings (min. 6 p.a.) serve as forum for good practice sharing and fostering innovation. In addition, the annual Subject away day provides opportunity for consultation and information sharing.

10.	<p>The Panel noted the Subject's use of MS Teams to encourage peer feedback within courses and the Panel would <b>encourage</b> the Subject to consider ways to further embed this alongside the other interactive tools across the programme. Ref: Section 4, para 4.9</p> <p>The Panel <b>encourages</b> the Subject to provide students with additional guidance on the peer review process. Ref: Section 4, para 4.13</p> <p>The Panel <b>suggests</b> that the Subject provide guidance to staff regarding the importance of providing sufficient and timely feedback and may wish to consider the introduction of a feedback template. Ref: Section 4, para 4.14</p>	<p>This would enrich the value of the peer review process for students</p>	<p>Head of Subject Head of School</p> <p>Head of Subject</p> <p>Head of Subject</p>
-----	--	--	---

**Response:**

Integrated peer feedback is one of the issues discussed in the Subject L&T meetings. It is also being considered in the ongoing programme reviews.

Several courses already include bespoke feedback templates. The issue is also discussed in the Subject L&T meetings, and is being considered in the ongoing programme reviews. Staff are regularly reminded of the importance of timely and sufficient feedback. The subject in line with others in the school will continue to feed into the assessment and feedback calendar to ensure transparency of deadlines.

11.	<p><b>IT</b> The Panel <b>recommends</b> that the Subject consult with central University IT services and</p>	<p>This would address the lack of consistency in the Moodle set-up throughout the School to enhance the student experience (students found it confusing).</p>	<p>Head of Subject Head of School</p>
-----	---	---	---

	LEADS to consider a uniform template for Moodle set-up where possible. Ref: Section 4 para 4.10		Mr Dave Anderson, Director of IT Services Director, LEADS
--	--	--	--

**Response School/Subject:**

The subject has been involved with decision making at school LTC in conjunction with SRC to confirm introduction of a moodle course template across UG levels and it is hoped this will also be applied at PG level 2 from AY 22/23. The Head of Subject and Subject L&T directors will consult with IT services and LEADS, with a view to achieving further improvements and consistency for academic year 22/23 onwards.

**Response Director of IT Services**

I have checked with both the Moodle team and the Learning Innovation Support Unit and neither have been contacted by the school. It may be that they have made use of the updated guidance "[Accessible and Inclusive Moodle template](#)"

**Response – LEADS**

Elliott Spaeth had at some stage before the pandemic invited members of the Moodle User Group to share and discuss templates, with several areas of the university doing so. However, that was a user-led endeavour.

12.	<p><b>Graduate Attributes</b> The Panel <b>recommends</b> that the Subject consider how to ensure that alumni and industry engagement within the curriculum is of sufficiently high quality alongside how this can be more systematically and successfully leveraged across UG and PG programmes Ref: Section 4 para 4.17</p>	Building on the existing links with alumni and industry should enhance the student experience and encourage alumni participation.	Head of Subject
-----	---	---	-----------------

**Response:**

This is on the agenda as part of the ongoing programme reviews. While industry engagement is an integral part of our accredited programmes, additional links can be established for other programmes.

	<b>Thematic Activity (Section 3 - The Student Voice)</b>	<b>Shared Enhancement Benefits</b>	<b>For the attention of</b>
13.	In view of the uncertainty of the University's engagement with the PTES, the Panel would <b>encourage</b> the Subject to consider what could potentially be done to communicate with PGTs	This would ensure the PGT students' feedback was noted	Head of School

	the importance of providing feedback by alternative routes such as Evasys. Ref: Section 5 para 5.1		
<b>Response:</b> The subject will participate in discussions to be held through the school student engagement forum in conjunction with school L&T committee to identify ways to improve communication and engagement with PGT students. Opportunities for in-session feedback and improved Staff-student liaison tailored to programmes and courses will also be explored and enacted.			
<b>14.</b>	<b>Student Representatives</b> The Panel would <b>encourage</b> the Subject to look at additional methods to raise student awareness of the student rep role and purpose. Ref: Section 5 para 5.2	Increased student awareness of the role of student rep should improve the engagement of students and facilitate the resolution of the feedback loop.	Head of Subject
<b>Response:</b> The two staff with student engagement roles will explore additional methods of communicating the student rep role.			
	<b>Thematic Activity (Section 4 Supporting Student Wellbeing)</b>	<b>Shared Enhancement Benefits</b>	<b>For the attention</b>
<b>15.</b>	<b>Adviser of Studies</b> The Panel <b>recommends</b> that the School/Subject review the Advising System to enhance visibility of the formal elements of, and improve engagement with the Advisory System, particularly the first meeting with Advisers of Studies. Ref Section 6 para 6.2 The Panel <b>recommends</b> that the College review the allocation of advisers to ensure that Social and Public Policy students are allocated an adviser from Urban Studies where possible. Ref Section 6 para 6.3	This would complement the work of the Social Sciences administrative advising team through the provision of academic advice to students.  This would ensure that Advisers of Studies had a knowledge of the specific academic challenges that Urban Studies students may face.	Head of College

**Response:**

Role of Academic Adviser and benefits of student engagement in the process will be defined/articulated by Chief Adviser and highlighted to new UG students via MA(SocSc) extended orientation for AY22/23.

Chief Adviser/ Dean L&T to investigate alternative models to enable allocation of academic advisers on subject basis within context of general degree.

<b>16.</b>	<b>Student Community</b> The Panel <b>encourages</b> the Subject to consider initiatives and resources to further develop the sense of student community, including the continuing support/promotion of the Social and Public Policy Society to support students to feel more 'at home' in Glasgow, particularly postgraduate taught students. Ref: Section 6 para 6.4	This should support students feel more 'at home' in Glasgow, particularly for postgraduate PGT who only have a year and particularly upon the emergence from lockdown.	Head of Subject
------------	---	--	-----------------

**Response:**

The Subject will return to in-person social events, as was established practice pre-Covid.

	<b>Thematic Activity (Section 5 - Collaborative Provision)</b>	<b>Shared Enhancement Benefits</b>	<b>For the attention</b>
<b>17.</b>	<b>Strategy</b> The Panel <b>recommends</b> that the Subject undertake a review of their strategic direction and reflect on how to progress future collaborations and to encourage current staff collaboration between Nankai and GU for postgraduate taught provision. Ref: Section 7 para 7.1.1  It is <b>recommended</b> that the Subject and School consider the staffing strategy for Nankai to introduce flexibility and a blended approach to teaching. Ref: Section 7 para 7.1.2	Using experiences of the Nankai collaboration would be beneficial in developing a strategy for current and future collaborations.	Head of Subject  Transnational Education Dean    Head of Subject Head of School



**Response: School**

The Subject plans to review the strategic direction of the Nankai collaboration, following receipt of a position paper from the School of Economics at Nankai.

In light of University-level discussion about a move towards a blended approach to teaching in Nankai, the Subject will review current staffing and teaching arrangements.

We are currently engaged in renegotiating our agreement with Nankai. This has also involved discussions with the convenor of our urban studies programme in Nankai with a Consideration will be given to blended learning approaches. This review will be completed in June 2022. (RB-TNE Dean)

**Response: TNE Dean**

The paper from Nankai is part of the overall review of the programme and modes of delivery such as blended learning.

Staffing levels are likely to remain constant to deliver the programme but of course this will be on line for the foreseeable future. Therefore in terms of delivery and staffing the situation in 2022/3 will be the same as this is subject to the original contract.

The new contract for a three year period 2023-26 is being worked on currently and will be subject to a further joint meeting with Nankai in the autumn. The June period referred to below is in terms of our own review to feed into further talks.

Obviously we cant pre judge but blended learning is likely to feature heavily in the report.

<b>18.</b>	<b>Workload Model</b> The Panel <b>recommends</b> that the workload model for Nankai teaching staff is reviewed to incorporate time for staff to reflect on teaching methods and to recognise the additional pressures on GU and visiting Nankai staff arising from these visits. Ref: Section 7 para 7.2	This would encourage staff to build on their current practice and to develop innovative learning and teaching methods.	Head of Subject
------------	---	--	-----------------

**Response:**

This can be accommodated through the revised Workload Allocation Model and, dependent on the strategic review (see 17).

19.	<p><b>Student Community</b>  It is <b>recommended</b> that the Subject should ensure conversational English classes are in the pre sessional sessions for visiting Nankai students.  Ref: Section 7 para 7.3</p>	<p>This provision would aid visiting students to maintain and develop their English language skills, and facilitate their greater assimilation into the community</p>	<p>English for Academic Study  Transnational Education Dean</p>
-----	--	---	---

**Response: English for Academic Study**

The EAP Manager for Pre-and In-sessional English would be happy to discuss the needs of visiting Nankai students with regard to conversational English classes, evaluate the appropriacy of existing provision for this group, and/or develop bespoke provision if required.'

**University of Glasgow****Academic Standards Committee – Friday 27 May 2022****The Glasgow School of Art: Common Academic Framework for Taught Degree Awards****Cover Sheet****Robbie Mulholland, Academic Collaborations Office****Brief Description of the Paper**

The attached paper is the GSA Common Academic Framework for Taught Degree Awards at The Glasgow School of Art. The draft framework has been amended in response to minor comments made by ASC at its meeting in March 2022.

**Action Requested**

ASC is asked to **approve** the GSA Common Academic Framework for Taught Degree Awards.

It was previously reported to ASC that the revised GSA Code of Assessment and Code of Appeals would also be received by ASC for approval at the current meeting. The documents are currently at the stage of advanced drafts but require some further amendments. ASC is therefore asked to **delegate authority for the approval** of both documents under summer powers to the Convener of ASC and the Clerk of Senate.

**Recommended Person/s Responsible for Taking Actions Forward**

GSA/Senate Office.

**Resource Implications**

No specific resource implications for the University have been identified.

**Timescale for Implementation**

Subject to ASC approval, the Common Academic Framework, the Code of Assessment and Code of Appeals will be implemented in September 2022.

**Equality Implications**

GSA has conducted an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) with respect to the framework and the summary report is enclosed with the paper. The EIA did not identify any fundamental adverse impacts due to the framework.

**Common Academic Framework for Taught Degree Programmes**

<b>Date of approval</b>	
<b>Approving body</b>	
<b>Date of EIA</b>	
<b>Author</b>	
<b>Responsible</b>	
<b>Related policies and documents</b>	

## Common Academic Framework for Taught Degree Programmes

### Contents

1. Introduction .....	4
1.1 Scope .....	4
1.2 Quality Assurance and Enhancement.....	4
1.3 Assessment .....	4
2. The Glasgow School of Art Graduate Skills and Attributes.....	5
3. Generic Composition of Programmes.....	6
3.1 Programme Intended Learning Outcomes .....	6
3.2 Credits.....	6
3.3 Levels .....	7
3.4 Stages.....	7
3.5 Academic Session .....	7
3.6 Semesters .....	7
3.7 Modes of Study.....	7
3.8 Duration of Study.....	7
3.9 Outgoing Exchange and Visiting Student Course Arrangements .....	7
3.10 Generic Programme Structures .....	8
4. Generic Composition of Courses.....	8
4.1 Credits.....	8
4.2 Levels .....	8
4.3 Stages.....	8
4.4 Course Intended Learning Outcomes .....	9
4.5 Course Assessment.....	9
4.6 Generic Course Credit Values .....	9
5. Learning.....	10
5.1 Contact Hours .....	10
5.2 Notional Learning Hours.....	10
6. Exceptions Rule .....	10
Appendices.....	12
Appendix 1. Summary of Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught Degree Awards .....	12
Appendix 2. Glossary of Terms .....	13

## 1. Introduction

1. The Glasgow School of Art is an accredited institution of the University of Glasgow, which has validated its undergraduate and postgraduate programmes since 1992.
2. The University of Glasgow recognises The Glasgow School of Art, through its Academic Council, as being responsible for the administration and development of the courses leading to GSA awards.
3. A summary of degrees awarded by the University of Glasgow in conjunction with The Glasgow School of Art is listed in Appendix 1.
4. The Glasgow School of Art's taught degree programmes are credit based and aligned to the [Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework \(SCQF\)](#) and [UK Quality Code for Higher Education](#).
5. The design of Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate programmes is underpinned by [QAA Subject Benchmark Statements](#) and, where relevant, the requirements of professional or statutory regulatory bodies (PSRBs).

### 1.1 Scope

6. The Glasgow School of Art Common Academic Framework for Taught Degree Programmes sets out requirements for Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate programmes at The Glasgow School of Art.
7. The framework is designed to:
  - a. Set out the principles for the design of Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate programmes.
  - b. Establish a shared understanding of academic terminologies, internal and external regulations, and frameworks that underpin GSA academic programmes.
  - c. Ensure consistency of student experience through the design of programmes and courses.
  - d. Provide a framework and guidance for the design and development of new programmes and courses, and encourage ongoing enhancement of existing programmes and courses.
8. Exceptions to the GSA Common Academic Framework for individual programmes may be sought by the relevant School (see section 6).

### 1.2 Quality Assurance and Enhancement

9. Quality assurance and quality enhancement are the processes, structures and policies by which GSA assure ourselves, our students, and our stakeholders, that we are maintaining and developing academic standards and quality of provision.
10. GSA has comprehensive quality assurance and quality enhancement processes in place to ensure and safeguard the quality of educational provision, the academic standards of programmes and courses, and the student learning experience.
11. The Glasgow School of Art Common Academic Framework should be read with reference to related GSA Academic policies, including the following:
  - [Programme Approval \(Validation\) Policy](#)
  - [Periodic Review and Revalidation Policy](#)
  - [Code of Assessment](#)
  - [Programme Regulations](#)

### 1.3 Assessment

12. The assessment of all Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate programmes is governed by [The Glasgow School of Art Code of Assessment](#).

13. The Code of Assessment sets out GSA's expectations as to the quality of assessment and feedback practices and the processes by which assurance of quality and standards is monitored and maintained.

## 2. The Glasgow School of Art Graduate Skills and Attributes

14. The Glasgow School of Art is committed to providing the highest quality learning experience to support students' creative, academic, intellectual and personal development.
15. Through our curriculum and engagement in our community, students have the opportunity to develop creative and academic knowledge and skills and personal skills and attributes. These equip students for creative lives, to successfully gain employment and self-employment, and to enable them to make positive contributions to culture, community and society.
16. GSA graduates are:

**Creative Learners**    **They are agile and creative life-long learners.**

They anticipate, understand and manage change effectively and demonstrate motivation, resourcefulness and resilience, effectively dealing with new challenges and unfamiliar contexts.

They are self-aware, recognise their strengths, and can determine priorities and strategies for professional development and personal growth.

**Creative Thinkers**    **They are imaginative and creative thinkers.**

They use their curiosity and knowledge to explore issues and ideas in innovative, ethically-informed and entrepreneurial ways.

They synthesise critical analysis, evaluation and reflection to problem-solve and develop meaningful and sustainable responses to personal, cultural, and societal issues.

**Creative Practitioners**    **They are skilled and creative practitioners.**

They understand that speculation, thinking through making, uncertainty and persistence underpin creativity and the realisation of ideas.

They select and experiment with materials, processes, technologies and environments to make and present work that impacts society and expands disciplines.

**Creative Collaborators**    **They are inclusive and creative collaborators.**

They work with people and communities to plan and lead projects and demonstrate leadership through recognising the strengths and values of others, taking on responsibilities, and positively contributing to teamwork.

They network and build connections in open, authentic, and purposeful ways and know that respect for self and others is essential to develop trusting, supportive and collaborative relationships.

**Creative Communicators**

**They are confident and creative communicators.**

They are storytellers, able to articulate and exchange ideas and concepts professionally in visual, written and digital ways, adapting to context and audience.

They ask questions, value diverse perspectives and feedback, and make progress through active listening, negotiation and personal accountability.

**Creative Citizens**

**They are responsible and creative citizens who care for people and the planet.**

They have a global outlook and know how their creative skills and attitudes are critical to addressing the climate and sustainability crisis.

They break down barriers to create a fair and equitable society and drive change towards developing a social, environmental and economically responsible future.

### **3. Generic Composition of Programmes**

17. All Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate programmes will adopt a common vocabulary in Programme and Course specifications and associated student-facing programme and course information. A glossary of common terms is provided in Appendix 2.
18. All taught GSA Programmes and Courses are credit rated.
19. All GSA Programmes are composed of Courses that together make up the total learning of a Programme. Programmes are characterised by credits, levels, stages and intended learning outcomes.

#### **3.1 Programme Intended Learning Outcomes**

20. Programme Intended Learning Outcomes are concise statements of what a student is expected to be able to demonstrate following successful completion of a programme.
21. Programme Intended Learning Outcomes are aligned to [SCQF Level Descriptors](#), address relevant [QAA Subject Benchmark Statements](#) and, where relevant, the requirements of professional or statutory bodies (PSRBs).

#### **3.2 Credits**

22. Credits within GSA Programmes are listed as [SCQF credits](#) and follow the principle that 1 credit = 10 notional learning hours.
23. Credits are awarded and accumulated, following assessment and confirmation of the achievement of the intended learning outcomes associated with a particular course and stages of study.
24. Where academic credit is awarded by The Glasgow School of Art, this will be on the basis of 2 SCQF credits = 1 ECTS

Note: the European Credit Transfer Scheme (ECTS) is a system used across Europe for the transfer and accumulation of academic credit.



### 3.3 Levels

25. Levels within Programmes align to [SCQF Levels](#). As per the SCQF Framework, levels indicate the depth and difficulty of learning.

### 3.4 Stages

26. Stages within Programmes are set at a specific level of study and designated total amount of credit.

- Undergraduate Programme Stages will be termed 1, 2, 3 & 4 and be aligned to SCQF levels 7 - 10.
- Stages in Programmes with Diplomas and Integrated Masters will be termed 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5 and be aligned to SCQF levels 7 - 11.
- Taught Postgraduate Programme Stages will be termed 1, 2 & 3 and be aligned to SCQF level 11.

27. Programme regulations outline minimum threshold progression requirements students must satisfy in order to progress to the next stage of a programme.

28. The achievement of progression requirements is evidenced through the graded outcomes of all courses within a designated Programme stage and confirmed at the relevant Exam Board.

29. Programmes Specifications detail Degree awards and possible early exit awards aligned to stages within a Programme. The requirements for awards are detailed in the associated programme regulations.

### 3.5 Academic Session

30. The academic session runs over three semesters from September to September.

31. In full-time mode the:

- Undergraduate academic session = 2 semesters (1200 notional learning hours)
- 1 year Taught Postgraduate academic session = 3 semesters (1800 notional learning hours)
- 2 year Taught Postgraduate academic session = 2 semesters (1200 notional learning hours)

### 3.6 Semesters

32. Semesters are normally 15 weeks in duration. Each semester will comprise:

- 10 weeks dedicated to teaching core curriculum
- 1 non-taught week for independent study and personal and professional development
- 1 week preparation for assessment
- 3 weeks dedicated assessment period in which assessment and feedback are scheduled. Taught elements will not be precluded in this period, and appropriate flexibility will be offered to meet individual programme curriculum requirements.

### 3.7 Modes of Study

33. Modes of study include full-time and part-time.

### 3.8 Duration of Study

34. The minimum and maximum periods of study for the award of a GSA Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate Degree are detailed in the relevant [Programme regulations](#).

### 3.9 Outgoing Exchange and Visiting Student Course Arrangements

35. All Programme Specifications will detail Outgoing Exchange and Visiting Student course arrangements, including stages, courses, credit values, levels and semesters.

### 3.10 Generic Programme Structures

36. The following table provides a generic overview of the Undergraduate Programme structure.

**Table 1. GSA Undergraduate Programme Structure**

Stage	Credits and SCQF Levels	Semester 1	Semester 2	Notional Learning Hours
4	120 credits at SCQF 10	120 Credits		1200
3	120 credits at SCQF 9	60 Credits	60 Credits	1200
2	120 credits at SCQF 8	60 Credits	60 Credits	1200
1	120 credits at SCQF 7	60 Credits	60 Credits	1200

37. All Undergraduate programmes share a 20 credit course delivered at a common time in Stage 1.

38. Stage 5 in Undergraduate Programmes and Integrated Masters will offer 120 credits at SCQF 11 deliverable across Semester 1 and 2.

39. The following tables provide a generic overview of Taught Postgraduate Programme structures.

**Table 2. GSA 1 Year Taught Postgraduate Degree Programme Structure**

Stage	Credits and SCQF Levels	Semester	Notional Learning Hours
3	60 credits at Level SCQF 11	3	600
2	60 credits at Level SCQF 11	2	600
1	60 credits at Level SCQF 11	1	600

**Table 3. GSA 2 Year Taught Postgraduate Degree Programme Structure**

Year	Stage	Credits and SCQF Levels	Semester	Notional Learning Hours
2	3	120 credits at Level SCQF 11	1&2	1200
1	2	60 credits at Level SCQF 11	2	600
1	1	60 credits at Level SCQF 11	1	600

40. All taught Postgraduate programmes offer a 20 credit Core Research Methods course in Stage 1 and 20 credit elective courses in stage 2.

### 4. Generic Composition of Courses

41. Programmes are composed of courses taught across stages, which collectively support students to achieve programme aims and intended learning outcomes.

42. Courses are characterised by credits, levels, stages, course intended learning outcomes and assessment.

#### 4.1 Credits

43. The minimum credit value of courses allowed for:

- Undergraduate Programmes = 10 credits (100 hours)
- Taught Postgraduate Programmes = 20 credits (200 hours)

44. Other course credit values allowed in Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate degree programmes are indicated in the relevant tables in section 4.6.

#### 4.2 Levels

45. Courses have one determined SCQF level and are aligned to specific Programme stages.

#### 4.3 Stages

46. Course delivery must start and be completed within the determined stage detailed in the relevant Course and Programme Specification.

#### 4.4 Course Intended Learning Outcomes

47. Course Intended Learning Outcomes are aligned to designated SCQF levels and map to Programme Intended Learning Outcomes.
48. Course Intended Learning Outcomes are concise statements of what a student is expected to be able to demonstrate following successful completion of a course.

#### 4.5 Course Assessment

49. Assessment of student learning is undertaken at course level, with each student's learning assessed against the course intended learning outcomes and published assessment criteria.
50. Assessment criteria can be the intended learning outcomes for the course or specific criteria aligned to the intended learning outcomes.
51. Course specifications provide assessment information and a detailed assessment scheme which ensures:
  - each student's learning is assessed against the stated learning outcomes of the course.
  - an appropriate range of assessment methods are utilised to effectively assess the intended learning outcomes of the course.
  - an appropriate combination of formative and summative assessment points to support the learning process, determine each student's performance and guide subsequent learning.
  - assessment methods are designed to take account of the course SCQF level and credit volume.

#### 4.6 Generic Course Credit Values

52. Course credit values allowed for courses for Undergraduate degree programmes are indicated in the tables below:

**Table 4. Undergraduate Degree - Stages / Levels / Courses Credit Values**

Stage	SCQF Level	Course Credit Values
4	SCQF 10	10/20/30/40/60/80
3	SCQF 9	10/20/30/40
2	SCQF 8	10/20/30/40
1	SCQF 7	10/20/30/40

53. Courses in Stage 5 of Undergraduate Programmes and Integrated Masters will be SCQF Level 11 with course credit values consistent with those allowed in Stage 4. See Table 4.
54. Course credit values allowed for courses for Taught Postgraduate degree programmes are indicated in the tables below:

**Table 5. 1 year Taught Postgraduate Degree - Stages / Levels / Courses Credit Values**

Stage	SCQF Level	Course Credit Values
3	SCQF 11	20/40/60
2	SCQF 11	20/40
1	SCQF 11	20/40

**Table 6. 2 year Taught Postgraduate Degree - Stages / Levels / Courses Credit Values**

Stage	SCQF Level	Course Credit Values
3	SCQF 11	20/40/60/80
2	SCQF 11	20/40
1	SCQF 11	20/40

**5. Learning**

55. GSA Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate programmes support the development of independent and autonomous learning skills.
56. Programme and Course specifications provide an overview of learning methods and hours, including scheduled contact and notional learning hours.
57. Students share responsibility for their learning, and they are expected to ensure they engage with scheduled learning and manage required independent learning hours.

**5.1 Contact Hours**

58. Contact hours is the time allocated to scheduled learning, teaching and assessment feedback activities.
59. The allocation of Course contact hours are proportionate to the volume of credits, required learning and level of study.
60. Contact hours come in different forms and will vary according to the discipline, subject, mode of delivery, intended purpose and learning and skills requirements.
61. Contact hours can include but are not limited to:
  - Lectures, Seminars and Tutorials
  - Academic or technical led practical workshops and supervised time in studio and workshops
  - Planned online and blended learning
  - Feedback (one-to-one or in a group) on assessed work
  - Scheduled office hours where staff are available for consultation and discussion

**5.2 Notional Learning Hours**

62. Notional Learning hours include all the learning activities required to achieve Intended Learning Outcomes, including contact time, independent learning and non-scheduled study.
63. Notional learning and non-scheduled study may include, but is not limited to:
  - Research activities
  - Using the library and VLE for independent study
  - Using the studio and technical workshops for the development of work
  - Reading and researching material in preparation for taught sessions
  - Personal preparation for tutorials, seminars and assessment
  - Self-reflection on learning
64. Notional Learning hours indicated on course specifications are for guidance only. Some students may require less or more time to complete their studies depending on knowledge and skills at point of entry, rate of progression, and any reasonable adjustments made for students with individual learning requirements.

**6. Exceptions Rule**

65. Exceptions to the GSA Common Academic Framework for individual programmes may be sought by the relevant School.
66. Examples where exceptions may be considered include the following:

- specific requirements due to accreditation by a professional body
  - programmes with partnership agreements and shared delivery of programme components, including programmes delivered jointly with the University of Glasgow.
67. The rationale for an exception request must be set out in a paper and presented at Boards of Study and a meeting of Academic Council by the relevant School.
68. Application for exceptions to the GSA Common Academic Framework must put forward two programme models; one compliant within the GSA Common Academic Framework and an alternative proposed programme model with a detailed rationale.
69. The Academic Quality Office, on request, will provide guidance on the process for seeking Academic Council consideration and approval.

## Appendices

### Appendix 1. Summary of Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught Degree Awards

The University of Glasgow awards the following degrees in The Glasgow School of Art.

