

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Thursday 21 May 2015**The Glasgow School of Art: GSA Singapore / Singapore Institute of Technology Partnership Review**

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

Review Panel

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Professor Ken Neil | Head of Research (Convenor) |
| Ms Janet Allison | Head of Academic Registry |
| Ms Jill Hammond | Head of Student Support and Development |
| Professor Vicky Gunn | Head of Learning and Teaching |
| Mr Will Judge | President of the Students' Association |
| Professor Elizabeth Moignard | University of Glasgow Senate Representative |
| Mr Alistair Payne | Head of the School of Fine Art |

Attending

| | |
|------------------|----------------------------------|
| Ms Lisa Davidson | Senior Academic Registry Officer |
|------------------|----------------------------------|

The Review Event was held on Monday 2 February 2015**1. Introduction*****Background Information***

- 1.1 Since September 2012, GSA has delivered Years 3 and 4 of its Bachelor of Art (Hons) Programmes in Communication Design and Interior Design in Singapore, in partnership with the Singapore Institute of Technology (SIT) and Temasek Polytechnic (TP). The programmes enable Diploma students from one of Singapore's Polytechnics to progress from a Diploma to a Bachelor of Arts (Hons) degree.
- 1.2 Students studying in Singapore undertake the same programme of study as at GSA Glasgow, and resources and equipment according to GSA specifications, but also access to the additional specialist resources, equipment and workshops of TP.
- 1.3 Every student studying in Singapore has the opportunity to spend three weeks in Scotland at GSA through the Overseas Immersion Programme (OIP), working directly with their counterparts in the same programmes based in Glasgow. This credit-bearing component provides an opportunity to see the Degree Show, experience the history of Glasgow and GSA, be immersed in the local cultural and industrial context, and undertake location-specific projects.
- 1.4 Years 3 and 4 at GSA Singapore are equivalent to Years 3 and 4 of the same programmes delivered at GSA Glasgow.
- 1.5 Students graduate with the same award as students based at the Glasgow campus.
- 1.6 At the time of the Review, a number of key management posts were vacant. Since the end of 2013, the Deputy Head of the School of Design has acted as the

Academic Coordinator (0.6FTE) and Programme Leader for the BA (Hons) Communication Design (Singapore) programme (until December 2014). In addition, the post of Director, GSA Singapore became vacant in November 2014. Following a restructure of staffing in GSA Singapore, the School of Design recently advertised and appointed a new Academic Coordinator who would take up the post in May 2015. It is anticipated that a new Programme Director will be appointed by the end of March 2015 and in post by June 2015.

Early Partnership Review

- 1.7 The current session (2014/15) is the third year of operation of the partnership with SIT.
- 1.8 The Self Evaluation Report preparation was led by the Deputy Head of the School of Design, in conjunction with former Programme Director of GSA Singapore and the Programme Leader for the BA (Hons) Interior Design.
- 1.9 In addition to the Self Evaluation Report, the School of Design made available to the Review Panel copies of the Programme Monitoring and Annual Reporting documentation, Staff Student Consultative Committee minutes or action points, Operation Committee minutes and staff organisational charts. Also available to the Review Panel were copies of the GSA Singapore Risk Register and notes from the Singapore Development Group.
- 1.10 Based on their consideration of the documentation submitted by the School of Design, the Review Panel identified topics to be explored further with students and staff during the Review Event. These topics covered a range of items and included the following:
 - The student experience of the Overseas Immersion Programme;
 - Exploring the implications of the reflective document's early insistence on the equivalence/identity of GSA Singapore student experience, courses, and assessment with those at GSA in Glasgow;
 - The students' experience of assessment (focusing on assessment methods and their understanding of the assessment criteria) and feedback;
 - Student Representation and facilitation of student engagement for students at GSA Singapore;
 - How the infrastructure of Board of Studies, Programme Meetings and the Operations Committee work together systematically;
 - Student support services and systems in an essentially out sourced context and how this impacts on the nature of programme level support;
 - The links between theory and practice and how they are encouraged in the learning environments.
- 1.11 During the Review Event, the Review Panel met with:

