University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 28 May 2010

Departmental Programmes of Teaching, Learning and Assessment: Report of the Review of Department of History of Art held on 5 February 2010

Mrs Lesley Fielding, Clerk to the Review Panel

Review Panel:

Professor John Coggins	Pro Vice Principal, Convener
Dr Tom Tolley	University of Edinburgh, External Subject Specialist
Mr Derek Bentley	Students' Representative Council
Dr Susan Stuart	Department of HATII
Dr Gordon Hay	Senate Assessor on Court
Dr Mary McCulloch	Learning and Teaching Centre
Mrs Lesley Fielding	Senate Office

1.   Introduction

1.1   The Department of the History of Art is located in 7/8 University Gardens and is part of the Faculty of Arts

1.2   The Department was the top ranked History of Art Department in the UK in the 2008 Research Assessment Exercise (RAE). The RAE recognises the quality of the Department's research profile which encompasses the 'international' band in terms of quality, with 85% being deemed 'world leading' (4*) or 'internationally excellent (3*), with 15% being 'internationally recognised (2*).

1.3   The previous internal review of the Department's programmes of teaching, learning and assessment took place in February 2004.

1.4   The Self Evaluation Report (SER) had been prepared by two senior members of staff and had been circulated to administrative and academic members of staff.

1.5   The Review Panel met with the Dean, Professor Murray Pittock, the Head of Department, Professor Nick Pearce and Professor Robert Gibbs. Dr Genevieve Warwick, the lead author of the SER, was not available to meet the Panel. The Review Panel also met with 13 members of staff, including 1 probationary member of staff, 3 Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs), 6 postgraduate students and 6 undergraduate students, representing all levels of the Department's provision.

2.   Background Information

2.1   The Department of the History of Art has 18 academic staff, including the Head of Department, supported by two Departmental Administrators and two Resource Centre Managers (job share). 13 Graduate Teaching Assistants are employed by the Department.

2.2   Student numbers for 2009-10 were as follows:

Students	Headcount
Level 1	176
Level 2	90
Level 3	48
Honours	42
Undergraduate Total	356
Postgraduate Taught	26
Postgraduate Research*	33

*(for information only - research is not covered by the Review)

The Review Panel considered the following range of provision offered by the Department.

- MA Hons in the History of Art (Single and Joint)

- MLitt Decorative Arts & Design History

- MLitt History of Collecting and Collections

- MLitt Making and Meaning: Approaches in Technical Art History

- MLitt Art in the 19th Century: Revolution, Revival and Reform

- MLitt Art: Politics: Transgression: Twentieth-century Avant-Gardes

The Department contributes at Level 1 and 2 to the MA (General Humanities) degree and is a core subject of the designated degrees in European Civilisation, Creative & Culture Studies and Historical Studies. The Department also contributes to the MLitt Medieval and Renaissance Studies

3.   Overall aims of the Department's provision and how it supports the University Strategic Plan

3.1   The Review Panel noted the Department's overall aims which were appropriately linked to the University's Strategic Plan and Learning and Teaching Strategy.

4.   An Evaluation of the Student Learning Experience

Aims

As stated in the SER, the aims of the Department's undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes are clearly laid out in programme specifications. The aims of all programmes take account of relevant benchmarks and other external reference points.

The Review Panel **commends** the Department on the courses offered which address the intellectual development of the students. At the meeting with undergraduate and postgraduate students, the students expressed their satisfaction with their experience and viewed the Department positively.

4.1   Benchmarking and other external reference points

4.1.1 The Review Panel noted the individuality of the Department's identity and explored how such a profile enabled them to engage with the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) Benchmark statements. The Department provided evidence of compliance to benchmarking through their programme specifications. In response to the Panel's observation that only one Benchmark had been referred to in the SER, at the meeting with staff, the Junior Honours Methodology course was highlighted as an example of the practice of enquiry-led teaching. Whilst the Panel concurred with such observations, it considered that the Department might engage further with issues such as reflective learning and suggests the Department investigates this area further. The possibility of introducing Reflective Journals might be considered. It may be helpful to know that there has been an example of good practice in the Reflective Development and Learning in Programme Design.