#### Undergraduate Degrees

Bachelor of Architecture (BArch)  
Bachelor of Arts (BA)  
Bachelor of Design (BDes)  
Bachelor of Engineering (BEng)  
Bachelor of Science (BSc)  
Master of Engineering (MEng)  
Master of European Design (MEDes)

#### Postgraduate Taught Degrees

Diploma in Architecture and Master of Architecture by Conversion (MArch)  
Master of Architectural Studies (MArch Studies)  
Master of Design (MDes)  
Master of Education (MEd)  
Master of Fine Art (MFA)  
Master of Letters (MLitt)  
Master of Science (MSc)

**Note:** Additional award titles may be agreed during the programme approval process.

## Appendix 2. Glossary of Terms

The following glossary of terms for Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate Programmes outlines vocabulary and definitions common to Glasgow School of Art programmes. It aims to achieve consistency in academic terminology and application in documentation relating to programmes and courses.

- **Award:** an award is the degree, certificate or diploma which is conferred following the successful completion of a defined programme of study.
- **Assessment Criteria:** assessment criteria are used to assess students' learning and performance against the intended learning.
- **Assessment Feedback Session:** a one-to-one meeting between a student and a member of staff to discuss assessment.
- **Assessment Scheme:** a term used to describe all formative and summative assessments within an academic course.
- **Academic Semester:** a block of learning, teaching and assessment used to split the Academic Session.
- **Academic Session:** a term used to describe the academic year which runs three semesters from September to September.
- **Briefing:** a session that presents key information or processes to students.
- **Contact Learning Hours:** contact hours are the time allocated to scheduled learning, teaching and assessment feedback activities. For further guidance see - [QAA Explaining Contact Hours](#).
- **Course:** a course is a self-contained unit of study on a particular topic, with a defined level, credit value, aims, intended learning outcomes, mode(s) of delivery and scheme of assessment.
- **Credit(s):** a measure of workload, where 1 credit equates to 10 notional learning hours.
- **Credit Value:** a term used to describe the number of credits at a specified level, assigned to a course, and awarded upon successful completion of a course. The course credit value is based on the estimated notional learning hours.
- **Credit and Qualifications Framework:** a credit Framework combined with a qualification's framework, for example, the [Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework](#).
- **Critique:** a group review of student work with a member of staff or peer-led.
- **Discussion group:** a discursive subject focused teaching session between students and a member of staff.
- **Exchange Study (Partner Institution):** an arrangement where part of the curriculum is delivered by another higher education provider.
- **European Credit Transfer Scheme (ECTS):** a system used across Europe for the transfer and accumulation of academic credit.
- **Formative Assessment:** assessments that are designed purely to inform both staff and students of the students' progress, allowing the students to reflect on and improve their work in time for the summative assessment point. Formative assessment does not contribute to the final grade of a course.
- **Formative Feedback:** all feedback is formative and provides both staff and students the opportunity to identify the strengths and weaknesses of a students work and inform future learning. Formative feedback may be given as a result of a formative or summative

assessment or through a range of ongoing teaching activities including, but not limited to, tutorials, reviews and discussion groups etc.

- **Grade Descriptors:** statements that define a level of achievement within a certain band of marks.
- **Group Meeting:** a meeting to discuss or share information, possibly interactive.
- **Group Tutorial:** a meeting between students and a member of staff to review progress or present material.
- **Independent Study:** students studying individually and/or collaboratively without supervision.
- **Individual Tutorial:** a one-to-one discursive teaching session between a student and a member of staff to review progress or present material.
- **Intended Learning Outcomes:** also known as ILOs, define what a student will acquire and be able to demonstrate upon successful completion of a period of learning, course or programme.
- **Lecture:** a presentation delivered to an audience of students, possibly pre-recorded and often involving discursive engagement with and between students.
- **Levels:** an indicator of the relative complexity, depth and autonomy of learning associated with a course, and courses within programme stages. See [SCQF Level Descriptors](#).
- **Marking Scheme:** a detailed framework for assigning marks.
- **Negotiated Technical Learning:** a scheduled session providing technical support for a specific student project.
- **Notional Learning Hours:** the expected total number of hours that a learner at a particular level is expected to require to spend, on average, to achieve the specified learning outcomes at the specified level. This may include contact hours, directed learning, independent study and assessment.
- **Orientation:** a session offering students an overview of a service and how to access it or general welcome.
- **Presentation:** a subject focused presentation delivered to a specified audience using agreed methods.
- **Programme:** a programme is defined as a set of compulsory and elective courses leading to a defined award, with defined aims, intended learning outcomes, mode(s) of delivery, and scheme of assessment.
- **Seminar:** a themed group discussion between a group of students and a member(s) of staff.
- **Stages:** stages within programmes may contain a number of courses. They are set at a specific level of study and designated total amount of credit.
- **Subject Benchmark Statements:** a published statement that sets out what knowledge, understanding, abilities and skills are expected of those graduating in each of the main subject areas and explains what gives that particular discipline its coherence and identity. The statements are consistent with the relevant generic qualification descriptors. See [QAA Subject Benchmark statements](#).
- **Summative Assessment:** assessments used to determine student performance in relation to intended learning outcomes and assessment criteria. Summative assessment contributes towards a student's overall grade and also has a formative purpose, providing feedback to students to support reflection and improvement.
- **Technical Induction:** a session that enables students to use technical facilities safely and responsibly.



- **Technical Workshop:** an interactive group session that focuses on the development of a particular technical process or skill.
- **Workshop:** an interactive group session that focuses on the development and exploration of an idea, process or skill.

## University of Glasgow

## Academic Standards Committee – Friday 27 May 2022

The Glasgow School of Art: Periodic Review Report of the School of Design held on 10<sup>th</sup> and 11th February 2022, by video conference

## Cover Sheet

Robbie Mulholland, Academic Collaborations Office

## Brief Description of the Paper

The attached paper is the report from The Glasgow School of Art (GSA) on the Periodic Review of the School of Design held on 10 and 11 February 2022, by video-conference. Two University of Glasgow academic staff members attended the review. The report was approved by the GSA Academic Council on 4 May 2022.

## Action Requested

- ASC is asked to **note** GSA's revalidation of the School of Design programmes (below) for a period of six years from September 2022 (see section 8.2)

BA (Honours) Communication Design  
 BA (Honours) Fashion Design  
 BA (Honours) Interaction Design  
 BA (Honours) Interior Design  
 BA (Honours) Silversmithing & Jewellery Design  
 BA (Honours) Textile Design  
 BEng/MEng (Honours) Product Design Engineering  
 MDes Communication Design  
 MDes Fashion & Textiles  
 MDes Graphics, Illustration & Photography  
 MDes Interior Design  
 MSc Product Design Engineering  
 M.Ed Learning, Teaching and Supervisory Practices in the Creative Disciplines  
 PG Certificate Higher Education Learning and Teaching in the Creative Disciplines  
 PG Certificate Supervisory Practices in the Creative Disciplines

- ASC is asked to consider and **approve** the revalidation of the following programmes delivered jointly by the University and GSA for a period of six years from September 2022 (see section 8.2):

BEng/MEng (Honours) Product Design Engineering. [The University is the administering institution for this programme and the relevant University programme approval procedures are in place for it.]; and

MSc Product Design Engineering

- ASC is asked to **note** the 12 recommendations and 4 commendations identified in the review (section 7) and the remainder of the report.

ASC is asked to note, that under the revision to the programme approval (validation) process for GSA programmes (approved by ASC at its meeting in October 2018), with the exception of programmes run jointly by the University and GSA, ASC approval is not required for the revalidation of GSA programmes agreed as part of the GSA Periodic Review process. GSA is required, however, to provide ASC with a summary of the programmes which have been revalidated (and this has been provided above).

**Recommended Person/s Responsible for Taking Actions Forward**

As identified in the report.

**Resource Implications**

No specific resource implications for the University have been identified, however ASC is asked to note the two programmes above delivered jointly between GSA and the University.

**Timescale for Implementation**

The revalidation of the above programmes will take effect from September 2022.

**Equality Implications**

GSA does not undertake Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) as part of the Periodic Review process.

## GLASGOW SCHOOL OF ART

## PERIODIC REVIEW REPORT: SCHOOL OF DESIGN

## SESSION 2021/22

**Review Panel**

Janet Allison	Academic Registrar
Allan Atlee	Deputy Director Academic and Convenor
John Ayers	Head of Technical Support
Dr Donald Ballance	University of Glasgow Senate Representative
Mark Charters	Head of Learning and Teaching
Isabel Deakin	Postgraduate Programme Leader, Mackintosh School of Architecture
Professor Elizabeth Moignard	University of Glasgow Senate Representative
Rory O'Neill	President of the GSA Students' Association
Dr John Rooney	External Subject Specialist and Senior Lecturer Graphic Design, Manchester School of Art
Dr Gina Wall	Programme Director, GSA Highlands & Islands Campus
Rebecca Wright	External Subject Specialist and Dean of Academic Programmes, Central Saint Martins, University of the Arts London

**Secretaries**

Jill Brown, Senior Policy Officer, Academic Quality Office  
Tricia Combs, Policy Officer, Academic Quality Office

**The Review Event was held on Thursday 10 February 2022 and Friday 11 February 2022 by Video Conference. The Panel held a pre-meeting on Thursday 3 February 2022.**

**1. INTRODUCTION*****Background Information***

- 1.1 The School of Design Periodic Review took place as scheduled in session 2021/22. Owing to the COVID-19 pandemic and resulting social distancing requirements, the entire event was held remotely.
- 1.2 All programmes in the School of Design were reviewed and considered for revalidation as part of the Periodic Review process undertaken in session 2015/16. Since the previous Periodic Review event, three programmes (Master of Design in Design Innovation and Citizenship, Master of Design in Design Innovation and Environmental Design, and Master of Design in Design Innovation and Service Design) transferred from the School of Design to the Innovation School which became a standalone school in August 2017. During the period under review, the M.Ed in Teaching, Learning and Supervisory Practices in the Creative Disciplines underwent major programme amendments which were implemented in session 2017/18, and the two programmes delivered in partnerships with the Singapore Institute of Technology (BA Communication Design and BA Interior Design) concluded with the final year cohort in session 2020/21.
- 1.3 Throughout the review period, the majority of the School of Design was based in the Reid Building with space in the Haldane and Barnes buildings. The Self-Evaluation report reflected on how the Reid was the School's primary location, however, Year 1 students in BA

Communication Design, BA Fashion Design, BA Interior Design, BA Silversmithing & Jewellery Design, and BA Textile Design students were located in the Haldane building, while all BA Interaction Design year groups were in the Barnes Building. As a result of increased student recruitment, the Year 1 space in the Haldane Building, unlike the Reid and Barnes, had limited space for group activity. The School intended to engage with the Estates Strategy and provide appropriate studio space for these students.

- 1.4 GSA was subject to QAA Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR) in 2020. The Outcome Report and Technical Report were published on 9 April 2021 where GSA received a summary judgement of Limited Effectiveness, with 16 recommendations and 6 commendations. In addition, GSA received 6 recommendations as a result of reports raised through the QAA Scottish Concerns Scheme. In line with the requirements of the QAA ELIR process and QAA Scottish Concerns Scheme, GSA has developed an action plan to respond to the recommendations of both, discussed with the University of Glasgow, and submitted to QAA. Further detail is provided in [Appendix C](#).

### ***Periodic Review***

- 1.5 [Appendix A](#) to this report provides a list of the provision offered and overseen as part of the Periodic Review.
- 1.6 The development of the Self-Evaluation Report was led by the School of Design Senior Management Team in collaboration with programme and course staff, Professional Support Departments, students, and the School's Board of Studies. Student consultation took the form of meetings between the Head of School<sup>1</sup>, Deputy Head of School<sup>2</sup>, Academic Development Lead, Academic Support Manager, and the Lead Reps; meetings at the programme level with students; and meetings of the Staff and Student Consultative Committee (SSCC). Of particular note was the first School Forum of session 2021/22 which informed the Self-Evaluation Report and was well attended by 40 students from across the School's programmes and years. The School Forum was planned by the Lead Reps and involved full group and small group discussion.
- 1.7 Having scrutinised the Self-Evaluation Report, and supporting documentation, the Review Panel identified themes and topics for further exploration during the review event. These included, but were not limited to:
- School Culture and Ethos;
  - Quality Assurance and Evaluation;
  - Curriculum;
  - Pedagogies, Spaces and Resources;
  - Student Partnership;
  - Staff Needs and Workforce Planning;
  - Internationalisation, Partnerships and Collaborations; and
  - Equality, Diversity and Inclusion.

---

<sup>1</sup> Head of School took up post in January 2022.

<sup>2</sup> The Deputy Head of School was previously the Acting Head of School until January 2022.

1.8 During the event on 10 and 11 February 2022, the Review Panel met with the following staff and student groups:

- Head of the School of Design and Deputy Head of the School of Design;
- Undergraduate Students;
- Postgraduate Students;
- Senior Management Team, comprised of Programmes Leaders, Heads of Departments, the Academic Support Manager, and the Academic Development Lead; and
- Lecturers, Technicians, Coordinators, and Administration Officer (including staff on fractional contracts).

A list of all staff and student groups who met with the Review Panel is provided in [Annex B](#).

1.9 Owing to the COVID-19 pandemic requiring the Periodic Review event to be held remotely, the Review Panel were unable to have a tour of the facilities. The Review Panel asked the staff and student groups to give feedback on the learning environment, and their responses are incorporated into the report.

## 2. OVERALL AIMS OF THE SCHOOL OF DESIGN PROVISION

### ***Periodic Review Process and the Self-Evaluation Report***

2.1 The Self-Evaluation Report reflected on the period since the last Periodic Review as one of “*profound turbulence*” as it included the June 2018 fire of the Mackintosh Building and the COVID-19 pandemic. The School lost access to the Reid Building following the fire, and this resulted in the temporary relocation of staff and students and necessitated adaptations to the timing of delivery of Design History & Theory and Design Domain courses. Similarly, the COVID-19 pandemic necessitated adaptations to the curriculum by shifting to online delivery followed by the development of a blended model. In reflecting on the impact of this period on the School, the Self-Evaluation Report noted that “*the lessons from this era, bookended by crises, helps us to re-define our practices and the ways in which they are identified, consolidated, and communicated. Despite these dramatic matters, the [School of Design] continues to grow and thrive, and the [School of Design] ethos builds on collegiate ways of working towards enhancing partnership between staff and students.*”

2.2 The Review Panel felt that the Self-Evaluation Report had been developed collaboratively with students and staff and appreciated that the consultation process had been clearly presented. The Review Panel were assured of the collegiate and collaborative approach to developing the Self-Evaluation Report and that the School had robust quality assurance processes in place. In addition, the Review Panel welcomed further discussion with School of Design staff and students regarding how these processes informed future planning and how the School evaluated their impact.

### ***Collaborative Working***

2.3 During the period under review, the School experienced a number of changes in senior leadership, including the appointment of an Interim Head of School which concluded in January 2022 when the new Head of School took up the post. Through discussion with the Senior Management Team, the Review Panel were pleased to be informed of a shift towards a more collaborative and collegiate approach amongst the senior staff. The Senior Management

Team facilitated the coming together of different disciplines to centralise resources, navigate disruptions, and develop innovative approaches to the challenges presented by the pandemic.

- 2.4 Through meetings with students and staff, the Review Panel were keen to explore the impact of the centralisation of technical resources. While recognising the challenges in guaranteeing access to workshops, it was noted that the Technical Support Department felt better resourced, and there was potential for a greater cross-disciplinary approach to making. Staff were appreciative of the centralised approach and the support provided by technicians, while noting the impact that the COVID-19 restrictions had on limiting access.
- 2.5 The Review Panel commended the collaborative working and collegiate approach, which included: (a) the leadership of the Interim Head of School in supporting the Senior Management Team in working collegiately and collaboratively through the pandemic to adapt to, and develop, innovative approaches; (b) the effort of all staff teams in working collaboratively in developing innovative practices in response to the pandemic; (c) collectively implementing the approach to a centralised Technical Support Department model and successful development of new practice as a result; and (d) collegiate approach to the development of the self-evaluation report in preparation for Periodic Review. **(Commendation 1)**

### ***School Ethos and Identity***

- 2.6 Regarding a sense of shared ethos and culture, the Senior Management Team expressed a view of the School of Design as an alliance of different programmes. The difference was expressed as a source of strength, with the Senior Management Team acting as an 'amalgamation of interests' which could learn from each other. The degree show was cited as an example of staff and students coming together to learn from across disciplines. Board of Studies and Student Staff Consultative Committee (SSCC) meetings were seen as providing the structure for these cross-School conversations. COVID-19 had precipitated an improved collegiate approach to working, and the Head of School noted there was now an opportunity to pause and reflect on these innovations and then move forward as a School.
- 2.7 Discussions with staff outside of the Senior Management Team revealed a less centralised impression, and staff described a sense of being a member of a department instead of a member of a School. Staff were clear on School priorities, ambitions, and values, and expressed that staff meetings were often focused on reacting to existing challenges instead of planning for future development. Staff differed when reflecting on the impact of COVID-19, with some staff describing a 'silo-ing' effect caused by losing informal meeting spaces, while others said remote working had facilitated more collaborative working. Staff were overall in agreement that they wished to regain the Assembly Building and the Refectory as informal meeting spaces, and that they wanted to better structure opportunities for coming together as a School.
- 2.8 Discussion with student panels emphasised how students felt a part of their programme, however no shared identity across the School of Design was evident. Students expressed a sense of community within their programme or department, with some differences in how connected they felt with students within their year group or across year groups. Those who did not feel connected with students outside their year group called for further integration, while noting how the COVID-19 restrictions had limited opportunities for such activity. Students were aware of examples in other Schools with more cross-School events which they saw as fostering connections amongst students.

- 2.9 Following discussions with staff and student panels, the Review Panel felt that although there was a strong sense of identity at the discipline level and that the Senior Management Team had taken on a collaborative approach during the pandemic, the School of Design should work towards a shared ethos and culture with leadership encouraged in all areas of responsibility across the School. Outside of the connections being developed within the Senior Management Team, the sense that departments were working in silos had limited cross-School opportunities for learning. The best practice of the Senior Management Team's collegiate approach should be filtered through to the programme and departmental levels so that leadership and ownership could be encouraged by those colleagues in the areas for which they were responsible.

The Review Panel were assured that interesting and useful initiatives were being undertaken across the School of Design, however, the School lacked a central narrative and central direction. Initiative was being deferred to the GSA-level or was seen as being driven by programmes, and the Review Panel felt that external steers were being sought at the School-level. The Review Panel wished to see the development of a more strategic School-level ambition and leadership. Overall, the Review Panel were pleased to note the innovative and interesting projects and developments taking place across the School, and that the School was poised for clearer leadership and articulation of a unified mission. The Review Panel recommended that processes and procedures should be implemented to encourage leadership across all areas of responsibility in the School of Design to identify, shape, develop, and better articulate the ethos and identity of the School. **(Recommendation 1)**

### **Staff Culture**

- 2.10 During discussions with the Head of School, Deputy Head of School, and both staff panels, staff reflected on the existing development opportunities. These included online modules provided by Human Resources, the M.Ed in Learning, Teaching and Supervisory Practices and the Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education Learning and Teaching in the Creative Disciplines programmes within the School of Design. Staff who had taken part in the Postgraduate Certificate noted how it had supported reflection on their values and aided curriculum development. The online modules were valued, and staff appreciated that they were accessible to both full-time and fractional staff. Staff reflected on how the Career Review process had served as a meaningful point for conversation regarding development needs, but expressed that it needed to be more consistently applied.
- 2.11 Regarding their ability to input into the curriculum, staff felt they had a large degree of control over their curriculum but would find it useful to review the structures which link years (see *Recommendation 4, section 3.11*). Staff noted that they had limited time to reflect on curriculum development. Limited time for reflection was a shared concern, with some staff noting that finding time within the academic year to institute any changes was limited.
- 2.12 The Review Panel recommended that the School work to foster and develop a staff culture and sense of community and that the School should: (a) review workload planning and develop a culture that ensures that all staff (including fractional staff) have structured opportunities for discussion and development, and that all departments have effective structures in place to effect change and develop curriculum; and (b) develop and support team-based development opportunities, opportunities to develop practice, and mainstream consistent use of CPD activities. **(Recommendation 2)**



- 2.13 The Review Panel commended the high number of School of Design staff undertaking the Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education Learning and Teaching in the Creative Disciplines, and the positivity of the impact as a result. **(Commendation 2)**

### **3. EVALUATION OF THE QUALITY OF THE PROVISION UNDER REVIEW**

#### ***Curriculum Development***

- 3.1 As part of the ELIR Action Plan, GSA began developing a Common Academic Framework for Taught Degree Awards which would establish and communicate common principles, characteristics, and structures in undergraduate and taught postgraduate programmes. The Common Academic Framework would be submitted for approval to the May 2022 Academic Council meeting, and major amendments to align programmes to the framework would be developed in academic session 2022/23 and session 2023/24 with implementation in session 2024/25. The Self-Evaluation Report reflected on the impact of the framework for the School of Design, noting that the School anticipated it would *“provide opportunities to intensify structures of programme and course-level learning, for example reconsidering assessment aligned to semesters.”*
- 3.2 The Self-Evaluation Report described the School’s curriculum design and review as being driven by programmes and student consultation, which informed strategic discussions with the Senior Management Team. Live projects were an important focus, and the Self-Evaluation Report stated that *“year on year, project planning for studio courses balances established and trusted methodologies with the value of updating approaches, with the core consideration of supporting attainment against Intended Learning Outcomes. A key factor is recognising the need for advance timetabling while being flexible to the energy of ‘live’ and collaborative projects.”*
- 3.3 The influential role of projects in the curriculum was expanded upon in discussion with the Head of School, Deputy Head of School, and both staff panels. Staff noted that projects were explored and tested through the curriculum, and students could address topical themes and engage with industry through live projects. Large studio courses were seen as useful for allowing flexibility. The Self-Evaluation Report noted how a flexible approach enabled live projects to become *“an integral part of the curriculum”*, citing the example of how the credit structure for BA Silversmithing and Jewellery had *“several studio projects [...] be adapted and changed to suit increasing numbers of students and the introduction of new technologies or techniques, for example an increased use of Rhino, the introduction of technical days as requested by Year 2 and 3 students and changing the duration of projects year on year.”*
- 3.4 The Senior Management Team saw their group as a space to discuss the currency of the curriculum, and the standing agenda for SMT meetings includes items for discussing sustainability, equality, wellbeing, diversity, and inclusion. Senior staff emphasized the role of student consultation in maintaining the currency of programmes and saw themselves as working with students in partnership to draw out their interests. This increased value placed on student partnership was connected to helping maintain the currency of the curriculum.
- 3.5 Discussion with staff panels revealed examples of local practices of curriculum evaluation, including requesting feedback from students after 2<sup>nd</sup> semester of Design History and Theory in years 3 and 4; requesting feedback at the end of projects from BA Silversmithing and Jewellery students; and an end of year survey for Product Design Engineering Students. Staff raised that online feedback and informal feedback was key, and that they were keen to learn

about any further opportunities for obtaining student feedback. Staff described students as being more forthcoming over Zoom online discussion, noting how it had changed the power imbalance and had a democratising effect. Staff pointed to how students had raised topical issues, like circular economy, which were then built into the curriculum. Feedback was seen as key for enabling co-creation, however, there was a noted challenge of capturing student engagement at course level for nested components. The Review Panel appreciated the description of staff not being the “*gatekeepers of knowledge*,” but felt that this partnership approach to curriculum development did not consistently surface in discussions with students.

- 3.6 Discussion with undergraduate students revealed instances where students felt like they had fed back into the design of the curriculum. Among some students, there was a sense that they had been given responsibility to tackle current challenges like sustainability, and that they felt they were part of guiding the direction of the programme and steering the curriculum. Others agreed that although they felt their opinions were welcomed by their tutors, they were not confident their feedback had resulted in change. Some postgraduate students with self-directed projects noted that they did not have much curriculum to which they could contribute, besides their electives. Those who did have more teaching felt they had some choice in the curriculum, and felt staff were receptive when they had feedback.
- 3.7 The Review Panel recommended that the School of Design should adopt a future focused curriculum review across all programmes in partnership with students, aligned with the development of the Common Academic Framework. Ownership for development should be encouraged across areas of responsibility. **(Recommendation 3)**

#### ***Curriculum and the Student Journey***

- 3.8 Undergraduate and postgraduate students were in agreement that they would benefit from a better understanding of the design and structure of the curriculum as a whole. Undergraduate students specifically raised that it was unclear how different aspects of the curriculum interlinked with each other, and they wanted to be informed of the specific reasons for completing a project and what skills should be obtained in order to avoid a sense of “*just making stuff*.” An example provided by one student was that during their first and second years of study they did not understand why they had only two days of contact. This did not become clear until they reached fourth year, at which point they realised their earlier years were designed to allow space to explore and develop their own practice. This had led to anxiety about why there had not been more teaching in the earlier years, and the student expressed that this anxiety would have been alleviated if the intended focus on exploration had been better articulated.
- 3.9 Postgraduate students also noted that a better understanding of how the different components fitted together would be beneficial, and expressed that they would appreciate approaching a project with a better understanding of the brief. For those who did not come from an art school background, a more structured approach to feedback and signposting on how projects could or should progress would be welcome. Additionally, students requested a monthly timetable and expressed confusion with how Canvas presented this information
- 3.10 During discussion with staff panels there was recognition that the organisation of the curriculum would benefit from a structure which clearly articulated the connection between years. Staff have freedom within their areas, but acknowledged that more cohesion at a School-level would be a welcome enhancement.

- 3.11 The Review Panel recommended that the School of Design develop a shared staff and student understanding of the student journey as mapped through the curriculum, especially in regards to how the different courses linked to one another, and this should be clearly articulated across all programmes. **(Recommendation 4)**

#### ***Nested Courses***

- 3.12 School of Design programmes include nested courses which are delivered across programmes: undergraduate students take First Year Experience Co-Lab 1 and Co-Lab 2 courses, Design History & Theory (DH&T) courses, and Design Domain Courses; and postgraduate students take Core Research Methods in stage 1 and have a choice of elective in stage 2. As noted in the Self-Evaluation Report, *“reflection on the relationship between courses and programmes is at various stages, some more advanced than others. For example, Core Research Methods (CRM) and First Year Experience (FYE) are recent courses and have operated exclusively in a period of disruption. This factor is a meaningful consideration for the [School of Design] as we segue into a refreshed next phase of development and L&T enhancement.”* The importance of reviewing nested courses and their integration into the programme identity was emphasised by the Head and Deputy Head of School.
- 3.13 As a general reflection of Periodic Review, the Review Panel felt that the School of Design should consider how the evaluation of Design History and Theory and Co-Lab fit into the reflections on the recommendations set by the Review Panel.