GSA Glasgow

Professor Irene McAra-McWilliam, Head of the School of Design

Ms Barbara Ridley, Deputy Head of the School of Design

Ms Pam Flanagan, Lecturer in Interior Design

Mr Patrick Macklin, Programme Leader, BA (Hons) Interior Design

Mr Nicholas Oddy, Joint Acting Head of Forum for Critical Inquiry

Mr Steve Rigley, Acting Programme Leader, BA (Hons) Communication Design

GSA Singapore (via skype)

Dr Jesse O'Neil, Lecturer in Forum for Critical Inquiry and additional teaching into Interior Design

Mr Paul Hume, Lecturer in Communication Design

Mr Michael Tan, Lecturer in Communication Design

Ms Nadia Wagner, Lecturer in Interior Design

Singapore Institute for Technology (via skype)

Dr Terence Heng, Deputy Programme Director, contributing to the delivery of Design Domain and Forum for Critical Inquiry courses.

Mr Jawn Lim, Deputy Programme Director, contributing to the delivery of Interior Design and Forum for Critical Inquiry courses.

GSA Singapore Class Representatives (via skype)

Mr Louis Teo Yi Wei, Year 4, Communication Design

Mr Leon Yeo Hai Tian, Year 4, Communication Design

Ms Yee Tan Sin, Year 4, Communication Design

Ms Cherie Hee Ruizhi, Year 3, Communication Design

Mr Benedict Ong Boon Wei, Year 4, Interior Design

Ms Ariff Zuhairah Binte Mohamad, Year 4, Interior Design

Ms Liang Qing-An, Year 3, Interior Design

Ms Melati Idayu Binte Zainal, Year 3, Interior Design

- 1.12 The Review Panel considered the following undergraduate provision offered by GSA Singapore:

BA (Hons) Communication Design (Singapore)

BA (Hons) Interior Design (Singapore)

- 1.13 Student numbers for session 2014/15 are as follows:

| Programme (Years 3 and 4) | FTE |
|--|------------|
| BA (Hons) Communication Design (Singapore) | 137 |
| BA (Hons) Interior Design (Singapore) | 92 |
| Total | 229 |

2. Meeting with the GSA Singapore Class Representatives

- 2.1 The Review Panel met with a group of Class Representatives to explore some of the topics detailed in section 1.9.

- 2.2 Of the group of students who met with the panel, five had undertaken the Overseas Immersion Programme (OIP) in June 2014, and they reported a very positive experience of their time at GSA Glasgow, enjoying in particular the opportunity to work with some of their peers in the Interior Design and Communication Design departments. There was, however, a sense that the students would prefer to attend during term time and interact with the cohort in Glasgow.

