University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 17 April 2015

Report from the Programme Approval Event held at Glasgow School of Art on 11 February 2015

PROGRAMME APPROVAL

Consideration of Master of Research

Approval Panel:	Professor Paul Anderson (Convenor), Ms Janet Allison, Mr John Ayers, Ms Jill Hammond, Mr Will Judge, Dr Daniel Livingstone, Professor Elizabeth Moignard, Professor Ken Neil, Mr Nicholas Oddy, Dr Alistair Payne, Ms Barbara Ridley.
Attending:	Dr Tim Sharpe, on behalf of MSA
Programme Proposal Team:	Professor Irene McAra McWilliam (Programme Proposer), Dr Emma Murphy (Proposed Programme Leader), Ms Madeline Smith (Head of Strategy, Institute for Design Innovation) Dr Martyn Evans (Director of Lancaster Institute of Contemporary Arts, Lancaster University, External Subject Specialist (written input only)), Ms Heather Baillie (Innovation Designer and GSA Graduate), Mr Sagar Ghoting (MDes Design Innovation and Service Design Student Representative), Ms Mafalda Moreira (PhD Design).
Secretary:	Ms Lisa Davidson, Academic Registry

Consideration

1.1 The Convenor welcomed the Panel and Programme Proposal Team and outlined the schedule of the meeting for UPC Programme Approval. The Convenor confirmed that any conditions set by the Approval Panel must be addressed by **24 February 2015**.

1.2 Further, the Convenor confirmed that, following consideration by the Approval Panel, any amendments deemed necessary to the approval documentation must be addressed in full, highlighted as appropriate and submitted to Academic Registry by **24 February 2015**.

1.3 The Head of the School of Design presented an overview of the development of the Master of Research programme, which had taken place between November 2014 and January 2015. The Approval Panel noted the rapid development of the programme and that this was to allow GSA to apply for a number of SFC-funded Master of Research places through the Digital Health Institute (DHI) Experience Lab project.

1.4 The Approval Panel noted that while the original Programme Proposal had proposed a Master of Research (Design), subsequently, following discussions at Executive Group level, it had been agreed that this should be developed as a Master of Research which could be offered GSA- wide. The Programme Approval documentation reflected this, however the Panel noted it was anticipated in the first year of operation, that the School of Design would be the lead.

1.5 The Approval Panel received positive feedback on the programme from the Student Representatives, all of whom offered differing perspectives relating to the potential appeal of the proposed offer. Mr Ghoting, in particular, offered a view which strongly

supported the School of Design's position that the Master of Research would be an attractive route for potential students interested in pursuing a professional Master degree though research (including placements in government, business or public services).

1.6   The Approval Panel noted that the External Subject Specialist was unable to attend the Programme Approval Event and had not provided sufficent written feedback in advance of the meeting. The Convenor highlighted that external subject specialist input to the process was mandatory and that, in the event that the specialist was unable to attend in person, exceptionally extensive written feedback was expected. The Approval Panel agreed that it should be a condition of approval that the External Subject Specialist provide written feedback on the Programme Approval documentation, for the Programme Team to reflect upon as appropriate.

1.7   The Head of the School of Design linked the development of the Master of Research with the GSA's ambition to grow its doctoral community by 25%. The Approval Panel noted the intention to create a platform for PhD growth, and that what was being proposed would enable a student to study on the Master of Research programme, and upon successful completion, they would be offered the opportunity to convert to Year 2 of GSA's PhD programme in a *1 + 2* model. The Programme Team provided assurances that in this case, the student would surrender their Master of Research award (i.e. not be awarded the Master of Research) and that there would be no double-counting of research. Further, that progression to Year 2 of the PhD would not be automatic, and that in order to be registered as a Year 2 PhD student, the student would be required to fulfil the existing criteria for the PhD scheme for progression. The Programme Team also confirmed that, in order to equate to the first year of the traditional PhD programme, all Master of Research students would conduct an equivalent level of Research Methods training.