4.2   Assessment, Feedback and Achievement

Student feedback

4.2.1 The Review Panel noted from the SER that the Department's failure to meet the three week deadline was a source of frustration amongst the undergraduate students. The late return of work was acknowledged by the staff when they met the panel. Whilst the main area of dissatisfaction lay at Levels 1 and 2, the Panel learned at the meeting with the students that some difficulties had also been experienced at Honours level. However, with regard to this particular issue, staff explained that the responsibility for collecting marked work at Honours level lay with the students. The Panel was concerned that this could be detrimental to the overall student experience and suggests that clear instructions be issued to students regarding the collection of work to avoid any misunderstanding.

While the Panel recognised the pressures on the Department it considered that the delivery of appropriate and timely feedback to students at Levels 1 and 2 required immediate attention. Accordingly, the Review Panel **recommends** that the Department review their procedures for the return of student work.

4.2.2 The Panel also considered it essential for the Department to review their practice of marking only within an individual's area of expertise. Changing this practice would increase the number of members of staff available to mark at Levels 1 and 2. At this level of study the notion that only relevant 'experts' can mark fairly and appropriately needs to be resisted. The possibility that all members of academic teaching staff could contribute to marking in all areas taught at these levels, thereby alleviating the current pressures on individuals and the resulting delays in the return of work, should be seriously considered by the Department. This issue will be discussed more fully under the Workload Model at point 4.6.2.

Anonymity

4.2.3 The issue of anonymity was discussed. The SER stated "Assessment of Honours essays and formative exercises at all levels is not anonymous". The Panel explored

this further at the staff meeting. The Panel learned that most of the Department considered that anonymous marking could disadvantage students. Despite the Department's arguments opposing complete anonymity, the Review Panel considered that this was inconsistent with Faculty policy. The Review Panel **recommends** that Department should review their policy on anonymous marking of Honours essays to ensure that they conform to the Faculty of Art's policy.

Undergraduate Examinations

4.2.4 The Review Panel sought clarification on the Department's procedures for the setting and approval of undergraduate examination papers which should ensure that students were not permitted to reuse material already addressed in coursework. The Panel learned that the practice varied within the Department and there was more a tacit understanding that examinations and essay questions should be fairly balanced than any official approval process. The Panel considered that this practice should be reviewed and the Department should consult their External Examiners on examination and essay questions. The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department should review their practice for the setting of examination and essay questions and implement official approval procedures.

Visual Test

4.2.5 The Review Panel discerned from discussions with the Level 1 and 2 undergraduate students that there was considerable confusion over what was required in the visual test. The students also expressed concern regarding the perceived variation in the level of support and guidance provided by different tutors for this test. The Review Panel explored this subject at the staff meeting and discerned that, whilst the test results did not reflect the students' lack of clarity, there was awareness that further deliberation on the visual test process would be required. It was evident from the Panel's discussions with the staff that there was a lack of consensus on what should constitute the structure and presentation of the visual test. The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department give serious consideration to identifying ways to clarify the test process and to ensure that all students are given an adequate level of preparation and support for the test.

4.3   Curriculum Design, Development and Content

Level 1 and 2

Essay Questions

4.3.1 During the Review Panel's meeting with the undergraduate students it emerged that the students found the Department's procedures for assigning essay topics both complicated and time consuming. The current process involved email notification to the students advising that essay questions had been posted on the Departmental notice board and required students to physically come into the Department in person to sign up for the essay of their choice. As numbers for each essay were restricted, students felt a sense of urgency in securing the topic of their choice. Whilst the Panel was assured of the Department's support for the students in this process, it concurred with the students' viewpoint that it was an inefficient practice and some students might be disadvantaged. The Review Panel strongly suggests that the Department explore other alternatives to the current system. The Department should also consider other options, such as Moodle, which could facilitate a sign up system whereby the essay topics are released on a set date. Alternatively, the Department could consider publishing the essay topics in the student handbooks at the beginning of the session, including a

specified date for signing up to an individual topic. The issue of the use of Moodle within the Department is further explored at point 4.7.3.