- 2.3 Some students expressed the view that following this very significant undertaking, they found that momentum generated by the experience was lost somewhat as they returned to Singapore during the summer vacation and were not engaged in the studio environment again until the start of the following academic session. In addition, the students who had attended the OIP in June 2014, and had been based in the Haldane Building, expressed the perception that students at GSA Glasgow had more studio space available to them to work in than that in GSA Singapore.
- 2.4 Those in Year 3 were looking forward to their trip in June 2015, noting in particular that they were keen to access the workshop facilities. In discussion with the Review Panel, it was clear that there was an element of uncertainty with regard to the itinerary for the 2015 OIP and the students expressed a desire for this information to be forthcoming to enable them to make plans accordingly.
- 2.5 The Review Panel explored the students' experience of assessment and it was clear from the discussion that they recognised the project brief as a key pedagogical form. Further, the students clarified that they were given clear criteria for the coursework to be submitted to a project brief but were unsure whether the External Examiners had access to this criteria to enable them to appropriately judge the students' work.
- 2.6 In exploring the format of critiques, it was apparent that students at GSA Singapore were more used to panel critiques rather than peer reviews. The students recognised the importance of critiques as a valuable form of formative feedback and were interested in the notion of holding asynchronous critiques with peers at GSA Glasgow.
- 2.7 The Review Panel explored with the students their understanding of the links between theory and practice encouraged in the learning environments. It was clear from discussions that not all students perceived clearly the crossover from studio to theory material.
- 2.8 The Review Panel were pleased to note that the students felt they were listened to and they considered that the Student Staff Consultative Committee was working well. In addition, the relative small size of the cohorts meant that as well as systematised feedback lines, informal feedback could be given to staff at a local level which facilitated the expedient resolution of minor issues. A positive example of the effectiveness of student feedback was provided by the students where they had requested additional workshops in studio and which were provided expediently.
- 2.9 The students provided detailed feedback regarding their access to the workshops at Temasek Polytechnic. The main issue focused on the difficulties students had experienced in accessing the workshops, describing a process which involved submitting a request form two days in advance regarding materials, then submitting a further request form to access the workshop facilities. The students expressed their frustration at this process which had left them feeling second to students at Temasek Polytechnic who seemed to be given priority. Students also highlighted that the academic calendars for GSA Singapore and Temasek Polytechnic were not synchronised, and that there had been occasions when they had not been allowed to access the workshop facilities as they were closed for maintenance. In addition, the Interior Design students felt that the restrictions on what they could make in the studios did not facilitate the exploration of materials.
- 2.10 Students who had accessed GSA's workshop facilities during the OIP, offered this as a comparison, and in particular highlighted that they valued the access to the screen printing and letter press facilities.
- 2.11 The Review Panel explored with the students how connected they felt with the student body at GSA Glasgow. It was clear from discussions that the students were keen to foster links, both with peers within their departments, and also with the wider

student population generally. Students were eager to participate virtually in activities on the GSA Glasgow campus which they felt would facilitate greater understanding and collegiate activity. The President of the Students' Association, in particular, was keen to identify ways in which the GSASA could support this endeavour. Initial suggestions for improving access included the live-streaming or videoing of events, lectures and workshops and utilising IT such as skype to create a platform for discussion between students in Singapore and Glasgow.

- 2.12 The Self-Evaluation Report confirmed that overall responsibility for student support resides with the Singapore Institute for Technology and is accessed through Temasek Polytechnic resources. The Review Panel explored the students' experience of the student support services available to them. The students reported that the IT support available to them had greatly improved since moving to the new campus, which was in great measure, owing to their proximity to IT Support. It was also clear from these discussions, that they felt able to approach GSA Singapore staff if they were experiencing problems with academic work, and reported that they also asked for advice from fellow students. Students highlighted that the GSA Singapore staff responded quickly to emails. Students were less clear regarding how they accessed other support services such as Counselling or Welfare. The Review Panel considered that, in light of the reported access issues to the technical facilities, it would be appropriate to explore this issue in greater detail.

3. Meeting with GSA Singapore and SIT Academic Staff

- 3.1 The Review Panel met with a group of GSA Singapore and SIT academic staff, along with the Deputy Head of the School of Design to explore some of the topics detailed in section 1.9.
- 3.2 Staff at GSA Singapore were of the view that the Overseas Immersion Programme (OIP) was a very valuable and significant experience for the students. It was clear from discussions, that staff had received positive feedback from those who had undertaken the OIP, and that it enabled students to *"feel part of the vision of what they think being at GSA means"*.
- 3.3 In light of the feedback from the Student Representatives, the Review Panel explored the issue of the timing of when the OIP was held. Staff acknowledged that there had been recent debate regarding whether it would be possible to hold the OIP prior to starting Year 3 of the programme. Staff were of the view that to hold the OIP during term time would be disruptive for the students, in addition to which, it would be challenging to find appropriate accommodation at GSA Glasgow for almost two hundred additional students. The staff also considered that it was beneficial for the students to attend the Degree Show and that this stood them in good stead for the start of their final year. It was clear from discussions, that staff had devoted considerable thought to how to resolve this issue in the best interest of the students.
- 3.4 The Review Panel had a wide ranging discussion regarding GSA Singapore's approach to Assessment and Feedback, and in particular explored how students understood the assessment criteria. Staff reported that they monitored this by holding regular review meetings and it was clear from discussions that the enhancement of learning and teaching was embedded in their approach.
- 3.5 It was also clear from discussions, that staff recognised they were operating within some significant constraints and they highlighted a number of issues which had impacted including staff retention in Singapore; large student numbers; the management of timetabling issues, and the reality of students in Singapore coming in with different prior educational experiences to those coming into Glasgow.