1.8   The Approval Panel explored how the Programme Team envisaged the delivery of the Research Methods training. In response, the Programme Team confirmed that they would fulfil this core research training but, in line with the ethos of the proposed Master of Research, students would undertake this in a flexible, bespoke way, appropriate to the discipline of research. The student and Supervisory Team would, at the outset, formulate a detailed Research Training Plan which would draw upon a) existing provision at GSA (from the PhD Research Training Programme, the current MRes Creative Practices or the MDes Design Innovation); b) existing provision at Research Partner institutions such as University of Glasgow; c) online VLE content developed for this programme, or d) other specific provision identified by the student with their Supervisory Team appropriate to the discipline of enquiry.

1.9   In relation to 1.8 the Approval Panel considered that this was innovative approach and that it would be beneficial to explore whether the flexible Research Methods training model proposed might be adopted more widely for PhD students.

[Action: **Head of Research]**

1.10   The Programme Team confirmed that in terms of supervision, the Primary Supervisor would be drawn from GSA's existing pool of supervisors; the Co-Supervisor(s) might be a member of staff at GSA or may be a member of one of the institution's existing research partners, such as the University of Edinburgh or the University of Glasgow.

1.11   The Approval Panel had a detailed discussion regarding where students would be based, and in particular relating to the delivery of supervision. The Programme Team confirmed that, initially, students would be accommodated at GSA Glasgow. In the future, there would be potential for students to be based the Creative Campus in Forres and at GSA Singapore. The Head of the School of Design highlighted that, depending on the nature of the research project proposed, students could be based

in many locations and that arrangements would be made to deliver supervision outwith a GSA setting, as appropriate. While there was a resource implication in terms of time and cost for this, it was recognised that, particularly in terms of offering professional Master degrees, there was a need to adapt GSA practice in order to respond to the proposed market.

1.12 Related to 1.11 above, there was discussion regarding the Research Degrees Guidance, which had been approved by Academic Council in December 2014, in particular relating to the section which set out the time-allocation expectations for Supervisors and Co-Supervisors. The Approval Panel agreed that it was important in terms of managing student expectation, that the time allocation in terms of direct contact was clarified, but accepted that there may be variables, such as the nature of the research project, which may impact on this. The Approval Panel agreed that the level of detail provided might benefit from review however this should be undertaken in an appropriate forum.

1.13 The Programme Team recognised that building a cohesive cohort from students potentially based over a number of locations would be challenging and the Approval Panel considered that the VLE would play a central role in supporting this endeavour. In light of this, the Approval Panel agreed that the Programme Team should focus on the development of these VLE materials, in particular how cohort support can be put in place in a virtual way.

1.14 In the course of discussions relating to the conversion to Year 2 of the PhD programme, following confirmation from the Programme Team that what was being proposed was a *1+2* model rather than a 1+3, the Approval Panel agreed that this clarification should be offered to the University of Glasgow, given that the Convenor of the University's Academic Standards Committee had previously queried this in his consideration of the Programme Proposal.

[Action: **Head of Academic Registry**]

1.15 The Approval Panel had a detailed discussion regarding how the proposed Master of Research would relate to the current PGT MRes in Creative Practice. As part of the Programme development, the Programme Team were keen to hold further discussions with the Head of the School of Fine Art to understand the future direction of the current MRes Creative Practices programme and synergise the development where appropriate.

1.16 The Approval Panel considered that, given the similarity in nomenclature, it was important to clarify to potential students the difference between the programmes in marketing and recruitment materials and agreed that the Programme Team would consult with colleagues in Marketing and Communication to ensure that the programme was positioned appropriately.

1.17 Some members of the Approval Panel expressed the view that given the research-based nature of the programme, there would have been value in discussing the proposals at both the Research Degrees Sub Committee and the Research and Knowledge Exchange Sub- Committees, though it was accepted that time-constraints had meant that this wasn't possible. Going forward, and as agreed with the University of Glasgow, in order to progress the approval of new programmes in one session, *Programme Proposals* and *Programme Approval* documentation must be considered and approved at the appropriate Academic Standards Committee.