4.3.2 **Level 2 – Seminars and Tutorials**

During the Review Panel's meeting with the undergraduate students, the students expressed frustration with the number of seminars and tutorials at Level 2. The students compared their experience in Level 2 to that of Level 1 and considered that, in terms of seminars and tutorials, Level 2 was less challenging. Tutor absenteeism and lack of consistency in tutorials were also sources of dissatisfaction. From discussions at the Staff meeting the Panel noted that the recent restructuring of Level 1 had improved that course but there had been no corresponding changes to Level 2. The Panel considered that with regard to Level 2, it was important that students increasingly learned to self direct their studies and that it was imperative that sufficient stimulation and guidance be provided by the Department. Furthermore, such action should also contribute to the improvement of student retention rates. The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department increases the number of seminars and tutorials at Level 2, where possible. The Panel also **recommends** that the Department examine ways of increasing the contribution of Graduate Teaching Assistants in delivering seminars.

20th and 21st Century Courses

4.3.3 The Review Panel explored the reference within the SER to comments pertaining to the lack of dedicated courses in late 20th-21st century art and queried whether the Department had a strategy to address this deficit. The Head of Department advised the Panel that the Department was in consultation with the Department of Historical and Critical Studies of the Glasgow School of Art (GSA) with the aim of developing a joint course to cover these areas within the curriculum. It was anticipated that such collaborative work with a cognate institution would be invaluable to the Department. The courses would provide a wider range of levels from undergraduate to research. The undergraduate students concurred with the Panel's view that there was insufficient coverage of this area and advised that the one course offered was greatly oversubscribed. The Panel strongly supports the Department's initiatives in relation to the GSA and would urge the Department to expand their provision relating to 20th and 21st century art.

4.3.4 **Postgraduate students**

During the meeting with the postgraduate students, the Review Panel perceived some uncertainty and confusion with regard to the Research Methods course which was taught during the first semester. The students acknowledged the value of the course, but did not see the relevance at this stage of their studies and believed that it would have more significance if taught later in the session. Additionally, the students would have preferred the course to have taken a more practical approach. The Panel raised these issues with the staff who considered that it was imperative that the students undertook work that required a different level of effort which was crucial for progression. The staff conceded that the course taught generic skills and that perhaps further contextualisation was needed. The Review Panel suggests that the Department consider how to raise the students' understanding of the key aims of the course.

4.4 Student Progression, Retention and Support

Honours

4.4.1 The Review Panel discussed the general experience of Junior and Senior Honours at their meeting with students. The students enjoyed their studies within the Department

and expressed appreciation about the benefits of research-informed teaching. There were, however, some areas that the students found less satisfying and the Panel explored these in greater depth.

The students expressed frustration with regard to the lack of choice of subjects at Honours level with certain courses being oversubscribed. Senior Honours students were troubled by the Department's reluctance to permit students to select courses from Junior Honours, regardless if considered more relevant to their field of study. The Review Panel raised these issues at the staff meeting and noted that, due to the logistics of teaching commitments and simultaneously accommodating study leave, it was not possible to offer a wider range of topics. Staff also cited the variations in credit ratings between Junior and Senior Honours as a further reason for not permitting Senior Honours students to select these courses which were not of the appropriate depth for final year courses.

The Review Panel noted the Department's conviction of the real importance of progression in work from Junior to Senior Honours. However, the Panel held the view that it was important for the Department to offer Honours students a wider choice of courses that better reflected their interests. The Panel noted that the teaching element within the Department was currently under-resourced and this would be addressed under the Workload Model at point 4.6.2. The Panel **recommends** that the Department should review the number of Honours courses in order to ensure that the areas of study outwith the research expertise of staff are not excluded. Attention should also be given to the coordination of the Honours years' courses.

Portfolio Course

4.4.2 The Review Panel was interested in the newly introduced Portfolio course which addressed the vocational element within the undergraduate programme and explored this with the undergraduate students. Whilst the students appreciated the advice given on dissertation writing, they also articulated some frustration regarding other aspects of the course. However, the students recognised that this was a new course and would benefit from further development.

At the staff meeting, staff intimated that there had been a number of difficulties due to the labour intensive and time consuming nature of the course. The assessment tasks, in particular, had caused considerable difficulty in marking and, although the difficulties were still evident, it was thought that these would be resolved by next session. The staff were positive about the success of the Portfolio course at a base level, and concurred that it had had a beneficial effect on the students' work, particularly in the area of their dissertations. The Review Panel agreed that difficulties were inevitable for a new course and was confident that these complications would be remedied by next session

Dissertations

4.4.3 The Review Panel learned that the undergraduate students considered that the current deadline for dissertation proposals at the end of the second semester of Junior Honours was too late. The students would prefer the deadline to be set for the first semester. The Review Panel suggests that the Department should re-evaluate the timing of the proposal deadline to ascertain whether there would be advantages to an earlier deadline.