#### ***Joint Programmes with the University of Glasgow***

- 3.14 Within the School of Design are two programmes delivered jointly with the University of Glasgow – the BEng/MEng Product Design Engineering and the MSc Product Design Engineering. Curriculum planning for the Product Design Engineering (PDE) programmes is discussed by the Joint Programme Committee, which reports to the Product Design Engineering Joint Board. The undergraduate and postgraduate programmes are accredited by the Institute of Mechanical Engineering, Institute of Engineering Designers, and the Institute of Engineering Technology. As described in the Self-Evaluation Report, *“sector changes and technological advancements afford PDE development potentials into a broader range of design and engineering subject material, such as an MSc pathway focusing on Electronic & Electrical Engineering. PDE’s strategic priorities include extending curricular emphasis on the ethics, responsibility, and legalities of developing and bringing ‘product’ to markets.”*
- 3.15 During discussion with the Senior Management Team, the Review Panel recognised the development of the new role of PDE Champion (within the James Watt School of Engineering at the University of Glasgow) as a positive development. As described in the Self-Evaluation Report, the role was introduced to support *“effective management of communications, curriculum development, supervisor allocation, and the enacting and assessment of the Technical Report,”* and would be evaluated by the Joint Programme Committee.

### **4. ASSURING THE STANDARDS OF AWARDS AND QUALITY OF PROVISION**

#### ***External Examiners Reports and the National Student Survey***

- 4.1 Staff panels recognised engagement with External Examiners as a key element in evaluating the standards of awards and the quality of provision. Reflecting on External Examiner reports was used to maintain the currency of the curriculum, and External Examiners were engaged as sounding boards for curriculum review. Many School of Design staff were External Examiners

for other institutions, using their wider knowledge of current themes to feedback into evaluation of the programme. The School confirmed that External Examiner reports and the actions made in response to their recommendations were shared with students at the department level.

- 4.2 The Self-Evaluation Report provided examples of how programmes responded to external examiner feedback with curriculum enhancements, including the BA Silversmithing & Jewellery which *“added an additional project to the 100-credit Studio course to make a clearer distinction on the amount of work required for submission. They also implemented more explicit guidance on assessment, ILOs and feedback, and continued their commended use of Canvas as a feedback platform.”*
- 4.3 In addition to External Examiner reports, staff discussed how the National Student Survey (NSS) scores served as a useful evaluation tool. In responding to a five-year downward trend in NSS scores for the BA Communication Design, staff described a working group which was setup to identify focus areas within the curriculum, including feedback and assessment. This approach was seen as helpful for framing specific issues, and through regular meetings updates could be provided and improvement tracked. The Self-Evaluation Report detailed a similar NSS Action Plan for BA Textile Design with a focus on student partnership and student voice. The Review Panel acknowledged that as part of the institution’s response to NSS, programme leaders for BA Communication Design and BA Textile Design have engaged with support workshops with the Deputy Director (Academic) and Head of Learning and Teaching, and progress will be reviewed upon release of the NSS in July 2022.

#### ***Programme Monitoring and Annual Reporting***

- 4.4 Through discussion with the Senior Management Team, the Review Panel were advised that the Periodic Review process had mapped onto other institution-led review processes including Programme Monitoring and Annual Reporting (PMAR) and development of the PMAR Quality Enhancement Action Plans (QEAP). These processes provided a cyclical loop for summative and formative evaluation. Staff described this as a rich loop whereby evaluation, following by action and reflection, could then be mapped onto forms of feedback, including that from External Examiners.
- 4.5 Staff outside of the Senior Management Team contributed to Programme Monitoring and Annual Reporting (PMAR), however, some noted they had not seen the final drafts of the report. Regarding the development of programme-level reports for PMAR, there were different practices across the School where some departments had a single author who wrote for both the undergraduate and postgraduate programmes, while in other areas the Programme Leader was responsible for their cognate area (*see Recommendation 6, section 4.10*).

#### ***Course Evaluation***

- 4.6 The Review Panel were keen to explore the School’s approach to course evaluation, and how it fed into School-level initiatives. Discussion with staff included examples of local practices of requesting course-level feedback from students, including: during the second semester of Design History and Theory in years 3 and 4; at the end of projects from BA Silversmithing and Jewellery students; and an end of year survey for Product Design Engineering Students.

- 4.7 The Review Panel felt that although course-level evaluation was being undertaken across the School, it was not undertaken systematically, and that the School would benefit from developing agreed processes for evaluation in place of localised approaches. The Review Panel recommended that the School of Design should develop a systemic, School-wide approach to course evaluation which feeds up into Programme Monitoring and Annual Reporting (PMAR) and School-level initiatives, and ensure all colleagues have opportunities to contribute.
- (Recommendation 5)**

#### ***Systemic Approach to Monitoring, Evaluating, and Sharing of Good Practice***

- 4.8 The Review Panel wished to explore how good practice was identified and shared across the School of Design. Senior staff pointed to the role of Senior Management Team as the platform for discussing emerging themes and identifying potential areas for action or good practice. Knowledge from staff teams was reported to the Senior Management Team where it would be explored and issues discussed for commonality. For example, the impact of COVID-19 restrictions on student and staff wellbeing was reviewed in order to mitigate anxiety and provide support and reassurance. Senior staff noted an upward trend towards mapping existing good practice and embedding it across the School.
- 4.9 Following discussion with the student panels, the Review Panel noted that there were examples of enhancement happening across the School, but that the School would benefit from these being shared more systematically. For example, the BA Silversmithing & Jewellery programme held a 'Monday Lunch Club' for their students, and students from other programmes expressed interest in having this initiative replicated across the School. The Review Panel reflected that the School would benefit from taking advantage of sharing good practice in a more structured way and for enhancement to be driven strategically at the School level. Additionally, enhancement projects should be set with clear objectives and with plans for monitoring progress and assessing impact and evaluation.
- 4.10 The Review Panel recognised that quality assurance mechanisms are well established and robust, but that evaluation and assessment of impact should be further developed. The Review Panel recommended that the School of Design should: (a) set clear goals which are monitored regularly and evaluated to determine impact when establishing enhancement projects; and (b) ensure that all staff receive completed Programme Monitoring and Annual Reporting (PMAR) documentation and updates on progression of outcomes.
- (Recommendation 6)**

#### ***Mainstreaming Equality, Diversity and Inclusion***

- 4.11 The Review Panel wished to explore the role and impact of the Equality Impact Assessments (EIA) undertaken for all School of Design programmes, while noting that most were completed before session 2018/19. The necessity of reviewing the EIAs was self-diagnosed in the Self-Evaluation Report, noting that "*across programmes, Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) require updating and more immediate weaving into the fabric of programmes. GSA's Equalities Officer will lead the streamlining of the process, and the [School of Design] will engage fully with this.*"
- 4.12 The Head of School noted that more work on embedding equality, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) would be undertaken, and the School was considering appointing a School EDI Lead to spearhead initiatives. Discussion with the Senior Management Team also revealed an emphasis and reliance on GSA-level initiatives, such as the introduction of the Equalities

Officer and the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee - for driving these issues. The Review Panel welcomed plans to identify a School Lead, and recommended that all staff should work towards upskilling in this area and reflect on practices at the programme, department, and School level.

- 4.13 In terms of the curriculum, the Head of School pointed to the work to decolonise and internationalise the curriculum and how the enthusiasm of colleagues underpinned these developments. The Deputy Head of School added that the Library had led on the decolonisation work, and that there were examples of this having impacts on curriculum design for studio, notably a Master's project reviewing the impact of the North Atlantic Slave trade and the Merchant City. The Self-Evaluation Report reflected on additional examples including *"the Responsible Design Manifesto project in [MDes] Fashion & Textiles, programme and course-level collaboration with GSA Library on decolonising reading lists and the creation of resources Padlets, and how diversity, equality and inclusivity inform Design Domain and the autoethnographic approaches in Core Research Methods."*
- 4.14 The Review Panel felt that the School lacked ambition in their approach to Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion in the School, and recommended that the School of Design develop this culture, and ensure that Equality Impact Assessments are updated regularly in line with GSA expectations. **(Recommendation 7)**

## 5. ENHANCEMENT IN LEARNING AND TEACHING

### ***Collaborative Partnerships and Exchange Strategy***

- 5.1 The Review Panel were keen to explore the School of Design's strategy for partnerships and exchange, particular in regards to the conclusion of the partnership with the Singapore Institute of Technology (SIT) in session 2020/21. As described in the Self-Evaluation Report, the School of Design *"sustains excellent international partnerships at programme, School and institutional level. The conclusion of the Singapore partnership, Brexit and the Pandemic have, and will continue to put a strain on this interconnectedness. At the same time, greater telematic connectivity has enhanced the capability of engagement and partnership potential, including greater diversification. This presents to be defined opportunity for the School of Design."*
- 5.2 The Head of School shared plans to build on staff's academic networks with other institutions, and to use these networks and knowledge to develop new international markets and partnerships. As a result of Brexit and the end of Erasmus, the Head of School was interested in seeking partnerships within the UK and with Ireland, noting the importance of providing exchange opportunities for students. The Review Panel felt that the impact of the partnership with the Singapore Institute of Technology, potential for continuing collaboration given the notable presence of GSA alumni in Singapore, and a broader structural review of international exchange should be explored. The School of Design should reflect on the collaboration with the Singapore Institute of Technology, and set-out clear ambitions for future exchange activities and collaborative partnerships. **(Recommendation 8)**

### ***Links with Industry***

- 5.3 During discussion with the Head of School and Deputy Head of School, there was reflection on student career pathways and recognition that flexibility and understanding of transferable skills was a key graduate attribute. The Self-Evaluation Report reflected on how the School

*“support[ed] and promot[ed] graduate attributes at ground level. For example, [BA Communication Design] hosts events featuring alumni and a weekly programme of online professional practice talks. Nested courses such as Design Domain and the First Year Experience increasingly invite recent graduates as speakers and contributors.”* At the postgraduate level, the Self-Evaluation Report included the example of activity for MDes Communication Design students which *“promotes graduate attributes, employability and internationalisation via professional studio tours, international collaborations with alumni, and its high recognition in student awards.”*

- 5.4 The Head of School noted the value of the industry voice in developing curriculum and planned to explore industry opinion on where gaps existed regarding graduates’ qualifications. This was often sought at degree shows which typically had industry awards, and the Head of School noted that an industry panel would be a valuable addition. The Review Panel agreed that the School would benefit from formalising links with industry through an industry advisory board.
- 5.5 Following discussion with staff and student panels and taking into consideration the numerous examples within the Self-Evaluation Report, the Review Panel were assured of the abundance of partner projects and how they were embedded in the curriculum. It was evident that partner projects were approached as a way for students to address topical themes and engage with industry and were opportunities for staff to make connections with the curriculum to research. The richness of partnership projects in the curriculum, evidenced across departments, was commended for adding value to the student experience. (**Commendation 3**)

### **Research and Knowledge Exchange Strategy**

- 5.6 The Review Panel wished to explore the School of Design’s strengths in research and knowledge exchange and how it fed into the School-level strategy. As described in the Self-Evaluation Report, the School’s *“research expertise lies in a substantive proportion of research-active studio and [Design History and Theory] (DH&T) staff, including practice-based.”* Through discussions with the Head of School and Deputy Head of School, there was acknowledgement that the School of Design’s practice-based elements of research were not as well established as the other Schools at GSA. However, there was nascent activity which the School hoped to capitalise on through work with the Research and Enterprise Committee, early career researchers, Visiting Professors, a Staff Forum led by academic and research staff, and by prioritising time for this activity in workloads.
- 5.1 The Head of School noted there was interest in building on the existing structures and opportunities provided by live projects to align these activities to research, and thus to review how research could be a driver for curriculum change. Staff in the Senior Management Team reflected on how staff research activity, including producing outputs and attending conferences, was feeding back into the review of programmes. A number of staff, including Programme Leaders and Heads of Departments were research active, and this was recognised as contributing to programme development.
- 5.2 Staff discussed how their own practice feeds into their areas of teaching, but that there were challenges to articulating this through existing research processes. The Review Panel reflected that it was important to develop a cross-School understanding of what research and practice were and their impacts. Staff noted that there were a lot of makers in the School who would like to articulate their practice-based research. Research was seen as a way to facilitate collaboration across the School, such as doctoral supervision with studio colleagues. The loss of

the Refectory and the Assembly Building was raised for how it diminished opportunities for seeding of research.

- 5.3 The Review Panel recommended that the School of Design's research and knowledge exchange strategy be developed, foregrounding and supporting practice based models and research teaching linkages. (**Recommendation 9**)

#### ***Climate and Social Justice Strategy***

- 5.4 The Review Panel wished to explore the School's ambitions regarding the climate emergency and social justice and how activity could be driven strategically. Through discussion with the Head of School and Deputy Head of School, it was evident that there were several projects relating to sustainability and community engagement taking place that had not surfaced in the Self-Evaluation Report.
- 5.5 During discussion with staff panels a number of examples of live projects addressing issues of climate and social justice were provided, and staff discussed how they sought to embed these issues into the curriculum and to provide students the opportunity to take ownership in responding to them. Studio was described as providing the platform for having this discourse with students.
- 5.6 Student panels reflected on examples of how climate and social justice had come through the curriculum, with some describing their courses as in line with recent developments and responding to ecological issues and sustainability. Students noted that they felt they were given responsibility to tackle these issues, but that it may have been too broad. The focus on ethics and sustainability was seen as having grown in recent years, and students were being encouraged to ask more questions as designers in relation to their own practice about why they were doing something and what the impact would be. Some students, however, noted that emphasis on sustainability was not yet being made crucial enough.
- 5.7 Heads of Departments raised different approaches on how to make these topics a core component of their curriculum, which included focussing on source materials, emphasising responsibility so that sustainability would be a by-product, embedding a culture which encouraged discussion with self-directed projects, and designing project outcomes which actively pursue these topics. For postgraduate taught students, the elective offering included courses which have recently launched and touched on these topics, such as circular economy, socially engaged practices, and permaculture design. The Postgraduate Certificate in Learning Teaching included exploration of how to address these issues through curriculum. Some staff noted that sustainability was already embedded into the Intended Learning Outcomes, while others noted an ambition to do so.
- 5.8 In the Self-Evaluation Report, the School self-diagnosed the climate emergency as an area for improvement, noting that the School "*could better integrate skills associated with addressing the climate emergency. Strategies to approach this might be modelled on existing good practice—integrated and strategic—and would centre on engagement with GSA Sustainability and student partnership goals (including those that might embed in GSA's developing Student Partnership Agreement) and GSA's ongoing work on Graduate Attributes.*"
- 5.9 As with the School's equality initiatives, the Review Panel noted the need for the School to develop a clear ambition in driving these activities forward. The Review Panel recommended



that the School develop a clear ambition and agenda for climate emergency and social justice activity, and that this should be led from a strategic level. (*Recommendation 10*)

## 6. ASSURING AND ENHANCING THE QUALITY OF THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE

### *Student Partnership*

- 6.1 The undergraduate student panels reflected on student voice mechanisms and agreed that student reps and tutors were keen to resolve local-level issues, though it was recognised that tutors could, at times, be too busy to respond to everything. Tutors were described as welcoming, and students appreciated that their tutors were open to discussions and viewed students' opinions as valid. Students cited some examples where they felt their feedback had been actioned, including calls for more guidance on using digital software. Specific examples of collating feedback were provided, which included a student-led Google form to capture information anonymously.
- 6.2 Beyond their immediate tutors and programme leaders, undergraduate students felt they did not know what happened to their feedback. With regards to the Class Rep structure and formal feedback mechanisms, undergraduate students noted the challenge of raising complaints, which could be redirected, and that it was unclear who would be taking responsibility. This was attributed to the structure as opposed to the individual person with whom the matter was raised. Students were unfamiliar with the School Forum, and the Review Panel felt more work was needed to make this known as a space for the student voice and partnership working.
- 6.3 The postgraduate student panel expressed more familiarity with student voice mechanisms, with some students sharing that they had many ways to raise questions and provide feedback, including a course-level focus group each semester, programme-level community meetings, School-level Student Staff Consultative Committees (SSCC), Boards of Studies, and Student Liaison meetings. Class Reps and Lead Reps discussed issues and would speak directly with course leaders, and the smaller class sizes were seen as helping students feel comfortable giving feedback. Postgraduate students provided some examples of how their feedback had been effective, which included improvements to lecture slides following Class Reps formally raising it with a lecturer, and following a student survey, the introduction of mixed tutorial groups to facilitate students meeting more of their cohort.
- 6.4 Staff panels recognised a positive change in student representation, noting that Class Reps and Lead Reps were noticeably more proactive and that the system was working more effectively than previous years. Staff were focused on demonstrating how feedback was responded to in order to close the feedback loop, as demonstrated by their 'You said, We did' accountability system. The challenge of ensuring the student feedback mechanisms worked effectively with larger cohorts, however, was raised.
- 6.5 Improvements in the effectiveness of student voice and partnership at an institutional-level was raised in discussions with the Head of School, the Deputy Head of School, and the Senior Management Team. It was agreed that the student voice was more effectively being incorporated into committees and discussions regarding quality at the programme and institutional level. The Senior Management Team reflected on how they used established feedback structures, including feedback from community meetings within programmes which fed into the School Liaison Forum and SSCCs, where actions could be identified and progressed. Knowledge through staff teams would be reported through to the Senior

Management Team, and that group would explore issues and discuss commonality. Lead Reps were engaged and worked closely with the Head of School, and were seen as drivers of change.

- 6.6 The Self-Evaluation Report reflected on the School's student partnership approach developed during the pandemic as a strength, noting that the School had "*made considerable progress in developing effective student feedback mechanisms, most particularly pertinent in [session 2021/22], which saw the establishment of a new weekly or fortnightly liaison meeting between Lead Reps, [Head of School] HofS, [Academic Support Manager] ASM and [Academic Development Lead] ADL. Within the continued disruptions of the pandemic, these sessions enable immediate dialogue around critical issues and a developmental feed-through towards further enhancing partnership. Notably, the School Forum in 21/22 Semester 1 saw a collaborative approach between Lead Reps and HofS, ASM, and ADL dovetailing with broader GSA enhancements to student voice and partnership.*" The establishment of a strong connection and linkages between the Senior Management Team and the Lead Reps in the School of Design was commended. **(Commendation 4)**

### **Workshops and Studio**

- 6.7 Student panels expressed an appreciation of the Reid Building for having a communal and collegiate atmosphere and good lighting. There was feedback, however, that the studio felt small considering the number of students who needed to share the limited space. Some students expressed concern that there was a sense of intruding on others and taking someone else's space when in the studio. The Head of School saw the potential of the School's buildings and shared that there were plans to review the floorplans and occupancy.
- 6.8 Undergraduate students discussed how interaction in studio was typically initiated by students and not guided by tutors, and examples were given of this happening across year groups within a programme. However, as Year 1 students were in a different space and students in different programmes in the later years were rarely in at the same times, interaction with students in Year 1 or with other programmes was limited.
- 6.9 Regarding workshops, undergraduate students raised some frustrations with not being able to access workshops of their choosing if they were deemed not relevant to their course. Students provided positive feedback about the studio space, but noted that workshop difficult to access. There was enthusiasm for accessing workshops outside of core requirements, and those students who had been able to had found them helpful. Staff were cognisant of the practical limitations of workshop accessibility given increases in student numbers and the pressures on physical spaces, and they acknowledged students' frustrations and the need to manage expectations about access.

### **Interdisciplinary Collaboration**

- 6.10 The Review Panel recognised that students were feeling isolated, partly due to COVID-19 restrictions and to being located in different locations on campus. There was a sense that students wanted to break down barriers and engage more with each other, but that it was not being done in a guided and formal way. Students also raised a lack of social space. The Review Panel felt that students were working in disciplinary silos and wished to see studio as the space for facilitating interdisciplinary collaboration.

- 6.11 The Senior Management Team reflected on the importance of students coming together as a community and the need to work as a staff team to encourage students to use studio, even if working on digital projects. In reflecting on the importance of informal collaboration, staff pointed to the Reid and studio space as critical. Visibility was important for making things, and they cautioned against overestimating the value of digital space. The negative impact of the loss of the Assembly Building and the benefits of informal sharing via exhibitions in the corridor were raised by all staff and student panels.
- 6.12 Undergraduate students provided mixed feedback regarding their experiences with Co-Lab. Students noted that Co-Lab 1 was delivered within their programme and felt no different from usual project work, while Co-Lab 2 involved collaboration with students from other Schools. It was still not possible to stay as engaged with the project as they would like, and they believed the experience would benefit from smaller groups.
- 6.13 Postgraduate students shared that they did not experience a great degree of collaboration with students from other disciplines. As the one-year programmes were very compact, there was limited opportunities for structured collaboration, though students were advised they could explore this independently. The electives were acknowledged as an opportunity for interdisciplinary collaboration, but interaction had been limited as they had been delivered online since March 2020 as a result of the pandemic.

#### ***Balance of Digital and Physical Resources***

- 6.14 The Review Panel were keen to explore how the move to online delivery as a result of COVID-19 had affected the School's approach to space usage and a balance between physical and digital resources. The Self-Evaluation Report reflected on the impact of the shift to a blended model, noting that *"these developments have led to a period of healthy development, risk-taking, experimentation, and re-tuned pedagogies and practice. The blended model also serves as useful interrogation of how we frame 'studio' and presents future developmental possibilities in expanding studio and internationalising the curriculum in innovative ways."*
- 6.15 Senior staff noted that augmentation through technology had been discussed at School-level and that the impacts of the shift to online delivery and then a blended model required further reflection. Digital resources were recognised as having become intrinsic with vast possibilities for innovation, and that there would need to be a healthy balance between the physical and digital. It was recognised that there would need to be a clear designation of where each activity was appropriate with the transition to in person activity. The Self-Evaluation Report provided an example of this balance in the MDes Interior Design programme where *"digital tools such as Padlet and Miro proved to be especially useful for peer feedback, as well as in-studio 'Can you Crit it?' events."* Staff panels discussed ambitions for enhanced language support, different types of learning resources, more sharing across institutions, carrying out fieldwork with a broader audience, and using film for modelling or describing the context of where things were made.
- 6.16 In discussing the impact of online delivery to the curriculum and students, the Senior Management Team reflected on the equal demand from students for digital tools and the traditional ways of manufacturing. Available digital tools were recognised by students as the future of industry, while traditional analogue processes, which slowed making, allowed for better understanding of each component. Staff noted that collaboration among students over Zoom had felt dynamic and had enabled students from across the world to share experiences together.

- 6.17 Regarding the balance between physical and digital resources, the Self-Evaluation Report stated that *“the most critical ongoing challenge is to balance the continuing potentials of technology-enhanced modes with the value of in-person learning. Moreover, the [School of Design] centres the exceptionally high value of in-person studio culture, as do student learners.”* Examples of how this balance was being addressed included continued use of digital cameras to record technical demonstrations and thus build a technical digital archive for BA Silversmithing & Jewellery students; replacement of physical shared exhibitions with online viewing which resulted in vertical sharing across BA Interior Design students in Years 1 to 4; staff innovations in using Canvas for formative assessment which provided a digital paper trail and enhanced insights into the progress of BA Interaction Design students; and pre-recorded Design Domain talks which improved accessibility and inclusivity.
- 6.18 The Review Panel recommended that the School of Design should review how it utilises its spaces in order to: (a) meet new emerging forms of studio use in teaching and learning, particularly in a post-COVID-19 environment; (b) achieve an appropriate balance between physical and digital resources; and (c) mainstream the best practice learned regarding online tools and digital delivery. **(Recommendation 11)**

### ***Personal Tutor Scheme***

- 6.19 As described in the Self-Evaluation Report, the School of Design ran a pilot of the Personal Tutor Scheme for BA Fashion Design and BA Textile Design students which had not been fully implemented as a result of COVID-19. The impression from the pilot was that the scheme had been *“supporting [Individual Requirement Form] IRF and EDI [equality, diversity and inclusion] in affording students an opportunity to discuss the IRF. Staff have made accommodations in tutorials and assessment submissions which has included extending deadlines for submissions to reduce stress for students with anxiety issues or neurodiverse students in written tasks”*

Staff who were familiar with the pilot noted that there had been an expectation that students would raise issues with their primary tutor, but they were familiar with instances of students going to a personal tutor instead. They were not aware of any evaluation of the pilot. As a small specialist institution where staff would have multiple responsibilities, staff raised that they would welcome further training regarding this type of support. The Review Panel recommended the School of Design should fully implement the Personal Tutor Scheme, brief and support staff to take ownership, and consider the process for monitoring the effectiveness of the Scheme across the School. **(Recommendation 12)**

## **7. SUMMARY OF PERCEIVED STRENGTHS AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

### ***Commendations***

- 7.1 The Review Panel commended the School of Design on the following, and identified that these were areas of good practice for dissemination across the GSA:
- 7.2 **Commendation 1 – Collaborative Working and Collegiate Approach**

The Review Panel commended the School’s collaborative working and collegiate approach, which included:

- a. the leadership of the Interim Head of School in supporting the Senior Management Team in working collegiately and collaboratively through the pandemic to adapt to, and develop, innovative approaches;
- b. the effort of all staff teams in working collaboratively in developing innovative practices in response to the pandemic;
- c. collectively implementing the approach to a centralised Technical Support Department model and successful development of new practice as a result; and
- d. collegiate approach to the development of the self-evaluation report in preparation for Periodic Review.

### **7.3 Commendation 2 – Staff Embracing Professional Development Opportunities**

The Review Panel commended the high number of School of Design staff undertaking the Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education Learning and Teaching in the Creative Disciplines, and the positivity of the impact as a result.

### **7.4 Commendation 3 – Richness of Partnerships in the Curriculum**

The richness of partnership projects in the curriculum, evidenced across departments, was commended for adding value to the student experience

### **7.5 Commendation 4 – Connection with Lead Reps in the School of Design**

The establishment of a strong connection and linkages between the Senior Management Team and the Lead Reps in the School of Design was commended.

### ***Recommendations***

- 7.6 The Review Panel made a number of recommendations, as set out below. All recommendations must be completed within 12 months and be formally reported by the Head of the School of Design to each Board of Studies, Education Committee and Academic Council within the 12-month period.