1.18 With regard to section 29 of the Programme Information Document, the Head of Student Support and Development confirmed that an Equality Impact Assessment would be required to be undertaken.

Conditions

2.1   The Programme Team should approach the nominated External Subject Specialist to provide written feedback regarding the Programme Approval documentation. Upon receipt of the feedback, the Programme Team should reflect upon the comments and amend the documentation as appropriate.

[Action: **Programme Leader, Master of Research**]

2.2   The Approval Panel agreed that the IELTs requirement for entry to the programme should be clarified in the Programme Approval documentation.

[Action: **Programme Leader, Master of Research**]

2.3   The Approval Panel agreed that the Programme Leader would meet with the Head of Academic Registry to identify and address aspects of language in the Programme Specification which were aspirational rather than in place.

[Action: **Programme Leader, Master of Research**]

2.4   The Approval Panel agreed that the Programme Team should meet with the Head of the School of Fine Art to understand the future direction of the current MRes Creative Practices programme and synergise the development where appropriate.

[Action: **Programme Leader, Master of Research**]

2.5   Following consultation with the School of Fine Art referenced in 2.4, the Programme Team would consult with colleagues in Marketing and Communication to ensure that the Master of Research programme was positioned appropriately.

[Action: **Programme Leader, Master of Research**]

2.6   In line with 1.13 above, and prior to the enrolment of the first cohort, the Programme Team should focus on the development of suitable VLE materials which would support and foster a cohesive and supportive network for students.

[Action: **Programme Leader, Master of Research**]

2.7   The Approval Panel considered that more detail regarding the allocation of funded places would be beneficial in the documentation.

[Action: **Programme Leader, Master of Research**]

2.8   The Programme Team would consult with the Head of Academic Registry regarding quality assurance policies such as the GSA Examination Board policy and External Examiners policy and processes such as Programme Monitoring and Annual Reporting and Admissions, with a view to clarifying where responsibility for the oversight for these important items would sit. Advice would be sought, as appropriate, from the Head of Research.

[Action: **Programme Leader, Master of Research**]

2.9   With regard to section 13 of the Programme Information Document relating to Knowledge Exchange, the Programme Team was invited to give consideration as to how the activity and outputs of the students was being archived in the Library.

[Action: **Programme Leader, Master of Research**]

2.10   The Approval Panel considered that it would be beneficial if there was one named Programme Leader responsible for the operation and delivery of the programme. Subsequent to the confirmation of the post-holder, it was agreed that the Programme Approval documentation would be amended as appropriate.

[Action: **Programme Leader, Master of Research**]

Recommendations

3.1   The Programme Team should undertake an Equality Impact Assessment on the

programme in session 2015/16.

[Action: **Programme Leader, Master of Research**]

Outcome

4.1 UPC **approved** the Master of Research for recommendation to Academic Council subject to the above conditions being met.

Panel Decision

The Panel **agreed** to recommend to Academic Council that the Master of Research programme be validated subject to the above conditions.

Professor Irene McAra McWilliam: ....

Professor Paul Anderson: ....

Please e-mail a copy of this document (typing a signature will suffice) to the Panel Convenor (p.anderson@gsa.ac.uk) and Academic Registry (l.davidson@gsa.ac.uk), by **24 February 2015** to ensure subsequent consideration by Academic Council and the University of Glasgow Academic Standards Committee.