Postgraduate

Work Placement

4.4.4 The Review Panel **commends** the Department's Work Placement course where valuable work experience is gained in a museum, gallery or other cultural institution. At the meeting with postgraduate students, it emerged that these work placements

have been most successful. The students were appreciative of the quality and status of the establishments involved and viewed the placements as an invaluable experience both in relation to their current studies and career development. The students also expressed appreciation of the Department's sympathetic approach to their other commitments when arranging the Work Placements.

Student Recruitment

4.4.5 The Review Panel considered that increased student recruitment would benefit the Department's income substantially which in turn would present opportunities for additional positions to be created both at teaching and administrative levels. The Panel considered that the proposed collaboration with the Glasgow School of Art would be beneficial in terms of student recruitment. The Panel **recommends** that the Department review their student recruitment strategy with the formulation of a strong business plan.

4.5 The Quality of Learning Opportunities

Visits to Art Galleries

4.5.1 The Review Panel noted, from the SER, that the Department had suspended student visits to the National Galleries of Scotland. The Panel learned that the Department considered that, since there was a substantial pool of resources available in Glasgow, it was not necessary for students to travel to Edinburgh for a rich learning experience. The considerable resources were evident from the access that students had to "behind the scenes" collections with a number of the Glasgow galleries. Such resources enabled them to engage with the objects on a more detailed level. The undergraduate students were enthusiastic about the many galleries and resources that were available in Glasgow but expressed a preference for more organised visits to galleries, particularly to the National Galleries. A student with experience of such visits at Levels 1 and 2, prior to their cessation, had found them to be most valuable.

The Panel agreed that there were vast resources available in Glasgow and urged the Department to ensure that the students fully engaged with the excellent resources available at the Hunterian Museum and other local galleries. However, the Panel **recommends** that the Department reassess the suspended visits to the National Galleries in Edinburgh as these also provided a wealth of resources. Additionally, these visits would contribute to the overall student learning experience, providing an opportunity for students to engage both intellectually and socially with their fellow students. If the Department had concerns about the financial implications of reintroducing these visits, there were a number of options the Department could employ such as the introduction of self study assignments which required the students to organise their own trips both locally and further afield. This could be done through Moodle and the Learning and Technology Unit of the Learning and Teaching Centre would be able to advise on such tasks.

4.6 Resources for Learning and Teaching (Staffing)

Teaching Process

4.6.1 The Review Panel applauded the benefits that the Department's status as a research-led Department has achieved. The Panel was pleased to note that, contrary to the impression portrayed in the SER, the Department has engaged with teaching practice on a research level. However, from the discussions with staff and students, the Panel considered that the Department's research-driven teaching ethos had created an imbalance in the teaching process, with staff acting individually and less as a cohesive unit. There was evidence the Department was trying to address this issue, but the Panel considered that more support and focus was required to achieve meaningful

change. The Panel **recommends** that the Department undertake a review of their teaching provision across all levels of provision to establish a more even equilibrium between research and teaching.

Workload Model

4.6.2 The Review Panel was concerned to note that the workload model was completed individually by staff members with no contribution from the Head of Department. On close scrutiny, the Panel discerned that there were major discrepancies in the current model and this should be corrected as a matter of urgency. Through wider discussions, the Panel noted that the Department's current practice of staff marking only within their specific area of expertise, created considerable variation in staff workloads. The Panel considered that at Levels 1 and 2, this was an unnecessary practice and that all staff should be able to undertake marking, thereby allowing a fairer distribution of work. This could be achieved by forming teams of markers who follow an agreed marking scheme. The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department modify its current marking practice with the aim of introducing an equitable distribution of the marking load at Levels 1 and 2.

Staffing - Graduate Teaching Assistants

4.6.3 The Review Panel was pleased to note the Graduate Teaching Assistants' (GTAs) favourable comments on their experience of teaching in the Department. The GTAs indicated that they had ample opportunities to voice concern and felt fully included in the postgraduate community.