- 3.6 It was apparent at the meeting that GSA Singapore and SIT academic staff considered they were a cohesive team and worked together to address issues, both academic and operational as they occurred. It was less clear from discussions as to what extent GSA Singapore staff identified themselves as part of the wider Programme Team at GSA Glasgow.
- 3.7 The Review Panel explored aspects of staff development with the academic staff, most of whom had attended the Learning and Teaching event hosted by University of Glasgow Singapore in 2014. All the staff reiterated that they were keen to complete GSA's Postgraduate Certificate in Learning and Teaching and were receptive when the Head of Learning and Teaching highlighted that she would be in Singapore scoping the delivery of the programme in September 2015.
- 3.8 The Review Panel explored the measures which had been put in place following the number of final year fails at summative assessment in June 2014. While it was clear that staff were aware of the GSA Code of Assessment and the degree regulations, it was less apparent in the discussions what steps had been taken to ensure that students have since been made fully aware of the implications of failing their 100 Credit Studio course in Final Year. While the Deputy Head of the School of Design was confident that the students had been given a thorough induction regarding this and that applicants were being advised accordingly at interview, staff in Singapore were less forthcoming on this issue which was of concern to the Panel.
- 3.9 The Review Panel explored the extent to which the links between theory and practice were clarified to students. The staff highlighted that the small staff numbers meant that Studio and Forum for Critical Inquiry were being taught by the same people. The staff were of the view that this crossover was valuable, facilitating a powerful connection between theory and practice. This practice of co-teaching Studio and FoCI assists students in integrating the two aspects in their degree studies.
- 3.10 The Review Panel had a detailed discussion with staff regarding the operation of the Staff Student Consultative Committee. While it was clear that student feedback from this forum was being fed-back appropriately to the School of Design Board of Studies it was also evident that issues raised, in the main, related to operational or housekeeping concerns. The Review Panel suggested that the Staff Student Consultative Committee could be utilised further to enhance the curriculum development of the programmes.
- 3.11 The staff highlighted some of the alternative methods used to illicit student feedback, and it was evident that students were given frequent opportunities to feedback on the teaching on the programme, completing feedback questionnaires on a frequent basis which were then evaluated by SIT. Staff reported that, while in post, the Director of GSA Singapore had access to the raw data from these surveys, but it was less apparent how this had been reported to the School of Design.
- 3.12 The staff corroborated the student feedback that access to technical facilities was an issue which caused frustration and they considered that it would require input at a management level to resolve this with Temasek Polytechnic.
- 3.13 The Review Panel explored the student support available to students with the staff. In addition to the services mentioned in the previous meeting, the staff highlighted that students had access to SIT's Academic Learning Centre, which delivered courses designed to enhance communication skills and provided writing guidance. The Review Panel welcomed this as a positive development, and considered that further detail on this resource would be helpful.