Explanation of Terminology (as approved by Academic Council)

Conditions: *All conditions must be satisfied before the programme can be validated.*

Recommendations: *The Programme Team is asked to report after one year, unless otherwise specified, on the progress made in addressing these.*

MAJOR PROGRAMME AMENDMENT

Consideration of Master of Design in Fashion and Textiles

Approval Panel:	Professor Paul Anderson (Convenor), Ms Janet Allison, Mr John Ayers, Ms Jill Hammond, Mr Will Judge, Dr Daniel Livingstone, Professor Irene McAra McWilliam, Professor Elizabeth Moignard, Professor Ken Neil, Mr Nicholas Oddy, Dr Alistair Payne.
Attending:	Dr Tim Sharpe, on behalf of MSA
Programme Team:	Mr Jimmy Stephen-Cran (Programme Leader), Ms Barbara Ridley (Deputy Head of the School of Design), Dr Helena Britt (Undergraduate Pathway Coordinator), Ms Julia MacLean (Design Process Portfolio Tutor), Mr Nick Rodgers (BA (Hons) Textiles Course Leader, Norwich University of the Arts External Subject Specialist), Ms Emma McAndrew (MDes Fashion and Textiles Student Representative)
Secretary:	Ms Lisa Davidson, Academic Registry

Consideration

1.1 The Convenor welcomed the Panel and Programme Team and outlined the schedule of the meeting for UPC Programme Approval. The Convenor confirmed that any conditions set by the Approval Panel must be addressed by **24 February 2015**.

1.2 Further, the Convenor confirmed that, following consideration by the Approval Panel, any amendments deemed necessary to the approval documentation must be addressed in full, highlighted as appropriate and submitted to Academic Registry by **24 February 2015**.

1.3 The Programme Leader provided an overview of the amendments to the MDes Fashion and Textiles and highlighted that the changes would simplify the programme and align the MDes Fashion and Textiles programme with other School of Design Masters programmes.

1.4 The Programme Leader provided an overview of the proposed amendments which included:

- The removal of Design Process Portfolio 1 Course (15 credits) from the Studio component of Stage 1. The intention was that this would be offered instead as a cross-GSA Postgraduate Stage 1 Core Research Skills option.
- The removal of Design Process Portfolio 2 Course (15 credits) from the Studio component of Stage 2. The intention was that this would be offered instead as a cross GSA Postgraduate Stage 2 Elective.
- The removal of Design Process Portfolio 3 (15 credits) from the Studio component of Stage 3. The Programme Team considered that this course was unnecessary as it duplicated existing Learning Outcomes.
- The removal of the Exit Portfolio Course (15 credits) as a stand-alone unit in Stage 3. The Programme Team confirmed that the content of this course would instead be integrated into the Studio component.

1.5 The External Subject Specialist expressed his support for the amendments which would, he considered, streamline the programme making it a more attractive offer to students.

1.6 The Approval Panel received positive feedback from the Student Representative, who

reported that the 2014/15 cohort had found that concurrent assessment deadlines for the various courses in current structure of Stage 1 and Stage 2 difficult to manage. The Student Representative expressed the opinion that the proposed changes would alleviate this issue.

1.7 The Approval Panel noted that the programme offered a part-time mode of study, and explored how this operated in practice. The Programme Leader confirmed that, while the programme had originally been validated with this option, it had never operated as a part- time programme and that there had been very little interest from prospective students in this mode of study. The Approval Panel confirmed that offering a part-time option was not obligatory and the Programme Leader, in consultation with the Head of the School of Design, confirmed that the documentation would be amended as appropriate to reflect that this programme would henceforth only be offered on a full-time basis. The Panel were of the view that the Programme Team should reflect on whether this programme could practically be offered in the part-time mode in the course of 2015/16 and make recommendations as appropriate in the School's forthcoming Periodic Review.

1.8 The Programme Team clarified that the *Core Research Skills: Creative Process Journal* course and the *Creative Process Portfolio* PGT Stage 2 elective would only be offered in the first instance to students from the School of Design. The Approval Panel highlighted that if these were subsequently to be offered to programmes outwith the School of Design, course approval documentation would require to be considered by Boards of Studies as appropriate.

1.9 With regard to section 29 of the Programme Information Document, the Head of Student Support and Development confirmed that an Equality Impact Assessment would be required to be undertaken.