### **7.7 Recommendation 1 – Leadership**

The Review Panel recommended that processes and procedures should be implemented to encourage leadership across all areas of responsibility in the School of Design to identify, shape, develop, and better articulate the ethos and identity of the School.

### **7.8 Recommendation 2 – Staff Culture and Sense of Community**

The Review Panel recommended that the School work to foster and develop a staff culture and sense of community and that the School should:

- a. review workload planning and develop a culture that ensures that all staff (including fractional staff) have structured opportunities for discussion and development, and that all departments have effective structures in place to effect change and develop curriculum; and
- b. develop and support team-based development opportunities, opportunities to develop practice, and mainstream consistent use of CPD activities.

### **7.9 Recommendation 3 – Curriculum Review in Partnership with Students**

The Review Panel recommended that the School of Design should adopt a future focused curriculum review across all programmes in partnership with students, aligned with the development of the Common Academic Framework. Ownership for development should be encouraged across areas of responsibility.

### **7.10 Recommendation 4 – Student Journey**

The Review Panel recommended that the School of Design develop a shared staff and student understanding of the student journey as mapped through the curriculum, especially in regards to how the different courses linked to one another, and this should be clearly articulated across all programmes.

### **7.11 Recommendation 5 – Course Evaluation**

The Review Panel recommended that the School of Design develop a systemic, School-wide approach to course evaluation which feeds up into Programme Monitoring and Annual Reporting (PMAR) and School-level initiatives, and ensure all colleagues have opportunities to contribute.

### **7.12 Recommendation 6 – Assurance and Standards**

The Review Panel recognised that quality assurance mechanisms are well established and robust, but that evaluation and assessment of impact should be further developed. The Review Panel recommended that the School of Design should:

- a. set clear goals which are monitored regularly and evaluated to determine impact when establishing enhancement projects; and
- b. ensure that all staff receive completed Programme Monitoring and Annual Reporting (PMAR) documentation and updates on progression of outcomes.

### **7.13 Recommendation 7 – Equality, Diversity and Inclusion**

The Review Panel felt that the School lacked ambition in their approach to Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion in the School, and recommended that the School of Design develop this culture, and ensure that Equality Impact Assessments are updated regularly in line with GSA expectations.

### **7.14 Recommendation 8 – Reflection on the Collaboration with Singapore Institute of Technology**

The School of Design should reflect on the collaboration with the Singapore Institute of Technology, and set-out clear ambitions for future exchange activities and collaborative partnerships.

### **7.15 Recommendation 9 – Research and Knowledge Exchange Strategy**

The Review Panel recommended that the School of Design's research and knowledge exchange strategy be developed, foregrounding and supporting practice based models and research teaching linkages.

#### 7.16 **Recommendation 10 – Climate and Social Justice**

The Review Panel recommended that the School develop a clear ambition and agenda for climate emergency and social justice activity, and that this should be led from a strategic level.

#### 7.17 **Recommendation 11 – Space and Pedagogy**

The Review Panel recommended that the School of Design should review how it utilises its spaces in order to:

- a. meet new emerging forms of studio use in teaching and learning, particularly in a post-COVID-19 environment;
- b. achieve an appropriate balance between physical and digital resources; and
- c. mainstream the best practice learned regarding online tools and digital delivery.

#### 7.18 **Recommendation 12 – Consistency in the Implementation of the Personal Tutor Scheme**

The School of Design should fully implement the Personal Tutor Scheme, brief and support staff to take ownership, and consider the process for monitoring the effectiveness of the Scheme across the School.

### **8. REVALIDATION OF THE PERIODIC REVIEW PANEL**

8.1 As an integral part of the Periodic Review process the Review Panel considered the revalidation of individual programmes. The Self-Evaluation report explicitly and frequently referenced individual programme provision, and the Review Panel considered the student experience and individual programme provision throughout the process.

8.2 The Review Panel invited Academic Council to approve the revalidation of the following degree programmes for a period of six years from September 2022, these being:

BA (Hons) Communication Design  
BA (Hons) Fashion Design  
BA (Hons) Interaction Design  
BA (Hons) Interior Design  
BA (Hons) Silversmithing & Jewellery Design  
BA (Hons) Textile Design  
BEng/MEng (Hons) Product Design Engineering  
MDes Communication Design  
MDes Fashion & Textiles  
MDes Graphics, Illustration & Photography  
MDes Interior Design  
MSc Product Design Engineering  
M.Ed Learning, Teaching and Supervisory Practices in the Creative Disciplines  
PG Certificate Higher Education Learning and Teaching in the Creative Disciplines  
PG Certificate Supervisory Practices in the Creative Disciplines

Academic Council approved revalidation of the above programmes at the meeting of 4 May 2022.

### **9. GENERAL REFLECTIONS OF THE PERIODIC REVIEW PANEL**

9.1 As a general reflection of the Periodic Review event, the Review Panel were assured of the excellent work happening across the School of Design, and that the Periodic Review event was

an opportunity to develop the structures and community required to support and direct this activity strategically at the School level.

- 9.2 Additionally, the School of Design should consider how the evaluation of Design History and Theory and Co-Lab fit into the reflections on the above recommendations.
- 9.3 The Periodic Review event was conducted remotely owing to the COVID-19 pandemic. The Review Panel were in agreement that it worked well, however, the intention would be to hold future events in person.



## ANNEX A: PROGRAMME PROVISION CONSIDERED AS PART OF THE PERIODIC REVIEW

The Review Panel considered the following provision offered by the School of Design (including student numbers for 2021/22):

Programme		Student FTE in 2021/22*
BA (Hons) Communication Design	<i>A four year programme</i>	178
BA (Hons) Fashion Design	<i>A four year programme</i>	91
BA (Hons) Interaction Design	<i>A four year programme</i>	48
BA (Hons) Interior Design	<i>A four year programme</i>	121
BA (Hons) Silversmithing & Jewellery Design	<i>A four year programme</i>	77
BA (Hons) Textile Design	<i>A four year programme</i>	88
BEng/MEng (Hons) Product Design Engineering	<i>A four year programme (BEng) A five year programme (MEng)</i>	164
<b>Undergraduate Total</b>		<b>767</b>
MDes Communication Design	<i>A two year programme</i>	50
MDes Fashion & Textiles	<i>A one year programme</i>	32
MDes Graphics, Illustration & Photography	<i>A one year programme</i>	28
MDes Interior Design	<i>A one year programme</i>	67
MSc Product Design Engineering	<i>A one year programme</i>	39
ME.d Learning, Teaching and Supervisory Practices in the Creative Disciplines	<i>A three year programme</i>	0
PG Certificate Higher Education Learning and Teaching in the Creative Disciplines	<i>A one year programme</i>	0
PG Certificate Supervisory Practices in the Creative Disciplines	<i>A one year programme</i>	0
<b>Postgraduate Taught Total</b>		<b>216</b>
<b>School of Design Total</b>		<b>983</b>

\* total Student FTE to complete with a Degree in 2021/22

## ANNEX B: SCHOOL OF DESIGN PERIODIC REVIEW – STAFF AND STUDENT MEETINGS

### 1. Meeting with group of Undergraduate Students: Thursday 10 February 2022, 13:15 – 14:15

Year	Programme
Year 1	BA (Hons) Interior Design
Year 1	BA (Hons) Interior Design
Year 2	BA (Hons) Fashion Design
Year 2	BA (Hons) Fashion Design
Year 2	BA (Hons) Interior Design
Year 2	BEng/MEng Product Design Engineering
Year 3	BA (Hons) Communication Design
Year 3	BA (Hons) Interaction Design
Year 3	BA (Hons) Silversmithing & Jewellery
Year 3	BA (Hons) Textile Design
Year 4	BA (Hons) Communication Design
Year 4	BA (Hons) Interior Design
Year 4	BA (Hons) Silversmithing & Jewellery
Year 4	BEng/MEng Product Design Engineering

### 2. Meeting with group of Postgraduate Students: Thursday 10 February 2022, 14:30 – 15:30

Year	Programme
Year 1	MDes Communication Design (GIP)
Year 2	MDes Communication Design (GIP)
Not identified	MDes Communication Design (GIP)
Year 1	MDes Interior Design
Year 1	MDes Interior Design
Year 1	MDes Interior Design
Year 1	MSc Product Design Engineering

### 3. Meeting with Senior Management Team Programme Leaders and Heads of Departments: Friday 11 February 2022, 10:30 – 12:00

Title
Academic Support Manager
Programme Leader MDes Communication Design (Graphics, Illustration & Photography)
Acting Programme Leader Interior Design (Undergraduate)
Programme Leader/ Head of Silversmithing & Jewellery (Undergraduate)
Programme Leader Interaction Design (Undergraduate)
Head of Design, History & Theory
Programme Leader Communication Design (Undergraduate)
Programme Leader M.Ed Learning & Teaching & Supervisory Practices in Creative Disciplines) (Postgraduate)
Academic Development Lead
Programme Leader/Head of Fashion & Textiles (Undergraduate / Postgraduate)
Programme Co-ordinator Interior Design (Postgraduate)
Programme Leader/Head of Product Design Engineering (Undergraduate / Postgraduate)

**4. Meeting with Lecturers and Professional Services Support: Friday 12 February 2021, 13:15 – 14:45**

Title
Lecturer, Fashion & Textiles
Lecturer, Silversmithing & Jewellery
Lecturer, Interior Design
Administration Officer
Lecturer, Product Design Engineering
Lecturer, Interaction Design
Lecturer, Design, History & Theory
Lecturer / Course Coordinator, Core Research Methods, Design History & Theory
Lecturer / Admissions Coordinator (Postgraduate), Fashion & Textiles
Technician, Technical Support Department
Lecturer, Interior Design
Lecturer, Communication Design
Lecturer/Technician, Communication Design
Course Co-ordinator Design Domain / Academic Development Lead
First Year Experience Coordinator

## **ANNEX C: ELIR and Scottish Concerns Scheme Reports**

GSA was subject to QAA Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR) in 2020. The Outcome Report and Technical Report were published on 9 April 2021 where GSA received a summary judgement of Limited Effectiveness, with 16 recommendations and 6 commendations. In addition, GSA received 6 recommendations as a result of reports raised through the QAA Scottish Concerns Scheme. In line with the requirements of the QAA ELIR process and QAA Scottish Concerns Scheme, GSA has developed an action plan to respond to the recommendations of both, discussed with the University of Glasgow, and submitted to QAA.

Following the result of Limited Effectiveness from the QAA ELIR process 2020 the GSA Director and Deputy Director Academic engaged in discussions with the QAA Scotland Director and senior staff, the University of Glasgow Principal and his senior colleagues, and the Scottish Funding Council's Chief Executive. Through these engagements, GSA Senior Leadership Group discussion, and consideration through GSA's Undergraduate and Postgraduate Committee, an approach to ELIR recovery was developed, and an action plan of response was approved by GSA's Academic Council in May 2021. The action plan was accompanied by approach principles which included that:

- GSA would prioritise the time to undertake structured reflection and discussion to ensure the right lessons were learned;
- GSA would adopt a whole GSA approach to this work, meaning that everyone would need to be involved at all levels in appropriate ways and committed to the change;
- through this recovery work GSA would develop a 'theory of change' that mainstreams good practice with regards future educational development and enhancement work;
- GSA would work openly and in close partnership with the GSA Students' Association, University of Glasgow, QAA Scotland, Student Partnership in Quality Scotland (SPARQS) and the Scottish Funding Council to ensure that actions are effective and lasting.

GSA's Academic Council has overall responsibility for the oversight and monitoring of the ELIR Action Plan and has tasked its subordinate committees with specific aspects of this work as necessary. Academic Council will review the ELIR Action Plan at each of its meetings in 2021/22 and will report frequently on progress to the GSA Board of Governors. Aligned to Academic Council's meeting schedule there will be quarterly liaison meetings with QAA Scotland to discuss progress and plan for an ELIR re-review. In addition, the GSA and the University of Glasgow have established a joint ELIR liaison group to maintain a close working relationship throughout the period of recovery. These liaison groups are scheduled to align with Academic Council dates in 2021/22.

**University of Glasgow****Academic Standards Committee – Friday 27 May 2022****Scotland's Rural College (SRUC): Validation of MRes Zoonoses & Epidemiology of Animal Infectious Disease****Cover Sheet**

**Robbie Mulholland, Clerk, Joint Liaison Committee of the University of Glasgow and Scotland's Rural College (SRUC)**

**Brief Description of the Paper**

The attached submission, which comprises two papers, relates to the validation of the MRes Zoonoses & Epidemiology of Animal Infectious Diseases, which took place at SRUC on the 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2022.

Paper 1 is the SRUC MRes Zoonoses & Epidemiology of Animal Infectious Diseases Validation report.

Paper 2 is the SRUC MRes Zoonoses & Epidemiology of Animal Infectious Diseases response to the validation report.

**Action Requested**

Academic Standards Committee (ASC) is asked to consider the attached reports, and **approve**:

The validation of the SRUC MRes Zoonoses & Epidemiology of Animal Infectious Diseases, with effect from September 2022 for a period of six years.

This programme will be offered from SRUC's North Faculty.

**Recommended Person/s responsible for taking the action(s) forward**

The Head of the Animal and Veterinary Science Department in SRUC's North Faculty.

**Resource Implications (where appropriate)**

No resource implications have been identified for the University.

**Timescale for Implementation (where appropriate)**

It is proposed that (subject to ASC approval) the MRes Zoonoses & Epidemiology of Animal Infectious Diseases programme will be offered from September 2022.

**Equality Implications (where appropriate)**

During the validation event, there were extensive discussions about the delivery mode and target group in relation to the programme. The review panel set, as a condition of approval, that there must be absolute clarity on the delivery model in the programme design narrative and specification. Students would require to be given clear information about the programme and what elements would be delivered online and/or in person, and what alternative options there may be.



**Scotland's Rural College**

**Masters of Research: Zoonoses and  
Epidemiology of Animal Infectious Diseases**

**2 March 2022**

## Contents

.....	0
1. Introduction.....	2
1.1 Review Panel.....	2
1.2 Context.....	3
2. Programme Introduction .....	4
3. Summary of Review Panel Discussions.....	5
3.1 Programme Award .....	5
3.2 Stakeholder Engagement.....	5
3.3 Delivery Model and Target Group.....	6
3.4 Learning and Teaching.....	8
3.5 International Students .....	9
3.6 Assessment Strategy .....	9
3.7 Programme Content.....	10
3.8 Ethics and Communication.....	11
3.9 Projects.....	12
3.10 Student Facilities .....	13
4. Commendations, Conditions and Recommendations.....	14
Appendix 1 – Programme/ Design Team Members .....	16

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Review Panel

<b>Organisation/ Role</b>	<b>Name</b>
SRUC Registrar (Convenor)	Kyrsten Black
SRUC Quality Assurance Lead	Karen Gray
SRUC Dean of Central Faculty	David Hopkins
SRUC PhD Student Representative	Laura Salazar
SRUC Head of Department (North Faculty)	Rob Graham
University of Glasgow Senior University Veterinary Clinician	Valentina Busin
Natural History Museum Principal Researcher, WHO Collaborative Laboratory	Aidan Emery
University of Surrey Senior Lecturer in Veterinary Parasitology and Head of Department of Epidemiology & Public Health	Martha Betson



## 1.2 Context

The Masters of Research Zoonoses and Epidemiology of Animal Infectious Diseases was proposed by the Veterinary and Animal Science Board of Studies and developed by colleagues in the North Faculty, specifically based at the Inverness site. Validation documents have been prepared by the Programme Design Team (Appendix 1), who are pleased to be introducing the first programme of this type to SRUC.

During the validation event, the panel had two meetings with the design team. The discussions were focused in the first instance, on general themes relating to the programme design and delivery, then moved to specific topics relating to the programme content and projects. The resulting dialogue was robust and provided the panel with confidence in the approval process. The outcome of the event was that the programme was validated, with several commendations, conditions and recommendations and will be recommended to the University of Glasgow for approval.

This report will be submitted to the Programme Approvals and Academic Standards Committee once it is finalised. Before the validation can be completed, all conditions imposed by the panel must be met. An action plan detailing how the conditions have been met must be provided to the Quality Assurance Lead. The team must also consider the recommendations made by the panel and include them in the action plan too, indicating how (or explaining why not) these will be addressed.

The action plan in response to the conditions and recommendations, along with the revised programme documentation must be submitted by the 29<sup>th</sup> of April to meet the deadline for submission to the May meeting of the University of Glasgow Academic Standards Committee. The action plan will be submitted to the Programme Approvals and Academic Standards Committee, out of committee, for approval prior to submission to the University of Glasgow.

This report is structured to reflect proceedings on the day, starting with a brief outline of the programme by the Programme Leader, followed by the summary of the broad topics covered in the general discussion and then the specific discussion about the programme content and projects.

## 2. Programme Introduction

The Programme Leader introduced the award noting that this will be the first Masters of Research degree for SRUC and the first in United Kingdom (UK) that focuses on epidemiology. It was noted that zoonotic diseases account for around 75% of emerging diseases in humans, based on viral infections, not considering bacterial and parasitic diseases. This, allied to the recent pandemic, highlights the importance of zoonotic diseases. Consequently, the team have designed a programme that will help support students to understand the underlying biology of disease, but also to help predict when these will occur. Further to this the team aim to immerse the students in the topic by engaging them in the research community and providing them with the opportunity to learn by doing i.e., a skills-based, student-centred Masters programme, enabling students to assess real world problems and through this develop their skills, scientific reasoning, critical thinking and analytical ability.

The programme will be offered in two formats i.e., a one-year full time distance learning programme, in which the students complete the three taught modules first, then each of the two project modules. Students must pass the *Epidemiological Analyses, Modelling, and Data Handling* module before progressing to the projects as this lays the foundation for students to analyse and interpret data. The alternative option is a two-year part time distance learning programme. In the first year, students would complete the *Epidemiological Analyses, Modelling, and Data Handling* and *Zoonoses and the Comparative Infectious Disease Biology* modules along with the first research project. In the second year they will complete the final taught module and the second project. The delivery of the programme will be by distance learning, with two immersive practical weeks (with an alternative offer for those who cannot attend in person). Although the projects will be data driven and predominantly based on existing research data, students will be given the opportunity to attend onsite and generate their own data for one project, if they wish.

Student support and engagement was noted as being key to the programme with the intention being to integrate students fully into the faculty and encourage engagement with the Student Association. Students will be offered online and on campus team building activities to help galvanise the group and embed students into the community in both Aberdeen and Inverness.

Stakeholder engagement during the development of the programme has been informal but included a range of externals including representatives from the Moredun Research Institute, the Royal Zoological Society and Public Health Scotland, who have welcomed the programme and been very positive about the planned graduate outcomes. Further to this, discussions have been held with internal staff and students. Additional meetings have been set up to discuss the programme with the Animal and Plant Health Agency (APHA) and the Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine.

## 3. Summary of Review Panel Discussions

### 3.1 Programme Award

As noted in the presentation and documentation, this is the first Masters of Research (MRes) to be offered by SRUC and the panel were interested to establish how and why the research team had concluded that the programme should be offered as an MRes as opposed to a more traditional Master of Science (MSc), particularly as the programme appears to have features of both. The team stated that they had evaluated the MRes programmes offered by other institutions and noted that many have a taught component and two large projects. It was decided that the same model should be adopted to ensure that the programme is equivalent to others and that the students feel that they are getting the same type of experience. Further to this the team explained that one of the taught modules is predominantly focused on research skills i.e., *Epidemiological Analyses, Modelling, and Data Handling*, and that the other modules *Zoonoses and the Comparative Infectious Disease Biology* and *Principles of Epidemiology and Health Management* also have research skills included. The *Principles of Epidemiology and Health Management* is all about application of those techniques, so that when the students get to the projects, they have firm grounding in research processes.

While the panel were content with the explanation, they were interested to establish, where in the programme, scientific philosophy, navigating funding, political and stakeholder engagement feature and if they are explicit as outcomes in the programme? The team explained that much of this is embedded within taught modules, but there is also specific training on those areas in both project modules. The first project module will focus more on how to write a proposal and who would be involved in research and collaboration, while the second project is more focussed on the professional scientist, who the stakeholders are and what type of research they will be doing. Further to this it was noted that due to the range of projects that may be undertaken, students will be provided with a suite of materials that they can dip in and out of and they will be guided into the processes that most closely fit the project they are each undertaking. Finally, it was noted that some projects would be based on existing data sets and the team emphasised that they would ensure that the students are trained in the elements surrounding ethics and data usage, to ensure that the right permissions are in place for the use of data.

### 3.2 Stakeholder Engagement

The extent of stakeholder engagement was not explicit in the programme documentation but was picked up in the initial presentation about the award. The panel were interested to establish how the team had collected the student feedback. The team explained that this had come from a range of sources and in the first instance from students undertaking the *Epidemiology* module as part of the Applied Animal Science degree. Through informal discussion they were asked for their feedback about the proposed programme. As some of the students had come from an animal care background and articulated into the animal science degree, they felt they didn't have a strong science background but after doing the *Epidemiology* module, they felt this had brought their knowledge up and they were now passionate about the subject and interested in the new programme. Further to this, the team have also spoken to individual PhD students as often MRes programmes are seen as a gateway into PhD programmes. Although some of the students were not particularly allied to the topic area, they did highlight that the way in which the programme is set

up will provide a good research foundation and help students to make a more informed decision about undertaking a PhD. The team have also recently had a meeting with animal science students from a range of backgrounds, who were really interested in the structure and liked the immersive research projects and the coursework/skills focus as they felt they could use these skills after finishing the programme.

Moving on to discussions about employer engagement, the panel were interested to know, to what extent the team felt that the organisations mentioned in the initial presentation would turn into employers of the programme graduates? The team noted that from the point of view of the Moredun and the Royal Zoological Society, if they take on graduates into their PhD programmes or into research positions, they need to have at least a Masters level qualification, therefore graduates from this programme will have the necessary skills they would be looking for and a good chance of being employed. Further to this, Public Health Scotland highlighted that they would welcome graduates that can find and interpret data. It was also noted that SRUC has found recruiting applicants with the necessary research skills a challenge, so this programme will help to fill a need internally too.

### **3.3 Delivery Model and Target Group**

Following the review of the programme documentation, the panel highlighted that further clarification about the planned delivery model was required, and although much of this was covered in the initial presentation, the panel were still interested to find out what kind of learner the team anticipate will be attracted to the programme, considering the difference between MSc and MRes programmes. The team responded saying that they think they will attract students that are coming straight out of a degree, as there have already been several applicants from that route along with an expectation that the programme is likely to attract people who are returning to study, especially after working in related sectors. For example, this could include individuals from Non-Government Organisations (NGOs) and Government teams, looking for developmental opportunities whereby they can learn through a process of doing. Some students that are already working in the sector may also be recruited and it is anticipated that they may come with their own data sets and project ideas. It is hoped that the programme will be attractive to a broad range of learners who are looking for a hands-on, active learning experience. Later, this programme will also be offered to senior students within the new School of Veterinary Medicine, as an intercalation opportunity.

During the presentation it was noted that the programme will be delivered through a blended model and the panel were interested to establish if this model would be focused on the one-year full time route or if there is sufficient flexibility in the part time option, to accommodate students who are also in full time employment. The team noted that they had considered the fact that most modern students are working in some capacity. Therefore, the benefit of being able to do a distance learning programme allows the ability to build in flexibility for students to learn at their own pace and in their own time. The part time option is specifically designed for this and support e.g., dedicated times to contact tutors will be included in the programme. Following up on that, the team were asked what the delivery model would look like in more detail i.e., when teaching sessions would be scheduled? In response the team stated that the lectures will be predominantly pre-recorded and made available on a weekly basis for students to review ahead of timetabled tutorials, enabling students to discuss any issues arising. Students who can't log on at the designated time, will be able to use forums to post their questions or email the tutor directly.

Similarly, practical sessions will be offered online, but will also be accompanied by recorded “How to” videos that students can access after the event. In terms of in-person delivery, the team are aiming to provide an on-campus introduction and induction week at the start of the programme. This will provide students with an opportunity to meet lecturers and undertake both laboratory and field work to help galvanise the group. For those who can’t attend, the team will offer alternative online activities and will aim to live stream laboratory work and recordings from the field. Later, there will be another immersive week focussed on laboratory practicals, during which students will have the opportunity to learn how to undertake key laboratory techniques such as e.g., Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) and Enzyme Linked Immunosorbent Assay (ELISA) testing etc, but more crucially be able to assess, understand and analyse the outputs. There will also be some face-to-face support for elements surrounding statistics and opportunities for students to engage with staff. Recordings will be provided for those who cannot attend. The nature of the projects mean that the majority can be done at a distance, however students will be offered the opportunity to do one project on site. At the end of the year, there will be an on-campus conference for the presentation of the projects. Finally, the team were asked how they could ensure that the students who cannot attend the practical weeks in person, would receive an equitable experience and it was highlighted that the pandemic has been instrumental in demonstrating the range and quality of resources that can be provided but that the key focus will be on ensuring that the students can interpret the outputs of the practical activities as this is fundamental to the programme.

Considering the delivery model described, there was further discussion about the suitability of the programme for international students. Due to the strict requirements associated with the issuing and monitoring of international student visas (i.e., the requirement for regular face to face meetings), this programme would not allow students to qualify for a visa. The team highlighted that this is part of the reason why they have tried to create a hybrid programme with options for both blended and fully remote engagement. It was noted that the programme has been discussed with the International Compliance Lead and there may be opportunities for international students to attend in person to undertake their project if they plan for this to be the first project so that they have time to apply for the visa and can specify exactly when they will be in the country and for how long. In conclusion it was highlighted that as a **condition** of approval, the delivery model and alternatives must be clear in the programme documentation, to ensure that students who are applying have appropriate expectations of the programme.

Following the private meeting of the panel, the planned delivery model was raised again in the second meeting with the review team. It was noted that although the team have planned for a one-year full time or two-year part time programme, experience within SRUC has shown that students who have commitments outwith their studies e.g., work or caring, often take longer than planned and this is acceptable within the regulations. The team were asked if they were prepared for this and if they have sufficient administrative support for the programme, to which they responded that they do have support currently but that there is a plan to recruit another person for this role. Equally they noted that they are aware that some students will take longer to complete the award and that they will need to accommodate this. In response to a question about the planned number of students, the team explained that their ambition is to recruit 15 – 20 students but anticipate that they will have 8 – 12 in the first few years. A minimum of five students has been set as a viable number to establish the programme. Finally, the panel confirmed that the planned exit awards for the qualification will be a Post Graduate Certificate, on completion of the three taught modules, a Post Graduate Diploma on completion of the three taught modules and the first project and the Masters on completion of all taught modules and both projects. As a consequence of this discussion, it was **recommended** that the team undertake discussions with Programme Leaders from other Masters

programmes (including the Programme Directors on the shared SRUC/Edinburgh Masters programmes) to explore the range of delivery models and pathways that are available for students and how these are managed. It was also **recommended** that the team implement the plan to recruit extra resource for programme administration. Finally, as a **condition**, the team are asked to include specific details about the available exit awards in the programme specification document.