The Panel learned that the GTAs marked assignments at Levels 1 and 2 and that they were also involved in seminar work and gave a limited number of lectures at Levels 1 and 2. This was important to the development of their teaching experience. The Review Panel observed that by increasing the number of lectures undertaken by the GTAs the workload of the teaching staff could be significantly eased and the GTAs would gain valuable additional teaching experience. However, the Panel appreciated that the GTAs were already stretched and suggests that the best way to deliver this additional teaching support and enhanced teaching experience for the GTAs would be to increase their number. Whilst the Panel appreciated the financial implications of such a move, the Panel **recommends** that the Department should ask the Faculty to provide extra funding for the recruitment of additional GTAs. This will have the double advantage of reducing the work load of the academic staff and increasing the teaching opportunities for PhD students in the Department.

4.6.4 The GTAs expressed their dissatisfaction with the University's level of remuneration and the terms and condition of their employment contract. They were paid only for the hours they taught and received no remuneration for preparation time. Additionally, in some instances, research contracts had been suspended during the summer period which was considered to be particularly damaging to any research work undertaken. The Review Panel considered that GTAs provide essential support to Departments and **strongly recommends** that the employment conditions and remuneration for Graduate Teaching Assistants be revised to reflect the invaluable contribution of their role to teaching and learning within the University.

4.6.5 The GTAs were satisfied with their training, however, further to comments made at the Undergraduate and Postgraduate students meetings concerning the variation in quality of tutors, the Panel considered that some more structured mentoring would be valuable in this connection. Therefore, the Panel suggests that the Department provide more guidance to GTAs in preparing for tutorial work.

Staffing – Probationary Staff

4.6.5 The probationary member of staff with whom the Review Panel met had been at the University for only three weeks, however, her first impressions were very positive. She

had started the New Lecturer and Teacher Programme and has had some Moodle training.

Staffing - Administrative Staff

4.6.6 The Review Panel noted, from both groups of students, the invaluable support and advice provided by the two administrative staff within the Department. This contributed to the positive perception of the Department. However, the Panel also noted from wider discussions with staff that the administrative staff had a heavy workload and it was essential for some additional support to be provided. The Panel considered that the forthcoming restructuring may present opportunities for additional support and **recommends** that this issue should be explored with the other Departments who will form part of the School of Creative Arts and Culture. Additionally, new staff appointments could be possible from income raised from increased student recruitment. This was discussed further at point 4.4.5.

4.7   Resources for Learning and Teaching (Other Resources)

Physical Resources

4.7.1 The Review Panel was made aware during a conducted tour of the Department's accommodation at 7/8 University Avenue that there was no disabled access to the building. This issue had been raised in the previous review and, at that time, it was concluded that due to the nature of the building it was impractical to implement disabled access. The Review Panel considered this was unacceptable. Disabled access could be possible at the rear of the building. The Review Panel **recommends** that the building at 7/8 University Gardens should be inspected with the purpose of refurbishment to permit wheelchair access.

ARTstor

4.7.2 The Review Panel explored the issue of the resource ARTstor which had been discontinued as outlined in the SER. The External Panel member advised that ARTstor offered over one million images in its digital library and that the package had been greatly improved over recent years. At the meetings with undergraduate and postgraduate students, both groups of students agreed they would welcome the addition of ARTstor. At the staff meeting, concern was expressed that, if ARTstor was available, the students might overlook other resources. Staff also advocated the resources available through Moodle, which contained almost 80,000 images and the Resource Centre's wide collection of slides which were being digitalised. The Review Panel acknowledged that there was a wealth of information available in-house, but emphasised that, given the Department's profile and prominence within the United Kingdom, it should have access to a superior resource centre. Student reliance on one particular resource could be circumvented by providing links on Moodle directing students to other areas. The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department explore the possibility of acquiring ARTstor as well as investigating the possibility of gaining access to the Auction House databases for student use.

Moodle

4.7.3 The Review Panel ascertained from the Department's SER and through consultations with both undergraduate and postgraduate students that the usage of Moodle within the Department varied considerably, discerning that current usage was optional. Both groups of students commented on the inconsistency of usage by staff members and considered that all staff should be strongly encouraged to use Moodle effectively. Departmental staff acknowledged that the use of Moodle was an evolving process. Whilst the Review Panel was pleased to note this, it concluded that there was a greater need for all staff to engage with the package in a more uniform manner as student expectations for Moodle would continue to increase accordingly. Additionally,

the benefits of greater engagement by staff with Moodle would in turn capitalise on the students' every-increasing IT skills. The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department standardise the use of Moodle and invest time for training. The Review Panel would refer the Department to the Humanities Advanced Technology and Information Institute (HATII) for an example of Good Practice in this area.