4. Meeting with the Head and Deputy Head of the School of Design

- 4.1 The Review Panel met with the Head and Deputy Head of the School of Design and gave further consideration to a number of topics which had been raised in the meetings with the students and staff based in GSA Singapore.
- 4.2 It was clear from discussions that the Overseas Immersion Programme (OIP) was considered one, if not the most positive feature of the offer and that staff at GSA Glasgow had worked hard to deliver a creative, cultural and professional experience for the students. The Deputy Head of the School of Design reported that student feedback on the OIP had been overwhelmingly positive and that its benefits were apparent on the students return to Singapore. To exemplify this, the Deputy Head of the School of Design described an instance where, as a result of their experience in the Studios at GSA Glasgow, in the first Staff Student Consultative Committee of 2014/15, Year 4 Interior Design students had asked for more workshops and hands-on creative activities in Studio which the Programme team were able to accommodate.
- 4.3 When the issue of the timing of the OIP was raised, while the Head and Deputy Head of the School of Design acknowledged that GSA Singapore students were keen to have more interaction with students at GSA Glasgow, that there was greater value in providing students making the transition from Year 3 to Year 4 with an opportunity to visit the Degree Show. In addition, the logistical issue of finding appropriate accommodation for more than a hundred students during term time was cited as a reason for holding the OIP out-with term-time.
- 4.4 In the course of discussions, the Review Panel highlighted the student perception that students at GSA Glasgow had more studio space available to them, which might be as a result of the fact that the whole of the Haldane Building had been made available to the cohort which visited in June 2014. It was agreed that student expectation with regard to studio space should be managed carefully and this should be taken into account when plans were developed for the OIP in June 2015.
- 4.5 The Review Panel led a wide-ranging discussion regarding Intended Learning Outcomes and the assessment criteria and the Deputy Head of the School of Design confirmed that the programmes delivered in GSA Singapore and GSA were identical, with project briefs contextualised as appropriate. The Deputy Head of the School of Design also confirmed that students at GSA Singapore were clearly briefed on the assessment criteria and they received a considerable amount of formative feedback, with written formative feedback being provided for every project.
- 4.6 The Review Panel explored how the School of Design could develop *partnership briefs* which would allow students in GSA Glasgow to work virtually with students at GSA Singapore to undertake and fulfill a shared project brief. The Review Panel recognised that the time difference and IT infrastructure presented logistical challenges, but considered that this should be an area of focus, which would bring benefits to both cohorts of students, and impact positively on emerging developments in Forres.
- 4.7 Further, the Review Panel considered that the School of Design should take steps to establish a student exchange programme which would allow students at GSA Glasgow to undertake a period of study at GSA Singapore, though it was acknowledged that there might be a resource implication in the short term. The Review Panel were pleased to note that plans for a student exchange programme were already in the early stages of development and considered that this should continue to be progressed in session 2015/16.

- 4.8 The Review Panel was also of the view that the School of Design should scope what opportunities there were to explore theorists emerging in Far East or Australasia noting, with interest, that when students were asked to name their favourite theorist, Viktor Papanek was the general consensus.
- 4.9 In discussions regarding the student access to technical facilities, it was clear that the School of Design was aware of the issues raised and had taken a number of steps to address this since the departure of the Director of GSA Singapore at the end of October 2014. While the Head of the School of Design acknowledged that the situation had been exacerbated by the departure of the Director of GSA Singapore, good progress had been made recently in rebuilding the association, in particular owing to positive engagement from the Programme Leader for Interior Design.
- 4.10 In relation to issues referred to in 4.9, the Review Panel explored the role of the Operations Committee, in particular regarding its management and oversight of the operation of the partnership. While it was clear that the Operations Committee was not the arena to address specific HR issues, the expectation that any impact on operational matters arising from HR issues should be understood and addressed at this level. The Review Panel considered that maintaining effective and harmonious communication between GSA Singapore, SIT and Temasek Polytechnic was fundamentally important to the successful continuation of the partnership.