### 3.4 Learning and Teaching

The MRes programme is a totally new area of delivery, so the panel were interested to establish if the programme is fully resourced and if any additional staffing or staff development is required for the launch of the programme. In response the team explained that they feel that they have the right number of staff for the programme but acknowledged that they will be bringing in some external expertise for specific aspects, which will be beneficial for the students. Several members of the delivery team already hold learning and teaching qualifications, but for those who don't, training events have been set up with the Centre for the Enhancement of Learning and Teaching (CELT) during this year and they will undertake the Professional Development Award starting in September.

The panel noted that some of the planned assessment activities for the award will include group work and wanted to discuss this further particularly in terms of how groups will be formed and assessed and how individual contributions will be managed. Through discussion it was evident that the team have discussed this approach and have considered how group activities will be incorporated into some of the individual modules e.g., as part of the presentations for the *Epidemiological Analyses, Modelling, and Data Handling* module, however it was acknowledged that the exact mechanisms for group work has in some instances not been finalised yet. It was **recommended** that the team further explore the concept of and planning for group assessment, to ensure that the approach is well developed and considered prior to implementation. In addition to the group work aspects, the panel were interested to hear how the team plan to support students to develop quantitative skills in an online learning environment. In response it was noted that colleagues within the team have experience of teaching statistics and quantitative skills to National Health Service (NHS) and University of Highlands and Islands (UHI) staff who have little or no prior knowledge and they have developed particular skills in communicating complex quantitative themes and giving instructions for use of "R". This, matched with screen sharing / tutor support and recorded mini lectures will provide a broad support base for the development of quantitative skills.

It was evident from the programme documentation that the intention is for the programme to be technology led. Through discussions it is also clear that the programme may attract students who are returning to study after a period of some years. The panel asked the team how they are planning to support the students to engage effectively with the technology. The team noted that the software used in data analysis is a very important part of it and that there are different levels of technology available. The team use a package that is commonly used in academia and will make this available with guidance, however it was noted that not all students will have the inclination or ability to learn the more complex software solutions and that the team will aim to have projects available that can be completed using less sophisticated methods such as excel. The programme called "R" is used extensively in research but is noted as being difficult to learn when first used, this stimulated a discussion about whether a student would be more employable if they are fully conversant with this approach. The team noted that this could be provided as an option, but it should not be assumed that it is a requirement. In terms of support, it was highlighted that there have been discussions recently within the research clinic about offering drop-in sessions to support

the use of “R” so that anyone experiencing difficulties can join on set days and times to ask questions and seek advice. It was **recommended** that the team further develop the concept of drop-in clinics to provide support for students, to develop their skills in the use and application of specific software programs.

### 3.5 International Students

As noted previously there was some discussion about the suitability and interest of this programme to international students. Following up on this, the panel were interested to hear how international students would be supported to apply for the programme. The team explained that all applicants will have to follow the normal SRUC application process and that this will be facilitated by the central team within Registry. For those seeking visas, they will be supported by the International Compliance Lead. In terms of supporting students who are non-native English speakers, there is an expectation that they will meet the required English level of competency, but they will also be signposted to the Student Support team if necessary. Further to this it was noted that several colleagues within the team are from an international background so understand the challenges the students might face and may even be able to support them in a range of languages.

Further to this, the team were asked how they plan to keep international students engaged and whether the curriculum will include diseases seen in developing countries. The team explained that they have a broad range of expertise and that everyone in the team does work that is focussed on United Kingdom (UK) and elements from abroad. Further to this several colleagues work with a variety of overseas countries, which brings a global perspective to the team. It was highlighted that zoonotic diseases are a global problem and there is an interest in the differences from country of origin of a particular disease compared to the UK and the United States, both in terms of disease and the associated politics.

Finally, the team were asked how they are going to foster a student/learning community (online and on campus), to which they explained that there are multiple options available for students to engage in learning communities, including linking with the research team in Inverness, engaging with the student community in the North Faculty and being included in the wider SRUC student community. In addition, there will be opportunities for the 'student voice' to influence the programme and to provide feedback to influence future programmes. It was **recommended** that the team engages with the Centre for the Enhancement of Learning and Teaching (CELT) to explore the development of a peer support network for the students. This is an area that is being developed extensively within SRUC and would be beneficial for this programme.

### 3.6 Assessment Strategy

It was noted in the programme documentation, that the intention is to conduct assessments on a continuous basis throughout the programme so the panel were interested to find out how this would be managed to ensure that the burden on staff and students is not too high. The team explained that they have tried to make the assessment strategy inclusive and continuous, and the intention is to stagger the assessments in semester one so that there is never more than one assessment due in a week. In terms of managing the burden for staff, online and statistics tests will be predominantly multiple-choice questions, which can be automatically marked with immediate feedback. The marking of written work will be shared among the team with strict marking criteria

devised and distributed for each one. The design of the projects has been split into separate elements including research proposals and presentations, although it is acknowledged that the broad marking will fall to the supervisor. However, the small cohort size should mean that no one member of staff should be required to mark more than two projects per year. Internal and external moderation will be conducted as per SRUC procedures. When asked about formative assessment, the team noted that they plan to conduct in class peer assessment discussions and will work through examples with students so that they can evaluate their readiness for summative assessments.

The panel highlighted that some of the individual module assessments appeared to be quite long, in response the team explained that some modules are based on broad topics, but the assessments will be set by individual staff according to the different elements e.g., modelling, mapping or practical and will be tailored to the topic. The proposed word counts are in line with the general SRUC guidance, but the team stated that they would be happy to revisit these. It was **recommended** that the team review the assessment strategy and loading for the programme to take account of the burden on staff and students.

### 3.7 Programme Content

In setting the scene for the discussion about the wider programme content, the panel were interested to establish in the first instance what the team anticipate the background knowledge of students will be. It was noted that a background knowledge in biological sciences (biology, zoology, animal sciences etc.), has been stipulated in the entry criteria but that it has also been identified that it will be good intercalation/ progression opportunity for veterinary students or graduates. Further to this, the team have also stipulated that students with a relevant Higher National Diploma and a minimum of three years experience in an associated sector will be able to apply. Considering this variation, the panel were interested to find out if the team would undertake an evaluation of the student's prior knowledge before starting module delivery. The team explained that they will undertake an induction but have decided to take the approach of assuming no prior knowledge, particularly in relation to the analytical elements as they are aware that students graduating from different programmes and coming from a range of backgrounds will have a diverse range of knowledge. The intention is to bring all students up to the same level through the delivery of the three taught modules at the start of the programme. This will be facilitated through discussion forums and formative statistical tests allied to ongoing student support, to ensure that all students have the same underpinning knowledge prior to starting the first project. Further to this, the panel were keen to understand if any additional resources would be available for those students who are more familiar with the underlying concepts, to which the team responded by explaining that the module set up will enable students to work through the modules at a pace that suits them individually but that the *Epidemiological Analyses, Modelling, and Data Handling* module must be achieved before they can move on to the first project.

In terms of the specific programme content, the panel were interested to establish if the team have factored in the development of transferable skills that are required by industry. It was noted that the programme has been designed so that the skills the students gain are transferrable. A number of colleagues within the team have come from pharmaceutical companies and various alternative career pathways so are fully aware of the need to ensure that the students are equipped for employment. Further to this, the panel wanted to understand the range of species that will be



included in the programme and it was clear from the team's response that the intention is to incorporate farm, small animal and equine species and have the capability to cover a wider range including wildlife and aquatics, as the focus will be on a full breadth of zoonotic organisms with a slight emphasis on notifiable diseases, but also on new and emerging conditions.

Considering the emphasis on zoonotic conditions, the panel asked if the team would include any human aspects of zoonoses e.g., how medical professionals deal with zoonoses and the associated reporting. The team explained that this would be covered and mentioned a range of projects which they have or are currently undertaking that include working with, for example, rural General Practitioners (GPs), Vets and the NHS. It was noted that these and /or similar projects may present opportunities for students to get involved and benefit from human data outputs, providing the necessary permissions can be secured. Within the *Principles of Epidemiology and Health Management* module, the team have added in specific topics on implementing change, stakeholder engagement and measuring impacts, thereby taking the content one step further than just focusing on the animal aspects. The team noted that they feel it is very important for students to work with a range of experts and don't just focus on the animal aspects as this has proven to be very important during the pandemic, during which several members of the team have been providing advice on the outbreak. In terms of being able to cover all the topics mentioned, the team explained that most of the basic principles will be covered in the three taught modules in semester one and that a range of examples covering both human and animal aspects will be used to illustrate these.

Returning to the earlier topic of international students and the inclusion of zoonotic diseases occurring elsewhere in the world, the panel wanted to know if reference to international agencies would be included in the programme. The team explained that they are hoping to invite guest lecturers from some of the international organisations e.g., the World Health Organisation and are aiming to include a lot of OIE (World Organisation for Animal Health) types of workstreams for risk assessments etc., into the modules to ensure that students become familiar with and can utilise them effectively. Finally, the team touched briefly on the impact of climate change and emphasised that the role of climate change is very important when considering what is happening with these diseases, highlighting that one of the literature review assessments will focus on climate sensitive organisms to address this. Considering the planned international scope of the programme, it was **recommended** that the team widen the stakeholder engagement e.g., to include Non-Government Organisations, charities and other agencies in developing countries.

### 3.8 Ethics and Communication

The panel noted that there is no mention of ethics in the programme aims or learning outcomes so were interested to find out where ethics would be included. The team noted that ethics will be embedded throughout the programme and that they will use two key reports i.e., the Nuffield and Belmont Research Reports as the underpinning standard of ethical research in animals and humans. Importance will be placed on data sharing, data ethics, confidentiality, accountability, responsible publication and integrity and these will be ingrained in the students from day one. Ethics will inform much of the materials delivered in the taught modules and will be reinforced in the project modules. Mention of the project modules enabled the panel to follow up with a question about ethical approval and the time taken for students to secure this. The team noted that this will need to be considered early in the semester to ensure that it does not impact on the start of the projects.

The team have built in writing ethical applications as part of the project assessment so the process will not just be an exercise in completing the documentation but will also be a learning opportunity.

In terms of scientific communication, the panel were keen to explore how this is going to be included in the programme and if the effective use of social media would be covered. The team explained that scientific communication and the assessment thereof, will be included in the taught components as students will have to be able to communicate scientific outcomes to a range of audiences. Assessments include scientific reports and policy briefs. Finally, the team noted that the SRUC Knowledge Exchange and Communications team have offered to provide delivery sessions on how scientists should interact with the media. At the conclusion of this discussion, the panel noted that ethical considerations are clearly a focus of the programme and suggested that as a **condition** of approval, the team must include specific reference to ethical considerations in the programme learning outcomes.

### 3.9 Projects

During panel discussions, it was evident that there was a feeling that the programme and in particular the inclusion of two projects is ambitious. Consequently, there was a desire to explore the planning of the projects in more detail, with the team being asked if they had considered modifications to way the projects could be organised i.e., to make the first slightly more protected, building in some more of the detail around research, before going for a full research project in the second. The team noted that the projects will be iterative and are designed to develop the skills, knowledge and confidence of the students, with the first focusing on principles and study design. Further to this, it was highlighted that the students will be supported according to the focus of their chosen projects and will not be expected to cover all aspects e.g., if they do not require social science ethical approval then they will not be directed to these resources. The first project will help students to apply the core skills and knowledge that they have gained in the taught modules and learn from the project process. The second module was described as the opportunity for students to build on the first project and become professional scientists. On completion, they will have the necessary skills to work effectively in the sector.

Considering that each student is required to complete two projects, the panel were interested to find out more about the availability of project topics for students i.e., if primary or secondary data sets would be used, whether there is any opportunity to re-use data and what the scope of the subject topics might include. The team responded by saying that they intend to make some data sets available and that it is possible that some data sets could be re-used, but that there will be an opportunity for students to generate their own primary data, although they will only be able to do this for one project. In terms of the scope of the subject area, it was highlighted that there are many aspects to epidemiology and that the team aim to take a multidisciplinary approach, which reflects the way they work currently. When asked about potential competition from students for proposed projects, it was noted that the team will follow a process of asking students to express an interest and then prioritising the choices selected.

The topic of systematic review was raised by the panel with the team being asked if this would include an element of meta-analysis. The team noted that the main focus will be on literature reviews which can lead to meta-analysis but that generally students will be steered away from systematic review in their own work, but that it would be covered as a research topic. Finally, it was

noted that the projects will be data driven and that the students will be trained to use free software that they can access and utilise at any time. There was some suggestion that income from tuition fees could be used to support projects or alternatively there may be some charitable funding that could be accessed to support projects.

### 3.10 Student Facilities

The panel noted that the intention is to deliver this programme from the Inverness site (i.e., the University of Highlands and Islands Campus), so the panel asked if students would have access to the necessary facilities and resources (e.g., library, meeting rooms, accommodation) for their programme. In response the team noted that the programme will be split between Inverness and Aberdeen but predominantly delivered from Inverness. Student support and library (online) access will be via the Aberdeen Campus. Discussions with UHI are ongoing in relation to library access and accommodation at the Inverness site, although students will be able to access Bed and Breakfast accommodation locally within Inverness, as an alternative. In the longer term, SRUC has plans to build a new building with teaching and laboratory facilities on site into which the students will be immersed. This facility will also have allied social and canteen facilities. However, it is acknowledged that this will not be ready for the first cohort so there are potential plans in place to deliver from the Aberdeen Campus site. As a **condition** of approval, the team must ensure that arrangements for students to access suitable and sufficient facilities are in place prior to the commencement of the programme.

## 4. Commendations, Conditions and Recommendations

The programme will be recommended to the University of Glasgow for approval, subject to a small number of conditions and recommendations, which are described (along with the commendations) hereafter.

### Commendations

The team are to be congratulated for the development of the programme and the quality of the documentation and are commended for:

1. providing clear evidence of strong leadership and team cohesion resulting in high-quality discussions during the review event.
2. the quality and experience of the development team, who demonstrated that they are highly experienced and passionate researchers with expertise in a wide range of subjects, that will bring authenticity and value to the programme.
3. the development of a highly topical programme that is particularly relevant to the challenges of the modern age and addresses a skills gap that has been identified by academia and industry.
4. their clear desire to enable students to pursue individualised student journeys.

### Conditions

In order for the programme to be recommended for approval to the University of Glasgow Academic Standards Committee, the following conditions must be addressed:

5. There must be absolute clarity on the delivery model in the programme design narrative and specification. Students must be given clear information about the programme and what elements will be delivered online and/ or in person and what the alternative options may be [3.3].
6. Specific details about the available exit awards must be included in the programme specification document [3.3].
7. Specific reference to ethical considerations must be included in the programme learning outcomes [3.8].
8. Arrangements for students to access suitable and sufficient facilities must be in place prior to the commencement of the programme [3.10].

### Recommendations

The review panel have proposed that the following recommendations be undertaken by the team:

9. Meet with Programme Leaders from other Masters programmes (including the Programme Directors on the shared SRUC/Edinburgh Masters programmes) to explore the range of delivery models and pathways that are available for students and how these are managed [3.3].
10. Implement the plan to recruit extra resource for programme administration [3.3]
11. Further explore the concept of and planning for group assessment, to ensure that the approach is well developed and considered prior to implementation [3.4].
12. Further develop the concept of drop-in clinics to provide support for students, to develop their skills in the use and application of specific software programs [3.4].

13. Engage with the Centre for the Enhancement of Learning and Teaching (CELT) regarding the development of Peer Support networks for students [3.5].
14. Review the assessment strategy and loading for the programme to take account of the burden on staff and students [3.6].
15. Consider the planned international scope of the programme, with a view to widening the stakeholder engagement to include Non-Government Organisations, charities and other agencies in developing countries [3.7].

## Appendix 1 – Programme/ Design Team Members

Name	Role	Attended validation Y/N
Dr Scott Lawton	Programme leader Module leader	Y
Dr Annette Boerlage	Module leader Co-leader	Y
Dr Roger Humphrey	Module leader Co-leader	Y
Dr Jude Eze	Module leader	Y
Dr Kate Stephen	Module leader	Y
Dr Maria Costa	Module leader	Y
Jane Brennan	Data Manager (North Faculty) and current educational admin support for Inverness Campus	Y

## SRUC Paper 2: Action Plan MRes Zoonoses and Epidemiology of Animal Infectious Diseases

State Board of Studies Name: Veterinary and Animal Sciences

State Programme Name: MRes Epidemiology of Animal Infectious Diseases

Approval: State Academic Year 2022

ACTION PLAN BASED ON PUBLISHED APPROVAL PANEL REPORT (March 2022)

Conditions of Approval			
<i>The panel set the following conditions</i>			
<b>Condition (a)</b>			
Section 3.3	There must be absolute clarity on the delivery model in the programme design narrative and specification. Students must be given clear information about the programme and what elements will be delivered online and/ or in person and what the alternative options may be.		
Actions	Name	Date	Progress
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We have provided a clear and detailed summary of this in the design narrative in a section entitled Delivery model and course structure</li> <li>• All marketing material will reflect the delivery model and structure so perspective students are aware of the course and course requirements</li> <li>• Students will be provided with a course handbook when arriving onto the course to help guide them through the course</li> <li>• We will be implementing a tutor scheme to help support the students throughout the course</li> <li>• We are in discussion with CELT throughout this process</li> </ul>	Dr Scott Lawton	Start date 2/03/22  Completion 13/09/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is ongoing</li> <li>• Design narrative and specification have been edited</li> <li>• Marketing material has been developed and is available</li> <li>• Academic staff are now in the process of developing material and devising mechanisms of delivery</li> </ul>

<b>Condition (b)</b>			
<b>Section 3.8</b>		Include specific reference to ethical considerations in the programme learning outcomes.	
<b>Actions</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Progress</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The following research lead programme learning out comes have been changed to reflect the ethical considerations through out the course:</li> <li>• Anticipate and incorporate assessments of the impact of epidemiological research findings on policy and society locally, nationally, and globally into recommendations for action whilst using an ethical framework for research and information dissemination</li> <li>• Design epidemiological studies, choosing, justifying, and implementing appropriate detailed protocols ethically</li> <li>• Ethically manage epidemiological data, constructing and implementing appropriate statistical and bioinformatic analyses</li> <li>• Description that highlights consideration to ethical training has been written into the design narrative</li> </ul>	Dr Scott Lawton	03/03/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completed</li> <li>• Ethics is an integral part of the course and has been embedded in each of the modules throughout the course</li> </ul>
<b>Condition (c)</b>			
<b>Section 3.8</b>		Ensure that arrangements for students to access suitable and sufficient facilities are in place prior to the commencement of the programme.	
<b>Actions</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Progress</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Arrangements have been made so that face to face activities can be run at the Aberdeen campus in the first year of the course as facilities at Inverness are still under construction</li> <li>• Discussion to be had surrounding student support and linking student facilities between Inverness and Aberdeen</li> <li>• Staff are being trained in the virtual teaching environments and how to use them and to support students using them</li> <li>• Moodle and course sites to be built</li> </ul>	Dr Scott Lawton and Prof Neil Foster	03/03/22 – 31/08/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On going discussion with student Office and Support</li> <li>• Draft timetables have been constructed to aid with timing requirements</li> <li>• Staff training and ongoing development of in relation to moodle and the virtual learning environment</li> </ul>



<b>Condition (d)</b>			
<b>Section 3.3</b>	Include specific details about the available exit awards in the programme specification document		
<b>Actions</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Progress</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To add paragraph to the specification document about the specific details of the exit awards</li> </ul>	Dr Scott Lawton	03/03/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completed</li> </ul>
<b>Recommendations associated with Approval</b>			
<b>Recommendation A</b>			
<b>Section 3.3</b>	The team undertake discussions with Programme Leaders from other master's programmes (including the Programme Directors on the shared SRUC/Edinburgh Masters programmes) to explore the range of delivery models and pathways that are available for students and how these are managed		
<b>Actions</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Progress</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continuous discussion with PLs of masters courses across SRUC and shared programmes</li> <li>Continuous discussion and training activities with CELT to develop delivery</li> </ul>	All	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Several meetings have been had with MSc leaders within and between faculties</li> <li>Discussion with the digital team and CELT on delivery approaches</li> </ul>
<b>Recommendation B</b>			
<b>Section 3.7</b>	Team widen the stakeholder engagement e.g., to include Non-Government Organisations, charities, and other agencies in developing countries		
<b>Actions</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Progress</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Organise meetings with the educational divisions of charities and organisation involved in the monitoring and control of infectious diseases in developing countries</li> </ul>	Dr Scott Lawton	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Awaiting responses from the educational divisions of WHO</li> <li>International Society of Tropical Animal Health and Veterinary Medicine</li> </ul>

<b>Recommendation C</b>			
<b>State recommendation:</b> The team further develop the concept of drop-in clinics to provide support for students, to develop their skills in the use and application of specific software programs			
<b>Actions</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Progress</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One drop-in clinic session per week is to be held online. Students can show up without booking.</li> <li>• A calendar with the clinic hosts and their skillsets (specific software programming and statistical skills) will be available at the beginning of each semester.</li> <li>• Students will also have the opportunity to seek advice on how to solve specific data queries (coding related queries and statistical queries) from the lecturers and MRES support team. For that, a list of skillsets (software programming and statistical skills) of the MRES team will be available so that students can seek advice to the staff most suited to answer their queries directly.</li> </ul>	All design team	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The structure and frequency of the drop-in clinics are being discussed</li> <li>• Meetings will be held online</li> </ul>
<b>Recommendation D</b>			
<b>State recommendation:</b> Review the assessment strategy and loading for the programme to take account of the burden on staff and students			
<b>Actions</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Progress</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To develop authentic assessment approaches which allow students to accumulate marks throughout the course</li> <li>• To reduce the burden of assessment for modules so that this is manageable for staff and students</li> <li>• To ensure the level of assessment is in line with the size of the module</li> </ul>	All design team	03/03/22 – 31/08/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ongoing</li> <li>• Assessments have been designed so they are appropriate for the size of the module</li> <li>• They have been staggered throughout the course so that deadlines do not clash and submission of a single piece of course work within a specific week</li> </ul>

<b>Recommendation E</b>			
<b>State recommendation:</b> The team further explore the concept of and planning for group assessment, to ensure that the approach is well developed and considered prior to implementation			
<b>Actions</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Progress</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the structure and utility of group assessments</li> <li>• Identifying a mechanism by which students can be give a group mark and an individual mark for contribution</li> </ul>	All design team	03/03/22 – 31/08/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ongoing and falls into the discussion surrounding authentic assessments above</li> <li>• In constant discussion with CELT on designing such assessments</li> </ul>
<b>Recommendation F</b>			
<b>State recommendation:</b> The team engages with the Centre for the Enhancement of Learning and Teaching (CELT) re: the development of Peer Support networks for students			
<b>Actions</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Progress</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engage with CELT in developing peer support networks for students</li> </ul>	All design team	03/03/22 – 31/08/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ongoing regular meetings</li> </ul>

**Recommendation B**

**State recommendation:** The team implement the plan to recruit extra resource for programme administration

<b>Actions</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Progress</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Identify administrative requirements</li><li>• Develop a link between Inverness and Aberdeen</li><li>• Employ a designated administrator</li></ul>	Dr Scott Lawton and Prof Neil Foster	03/03/22 – 31/08/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Requirements for administrative role identified</li><li>• Discussion in progress with student office on requirements from Inverness</li><li>• Administrative assistance is currently being provided and increased from the administrative team in Inverness</li></ul>

*Add Further Recommendations from the (re)approval as necessary*

**University of Glasgow**

**Academic Standards Committee – Friday 27 May 2022**

**Edinburgh Theological Seminary (ETS): Recommendation for New Member of Staff to be Granted Associate University Lecturer (AUL) Status**

**Robbie Mulholland, Clerk to the UoG-ETS Joint Board**

At the meeting of the University of Glasgow-Edinburgh Theological Seminary Joint Board which took place on 15 December 2021, a list of new ETS staff were approved (for onward recommendation to Academic Standards Committee) as University of Glasgow Associate University Lecturers (AULs). The report of the Joint Board meeting was approved by Academic Standards Committee at its meeting on 28 January 2022.

ETS has now advised that the name of one new member of staff who should have been included in the paper that went to the Joint Board was omitted. ETS has now forwarded the details of the member of staff (please see details below) to the University.

The Clerk of Senate, as Convener of the UoG-ETS Joint Board, has now approved, for onward recommendation to ASC, that the member of staff be granted Associate University Lecturer (AUL) status.

**Action Requested**

ASC is asked to confirm **approval** of the appointment.

**Zachary Purvis**

Lecturer in Church History  
Edinburgh Theological Seminary

**University of Glasgow**

**Academic Standards Committee - Friday 27 May 2022**

**The Glasgow School of Art: School of Simulation & Visualisation –  
Final Update on the Periodic Review Action Plan**

**Cover Sheet**

**Robbie Mulholland, Clerk, Joint Liaison Committee of the University of  
Glasgow and The Glasgow School of Art**

**Brief Description of the Paper**

The School of Simulation & Visualisation at The Glasgow School of Art was subject to Periodic Review in session 2019-20. The School received 7 commendations and 5 recommendations. Progress with the recommendations has been tracked via an Action Plan (attached).

The attached paper is the final update on progress made against the recommendations.

**Action Requested**

Academic Standards Committee is asked to **note** the final update on progress made against the recommendations from the Periodic Review of the School of Simulation & Visualisation and consider the adequacy of the responses made.

**Recommended person/s responsible for taking action(s) forward**

GSA.

**Resource Implications**

None identified for the University.

**Timescale for Implementation**

As outlined in the paper.

**Equality Implications**

One action is directed at improving diversity in recruitment. No other equality implications have been identified.