Course Handbooks

4.7.4 From the course handbooks provided by the Department for Level 1 through to Senior Honours, the Review Panel considered that there were a number of areas within the handbooks that would benefit from revision. In general, the Panel noted that there was a lack of progression through the Levels as evidenced from the inclusion of "How to write a good essay" which was repeated at all levels except Level 1. The Panel considered that the guidance required on how to formulate an essay at Level 1 should have evolved by time it reached Junior and Senior Honours. The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department contact the Learning and Teaching Centre for further advice and for instances of Good Practice with regard to Handbooks.

Resource Centre

4.7.5 The Review Panel visited the Resource Centre as part of the tour of the Department's facilities. Whilst all students expressed the view that the Resource Centre was helpful, the postgraduate students were the main users of the area. The undergraduate students tended to use the Resource Centre if they were unable to obtain books or reference material from the main library. Both groups had a minor criticism that there was no electronic catalogue. The staff advised the Panel that they were currently attempting to raise funds for developing an on-line catalogue but that it was a work in progress. The Panel suggests that the Department endeavour to speed up the digitalization of the slide collection and modernisation of the catalogue.

5. Maintaining the Standards of Awards

The Review Panel was satisfied with the Department's provision in this area.

6. Assuring and Enhancing the Quality of the Students' Learning Experience

Employability and PDP

6.1.1 The Review Panel had noted that there was no mention of Personal Development Plans (PDP) or Employability within the Department's SER. However, through discussions with the Head of Department and Key staff, it became evident that the Department had engaged with these areas through initiatives such as Work Placements and the Portfolio Course. The Review Panel **commends** the Department for its Work Placement initiatives. However, the Panel was concerned that whilst there were pockets of PDP and Employability occurring, they were not being delivered widely across the programmes. The Panel considered that the introduction of these initiatives should be addressed at Level 1 onwards. These could take the form of peer-assisted learning with students providing each other with feedback. Moodle could be a pivotal instrument in such an initiative. The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department undertake to develop PDP and Employability through all levels of provision and suggests that the Department contact the Learning and Teaching Centre for examples of Good Practice.

Staff-Student Liaison Committee

6.1.2 The Review Panel enquired, at the meeting with staff, about the success of the Staff Student Liaison Committee (SSLC) and learned that the staff found it difficult to motivate students to become involved. Both groups of students were aware of the

SSLC meetings but were unclear as to the distribution of minutes or any follow-up action. The Panel considered that meeting once per semester was not adequate and, whilst they appreciated the Department's difficulties in recruiting students at an early stage, the Panel **recommends** that the Department hold the SSLC meetings more frequently, preferably twice per semester.

7.   Summary of Perceived Strengths and Areas for Improvement in Learning and Teaching

Key Strengths

- Excellent research rating

- Intellectually developed courses

- Approachable and helpful staff

- Excellent access to civic collections

- Excellent Work Placements for students

Areas to be improved or enhanced

- New Workload Model

- Equilibrium between research and teaching

- Overseas Student Recruitment

- Moodle

- Wider selection of courses and Junior and Senior Honours

- Increased engagement with Learning and Teaching principles

- Adoption of Good Practice from other Departments

Conclusions and recommendations

Conclusions

The Review Panel **commends** the Department on the overall scope and quality of its provision. The students and GTAs were overall very positive about the staff and the support they received within the Department. Despite the number of recommendations, the Panel was impressed with the level of commitment displayed by staff and students.

Recommendations[1]

The recommendations interspersed in the preceding report are summarised below. The recommendations have been cross-referenced to the paragraphs to which they refer in the text of the report. They are grouped by the areas for improvement/enhancement and are ranked in order of priority.