1.10 The Approval Panel emphasised the importance of ensuring that current applicants were made aware of the proposed amendment to the programme. The Programme Leader confirmed that the proposed changes would be highlighted to applicants at interview stage. It was reiterated that, subsequent to approval by the University's Academic Standards Committee, the School of Design would be required to write to all applicants holding offers to advise them of the change to the programme. Academic Registry would be able to provide a list of applicants together with the relevant contact details on request.

1.11 In the course of discussions, the Approval Panel noted that the course specification for *Design Theory: Culture, Context and Contemporary Practice* was not available in the documentation submitted for approval. Following confirmation that this was a shared course currently forming a constituent of all other School of Design PGT Masters programmes, the Panel considered that it would have been helpful to have the course specification made available to get a complete view of the programme offer. The Panel agreed that in future, all course specifications pertaining to the programme under consideration should be made available to the Panel.

[Action: **Academic Registry**]

1.12 **Secretary's Note**: Subsequent to the meeting at which it was confirmed that the *Core Research Skills: Creative Process Journal* course and the *Creative Process Portfolio* would only be available to students on School of Design Postgraduate Taught programmes, and following discussion with the Programme Team, the Programme Leader for the MDes Fashion and Textiles programme confirmed that these courses would revert to their original course titles, namely *Design Process Journal* course and the *Design Process Portfolio*. The Convenor of the School of Design Board of Studies approved this on 18 February 2015 and the Convenor of the Approval Panel approved

this on 2 March 2015.

Conditions

3.1 With regard to section 29 of the Programme Information Document, an appropriate statement should be provided to, and in consultation with, the Head of Student Support and Development, regarding an Equality Impact Assessment.

[Action: **Programme Leader, MDes Fashion and Textiles**]

3.2 In line with 1.7 above, the Programme Specification and Programme Information Document should be updated as appropriate to reflect that this programme would henceforth only be offered as a full-time mode of study.

[Action: **Programme Leader, MDes Fashion and Textiles**]

3.3 In line with 1.8 above, section 15 of the course specifications for *Core Research Skills: Creative Process Journal* course and the *Creative Process Portfolio* should be updated to reflect that these courses are only available to students on a School of Design PGT programme.

[Action: **Programme Leader, MDes Fashion and Textiles**]

3.4 The Programme Team should revisit section 14 of the Programme Specification to provide an appropriate QAA Subject Benchmark Statement.

[Action: **Programme Leader, MDes Fashion and Textiles**]

3.5 The Programme Team should revisit section 22 of the Programme Specification regarding the requirements for progressing from each stage. The Approval Panel recommended that this should take the form of a link to the Postgraduate Taught Awards regulations in the GSA section of the University of Glasgow Calendar.

[Action: **Programme Leader, MDes Fashion and Textiles**]

3.6 The Programme Team should revisit Section B, Questions 8, 9 and 10 of the Programme Information Document and amend them to reflect that the nature of the programme.

[Action: **Programme Leader, MDes Fashion and Textiles**]

3.7 In line with 1.12 above, the course specifications for *Core Research Skills: Creative Process Journal* course and the *Creative Process Portfolio* should be updated to reflect that these courses had reverted to their original course titles, namely *Design Process Journal* course and the *Design Process Portfolio*.

[Action: **Programme Leader, MDes Fashion and Textiles**]

Recommendations

4.1 In line with 3.1 above, the Programme Team should undertake an Equality Impact Assessment on the programme in session 2015/16.

[Action: **Programme Leader, MDes Fashion and Textiles**]

4.2 In line with 1.7 above, the Programme Team should reflect on whether the MDes Fashion and Textiles could be offered in the part-time mode in the course of 2015/16 and make recommendations as appropriate in the School's forthcoming Periodic Review.

[Action: **Programme Leader, MDes Fashion and Textiles**]

Outcome

5.1 UPC **approved** the amendments to the MDes Fashion and Textiles programme to Academic Council, subject to the above conditions being met.

5.2 Subsequent to approval by Academic Council and the University of Glasgow's

Academic Standards Committee, the School of Design is required to write to all applicants holding offers to advise them of the change to the programme.