5. Meeting with the Deputy Head of the School of Design and Academic Staff from GSA Glasgow

- 5.1 The Review Panel met with the Deputy Head of the School of Design, the Programme Leader of the BA (Hons) Interior Design, the Programme Leader of the BA (Hons) Communication Design, the Joint Acting Head of Forum for Critical Inquiry and a Lecturer in Interior Design. The Review Panel explored topics which had been raised in the previous meetings.
- 5.2 In line with earlier discussions, the academic staff were fulsome in their praise of the Overseas Immersion Programme (OIP), and considered it an invaluable experience for the students. They agreed that it provides them with an opportunity to build relationships with academic staff and students at GSA Glasgow, to experience the fabric of the city and engenders a sense of belonging.
- 5.3 The Lecturer in Interior Design, whom was closely involved in the development and delivery of the OIP in June 2014, highlighted that, as part of her research for her Postgraduate Certificate in Learning and Teaching, she had interviewed students regarding their views on the effectiveness of the OIP while in Glasgow and when they had returned to Singapore. The students provided highly positive feedback, in particular highlighting the importance of being in the physicality of GSA Glasgow which provided them with a real sense that they are part of the GSA legacy. Academic staff highlighted that on return from the OIP, students appeared more disposed to debate with staff, most noticeable by taking the opportunity to negotiate the terms of their final year project.
- 5.4 The Review Panel explored the timing of the OIP and the academic staff were of the view that the benefits of holding the OIP in conjunction with the Degree Show outweighed the other considerations. The academic staff highlighted that Design students from GSA Glasgow were employed as student ambassadors during the OIP and played an active role, not only in the studio, but also through social media and at a number of social events hosted by the School of Design over the three week period. In the course of discussions, it was suggested that the School of Design could give consideration to recruiting student ambassadors from the Mackintosh School of Architecture and the School of Fine Art which might provide GSA Singapore students with a wider view of GSA Glasgow.

- 5.5 The Review Panel were keen to explore whether there was an appetite for developing an Overseas Immersion Programme in Singapore for students from GSA Glasgow to participate in. The academic staff were clear that while this would be a positive aspiration for the long-term, they did have concerns that holding a similar OIP in Singapore would be highly resource intensive, both in terms of cost to the students and in the time it would take to develop a suitable programme. Academic staff appeared more optimistic that the development of a student exchange programme would be more achievable in the short to medium-term.
- 5.6 It was clear from discussions with the academic staff that there was enthusiasm for developing virtual briefs to facilitate collaborative project working between GSA Singapore and GSA Glasgow students. However, academic staff highlighted that the time difference and access to appropriate and reliable technology were issues which required resolution before this type of project working could become regularised.
- 5.7 The academic staff were candid regarding the challenges they had faced during a period of significant turnover in terms of studio staff, both in Glasgow and in Singapore and it was clear that academic staff were keenly anticipating the forthcoming appointments. Academic staff were also supportive of colleagues in GSA Singapore and were of the view that the small staff team which delivered across Studio, Forum for Critical Inquiry and Design Domain worked well.
- 5.8 The Review Panel explored assessment practices with the academic staff and noted that, while steps had been taken to assure as far as possible that they were the same as at GSA Glasgow, it was clear that the culture of student-centred peer-review was not prevalent. While it was recognised that students were more accustomed to Panel Reviews, the Review Panel explored ways in which virtual environments could be utilised to enable asynchronous critiques between students in Glasgow and Singapore and expressed the view that this should be an area of development in the future.
- 5.9 In relation to the programme provision, it was clear from discussions that academic staff had found that they needed to adapt their approach to delivering the curriculum within the terms of programme documentation. The Review Panel noted that while the programme and course documentation were identical to those for the programmes delivered in Glasgow, the content of the project briefs evidenced apposite academic difference in the application of project briefs to educational context. The Acting Joint Head of the Forum for Critical Inquiry highlighted the challenges faced by students coming from the polytechnic system, in particular with regard to the approach to theoretical and critical thinking and there was a perception that students in Singapore were enrolling with different prior educational experiences to those coming into Glasgow. Academic staff highlighted in particular the challenges faced by male students returning from undertaking their national service in the army, and it was recognised that these students might need support adjusting to a culture which actively encourages critical interrogation.
- 5.10 The Review Panel noted that initially a bridging programme had been considered, and it was clear that academic staff had taken deliberate steps to support students in the transition from polytechnic to higher education, particularly during in the steep learning curve at the start of Year 3.
- 5.11 The academic staff were of the view that the student representative system was active at a local level at GSA Singapore, with feedback from Staff Student Consultative Committees feeding into the School of Design Board of Studies as appropriate, but it was less clear how engaged students were in curriculum development. Staff also reported that GSA Singapore student representatives were highly organised and proactive, particularly in the fundraising and preparation for events such as the Degree Show.