# THE GLASGOW SCHOOL OF ART

ACADEMIC COUNCIL: COVERSHEET	
<b>To, Date:</b>	Academic Council, 4 May 2022
<b>Paper Author (and designation):</b>	Professor Paul Chapman, Head of the School of Simulation and Visualisation and Dr Daniel Livingstone, Head of Academic Programmes
<b>Title of Paper:</b>	School of Simulation and Visualisation: Periodic Review Action Plan – Final Update
<b>Summary of Paper:</b>	The School of Simulation and Visualisation was subject to Periodic Review in academic session 2019/20. The School received 7 commendations and 5 recommendations. Progress with the recommendations has been tracked through the attached Action Plan, which has been considered at each meeting of the School's Board of Studies, Education Committee (formerly UPC) and Academic Council during 2021/22.
<b>Recommendations: (note/discuss/approve)</b>	Academic Council is invited to <b>approve</b> the Final Update to the Action Plan.
<b>Consultation:</b>	Board of Studies and Education Committee.
<b>ELIR Implications:</b>	Not applicable.
<b>Resource Implications:</b>	None identified.
<b>Equality Impact Assessment Implications:</b>	One action is directed at improving diversity in recruitment. No other implications.
<b>Legal and Regulatory Considerations:</b>	None identified.
<b>Data Protection</b>	The paper complies with requirements of the Data Protection Act 2018.
<b>Freedom of Information (FOI):</b>	No material of sensitive or confidential nature
<b>Next Steps:</b>	Subsequent to approval by Academic Council, the School of Simulation and Visualisation Periodic Review Action Plan Final Update will be provided to the University of Glasgow's Academic Standards Committee for noting.

<b>Submitted by:</b>	Prof. Paul Chapman Head of School, Dr Daniel Livingstone, Head of Academic Programmes
<b>Date</b>	17 March 2022

	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Action Plan</b>	<b>By Whom</b>	<b>Timescale</b>	<b>Progress</b>	<b>Completed</b>
<b>1</b>	<p><b>School Vision and Strategy</b> A school vision statement and strategy, spanning research, commercial and curricular ambitions, should be collaboratively generated and clearly articulated, with the ambition and strategy of the School aligned to that of the GSA.</p>	<p>A small series of workshops to take place, with staff, students and externals to identify strategic strengths and priorities, to collaboratively generate new vision and strategy.</p> <p>Workshops may be integrated with other development workshops</p>	HoS	Workshops in first and second half of calendar year 2021, to report to SimVis BoS, October 2021	<p>Initial SMT discussions took place during Spring Break. Discussions with GSA Senior Leadership developed scope of new strategy.</p> <p>GSA is currently engaged in setting out a new School Vision and Strategy, and working on Enhancement Led Institutional Review response.</p> <p>Working with GSA Senior Management &amp; Board of Governors, a broader review of strategy for GSA and SimVis is currently being undertaken, which will align with the emergent GSA Strategic Plan for 2022-27 and will continue to be discussed with all school staff.</p>	Mar 2022



<p><b>2</b></p>	<p><b>Equality and Diversity</b> The Review Panel recommended that, in line with GSA's Equality Outcomes, the School explores strategies to proactively diversify the staff and student body through recruitment processes. The School should also continue the work ongoing in 'decolonising the curriculum'.</p>	<p>To expand and extend recent work, led in school by PL BDes. Additional workshops with staff and students on Equality &amp; Diversity and decolonising the curriculum, with report (with recommendations, actions and good practice examples) to be provided for BoS in October 2021 One workshop in each topic to be arranged in calendar year.</p>	<p>PL BDes HAP</p>	<p>Final report, SimVis BoS, October 2021</p>	<p>SimVis Learning &amp; Teaching Committee to progress. Discussion held at SimVis' LTC during spring break to progress. Separate workshops held June '21 with staff and students, led by PL BDes. All academic staff to engage with ongoing work on 'decolonising the curriculum'. PLs to lead on recruitment diversity actions.</p> <p>PL BDes prepared a report to summarise the outcomes of discussions, seminars and additional meetings held with staff across GSA, with suggested strategies for proactively diversifying the staff and student body.</p>	<p>October 2021</p>
<p><b>3</b></p>	<p><b>Sustainability</b> The Review Panel recommended that the School be more explicit about their sustainability agenda and ensure this is clearly articulated to the student body within the curriculum.</p>	<p>Staff review of sustainability work that already occurs in SimVis, collate examples, and consider how to highlight this more effectively to students through curricular and extra-curricular means</p>	<p>HAP</p>	<p>Final report, SimVis BoS, October 2021</p>	<p>Discussion held at SimVis' LTC during spring break identified projects relating to sustainability that may be suitable for inclusion in communications.</p> <p>HAP took lead on this, and sustainability has been built more explicitly into curriculum across a range of programmes and courses.</p>	<p>October 2021</p>

	<p><b>4 ILO Review</b></p> <p>The School should review their ILOs which are currently quite prescriptive and high in volume. The ILOs were identified as too restrictive and should better reflect the programmes and their ambitions.</p>	<p>PLs to lead review of ILOs for each programme, supported by other academic staff. At least one consultation meeting to take place for each programme, to consider programme ILOs. In person and/or written input to be obtained from other stakeholders (departments within GSA, external examiners, etc.)</p> <p>Initial consultations to take place by end May 2021, and may be held jointly with other events (e.g. Strategy workshops)</p> <p>Final output to be a report with outline recommended programme changes, October 2021. Note: After action completed, programme changes would be implemented through 2022, starting with proposal to GSA SLG and marketing consultations.</p>	<p>HAP HoUG PLs</p>	<p>Final report, SimVis BoS, October 2021</p>	<p>Initial staff reviews for BSc Immersive Systems Design, MSc Visualisation completed. Staff reviews are in progress for both BDes and MDes.</p> <p>Staff pages on Canvas established with lists of all current programme and relevant Course ILOs to support review, and comments invited for discussion.</p> <p>Canvas discussion complete. Proposed ILO revisions were developed, discussed, sent to externals for comment, and reviewed and discussed with GSA Head of Programme Development.</p> <p>The review was completed in September 2021, and plans are in place to introduce the revised ILOs through major programme change process, working alongside work within GSA on introducing a new Academic Framework. PG paperwork to be progressed AY 2021-22, UG changes are dependent on GSA Academic</p>	<p>Mar 2022</p>
--	--	--	-----------------------------	---	--	-----------------

					<p>Framework, and will follow in AY 2022-23.</p> <p>March 2022: Major Change proposals for PG programmes approved by GSA Planning Group. UG Proposals folded into ongoing work on UG Common Academic Framework</p>	
<p><b>5 Opportunities for Collaboration</b> The School should consider how to improve the opportunities for collaboration within the School curriculum, and more broadly across the GSA to support linkages with the main campus (and the Forres campus).</p> <p>The Review Panel further recommended that the</p>	<p>Programme and Pathway leaders to meet to review collaborative provision within SimVis, discuss possible additional opportunities</p> <p>HAP &amp; HoUG Engage with other schools in discussions on possible collaborative opportunities</p> <p>Arrange discussions with GSA exhibitions &amp; marketing staff &amp;</p>	<p>PLs</p> <p>HAP &amp; HoUG</p> <p>Interactive Audio Lecturer &amp;</p>	<p>Final report, SimVis BoS, October 2021</p>	<p>Existing collaborations within SimVis across years and programmes identified, and new forms of collaboration progressed. Digital Sculpting tutor progressing discussions with Silversmithing &amp; Jewellery, and initial discussions also held with Fashion &amp; Textiles. One MSc project co-supervised with input from lecturer in Interior Design, and one with supervision support from TSD.</p> <p>Additionally, short course discussions with NFTS undertaken, and CPD course started (first session 28/7).</p> <p>P/T Interactive Audio lecturer and P/T 3D &amp; VR lecturer</p>	<p>October 2021</p>	

	<p>School consider having more visible exhibitions of projects and work ongoing across the School.</p>	<p>academic staff involved in exhibitions across GSA to identify good practice and practical approaches. Consult with students on exhibitions and opportunities, including digital.</p>	<p>P/T VR Lecturer</p>		<p>appointed to new role in developing and supporting student online and IRL exhibition opportunities. Along with HAP, discussions held with various PLs and exhibitions staff across GSA to collect examples of good practices, and plans developed for implementation.</p>	
--	--	---	----------------------------	--	--	--

**University of Glasgow**

**Academic Standards Committee – Friday 27 May 2022**

**Periodic Subject Review: Review of Film & Television Studies,  
Theatre Studies, and the Centre for Cultural Policy Research held  
on 3 and 4 March 2022**

**Cover Sheet**

**Dr Richard Lowdon, Clerk to the Review Panel**

**Brief Description of the Paper**

Report of the Periodic Subject Review of Film & Television Studies, Theatre Studies, and the Centre for Cultural Policy Research held on 3 and 4 March 2022.

In line with sector best practice the University continues to review its Periodic Subject Review (PSR) process to ensure it remains relevant and continues to demonstrate a more explicit focus on enhancement. The PSR was managed in an online format.

**Action Requested**

Academic Standards Committee is invited to note the report which includes 12 recommendations for onward transmission to those identified for action. (The draft report was reviewed by two members of ASC and the Convener, in accordance with the revised process agreed in session 2019-20.)

**Recommended Person/s responsible for taking the action(s) forward**

As identified in the Action Plan section of the report.

**Resource Implications (where appropriate)**

Not applicable.

**Timescale for Implementation (where appropriate)**

An update to the recommendations will be provided to ASC in six months.

**Equality Implications (where appropriate)**

As identified in the report.

## University of Glasgow

## Academic Standards Committee – Friday 27 May 2022

**Periodic Subject Review: Review of Film & Television Studies,  
Theatre Studies, and the Centre for Cultural Policy Research held  
on 3 and 4 March 2022**

**Dr Richard Lowdon, Clerk to the Review Panel**

**Review Panel:**

Professor Neil Evans	Convener of the University's Academic Standards Committee, and Professor of Integrative Physiology, Panel Convener
Professor Heike Roms	University of Exeter, External Subject Specialist (Theatre Studies)
Dr Michael Lawrence	University of Sussex, External Subject Specialist (Film Studies)
Dr Bethan Wood	Elected Academic Staff Member on Court
Duncan Henderson	Students' Representative Council
Professor Marc Alexander	School of Critical Studies, Cognate Member
Dr Amanda Pate	Academic and Digital Development
Dr Richard Lowdon	Senate Office, Clerk to the Review Panel

**1. Outcome**

- 1.1.1 The Panel **confirmed** there were no concerns regarding the academic standards of programmes delivered by Film & Television Studies, Theatre Studies, and the Centre for Cultural Policy Research, and recommended the validation of all programmes for a further six years.
- 1.1.2 The Panel **confirmed** that Film & Television Studies, Theatre Studies, and the Centre for Cultural Policy Research had a transparent academic governance and quality assurance structure which aligned to the University's regulatory framework.

**2. Summary and context****2.1 College structure**

- 2.1.1 The three subject areas under review are Film & Television Studies, Theatre Studies, and the Centre for Cultural Policy Research. These subjects are all part of the School of Culture and Creative Arts, which was formed in 2010 as one of the four Schools in the College of Arts. The other subject areas within the School are History of Art, Music, and the Kelvin Centre for Conservation. The School of Culture & Creative Arts, and the subject areas within the School have teaching and research collaborations across the College of Arts and the wider University.

## 2.2 Preparation for the 2022 Periodic Subject Review (PSR) and members of staff involved in the Review

- 2.2.1 The Reflective Analysis (RA) was written by Dr Amy Holdsworth (Head of Film & Television Studies), Dr Lizelle Bisschoff (Film & Television Studies), Professor Minty Donald (Head of Theatre Studies), Professor Elizabeth Tomlin (Theatre Studies), Professor Raymond Boyle (Director of the Centre for Cultural Policy Research), Pauline McLachlan (Head of Professional Services, School of Cultural & Creative Arts), and Karen Thompson (Convener of the School of Culture & Creative Arts Learning & Teaching Committee). Professor Kate Oakley (Head of the School of Cultural & Creative Arts) was responsible for the final edit of the RA.
- 2.2.2 The Review Panel met with the Head of the School of Cultural and Creative Arts (Professor Kate Oakley); Professor Raymond Boyle (Director of the Centre for Cultural Policy Research); Professor Minty Donald (Head of Theatre Studies); Dr Amy Holdsworth (Head of Film & Television Studies); Professor Gillian Doyle (Centre for Cultural Policy Research); Professor Elizabeth Tomlin (Head of Theatre Studies from August 2022); five undergraduate students; four Postgraduate Taught (PGT) students representing each of the three subject areas; 21 members of teaching and affiliate staff; four early-career staff representing each of the three subject areas; 10 Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) and external tutors; and seven members of Management, Professional and Administrative (MPA) and Technical staff. The Panel also met with Professor Wendy Anderson (College of Arts Dean of Learning & Teaching) and Dr Victoria Price (College of Arts Dean of Postgraduate Teaching).
- 2.2.3 It was noted in the RA, and within review meetings, that although present within the same School, the subject groupings for the PSR reflected a historical association. The three areas under review had evolved in quite different directions and now had quite different provision, some different aims, and faced some divergent challenges. In light of this, the generation of the RA was considered quite challenging in places.

## 2.3 Staff involved in teaching

- 2.3.1 68 members of staff (43.0297 FTE) contributed to teaching across Film & Television Studies, Theatre Studies, and the Centre for Cultural Policy Research. These staff had a wide range of roles, including lecturers, senior lecturers, professors, graduate teaching assistants (GTAs), teaching assistants, external tutors, research associates, research fellows, technical staff, project assistants, transcription assistants, and production editors.

## 2.4 Student numbers

Student numbers between 2017-18 and 2020-21 are summarised as follows:

Subject	Students (FTE) 2017-18	Students (FTE) 2018-19	Students (FTE) 2019-20	Students (FTE) 2020-21
Centre for Cultural Policy Research	55	47	84	140
Film & Television Studies	216 (UG) 59 (PGT)	227 (UG) 57 (PGT)	255 (UG) 35 (PGT)	274 (UG) 58 (PGT)
Theatre Studies	216 (UG) 40 (PGT)	215 (UG) 38 (PGT)	185 (UG) 40 (PGT)	192 (UG) 48 (PGT)
<b>Total</b>	571	566	599	712

## **2.5 Range of Provision under Review**

The Review Panel considered the following range of provision currently offered by Film & Television Studies, Theatre Studies, and the Centre for Cultural Policy Research:

### *Undergraduate*

- MA Creative Arts & Industries (School-wide programme starting in 2022-23)
- MA Film & Television Studies
- MA Theatre Studies

### *Postgraduate Taught*

- MLitt Film & Television Studies
- MLitt Playwriting & Dramaturgy
- MLitt Theatre & Performance Practice
- MLitt Theatre Studies
- MSc Creative Industries & Cultural Policy (School-wide programme from 2021-2022)
- MSc Film Curation
- MSc Filmmaking & Media Arts
- MSc Media Management

## **3. Strategy for Development**

### **3.1 Progress since the last review**

3.1.1 In the previous PSR for Film & Television Studies, Theatre Studies, and the Centre for Cultural Policy Research, the Review Panel commended the subject areas for their broad-based and interdisciplinary curriculum, the use of external partners, the research-led and practice-based elements of their teaching, and the wide range of assessment modes that were used. Since the last PSR, these areas had been developed further, and new programmes had been introduced in areas such as Filmmaking & Media Arts, Film Curation, and Theatre Studies, in an effort to enhance employability, and increase student numbers. Student numbers had particularly increased in the Centre for Cultural Policy Research. For example, student numbers on the MSc in Media Management programme had increased from 48 students in 2015 to 105 students in 2021-22. Student numbers on the MSc in Creative Industries and Cultural Policy had also increased from a base of 17 students to 86 students since becoming a School-wide programme in 2021-22. In Film & Television Studies, undergraduate student numbers had also increased in recent years, and two new postgraduate programmes had been introduced - the MSc in Filmmaking & Media Arts, and the MSc in Film Curation (see paragraph 3.5.1 for further information about student numbers). The development of these new programmes reflected the subject's ambition to more fully embed screen skills and training across its postgraduate portfolio. In Theatre Studies, the subject had developed and introduced Honours and PGT courses that continued to be highly interdisciplinary, and that ranged across historical and contemporary periods, engaging with the professional practices of theatre and with research-led analysis of theatre and performance.

3.1.2 The introduction of new programmes following the recommendations of the previous PSR had also led to the revision of the curriculum and teaching model across the subject areas. For example, a strong theme, particularly in both Film & Television



Studies and Theatre Studies, has been the deepening of emphasis on professional practice, and the further development of strong partnerships with cultural organisations.

### *League table success*

3.1.3 The Review Panel noted from the RA that, in 2020-21, Film & Television Studies at Glasgow was ranked first in the UK in the Complete University Guide, second in the UK in the Times and Sunday Times Good University Guide, and third in the UK in the Guardian University Guide. Theatre Studies had also enjoyed league table success, coming top in the UK in the Complete University Guide in 2019, 2020, and 2021. The Panel acknowledged the consistently high league table rankings of Theatre Studies and Film & Television Studies, and noted that this served as a useful illustration of the quality of each subject's learning and teaching provision. Therefore, the Review Panel **commends** the high league table positions of Theatre Studies and Film & Television Studies as indicators of effective practice throughout the subject areas.

## **3.2 Vision and strategy**

3.2.1 As stated in the RA, the School of Culture & Creative Arts has a number of strategic aims, these include:

- Successfully launching the undergraduate Creative Arts and Industries programme in September 2022.
- Strengthening employability across all undergraduate and PGT programmes.
- Reviewing existing external partnerships across the School to identify new ways in which external resources might be used to expand and enrich learning and teaching provision.

3.2.2 These objectives were reflected in different ways across Film & Television Studies, Theatre Studies, and the Centre for Cultural Policy Research (CCPR). CCPR's main strategic aim was to promote and extend its position as a leading centre for PGT level teaching in media management. CCPR also aimed to manage student recruitment and growth on the MSc Media Management programme with a view to diversifying its student intake. This was particularly important given the high proportion of students that were drawn from a single market, China. The strategy for development for Film & Television Studies focused on two central elements. The first element was to strengthen the portfolio of critical and creative practice-based teaching, and the second element was to reinvigorate the learning and teaching community following the COVID-19 Pandemic. In Theatre Studies, the main strategic objective was to review Level 1 and Level 2 to ensure that student take-up of Honours courses remained high, and to ensure that students were well-prepared for study at Honours level. The subject also aimed to embed within the curriculum, and in its wider support and pastoral practices, a sensitivity to difference and diversity. In part, this would be achieved through efforts to decolonise the curriculum, and by fostering a more welcoming and supportive environment for neurodiverse students and students with disabilities. Efforts would also be made to seek greater diversity among the staff and student body.

### *Decolonising the curriculum*

3.2.3 The efforts of Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies to decolonise their curriculum was discussed at the meeting with the Head of School, Heads of Subject, College Dean of Learning & Teaching, and the College Dean of Postgraduate Teaching. During that meeting, the Review Panel was informed that Theatre Studies had taken a number of steps to decolonise its curriculum, including the appointment of artists and visiting tutors of colour as guest lecturers on courses such as 'Writing for Performance', 'Devising', 'Playwriting 2', and the prioritisation of scholars of colour and

scholars from developing nations to feature in the subject's online research seminar series. The subject had also instigated an individual review of courses to evaluate material and citations from a decolonising and anti-racist perspective with a view to making changes in the 2022-23 academic session. Film & Television Studies had attempted to diversify its curriculum by introducing a variety of genres and styles of film and media into its pedagogy and the screening components of the MSc in Filmmaking & Media Arts, including African, Iranian and indigenous cinema, and films with female directors. However, Theatre Studies had faced challenges recruiting staff with specific expertise in theatre in the 'Global South'. Both subject areas also acknowledged the lack of ethnic diversity amongst their staff and were making efforts to widen their pool of job applicants and pursue role descriptions that would diversify their curriculum and attract applicants of colour. The Review Panel welcomed the efforts of Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies to decolonise their curriculum and enhance staff diversity, and **commends** both subject areas for their work in this area.

- 3.2.4 The Review Panel discussed the issue of diversifying the curriculum at the meeting with undergraduate students. During this meeting, students acknowledged that Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies were undertaking work to decolonise the curriculum and diversify their staff. However, some students expressed frustration about the lack of non-white teaching staff in both subject areas and, while aware of initial smaller curricular changes, were not aware of the preparations for further changes to decolonise the curriculum. While the Panel welcomed the efforts of Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies to decolonise the curriculum, the Review Panel **recommends** that Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies updates students more regularly on their plans, and involves students more in their discussions about diversifying the curriculum and enhancing staff diversity.

#### *School-wide courses and programmes*

- 3.2.5 The Review Panel noted from the RA, and at the meeting with the Heads of Subject and Head of School that the School of Culture & Creative Arts had sought to reflect its collaborative strengths through the development of School-wide courses and programmes. For example, the School offered team-taught courses in 'Genders', 'Festivals' and 'Making Time'. The Centre for Cultural and Policy Research (CCPR) had also created a programme, 'Creative Industries & Cultural Policy', that had been developed into a School-wide PGT programme, and the School was planning to launch a School-wide undergraduate programme in September 2022, 'Creative Arts and Industries'. The development of a School-wide undergraduate programme was based on the School's belief that cultural industries were broad and drew on multiple cultural practices and traditions. The programme would combine theory and practice courses, and would contain employability and work-based elements aided by the recruitment of a new member of staff with a specialism in work-based learning.
- 3.2.6 The Panel welcomed the introduction and development of School-wide courses and programmes, and agreed that drawing on expertise from across the School would help to enhance collaboration and the sharing of good teaching practice within the School. The Panel also welcomed the appointment of a new member of staff with a specialism in work-based learning to convene the new 'Creative Arts & Industries' undergraduate programme, and noted that this would enhance graduate attributes and employability amongst undergraduate students. Therefore, the Review Panel highlighted the development of School-wide courses and programmes as an example of **good practice** within the School of Culture & Creative Arts.

### 3.3 Physical and technical resources

#### *Teaching space and technical support on campus*

- 3.3.1 The Review Panel noted from the RA that one of the biggest challenges for all three subject areas was the lack of space and production resources on campus. This issue was highlighted in the last PSR, and a recommendation was made that the School of Culture & Creative Arts should work with the College of Arts to review how teaching space, equipment, and technical support staffing requirements could be supported in the future to ensure that the subjects' accommodation needs were reflected in the College of Arts and University estate plans. Since the last PSR, work had been undertaken by School staff on plans for a new College of Arts building which would have offered new facilities. However, the College of Arts building was no longer in the University's campus development plans.
- 3.3.2 Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies were currently housed within Gilmorehill Halls, which was recently reconfigured to accommodate shared staff offices and administrative staff. No improvements had been made to practical teaching spaces in Gilmorehill Halls, although a new media room, equipped with high quality workstations, was scheduled to open in 8 University Gardens in 2022. This media room would be made available to both Music and Film & Television Studies. Since the last PSR, Theatre Studies had not been given any additional facilities on top of their existing purpose-built theatre, studio, and a space that had previously been used as a carpentry workshop. However, undergraduate and postgraduate students had been granted extended access in the evenings and weekends to practice spaces, and Theatre Studies hoped that this access could be retained with a swipe card system to improve security in Gilmorehill Halls.
- 3.3.3 As noted in the RA and in the meeting with the Head of School and Heads of Subject, both Theatre Studies and Film & Television Studies had seen a growth in the demand for production-based courses. However, they were unable to meet that demand due to the lack of space, production equipment, production software, and technical support staff on campus. As a result, they had been forced to cap student numbers on the MSc in Filmmaking and Media Arts, and the MLitt in Theatre and Performance Practice. There was also growing demand for practice-based work at undergraduate level, which the subject areas were unable to accommodate. Regarding CCPR, the Director of the Centre informed the Panel that the growth of PGT numbers and the lack of dedicated CCPR PGT teaching space had resulted in challenges with timetabling and identifying suitable teaching rooms.
- 3.3.4 Given the decision not to progress with the College of Arts Building, the School of Culture & Creative Arts was currently planning a feasibility study to explore how it might utilise partnerships with cultural organisations across Glasgow to increase access to practice teaching spaces. This study would report in the spring or summer of 2022. However, the Panel was informed that gaining access to practice teaching spaces through partnerships with organisations such as theatre companies was challenging because most of these spaces were already fully booked, and the demand for practice teaching spaces had increased due to the booming Scottish screen industry. In addition to this, Glasgow-based theatre companies were themselves very short of performance and rehearsal space, and often made requests to utilise spaces owned by the University.
- 3.3.5 The Panel was concerned about the lack of space and production resources on campus to support the growth of Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies programmes, particularly given the decision not to progress with a new College of Arts building. The Panel recognised the efforts made by the School of Culture & Creative Arts to develop and secure suitable spaces and **recommends** that the College of Arts works with the School of Culture & Creative Arts and University Estates to identify ways

in which each of the subjects' teaching space, equipment, and technical support staffing requirements can be secured to enable them to meet the demand for production-based courses and support future growth.

#### *Access to licensed content and subscription-based services*

- 3.3.6 As noted in the RA, and at the meeting with the Head of School and Heads of Subject, one of the major challenges faced by Film & Television Studies during the COVID-19 Pandemic was the issue of enabling remote access to screenings and licensed content for all students. Due to copyright restrictions and geoblocking, Film & Television Studies had been forced to identify workarounds to this problem assisted by their technician, Michael McCann. However, these issues had not been resolved, and an increased reliance on subscription-based streaming services had acted as a significant barrier to teaching in Film & Television Studies, with some staff members paying for subscription services out of their own pocket. Although investments had been made in services such as BFIPlayer and BoB, Film & Television Studies required more University support to address issues of copyright and access to subscription-based resources. The Review Panel was also informed that failure to provide students with remote access to licensed content and subscription-based resources made it difficult for Film & Television Studies to comply with the University's Accessible and Inclusive Learning Policy. In addition to this, concerns were raised in the meeting with teaching staff about the move to online learning requiring students to have the necessary technology and IT equipment at home to access teaching materials and recorded lectures. As a result, there was a danger that this could result in discrimination against students who did not have the required equipment at home.
- 3.3.7 The Panel welcomed the efforts of Film & Television Studies to identify solutions to the issue of copyright restrictions and geoblocking. However, the Panel shared the subject area's concerns about remote access to screenings and licensed content, and access to subscription-based screening services. Therefore, the Review Panel **recommends** that the School of Culture & Creative Arts works with the College of Arts and Information Services to outline the requirements of Film & Television Studies for licensed content and subscription-based streaming services to ensure that all students are able to access these resources. The Review Panel also **recommends** that the other subject areas are able to feed into this process and outline their IT and software requirements.