[Action: **Deputy Head of the School of Design**]

Panel Decision

The Panel **agreed** to recommend to Academic Council that the amendments to the MDes Fashion and Textiles programme be approved subject to the above conditions.

Mr Jimmy Stephen-Cran   *Jimmy Stephen-Cran*

 Professor Paul Anderson: ....

Please e-mail a copy of this document (typing a signature will suffice) to the Panel Convenor (p.anderson@gsa.ac.uk) and Academic Registry (l.davidson@gsa.ac.uk), by **24 February 2015** to ensure subsequent consideration by Academic Council and the University of Glasgow Academic Standards Committee.

Explanation of Terminology (as approved by Academic Council)

Conditions: All conditions must be satisfied before the programme can be validated.

Recommendations: The Programme Team is asked to report after one year, unless otherwise specified, on the progress made in addressing these.

MAJOR PROGRAMME AMENDMENT

Consideration of BA (Hons) Fashion Design and BA (Hons) Textile Design

Approval Panel:	Professor Paul Anderson (Convenor), Ms Janet Allison, Mr John Ayers, Ms Jill Hammond, Mr Will Judge, Dr Daniel Livingstone, Professor Irene McAra McWilliam, Professor Elizabeth Moignard, Professor Ken Neil, Mr Nicholas Oddy, Dr Alistair Payne.
Attending:	Dr Tim Sharpe, on behalf of MSA
Programme Team:	Mr Jimmy Stephen-Cran (Programme Leader), Ms Barbara Ridley (Deputy Head of the School of Design), Dr Helena Britt (Undergraduate Pathway Coordinator), Ms Julia MacLean (Design Process Portfolio Tutor), Mr Nick Rodgers (BA (Hons) Textiles Course Leader, Norwich University of the Arts External Subject Specialist), Ms Kathryn O'Brien (BDes (Hons) Fashion and Textiles Student Representative)
Secretary:	Ms Lisa Davidson, Academic Registry

Consideration

1.1 The Convenor welcomed the Panel and Programme Team and outlined the schedule of the meeting for UPC Programme Approval. The Convenor confirmed that any conditions set by the Approval Panel must be addressed by **24 February 2015**.

1.2 Further, the Convenor confirmed that, following consideration by the Approval Panel, any amendments deemed necessary to the approval documentation must be addressed in full, highlighted as appropriate and submitted to Academic Registry by **24 February 2015**.

1.3 The Programme Leader introduced the amendments to the BDes (Hons) Fashion and Textiles and outlined the academic rationale.

1.4 There were three specific matters of note:

- To amend the award title from BDes/BDes (Hons) to BA/BA (Hons) which would align undergraduate fashion and textiles with other School of Design undergraduate programmes and UK competitor programmes. The BA (Hons) award is more widely recognised internationally in the subject area than BDes (Hons).
- To amend programme documentation to reflect that what is being offered is two pathways and that students would undertake and graduate with either a BA (Hons) Fashion Design or BA (Hons) Textile Design. The Programme Team highlighted that the current title 'Fashion and Textile Design' implied the combined study of fashion and textiles and had led to confusion in terms of marketing, recruitment and student expectation.
- Course consolidation and revision. These changes aligned fashion design and textile design with other School of Design undergraduate BA programmes and streamlined assessment.

1.5 The External Subject Specialist provided positive feedback with regard to the proposed amendments, highlighting in particular the importance of providing clarity to prospective and current students regarding the nature of the programme to which they are applying to/studying on.

1.6 The Approval Panel noted that there was positive student support for the changes and that the Programme Leader was anticipating that all the students currently on

programme, would elect to move to the new programme structure. The Programme Leader confirmed that, in the event that some students did not wish to transfer to the new programme structure, adjustments would be made to run both structures concurrently. The Approval Panel highlighted that, subsequent to approval by the University's Academic Standards Committee, the School of Design would be required to obtain each student's written consent to their transfer to the new programme structure. Academic Registry would be able to provide a list of students together with the relevant contact details on request.