- 5.12 The Review Panel explored the extent to which students at GSA Singapore had access to extra-curricular activities, such as those provided by the GSA Students' Association. While it was apparent through the discussion, that students had opportunities to participate and contribute to activities such as the 100 Day Show and the student magazine *Wolf*, this detail might have been better reflected in the self-evaluation report. The academic staff agreed that focus should be directed towards developing a virtual space which would allow greater student contact between Glasgow and Singapore.
- 5.13 It was clear from discussions that there was scope for staff between GSA Glasgow and GSA Singapore to develop ways of working together in a more integrated manner. Academic staff who had experience of teaching at GSA Singapore had described delivering lectures to big groups of students and staff, and they expressed a willingness to develop alternative ways of joining together with GSA Singapore staff to engage with students in smaller groups.
- 5.14 In line with earlier discussions regarding the student access to technical facilities, the Programme Leader for the BA (Hons) Interior Design programme reported that there had been good progress in terms of rebuilding relationships with Temasek Polytechnic and that there was now an opportunity to raise the concerns expressed by staff and students.

6. Consideration of the Self-Evaluation Report

- 6.1 The Review Panel noted that it was clear that the School of Design had approached the Review process including the Self Evaluation form in a conscientious manner. The Review Panel considered that a more reflective approach, with richer detail and more examples of the work undertaken in the development of GSA Singapore would have evidenced more effectively the student journey and that they could consider using this reflective approach for future programme monitoring exercises.

7. Identification of Good Practice and Dissemination Across GSA, as Appropriate

- 7.1 The Review Panel considered that the commendations set out in section 8 below represent good practice and invited Academic Council to consider how the GSA Singapore successes can be best disseminated for awareness and action cross-GSA.

8. Commendations

- 8.1 The Review Panel commended the School of Design on the following:

Commendation 1

- 8.2 The Review Panel noted that the students had reported a highly positive experience on the Overseas Immersion Programme and that it was clear from discussions that following their visit to GSA, students identified themselves with the Institution and were proud of this connection. The Review Panel commended the School of Design for its meticulous development of the Overseas Immersion Programme noting that considerable work had been undertaken in the organisation of this to ensure a positive student experience.

Commendation 2

- 8.3 The Review Panel considered that the Programme Teams at GSA Singapore should be commended on the way they had developed a cohesive and effective team with colleagues at SIT, highlighting in particular, the positive staff morale which was exhibited in the meeting.

Commendation 3

- 8.4 The Review Panel commended the Programme Teams at GSA Singapore for the integrated teaching approach which had been adopted and the way in which the small staff team delivered across Studio, Forum for Critical Inquiry and Design Domain. Given the significant structural changes currently under consideration at GSA Glasgow, the Review Panel considered that the School of Design may wish to explore ways in which this good practice could be shared with colleagues GSA-wide.

Commendation 4

- 8.5 The Review Panel considered that it was clear that forward looking enhancement of learning and teaching was part of the mindset for GSA Glasgow School of Design staff and commended the School of Design for creating the conditions for this to develop.