### **3.4 Student admissions**

#### *Growth in student numbers*

- 3.4.1 As noted in the RA, some of the subject areas under review had seen significant increases in student numbers in recent years. In the Centre for Cultural Policy Research (CCPR), student numbers had more than doubled over the previous three years. In Film & Television Studies, undergraduate student numbers (which made up 82.5% of its total student cohort) had grown by 27% since 2017, and postgraduate student numbers had remained broadly stable. In Theatre Studies, the number of undergraduate students had remained stable but postgraduate student numbers had increased by 20% since 2017. Therefore, the Review Panel **commends** the good student growth rates for each of the subject areas, particularly in the Centre for Cultural Policy Research.

## *Admissions caps*

- 3.4.2 The Review Panel noted from the RA that both Theatre Studies and Film & Television Studies had seen an increase in demand for production-based courses, which had forced them to cap student numbers due to the lack of space and technical resources on campus. In the Centre for Cultural Policy Research (CCPR), the increase in student numbers had been exacerbated by the fact that its MSc Creative Industries and Cultural Policy, and MSc in Media Management programmes had been forced to postpone their September 2020 student intake until January 2021 due to the COVID-19 Pandemic. As a result, CCPR had to teach two student cohorts simultaneously during the first semester of the 2021-22 academic session. Increases in student numbers in Film & Television Studies had resulted in increased class sizes, particularly at Honours and postgraduate level. This, in turn, had increased pressure on staff teaching workloads (including dissertation supervision) and assessment schedules and timetabling. It was also noted that there had been an increased number of requests for pastoral support - an issue that was particularly noticeable in Film & Television Studies where 33.8% of students were registered as having a specific learning difficulty, and 28.2% of students were registered as having a mental health condition (see paragraphs 6.1.4 and 6.1.5 for further information about student mental health). As a consequence of increased student numbers, subjects were forced to make pedagogical changes such as increasing the number of team-taught courses and holding multiple seminar groups.
- 3.4.3 Regarding the growth in student numbers at postgraduate level, the RA noted that the proportion of international students had increased significantly across each of the subject areas. In CCPR, 78.6% of the students on the MSc in Media Management were international students, of which 76.8% were from China. On postgraduate programmes run by Film & Television Studies, 43.1% of students were Chinese, and in Theatre Studies 20.8% of postgraduate students were from China, which represented a doubling since 2017. This had posed a number of challenges for each of the subject areas in relation to the different prior learning experiences of Chinese students and the increased requirement for English language support. As a result, there was a recognition amongst each of the subject areas that work was required to diversify the recruitment pool.
- 3.4.4 The issue of increased student numbers and admissions was also discussed at the meeting with the Head of School and Heads of Subject, and at the meeting with teaching staff. At the meeting with teaching staff, staff raised concerns about the lack of control that they had over the admissions process. In particular, staff informed the Review Panel that communication with Glasgow International College (GIC) regarding international student recruitment had been poor, which had made it challenging for staff to plan ahead because students often joined programmes at late notice. This, in turn, had resulted in programmes exceeding their student numbers cap, which had impacted on staff teaching and supervision workloads. Echoing the comments that were made in the RA, staff also informed the Panel that the standard of written and spoken English amongst the international student cohort was sometimes quite limited. As a result, these students often required significant support, which impacted on staff workloads. This issue had been particularly apparent during the 2020-21 academic session when the University made the decision to accept students who had undertaken a Duolingo English language test. Staff expressed concerns that the Duolingo test was inferior to other English language tests and that this had resulted in students being accepted onto programmes with poor written and spoken English skills.
- 3.4.5 At the meeting with the Head of School and Heads of Subject, the Panel was informed that the School and subjects had been in dialogue with Planning, Insights and Analytics (PIA), and External Relations regarding student recruitment, particularly at postgraduate level. However, the Heads of Subject and Head of School acknowledged

that there had been challenges regarding communication with GIC, and that student caps on some programmes, particularly production-based programmes, needed to be reduced due to the lack of space, staffing and technical resources on campus.

- 3.4.6 The Panel noted the concerns of staff about the impact of increased student numbers on workloads, the lack of communication with GIC, and the standard of written and spoken English amongst the international student cohort. However, the Panel recognised that the Heads of Subject and Head of School were currently liaising with staff in PIA and External Relations regarding these matters. The Panel was also sympathetic to the efforts of teaching staff and would encourage the School to reflect on the impact of increased student numbers once some of the temporary COVID-19 mitigation measures had been removed. Therefore, the Review Panel **recommends** that the Head of School and Heads of Subject continue to meet with Planning, Insights and Analytics (PIA), and External Relations to identify suitable caps for programmes and set appropriate English language requirements for international students, noting the concerns of teaching staff about the Duolingo English language test. The Review Panel also **recommends** that the School and each of the subject areas works with PIA and External Relations to formulate plans for diversifying student recruitment pools.

#### *Widening access*

- 3.4.7 As noted in the RA, and at the meeting with the Head of School and Heads of Subject, Theatre Studies and Film & Television Studies had made a strong commitment to widening participation on its programmes. In Film & Television Studies, 32.3% of its students were recruited from the 40% most deprived areas in Scotland - a figure that was roughly in line with the College of Arts average. Film & Television Studies had also seen an increase in the proportion of students entering its degrees through the University's 'Access' programmes, with 19.3% of students entering degree programmes via this route in 2020, compared with 7.4% in 2017. In addition to this, Film & Television Studies regularly participated in the University's Widening Participation Summer School. In Theatre Studies, 41.4% of students were drawn from the 40% most deprived areas in Scotland, with 23.4% of students entering their degrees via the University's 'Access' programmes - figures that had increased each year, and that were ahead of the College of Arts average. Therefore, the Review Panel **commends** the commitment of Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies to widening participation, and their efforts to increase the proportion of students from deprived areas.

### **3.5 External engagement activities**

#### *Dear Green Bothy*

- 3.5.1 The Review Panel noted from the RA that the School of Culture & Creative Arts 'Cultural Activities and Collaborations Committee' was responsible for overseeing an active programme of public engagement and dissemination. For example, the School had played a significant role in the University's engagement activities during the United Nations Climate Change Conference, COP26, through the establishment of the 'Dear Green Bothy' programme. The programme consisted of a series of free public events and activities, which aimed to demonstrate the vital role played by the arts and humanities in understanding and addressing the climate emergency. Both Theatre Studies and Film & Television Studies had contributed to the programme through their involvement in, and organisation of, events such as 'The Walking Library for a Wild City', 'Queer River, Wet Land', and 'We Get Shot with Silent Bullets: Screenings and Discussions with Africa in Motion'. Therefore, the Review Panel **commends** Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies for their contributions to the University's external engagement activities during COP26.

## 4. Learning and teaching enhancement

### 4.1 Development of alumni networks, external partnerships and work placement opportunities

#### *Alumni networks*

- 4.1.1 As noted in the RA, and at the meeting with the Head of School and Heads of Subject, all three subject areas had strong links with their alumni, who took part in a range of activities to support current students. For example, alumni from Film & Television Studies had been involved in School career events, and had been invited to give guest lectures sharing their career journeys in the film and television industry. These events allowed students to talk with alumni and learn about the different career opportunities available to them, and the challenges associated with working in the sector. Careers events also provided students with opportunities to develop their networking and communication skills - graduate attributes that were highly valued in creative arts careers. In addition to this, Film & Television Studies had created a Facebook group for PGT students and alumni. This page allowed students to interact with alumni and to receive information about internship and employment opportunities, and upcoming events. Film & Television Studies had also collated alumni profiles and published them on its postgraduate programme web pages and through social media, as well as using them in marketing and conversion activities.
- 4.1.2 Another example of alumni engagement was the development of an 'At Home' series of online lunchtime conversations with Scottish artists, many of whom were alumni of the University, during the COVID-19 Pandemic. These sessions were instigated by Theatre Studies and were designed primarily as a way of keeping students in touch with the local theatre scene and people associated with the performing arts sector. Students had also commented that the series had provided them with a useful opportunity to see and hear about the different professions that recent graduates had gone into, and that it had encouraged them to reflect on the different career trajectories that they themselves might take. In addition to the 'At Home' series, Theatre Studies had also engaged with alumni by inviting graduates back to take part in teaching.
- 4.1.3 The Review Panel acknowledged the work that had been undertaken by Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies to maintain links with its alumni, and to draw on this network to enhance graduate attributes, and provide internship opportunities and careers guidance for current students. Therefore, the Review Panel had identified this as an example of **good practice** within the subject areas. The Panel agreed that the 'At Home' series was an innovative way of connecting students with practitioners and theatres at a time when social distancing regulations prevented students from attending performances and engaging with artists in person. The Panel further noted that the 'At Home' series had provided Theatre Studies students with valuable opportunities to reflect upon the career options available to them. Therefore, the Review Panel **commends** Theatre Studies for developing the 'At Home' series during the COVID-19 Pandemic.

#### *External partnerships*

- 4.1.4 As noted in the RA, and at the meeting with the Head of School and the Heads of Subject, all three subject areas made use of guest lecturers from a wide range of organisations, including BBC Scotland, Regional Screen Scotland, National Theatre of Scotland, Creative Scotland, OFCOM Scotland, Channel 4: Nations and Regions, Berwick Film Festival, Alchemy Film Festival, African in Motion, and Aya Films. Each subject area also made use of a number of independent practitioners who delivered workshops and masterclasses to students. Students had expressed support for more careers advice, work placement opportunities, networking opportunities, and courses centring on industry-focused skills. In response to this, Theatre Studies was in the

process of developing a new course, 'Professional Practice - Pathways into the sector', commencing in the 2022-23 academic session, which would support students to identify, critically reflect on, and develop skills to enhance opportunities in line with their career goals. In addition to this, Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies continued to embed industry-related teaching across its programmes. For example, a new honours option had been introduced in 2020-21 on 'Working in the UK Screen Industries', which aimed to complement an existing core course on 'Media and Cultural Policy'.

- 4.1.5 Aside from changes to the curriculum, the School of Culture & Creative Arts had invested in a sponsorship of the Edinburgh International TV Festival 'talent schemes'. Film & Television Studies had also taken the opportunity to establish a partnership with the British Film Institute, and had developed a new partnership with the Glasgow Media Access Centre. These partnerships had enabled the subject area to provide production skills training for a small group of undergraduate students. Building on the success of these collaborations, Film & Television Studies had recently established a 'partnerships co-ordinator' position within the subject area.
- 4.1.6 The Review Panel welcomed the work that had been undertaken by Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies to develop partnerships with external organisations and independent practitioners within the creative industries sector to enhance graduate attributes and provide students with specialist skills. Therefore, the Review Panel highlighted the efforts of Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies to engage with external partners as an example of **good practice**.

#### *Work placements and internship opportunities*

- 4.1.7 As noted in the RA, Theatre Studies students were given the opportunity to undertake individual projects with partner organisations. In Film & Television Studies, a range of partnerships with external organisations had been established to aid in the delivery of professional skills development. For example, students on the MSc in Film Curation programme undertook a work-based placement or a creative project as part of a compulsory course. Film & Television Studies had also worked in partnership with the Africa in Motion Film Festival and Hungry Bear Media to develop internship and volunteering opportunities for students, and students had been offered paid internship opportunities to assist subject staff with their practice-led research. These internships provided students with a chance to engage with artists and to develop new skills in areas such as production design.
- 4.1.8 At the meeting with undergraduate students, the Review Panel was informed that placement and internship opportunities were usually discussed in the later years of undergraduate degree programmes, and that they had been mentioned at Staff-Student Liaison Committee meetings. However, students on Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies programmes also informed the Panel that they would appreciate more information about specific industry placement and internship opportunities, and that they would welcome more workshops, seminars and networking opportunities with employers.
- 4.1.9 The Panel recognised the efforts that had been made by Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies to provide students with placement and internship opportunities. However, the Review Panel **recommends** that Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies provides more information to undergraduate students at an earlier point in their degree programme about placement, internship and networking opportunities with employers, and opportunities to attend industry-related workshops and seminars. The Review Panel also **recommends** that Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies draw on their extensive alumni network in order to assist them with this work.



## 4.2 Approaches to assessment

### *Range of assessments*

- 4.2.1 As noted in the RA, and at the meeting with the Head of School and Heads of Subject, each of the subject areas used a broad range of teaching methods and types of assessment on their programmes. In Theatre Studies, students were exposed to a variety of assessment methods, which enabled them to gain skills in leading workshops, delivering presentations, group creative practice, digital and live performances, arts criticism, scriptwriting, developing portfolios, producing dramaturgical reports and curation briefs, as well as more traditional skills such as essay writing. Assessments in Theatre Studies were also designed to teach skills that were directly applicable to the theatre industry. For example, the subject had developed work placements where students were allocated individual projects undertaken with a partner organisation. The subject had also developed an Honours course, 'Shaping Futures', that engaged students in work-based learning through seminars focussed on theatre in the context of Scottish cultural industries. The course was assessed by an industry-focused project that was designed by a partner organisation under guidance and in collaboration with School staff.
- 4.2.2 In Film & Television Studies, assessments were designed to offer undergraduate and PGT students opportunities to learn and gain skills in a number of vocational areas. For example, students gained digital and data management skills through audio-visual essays, archive projects, and critical blogs, and enhanced their professional practice skills through report writing, pitching exercises, presentations, and through the preparation of production documents. Students also had the option to undertake an audiovisual essay/dissertation, which offered them the opportunity to improve their creativity and practical skills within an academic framework. In particular, the audiovisual essay/dissertation allowed them to develop an understanding of visual and sound editing, digital screen capture, file handling, the manipulation of on-screen text, performing and recording voiceovers, and filming. Students also developed an appreciation of how to produce audiovisual forms that were most likely to circulate on social media – a skill that was applicable to a variety of jobs in the creative industries sector.
- 4.2.3 The Review Panel noted that Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies utilised a broad range of assessment methods across its undergraduate and PGT portfolio. The Panel also noted that assessments such as work-based projects, pitching exercises, and audiovisual essays allowed students to develop skills that would be directly relevant to a number of careers. Therefore, the Review Panel identified the range of work-based and sector-relevant assessment opportunities offered to students as an example of **good practice** within Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies.

### *Aligning assessment outcomes and feedback*

- 4.2.4 As noted in the RA, all three subject areas employed a range of assessment methods across their programmes. These assessment methods had been adapted to support professional practice and work-based learning, and underwent significant changes in response to the COVID-19 Pandemic. Feedback on assessments was provided orally to students in discussions in seminars and workshops, in showcases and screenings of student work, in individual and group tutorials, and in peer-based learning activities. Written feedback was provided through comments on assessments, a feedback pro-forma in which individual criteria were addressed, and comments on seminar preparation activities via Moodle.
- 4.2.5 In Film & Television Studies, course leaders provided bespoke preparation sessions for assessments that included explanations of Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) and assessment criteria. Detailed information on ILOs was also provided in course

documentation, and tutors were encouraged to outline the aims and objectives of weekly topics and lectures in class materials. In addition to this, assessment criteria were discussed with students in seminars, and these criteria were specifically addressed in written feedback on assessments. In an effort to more explicitly link marker comments to ILOs and assessment criteria, Film & Television Studies had made changes to its assessment feedback template in 2018-19. These changes, which had been discussed at Staff-Student Liaison Committee meetings, had been received positively by students, and the subject area had seen an improvement in its score for the assessment and feedback questions in the National Student Survey (NSS). In Theatre Studies, the subject had recently been commended by their External Examiner for its practice in Level 2 of explicitly aligning ILOs with each assessment task in the course handbook, which enabled students to see clearly what they were being assessed on. In response to this positive feedback, the subject was planning to extend this practice to all of its courses at the start of the next academic session.

- 4.2.6 The issue of assessment feedback was discussed in the meetings with undergraduate and PGT students. In the meeting with undergraduate students, students informed the Review Panel that they were generally satisfied with the level of feedback that they received on their assessments, and that feedback had helped them to improve their marks in subsequent assessments. Students also informed the Panel that feedback was usually timely. However, while some students informed the Panel that they had been encouraged by staff to attend their office hours to receive advice and feedback on their assessments, other students informed the Panel that staff could have done more to advertise their office hours and persuade students to attend. One student also informed the Panel that, due to the number of students requesting extensions and submitting Good Cause requests, they had not received feedback on one of their essays until the day before the exam, which made it impossible for them to apply the lessons learned from their feedback to their exam. In addition to this, students informed that Panel that there were sometimes inconsistencies between their assessment marks and the written feedback that they received. The Panel asked students if they had received any formative assessments during their programme. Some students in Film & Television Studies informed the Panel that they had been given optional formative assessment opportunities, whereas students on Theatre Studies programmes noted that they would welcome more formative assessment opportunities.
- 4.2.7 At the meeting with PGT students, students on the Centre for Cultural Policy Research (CCPR) programmes informed the Panel that feedback on assessments was sometimes received after the University's 15 working day target. However, delays to feedback were always well-communicated by staff. Students on CCPR programmes also expressed concerns that assessment deadlines were not spread out enough (which had resulted in some students requesting extensions), and that assessment feedback was not detailed enough. Students on Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies PGT programmes informed the Panel that feedback on their assessments had been timely and detailed, and that they often received feedback via Moodle. Regarding formative assessment opportunities, students on Film & Television Studies PGT programmes noted that they had completed a short formative essay, and that the guidance received in their feedback had assisted them in later summative assessments. Given their positive experience of formative assessments, Film & Television Studies students informed the Panel that they would welcome more formative assessment opportunities on their programmes.
- 4.2.8 The Panel recognised that Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies had undertaken work to clarify and communicate ILOs and assessment marking criteria with students, to align ILOs with assessment tasks, and to link marker comments to ILOs and assessment criteria by updating the assessment feedback template. The Panel also noted that students generally appreciated the depth of feedback received on

their assessments and the efforts of staff to provide timely feedback and communicate any delays. However, the Panel also observed that students in all of the subject areas had expressed a desire to receive more formative assessment opportunities, and that some students had expressed concerns about a lack of consistency between assessment marks and written feedback, and assessment deadlines being too close together. Therefore, the Review Panel **recommends** that each of the subject areas undertakes an assessment mapping exercise to ensure that assessment deadlines are adequately spaced, and that feedback is received in advance of subsequent assessments. The Review Panel also **recommends** that each of the subject areas reviews assessment literacy and considers providing students with more formative assessment opportunities, and that they review their feedback sheets to ensure that assessment marks and written feedback are consistent.

### **4.3 Staff support**

#### *Support for Graduate Teaching Assistants and external tutors*

- 4.3.1 As noted in the RA, Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) were used across all three subject areas to support teaching. GTAs were recruited onto two-year contracts and had received significant pay increases in recent years, in addition to payment for teaching preparation time. Regarding support, each GTA was provided with a teaching mentor, and GTAs were invited to set up peer observations to learn from their peers and enhance their teaching practice. Film & Television Studies also invited each GTA to attend at least one subject meeting per academic year (paid). GTA tutors teaching at Levels 1 and 2 were inducted via teaching team meetings prior to the start of each semester, and all new GTAs undertook mandatory training by the College of Arts. Where GTAs were involved in marking, their marks were moderated by teaching or moderation teams. In addition to this, Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies employed professional artists as tutors. These affiliate staff members were mentored by the Course or Programme Convener who assisted them with marking through preparatory meetings and proactive moderation.
- 4.3.2 At the meeting with GTAs and external tutors, the Review Panel was informed that GTAs and external tutors generally enjoyed their role, and that there was a strong sense of collegiality within the GTA and external tutor community. GTAs and external tutors also informed the Panel that they felt supported by their peers, and spoke positively about the informal mentoring and peer-observation system that they had helped to develop. However, a number of concerns were highlighted during this meeting. First, some GTAs felt that they had received insufficient mentoring from members of teaching staff, and that there was sometimes a lack of clarity about what feedback they should be providing to students in response to queries about assessment marks. GTAs and external tutors also informed the Panel that they had received little guidance on marking presentations, and that there were sometimes differences between Course Conveners regarding their levels of expectation. Second, GTAs raised concerns about the lack of time that they had to mark assessments. In particular, they informed the Panel that they were only given two weeks to mark student work because another week was required for moderation. Marking turnaround times were sometimes reduced further if students requested extensions. Third, GTAs and external tutors informed the Panel that they were only paid for one hour of preparation time for tutorials and workshops, and that this was not sufficient to review and familiarise themselves with the lecture materials and plan/devise teaching sessions. Concerns were also raised by GTAs and external tutors that they sometimes only received teaching materials from staff immediately prior to their teaching session. In addition to this, GTAs and external tutors noted that as front-facing staff, particularly during the COVID-19 Pandemic, they had responded to lots of email enquiries from students and that they often provided wellbeing support for students, which wasn't

always recognised by their subject. Fourth, the Panel was informed by a number of GTAs and external tutors that they should receive more appreciation for the teaching contributions that they made, and that they did not feel included as part of the wider teaching community within their subject. In particular, they commented that they were 'always the last to know' and 'were not part of the conversation' when teaching decisions were made. Fifth, GTAs and external tutors informed the Panel that they did not receive student feedback on their teaching, which meant that they lacked evidence of good teaching practice for academic job applications. Some GTAs and external tutors also noted that they had not been given access to Moodle, which hindered their ability to prepare for teaching sessions.

- 4.3.3 The Panel recognised the significant contributions that GTAs and external tutors had made to teaching within each of the subject areas, and the sense of community amongst GTAs and external tutors. However, the Panel was concerned about the mentoring and support for GTAs and external tutors, their lack of preparation and marking time, the lack of recognition that they received for the pastoral support that they provided to students, and the integration of GTAs and external tutors into the wider teaching community within each subject. Therefore, the Review Panel **recommends** that each of the subject areas reviews the guidance, support and mentoring arrangements for GTAs and external tutors, the preparation time that GTAs and external tutors are paid for, and explores the possibility of providing these staff with student feedback via EvaSys. The Review Panel also **recommends** that each of the subject areas develops a plan for integrating GTAs and external tutors into the subject's learning and teaching community, and provides increased opportunities for involvement (paid or unpaid) in subject and School-level learning and teaching meetings.

#### *Support for early-career staff*

- 4.3.4 The Review Panel noted from the RA that all early-career academic staff undertook the Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice (PGCAP) as part of the university's Early Career Development Programme (ECDP). Early-career staff were also supported by their Head of Subject, an ECDP mentor, and through course development processes within the School of Culture and Creative Arts, and the College of Arts. At the meeting with early-career staff, the Panel was informed that staff felt well-supported by fellow members of academic staff from their subject area, and that they received help when their workloads became excessive. However, concerns were raised that staff on short-term contracts did not have access to training via the PGCAP and ECDP programme, which reduced their opportunities to gain the experience and skills required for full-time posts. Staff also expressed concerns that they were unable to focus on one course and develop it due to the lack of staff in some subject areas combined with the impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic, colleagues being on research leave, and colleagues being bought out of teaching for roles elsewhere in the University, which left remaining staff with higher teaching workloads. In addition to this, staff raised concerns that the additional work involved in teaching practical courses, while recognised locally, was not reflected in larger-scale workload models, and that this had impacted on the recommended teaching reduction for staff undertaking the PGCAP of 50% in year one and 25% in year two. Similar issues were raised in the meeting with teaching staff, where the Panel was informed that PhD supervision and MSc dissertation supervision was not adequately accounted for in workload models. Furthermore, some staff raised concerns about the lack of recognition in the promotions criteria for staff on the Research & Teaching track and in the Research Excellence Framework (REF) for practice-based research outputs.
- 4.3.5 The Panel noted that, while early-career staff felt supported and well-integrated within each subject's teaching community, some work was required to ensure that early-

career staff were given more time to engage in training and development opportunities. Therefore, the Review Panel **recommends** that the College, School, and each of the subject areas reviews their workload models to ensure that practical teaching, and PhD and MSc dissertation supervision is adequately accounted for, and that early-career staff undertaking the PGCAP are able to take advantage of the recommended workload reductions for years one and two of the programme.

#### 4.4 Responding to challenges

##### *Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic*

- 4.4.1 As noted in the RA, and at the meetings with the Head of School and Head of Subjects, and teaching staff, the COVID-19 Pandemic had had a significant impact on teaching delivery in each of the subject areas. Some production-based programmes and courses were unable to run during the 2020-21 academic session due to physical distancing restrictions, and Centre for Cultural Policy Research (CCPR) programmes were required to move their start date from September 2020 to January 2021. The move to online teaching and assessment posed particular challenges for practice-based courses, and had forced each of the subject areas to adapt their teaching and assessment practices. In Theatre Studies, staff and students explored how to create work in digital formats for assessment. This had been largely successful, resulting in one student submission winning the 2021 award for best assessed group work in the annual School Undergraduate Prize. A newly-appointed member of staff specialising in digital arts, Dr Eirini Nedelkopoulou, had also developed a new course in digital theatre to further develop this aspect of the subject's curriculum. This linked with the 'collaboratively minded digitally enhanced' imperative in the University strategy, and the College of Arts Learning & Teaching Strategy's aim of 'Evolving Approaches to Student-Centred Active Learning' through 'maximising and supporting engagement with blended learning opportunities'.
- 4.4.2 During the meeting with teaching staff, staff informed the Review Panel that each of the subject areas had adapted well to the challenges posed by the COVID-19 Pandemic. For example, subjects had invited guest speakers to deliver online lectures and talks to students, and Theatre Studies had instigated an 'At Home' series of online, lunchtime conversations with Scottish artists (see paragraph 4.1.2 for further information about the 'At Home' series). However, the Pandemic had also placed a great deal of pressure on staff, and had required them to adapt their teaching and learn new technical skills within a very short timeframe. In addition to this, the Pandemic had resulted in an increased number of students suffering from mental health-related issues, resulting in a greater number of Good Cause submissions and requests of extensions. This, in turn, had impacted on the timing of assessments and assessment feedback, and had placed additional pressures on markers, Course Conveners and learning and teaching administrators.
- 4.4.3 The Review Panel recognised the considerable efforts made by staff in each of the subject areas to adapt their teaching and assessment practices in response to the COVID-19 Pandemic. The Panel particularly praised the efforts of Theatre Studies to adapt assessments to digital formats, and to use some of the lessons learned during the Pandemic to develop a new course in digital theatre. Therefore, the Review Panel identified the positive response of each of the subject areas to the COVID-19 Pandemic as an example of **good practice**.