Resources for Learning and Teaching (Staffing)

Recommendation 1:

> The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department undertake a review of their teaching provision across all levels of provision to establish a more even balance between research and teaching. *[paragraph 4.6.1]*

> For the attention of: **The Head of Department**

Recommendation 2:

> The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department re-examine its current marking practice with the aim of introducing widespread marking by all staff at Levels 1 and 2 *[paragraph 4.6.2]*

> For the attention of: **The Head of Department**

Recommendation 3:

> The Review Panel **strongly recommends** that the employment conditions and remuneration for Graduate Teaching Assistants be revised to reflect the invaluable contribution of their role to teaching and learning within the University. *[paragraph 4.6.3]*

> For the attention of: **The Director of Human Resources**

The Dean of the Faculty of Arts *Recommendation 4:*

> The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department undertake a review of the role of GTAs with the aim of providing them with increased opportunities for lecturing experience and it **further recommends** that the Faculty provide additional funding for recruiting additional GTAs to ease the work loads of academic staff. [*paragraph 4.6.3]*

> For the attention of: **The Head of Department**

> **The Dean of the Faculty of Arts**

Recommendation 5:

> The Review Panel considered that there was a need for additional administrative support. The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department utilise the forthcoming

---

[1] Recommendations will be re-directed, as appropriate, once roles in new University structure have been finalised.

restructuring to explore opportunities for additional support with the other Departments who will form The School of Creative Arts and Culture. *[paragraph 4.6.5]*

For the attention of: **The Head of Department**

Assessment, Feedback and Achievement

Recommendation 6:

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department review their procedures for the return of student work. *[paragraph 4.2.1]*

For the attention of: **The Head of Department**

Recommendation 7:

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department reviews their policy on anonymous marking of Honours essays to ensure that they conform to the Faculty of Art's policy on anonymous marking. *[paragraph 4.2.3]*

For the attention of: **The Head of Department**

Recommendation 8:

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department should review their practice for the setting of examination and essay questions and implement official approval procedures for this process. *[paragraph 4.2.4]*

For the attention of: **The Head of Department**

Recommendation 9:

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department give serious consideration to identifying ways to clarify the visual test process and to ensure that all students are given adequate preparation for this test. *[paragraph 4.2.5]*

For the attention of: **The Head of Department**

Student Progression, Retention and Support

Recommendation 10:

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department should review the number of Honours courses in order to ensure that the areas of study outwith the research expertise of staff are not excluded. Attention should also be given to the coordination of the Honours years' courses. *[paragraph 4.4.1]*

For the attention of: **The Head of Department**

Recommendation 11:

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department consider ways and initiatives in which to increase student recruitment. *[paragraph 4.4.5]*

For the attention of: **The Head of Department**

The Director of Recruitment and International Office

Resources for Learning and Teaching (other Resources)

Recommendation 12:

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department standardise the use of Moodle and invest time for training. *[paragraph 4.7.3]*

For the attention of: **The Head of Department**

The Acting Director of Humanities Advanced Technology and Information Institute (HATII)

Recommendation 13:

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department explore the possibility of acquiring ARTstor as well as investigating the possibility of gaining access to the Auction House databases for student use. *[paragraph 4.7.2]*

For the attention of: **The Head of Department**

Recommendation 14

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department contact the Learning and Teaching Centre for further advice and for instances of Good Practice with regard to course handbooks. *[paragraph 4.7.4]*

For the attention of: **The Head of Department**

Faculty of Arts Representative, Academic Development Unit, Learning and Teaching Centre

Recommendation 15:

The Review Panel **recommends** that the building at 7/8 University Gardens should be inspected with the purpose of refurbishment to permit disabled access. *[paragraph 4.7.1]*

For the attention of: **The Director of Estates and Buildings**

The Head of Department

Assuring and Enhancing the Quality of the Students' Learning Experience

Recommendation 16:

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department undertake to develop PDP and Employability through all levels of provision and suggests that the Department contact the Learning and Teaching Centre for examples of Good Practice. *[paragraph 6.1.1]*

For the attention of: **The Head of Department**

Faculty of Arts Representative, Academic Development Unit, Learning and Teaching Centre

Director of the Careers Service

Recommendation 17:

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department hold the Staff-Student Liaison Committee meetings more frequently aiming for two per semester. *[paragraph 6.1.2]*

For the attention of: **The Head of Department**

The Quality of Learning Opportunities

Recommendation 18:

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department reassess the suspended visits to the National Galleries in Edinburgh. *[paragraph 4.5.1]*

For the attention of: **The Head of Department**

Curriculum Design, Development and Content

Recommendation 19:

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department increases the numbers of seminars and tutorials, where possible. *[paragraph 4.3.2]*

For the attention of: **The Head of Department**