Commendation 5

- 8.6 The Review Panel commended the Programme Teams at GSA Singapore on the student facing extra-curricular activities, such as the 100 Days and 300 Days events which had developed in the course of the collaboration.

9. Conditions

- 9.1 The Review Panel made the undernoted conditions:

Condition 1

- 9.2 The School of Design should ensure that the Operations Committee meets, as agreed in the remit, twice per academic year. In addition, the School should maintain a watching brief to ensure that the Committee operated effectively to its remit, and managed issues arising in the operation of the partnership within this remit. This includes managing any issues raised as a consequence of HR-related matters.

Condition 2

- 9.3 The School of Design should review the nature of the workshop provision available to students and, if appropriate, approach Temasek Polytechnic with a view to negotiating a more balanced approach to access for GSA Singapore students.

Condition 3

- 9.4 The School of Design should clarify the nature and scope of the student support available to students. This should include consideration of how the student support is signposted and accessed by students.

Condition 4

- 9.5 The School of Design is required to provide a separate report to the Head of Academic Registry which detailed, in full, the issues which led to the 100 credit fails at Final Year summative assessment in June 2014. In addition to providing clarity on this matter, the report should detail how the School of Design responded at the time and what measures have been put in place to ensure that students and staff are aware of the consequences of a fail at this stage, informed by the current GSA regulations for degree provision in Singapore.

10. Recommendations

- 10.1 The Review Panel has made the undernoted recommendations:

Recommendation 1

- 10.2 The Review Panel recommended that the Programme Teams should focus and develop briefs that would foster collaboration and integration between students at

GSA Glasgow and GSA Singapore. In addition, the School of Design should consider how students could be better supported to link with peers on other programmes and that discussions with the President of the Students' Association would be a useful starting point.

Recommendation 2

- 10.3 In line with the discussion in section 4.6, the Review Panel recommended that the Programme Teams explore the usage of virtual environments, in particular to consider the holding of asynchronous critiques and developing partnership project briefs between different locations.

Recommendation 3

- 10.4 The Review Panel recommended that the School of Design should give consideration to how an exchange programme could be developed which would allow GSA Glasgow students the opportunity to visit GSA Singapore, although it was acknowledged that the resources required may not allow this in the short term.

Recommendation 4

- 10.5 The Review Panel recommended that the Programme Teams should endeavour to recognise design theorists emerging in the Far East (English and non-English speaking) in all GSA locations, in a manner which draws students into the idea that GSA's legacy as a design centre is still emerging.

Recommendation 5

- 10.6 The Review Panel recommended that the School of Design explore ways of delivering design education in different cultural contexts that operate to encourage internationalisation of the curriculum within GSA as a whole.

Recommendation 6

- 10.7 The Review Panel recommended that the School of Design should explore ways of using staff exchange in a systematic way to enhance staff development.

Recommendation 7

- 10.8 The Review Panel recommended that the School of Design should link with the Head of Learning and Teaching to undertake a mapping of all Intended Learning Outcomes against assessment criteria and course documentation.

11. Follow-up Reporting from the School of Design

- 11.1 The School of Design is invited to provide a brief report explaining how the conditions and recommendations have been, or will be, met to the May 2015 meeting of Academic Council. The report should include an action plan and timeline for addressing the conditions and recommendations set out in the Review Report. Progress will be reviewed as part of the action list discussions at subsequent meetings of the Undergraduate and Postgraduate Committee and Academic Council.

- 11.2 A formal report on the progress made in addressing the conditions and recommendations of the Review will be submitted to Academic Council (via Undergraduate and Postgraduate Committee) approximately one year from the date that the Panel's Report was received by that Committee. The School of Design should also report on the steps it has taken to feedback to students on the outcomes of the review and on the actions taken. The Convenor of the Review Panel will review the progress reports to ensure that the recommendations have been adequately addressed and reported, including evidence of dissemination of recommendations to students. Academic Council may request further follow-up reports in certain circumstances, for example, where progress has been limited or delayed.