## **5. The student voice**

### **5.1 Responding to student feedback**

#### *Closure of feedback loops*

- 5.1.1 As noted in the RA, and at the meeting with teaching staff, each subject incorporated a range of formal and informal feedback mechanisms into teaching in order to gather student feedback. The main method of gathering course-specific feedback was via course evaluation surveys that were sent to students for every course at the end of each semester. These surveys were produced and distributed to students using EvaSys course evaluation software, and students were usually encouraged to complete these surveys in class using their laptop, tablet, or smartphone. Once surveys had been completed, EvaSys automatically collated a summary report, which included all student comments and a statistical summary of student responses to all of the survey's closed questions. This report was sent to all members of staff that taught on the course, who then produced a Summary and Response Document (SARD) summarising student comments and any actions that would be taken to address issues that had been raised. This document was then uploaded to Moodle to allow students to see how their concerns were being acted upon.
- 5.1.2 Student feedback was also gathered via Staff-Student Liaison Committee (SSLC) meetings, which took place once a semester. These meetings were attended by student representatives from each level, and provided a forum for passing on and discussing student feedback with staff. Regarding the mechanics of SSLC meetings, the RA noted that agendas for each meeting were agreed and circulated in advance. Course evaluation feedback was also included as a standing item on every SSLC meeting agenda to ensure that student representatives were informed directly about any actions that had been taken to address issues that had been raised by students. Prior to each meeting, student representatives were encouraged to gather feedback from their classmates in person, and via email and social media. During the meeting, staff responded to any issues raised by the student representatives, and updated the representatives of any changes or progress that had been made towards resolving issues that had been identified in previous meetings. Following each meeting, minutes were circulated to all committee members and made available to students.
- 5.1.3 In addition to course evaluation surveys and SSLCs, the RA, and staff at the teaching staff meeting informed the Review Panel that mid-semester feedback was sometimes gathered by individual members of staff, which allowed them to implement changes prior to the end of the semester. Feedback was also gathered and responded to informally by staff over email, in person, and during supervisory meetings.
- 5.1.4 At the meeting with teaching staff, the Review Panel was informed that student response rates for course evaluation surveys had declined during the COVID-19 Pandemic, and that the low response rates for some courses had significantly undermined the usefulness of these surveys as a means for gathering student feedback and evidence of good teaching practice for promotions applications. Concerns were also raised that poor response rates sometimes resulted in feedback being unrepresentative of the class as a whole, which had made it counterproductive to produce Summary and Response Documents (SARDs) for some courses.
- 5.1.5 The issue of student feedback was also discussed at the meetings with undergraduate and PGT students. At these meetings, the Review Panel was informed that SSLC meetings generally worked well and that student representatives were comfortable sharing their concerns with staff. Students also felt that staff were willing to listen to issues raised by students, and that they were receptive to suggestions for improvements. In addition to this, students spoke positively about opportunities to provide mid-semester feedback, which allowed staff to be more responsive and

address any issues prior to the end of the course. However, concerns were raised by some students that minutes from SSLC meetings were not made available to students in all subject areas after each meeting. Some students also informed the Panel that they did not know who their class representatives were.

- 5.1.6 Regarding EvaSys course evaluation surveys, some students informed the Panel that they had not received course evaluation surveys for all of their courses, and that Summary and Response Documents were not always produced by staff or posted on Moodle in response to student feedback. This meant that some students were unclear about how their concerns were being addressed, and that this acted as a disincentive to completing future course evaluation surveys.
- 5.1.7 While the Panel agreed that students were generally content with the operation of SSLCs, the Panel noted from the documentation provided by each of the subject areas that the availability of SSLC minutes was only partially satisfactory. However, it was unclear whether the absence of these minutes was the result of meetings not taking place or of minutes not being recorded and stored centrally. Echoing the comments made in the meetings with undergraduate and PGT students, and in the meeting with teaching staff, the Panel also noted that some courses had not produced SARDs in response to student feedback, and that response rates for course evaluation surveys had been variable across courses. Therefore, the Review Panel **recommends** that each of the subject areas liaises with the Senate Office to develop a strategy for increasing student response rates for EvaSys course evaluation surveys, and that the subject areas that are not already doing so explore the possibility of sending mid-semester surveys to students to enhance student engagement. To facilitate the closure of feedback loops, the Review Panel also **recommends** that the subject areas develop a mechanism to ensure that Summary and Response Documents are completed for all courses where response rates are statistically significant, and that SSLC minutes are recorded and made available to all students. The subject areas should also ensure that there is effective communication of the actions taken in response to feedback to both students and staff.

## **6. Supporting student wellbeing**

### **6.1 Student support mechanisms**

#### *Administrative support*

- 6.1.1 As noted in the meeting with MPA and technical staff, the administrative and technical support team acted as the first point of contact for most students from all three subject areas. Members of MPA and technical staff received large numbers of student queries relating to a range of academic and non-academic matters. Staff felt well-equipped to respond to students' questions and were able to signpost students to relevant University support services if their problems could not be resolved locally. Members of the MPA and technical support team also noted that they felt well-supported by their colleagues, and that there were strong lines of communication between team members and members of teaching staff.
- 6.1.2 At the meeting with teaching staff, and in the responses to the staff survey, the Panel received positive feedback about the dedication and level of support that teaching staff had received from members of MPA and technical staff. Staff also welcomed the recent decision to allocate administrative support to specific subject areas, and to provide a single administrative contact for undergraduate programmes. In the meeting with MPA and technical support staff, the Panel observed that there was a strong sense of community and collegiality amongst the MPA and technical support team, and that staff were enthusiastic and committed to enhancing the student experience. Therefore, the Review Panel identified the quality of administrative support and sense of community

within the MPA and technical support team as an area of **good practice** within the subject areas.

#### *Disability and mental health support*

- 6.1.3 The RA noted that information about student support services was widely promoted to students at induction events and in class. Links to relevant services were also published on Moodle course pages, and representatives of key support services were invited to deliver induction talks. The RA further noted that teaching staff and administrative staff in each of the subject areas had good lines of communication with student support services such as Disability Services, and that students with additional support requirements were encouraged to register with Disability Services to ensure that necessary support arrangements were put in place.
- 6.1.4 Regarding support for mental health, the Review Panel was informed at the meeting with teaching staff that staff encouraged students to contact Counselling & Psychological Services (CAPS) if they required any support with mental health-related issues. However, teaching staff, particularly those involved in dissertation and thesis supervision, were often approached by students in relation to their mental health concerns. Staff noted that they sometimes felt ill-equipped or had inadequate support to handle these situations. The experience of encountering large numbers of distressed students had also impacted on their own mental wellbeing. Furthermore, staff noted that students who had attempted to access CAPS had informed them that there were large backlogs and waiting lists, and they expressed concerns that students on one-year PGT programmes occasionally failed to access any support whatsoever during their studies. Staff also expressed the view that more resources were required for CAPS to reduce appointment waiting times and ensure that students could always access the mental health support that they required.
- 6.1.5 The issue of mental health support was also discussed in the meetings with undergraduate and PGT students. At those meetings, students informed the Panel that they had struggled with their mental health during the COVID-19 Pandemic as a consequence of being unable to study and interact with their classmates face-to-face. Students were aware of CAPS and how to access this service. However, echoing the comments that were made by teaching staff, concerns were expressed at the meeting with undergraduate students about the long waiting times for appointments. Students at this meeting also informed the Panel that, while it was often possible to make an initial appointment with CAPS, it was difficult for students with long-term counselling requirements to arrange successive appointments. The Panel was concerned about the length of time that it was taking for students to secure appointments with CAPS despite the recent expansion of the service, and the appointment of additional counsellors and wellbeing officers. Therefore, the Review Panel **recommends** that the subject areas liaise with Counselling & Psychological Services (CAPS) to outline their support requirements and highlight the difficulties that students have faced accessing the service.

#### *Advising and academic support*

- 6.1.6 As noted in the RA, academic advising for all undergraduate students within the College of Arts was carried out by the Arts Advising Team. Arts Advising were responsible for responding to all queries from Level 1 and Level 2 students within Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies, and the Honours Convener was responsible for responding to queries from Level 3 and Level 4 students. In Theatre Studies, undergraduate students also received advice about changing courses and future study options during advisory lectures at the end of Level 1, Level 2, and Level 3. At postgraduate level, each incoming PGT student attends a series of individual meetings with their Programme Convener to discuss the various course choices that are



available. During PGT programmes, students are also encouraged to have early conversations about PhD opportunities with conveners, and the Postgraduate Research (PGR) Convener organises a session with PGT students to discuss PhD and scholarship opportunities. In addition to this, Film & Television Studies were discussing the possibility of developing a personal tutoring system for PGT students. This would involve each member of staff in the subject area having a cohort of personal tutees who could provide subject-level support to complement the existing advising services.

- 6.1.7 Academic advising was discussed at both the undergraduate and PGT student meetings. At the meeting with undergraduate students, the Review Panel was informed that students generally, but not always, knew who to contact if they required academic support, although some students raised concerns that the Arts Advising Team could be difficult to access at peak times. At the meeting with PGT students, the Panel was informed by some students that they required more academic and advisory support, and that they did not have a dedicated person who they could contact with academic-related questions. However, students in Film & Television Studies informed the Panel that communication with subject staff was generally good, and that they had received information about academic support services such as Student Learning Development (SLD).
- 6.1.8 The Panel noted that the College of Arts had recently appointed three 'Student Support Officers' (SSOs) to provide frontline support for students. These SSOs supported students by listening to their concerns, helping them to resolve issues independently, and signposting them to sources of information, advice and guidance in relation to their studies, their wellbeing, and their future careers. Given the concerns raised by members of teaching staff about the increasing number of mental health-related queries from students, and the concerns raised by postgraduate students about the lack of academic and advisory support, the Review Panel **recommends** that the subject areas clarify lines of responsibility for academic and non-academic student support. As part of this work, the Review Panel recommends that each of the subject areas communicate with students about the support that can be provided by the College of Arts Advising team (Levels 1 and 2), the Honours Convener (Levels 3 and 4) and the new College of Arts Student Support Officers (SSOs), and that the subject areas liaise with the SSOs to ensure that they interface effectively with teaching staff, subject MPA and technical support staff, subject advisory staff, and University student support services. The Review Panel also **recommends** that each of the subject areas reviews the signposting of University support services such as Student Learning Development (SLD), Disability Services, Counselling and Psychological Services (CAPS), and the College Student Support Officers, in programme handbooks, communications sent to students, and in induction lectures.

#### *Communication between staff*

- 6.1.9 The issue of communication with teaching staff was discussed at the meeting with PGT students. During this meeting, students informed the Review Panel that communication with staff was generally good, and that staff listened to their concerns. However, some students informed the Panel that there was a lack of communication between staff on their programme, and that this had resulted in the duplication of some teaching content. The Panel was satisfied that lines of communication between students and teaching staff were usually good, and that students felt comfortable contacting members of staff with their queries. However, the Review Panel **recommends** that each of the subject areas develops a strategy to improve communication between programme teaching staff, and reviews course content during programme-level PGT teaching meetings to ensure that teaching content is not duplicated.

## **6.2 Retention and progression**

6.2.1 The RA stated that both Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies had strong continuation and progression rates, although there had been a slight drop off in these rates in 2020. In Film & Television Studies, progression had fallen from 95% in 2019 to below 90% in 2020. In Theatre Studies, progression had fallen from 94.1% in 2019 to below 90% in 2020. Both subject areas believed that the reduction in progression rates had been influenced by the COVID-19 Pandemic, and agreed that this would need to be monitored over the coming years.

## **7. Summary and conclusions**

### **7.1 Key strengths**

The Review Panel identified the following areas as key strengths:

- The consistently high league table positions of Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies.
- The development of School-wide programmes, and the growth in student numbers, particularly in the Centre for Cultural Policy Research.
- The commitment of Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies to widening participation, and increasing the proportion of their students from deprived areas.
- The engagement of Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies with external partners, and the work undertaken by Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies to maintain links with its alumni to provide internship opportunities and careers guidance for current students.
- The quality of administrative support and sense of community within the MPA and technical support team.
- The work undertaken by Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies to decolonise their curriculum and enhance staff diversity.
- The external engagement activities carried out by Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies during COP26.
- The constructive response of each of the subject areas to the COVID-19 Pandemic, including the development of the 'At Home' series by Theatre Studies.

### **7.2 Areas for enhancement**

The Review Panel highlighted the following areas as opportunities for further work:

- Ensuring that each of the subjects' teaching space, equipment, and technical support staffing requirements can be secured, and ensuring that students are able to access licensed content and subscription-based streaming services.
- Identifying suitable caps for programmes and setting appropriate English language requirements for international students.
- Communicating plans to decolonise the curriculum and enhance staff diversity with students and involving students in those discussions.
- Providing undergraduate students with more information at an earlier point in their degree programme about placements, internships and networking opportunities with employers, and opportunities to attend industry-related workshops and seminars.

- The spacing of assessment deadlines to ensure that feedback is received in advance of subsequent assessments, and ensuring that assessment marks and feedback are consistent, and that students are provided with more formative assessment opportunities.
- Support for Graduate Teaching Assistants and external tutors.
- Ensuring that workload models adequately reflect the work required for practical teaching and supervision, and that early-career staff are able to take advantage of the recommended workload reductions for the PGCAP.
- Ensuring the successful closure of student feedback loops and improving communication about routes to closure to students.
- Clarifying the lines of responsibility for academic and non-academic student support and improving the signposting of University support services.
- Improving communication between programme teaching staff.

Specific recommendations addressing these areas for work are listed in the table below, as are a number of further recommendations on particular matters.

### 7.3 Conclusion

The Review Panel concluded that Film & Television Studies, Theatre Studies, and the Centre for Cultural Policy Research were committed to enhancing the quality of teaching provision across their programmes. In particular, the Panel recognised the work that had been undertaken by staff in each of the subject areas to adapt their teaching and assessment methods in response to the COVID-19 Pandemic, including the introduction of the 'At Home' series of online lunchtime conversations with Scottish artists. The Panel also recognised the significant contributions that had been made by Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies to the University's external engagement activities during COP26, and the work that had been undertaken by both subject areas to decolonise their curriculum. In addition to this, the Panel acknowledged the efforts that had been made by each of the subject areas to develop and maintain links with alumni and external partners, and to provide students with a broad range of work-based and sector-relevant assessment opportunities, which allowed them to develop skills that would be directly relevant to a number of careers. The Panel has made a number of recommendations, identifying opportunities for the subject areas to further enhance the quality of their learning and teaching provision. However, these recommendations should not detract from the Panel's overall view of Film & Television Studies, Theatre Studies, and the Centre for Cultural Policy Research as highly successful subject areas within the School of Cultural and Creative Arts.

## 8. Commendations

The Review Panel commends Film & Television Studies, Theatre Studies, and the Centre for Cultural Policy Research on the following, which are listed **in order of appearance** in this report:

### Commendation 1

The Review Panel **commends** the high league table positions of Theatre Studies and Film & Television Studies as indicators of effective practice throughout the subject areas. [Paragraph 3.1.3]

## **Commendation 2**

The Review Panel **commends** Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies for the work that they have undertaken to decolonise their curriculum and enhance staff diversity. [Paragraph 3.2.3]

## **Commendation 3**

The Review Panel **commends** the good student growth rates for each of the subject areas, particularly in the Centre for Cultural Policy Research. [Paragraph 3.4.1]

## **Commendation 4**

The Review Panel **commends** the commitment of Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies to widening participation, and their efforts to increase the proportion of students from deprived areas. [Paragraph 3.4.7]

## **Commendation 5**

The Review Panel **commends** Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies for their contributions to the University's external engagement activities during COP26. [Paragraph 3.5.1]

## **Commendation 6**

The Review Panel **commends** Theatre Studies for developing the 'At Home' series during the COVID-19 Pandemic. [Paragraph 4.1.3]

## **9. Good practice**

- The development of School-wide courses and programmes. [Paragraph 3.2.6]
- The work undertaken by Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies to maintain links with alumni, and to draw on this network to enhance graduate attributes, and provide internship opportunities and careers guidance for current students. [Paragraph 4.1.3]
- The efforts of Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies to engage with external partners. [Paragraph 4.1.6]
- The range of work-based and sector-relevant assessments offered to students in Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies. [Paragraph 4.2.3]
- The positive response of each of the subject areas to the COVID-19 Pandemic. [Paragraph 4.4.3]
- The quality of administrative support and sense of community within the MPA and technical support team. [Paragraph 6.1.2]

## **10. Recommendations for further enhancement**

10.1.1 The recommendations for enhancement detailed in the table below are aligned to the four key thematic sections of the Reflective Analysis as follows, with the recommendations listed in order of priority within each section:

- Strategy for development
- Learning and teaching and enhancement
- The student voice
- Supporting student wellbeing

## Periodic Subject Review of Film & Television Studies, Theatre Studies, and the Centre for Cultural Policy Research

### RECOMMENDATIONS

THEMATIC ACTIVITY: (Section 1: Strategy for development)	Enhancement benefits	For the attention of	For information
<i>Teaching space, equipment and IT support requirements</i>			
<p>The Review Panel <b>recommends</b> that the College of Arts works with the School of Culture and Creative Arts and University Estates to identify ways in which each of the subjects' teaching space, equipment, and technical support staffing requirements can be secured to enable them to meet the demand for production-based courses and support future growth.</p>	<p>Ensuring that each of the subject areas is able to meet current and future demand for programmes.</p> <p>Ensuring that students have the space and equipment required to support their learning.</p>	<p>Head of School, Head of Film &amp; Television Studies, Head of Theatre Studies, Director of the Centre for Cultural Policy Research</p> <p>Director of University Estates</p> <p>College of Arts Management Group</p>	
<p>The Review Panel <b>recommends</b> that the School of Culture and Creative Arts works with the College of Arts and Information Services to outline the requirements of Film &amp; Television Studies for licensed content and subscription-based streaming services to ensure that all students are able to access these resources. The Review Panel also <b>recommends</b> that the other subject areas are able to feed into this process and outline their IT and software requirements.</p>	<p>Allows students to access the resources required for learning.</p> <p>Reduces inequality of access amongst students.</p>	<p>Head of School, Head of Film &amp; Television Studies, Head of Theatre Studies, Director of the Centre for Cultural Policy Research</p> <p>Director of University Estates</p> <p>Director of Information Services</p> <p>College of Arts Management Group</p>	
<i>Student caps and English language requirements</i>			
<p>The Review Panel <b>recommends</b> that the Head of School and Heads of Subject continue to meet with Planning, Insights and Analytics (PIA), and External Relations to identify suitable caps for programmes and set appropriate English language requirements for international students, noting the concerns of teaching staff about the Duolingo English language</p>	<p>Ensures that students can be adequately supported on their degree programmes.</p> <p>Reduces staff workloads.</p>	<p>Head of School, Head of Film &amp; Television Studies, Head of Theatre Studies, Director of the Centre for Cultural Policy Research</p> <p>Director of External Relations</p>	

test. The Review Panel also <b>recommends</b> that the School and each of the subject areas works with PIA and External Relations to formulate plans for diversifying student recruitment pools.		Director of Planning, Insights & Analytics	
<i>Decolonising the curriculum</i>			
The Review Panel <b>recommends</b> that Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies updates students more regularly on their plans to decolonise the curriculum, and involves students more in their discussions about diversifying the curriculum and enhancing staff diversity.	Improved communication between staff and students. Making students feel more involved in the decision-making process in each subject.	Head of School, Head of Film & Television Studies, and Head of Theatre Studies	
<b>THEMATIC ACTIVITY: (Section 2: Learning and teaching enhancement)</b>	<b>Enhancement benefits</b>	<b>For the attention of</b>	<b>For information</b>
<i>Developing graduate attributes</i>			
The Review Panel <b>recommends</b> that Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies provides more information to undergraduate students at an earlier point in their degree programme about placement, internship and networking opportunities with employers, and opportunities to attend industry-related workshops and seminars. The Review Panel also <b>recommends</b> that Film & Television Studies and Theatre Studies draws on its extensive alumni network in order to assist them with this work.	Enhances graduate attributes and employability. Allows students to make strategic decisions about which courses to take. Gives students a sense of the range of career opportunities available.	Head of School, Head of Film & Television Studies, and Head of Theatre Studies	
<i>Assessment mapping</i>			
The Review Panel <b>recommends</b> that each of the subject areas undertakes an assessment mapping exercise to ensure that assessment deadlines are adequately spaced, and that feedback is received in advance of subsequent assessments. The Review Panel also <b>recommends</b> that each of the subject areas reviews assessment literacy and considers providing students with more formative	Reduces the clustering of assessment deadlines, and reduces the pressure on students. Allows students to learn from their feedback and improve the quality of their work.	Head of School, Head of Film & Television Studies, Head of Theatre Studies, Director of the Centre for Cultural Policy Research, and Dr Kimberly Davis (Academic & Digital Development)	

assessment opportunities, and that they review their feedback sheets to ensure that assessment marks and written feedback are consistent.			
<i>Support for Graduate Teaching Assistants, early-career staff, and staff workloads</i>			
The Review Panel <b>recommends</b> that each of the subject areas reviews the guidance, support and mentoring arrangements for Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) and external tutors, the preparation time that GTAs and external tutors are paid for, and explores the possibility of providing these staff with student feedback via EvaSys. The Review Panel also <b>recommends</b> that each of the subject areas develops a plan for integrating GTAs and external tutors into the subject's learning and teaching community, and provides increase opportunities for involvement (paid or unpaid) in subject and School-level learning and teaching meetings.	<p>Improves engagement amongst Graduate Teaching Assistants and external tutors.</p> <p>Allows Graduate Teaching Assistants and external tutors to feel valued and have a sense of belonging in their subject/School.</p> <p>Improves cohesion within subjects/Schools.</p> <p>Improves the consistency of the student learning experience.</p> <p>Enhances the career prospects of Graduate Teaching Assistants and external tutors.</p>	<p>Head of School, Head of Film &amp; Television Studies, Head of Theatre Studies, and Director of the Centre for Cultural Policy Research</p> <p>Richard Lowdon (Senate Office)</p>	
The Review Panel <b>recommends</b> that the College, School, and each of the subject areas reviews their workload models to ensure that practical teaching, and PhD and MSc dissertation supervision is adequately accounted for, and that early-career staff undertaking the PGCAP are able to take advantage of the recommended workload reductions for years one and two of the programme.	<p>Allows for a fairer distribution of workloads and helps to reduce inequalities.</p> <p>Enhances the career prospects of early-career staff.</p>	<p>Head of School, Head of Film &amp; Television Studies, Head of Theatre Studies, and Director of the Centre for Cultural Policy Research</p>	<p>Director of Academic &amp; Digital Development</p>

THEMATIC ACTIVITY: (Section 3: The student voice)	Enhancement benefits	For the attention of	For information
<i>Closure of feedback loops</i>			
<p>The Review Panel <b>recommends</b> that each of the subject areas liaises with the Senate Office to develop a strategy for increasing student response rates for EvaSys course evaluation surveys, and that the subject areas that are not already doing so should explore the possibility of sending mid-semester surveys to students to enhance student engagement. To facilitate the closure of feedback loops, the Review Panel also <b>recommends</b> that the subject areas develop a mechanism to ensure that Summary and Response Documents are completed for all courses where response rates are statistically significant, and that Staff Student Liaison Committee minutes are recorded and made available to all students. The subject areas should also ensure that there is effective communication of the actions taken in response to feedback to both students and staff.</p>	<p>Improves response rates for course evaluation surveys and ensures that a more representative sample of student feedback is received.</p> <p>Allows staff to make changes to programmes in response to student feedback.</p> <p>Allows staff to demonstrate how they have responded to student feedback.</p> <p>Enhances student engagement with programmes.</p>	<p>Head of School, Head of Film &amp; Television Studies, Head of Theatre Studies, Director of the Centre for Cultural Policy Research</p> <p>Richard Lowdon (Senate Office)</p>	
THEMATIC ACTIVITY: (Section 4: Supporting student wellbeing)	Enhancement benefits	For the attention of	For information
<i>Student wellbeing support</i>			
<p>The Review Panel <b>recommends</b> that the subject areas clarify lines of responsibility for academic and non-academic student support. As part of this work, the Review Panel recommends that each of the subject areas communicate with students about the support that can be provided by the College of Arts Advising team (Levels 1 and 2), the Honours Convener (Levels 3 and 4) and the new College of Arts Student Support Officers (SSOs), and that the subject areas liaise with the SSOs to ensure that they interface effectively with teaching staff, subject MPA and technical support staff, subject advisory</p>	<p>Improves the quality of academic and non-academic support provided to students.</p> <p>Reduces the pressure on MPA and technical support staff, and teaching staff.</p> <p>Clarifies the lines of responsibility for student support amongst staff in the School/subject area.</p>	<p>Head of School, Head of Film &amp; Television Studies, Head of Theatre Studies, and Director of the Centre for Cultural Policy Research</p> <p>College of Arts Student Support Officers</p>	



<p>staff, and University student support services. The Review Panel also <b>recommends</b> that each of the subject areas reviews the signposting of University support services such as Student Learning Development (SLD), Disability Services, Counselling &amp; Psychological Services (CAPS), and the College Student Support Officers, in programme handbooks, communications sent to students, and in induction lectures.</p>	<p>Provides students with greater clarity about who to contact for academic and non-academic support.</p>		
<p>The Review Panel <b>recommends</b> that the subject areas liaise with Counselling &amp; Psychological Services (CAPS) to outline their support requirements and highlight the difficulties that students have faced accessing the service.</p>	<p>Makes the University aware of the scale of mental health support required by students.</p> <p>Allows the University to adequately resource Counselling and Psychological Services.</p>	<p>Head of School, Head of Film &amp; Television Studies, Head of Theatre Studies, and Director of the Centre for Cultural Policy Research</p> <p>Director of Counselling &amp; Psychological Services</p>	
<p><i>Communication between staff</i></p>			
<p>The Review Panel <b>recommends</b> that each of the subject areas develops a strategy to improve communication between programme teaching staff, and reviews course content during programme-level PGT teaching meetings to ensure that teaching content is not duplicated</p>	<p>Reduces the duplication of course content.</p> <p>Improves the student learning experience.</p> <p>Provides students with greater clarity about who to contact for academic support.</p>	<p>Head of School, Head of Film &amp; Television Studies, Head of Theatre Studies, and Director of the Centre for Cultural Policy Research</p>	