1.7   The Approval Panel emphasised the importance of ensuring that current applicants were made aware of the proposed amendment to the programme. The Programme Leader confirmed that the proposed changes would be highlighted to applicants at interview stage. It was reiterated that, subsequent to approval by the University's Academic Standards Committee, the School of Design would be required to write to all applicants holding offers to advise them of the change to the programme. Academic Registry would be able to provide a list of applicants together with the relevant contact details on request.

1.8   The Approval Panel considered the disaggregation of the BDes (Hons) Fashion and Textiles into two distinct programmes (BA (Hons) Fashion Design and BA (Hons) Textile Design and the Programme Team confirmed that this was being proposed to clarify to potential applicants that these were two distinct programmes, albeit that there were close connections between the cohorts in the studio environment. The Approval Panel noted that this had been agreed subsequent to the Board of Studies and highlighted that if this programme were disaggregated, there would be financial implications, for example, an increase in the validation fee to the University. The Approval Team agreed that the Programme Team should meet with colleagues from Marketing and Academic Registry to discuss whether a *hub and spoke* model would be more appropriate.

1.9   In the event that it was agreed that there was a clear academic rationale for the disaggregation of the programme, the Approval Panel considered that this should be reflected appropriately in the programme documentation. Therefore, separate Programme and Course Specifications would be required for each programme. The Approval Panel noted that, in this event, two separate Annual Programme Reports would be required.

1.10   **Secretary's Note:** The Head of the Department of Fashion and Textiles subsequently confirmed that the programme would be disaggregated into two distinct programmes: BA (Hons) Fashion Design and BA (Hons) Textile Design.

1.11   The Approval Panel considered the *Studio 4 (FoCI Essay)* course specification and the Programme Team clarified that the students who do not undertake the Dissertation, are set a project, usually in the form of a short external competition, which is included in their portfolio submission at Summative Assessment. The Approval Panel considered that this should be reflected in the *Indicative Content* (section 9) of the course specification.

1.12   With regard to section 29 of the Programme Information Document, the Head of Student Support and Development confirmed that an Equality Impact Assessment would be required to be undertaken.

1.13   **Secretary's Note**: Subsequent to the meeting and following discussions with the Deputy Head of the School of Design, it was confirmed that in light of the new programme structure, new course specifications would be required for incoming exchange and study aboard students.

Conditions

2.1   In line with 1.8 above, the Approval Team agreed that the Programme Team should arrange a meeting with colleagues from Marketing and Academic Registry to discuss whether a *hub and spoke* model would be more appropriate.

[Action: **Head of Department, Fashion and Textiles**]

2.2   In line with 1.9 above, in the event that it is agreed that there is a clear academic rationale for the disaggregation of the programme, this should be reflected appropriately in the programme documentation and separate Programme and Course Specifications should be developed for each programme.

[Action: **Head of Department, Fashion and Textiles**]

2.3   In line with 1.11 above, with regard to the *Studio 4 (FoCI Essay)* course specification details of the project (or short external competition), should be outlined in the *Indicative Content* (section 9).

[Action: **Head of Department, Fashion and Textiles**]

2.4   In line with 1.12 above, in section 29 of the Programme Information Document, an appropriate statement should be provided to, and in consultation with, the Head of Student Support and Development, regarding an Equality Impact Assessment.

[Action: **Head of Department, Fashion and Textiles**]

2.5   In line with comments from the External Subject Specialist, the Programme Team should give consideration to the Level 2 Aims (section 10.2 of the Programme Specification) and reflect upon the use of IT applications.

[Action: **Head of Department, Fashion and Textiles**]

2.6   The Approval Panel agreed that the learning and teaching methods and formal contact/notional learning hours in the course specifications for Studio should be amended to ensure parity and incremental development across levels.

[Action: **Head of Department, Fashion and Textiles**]

Recommendations

3.1   In line with 2.4 above, the Programme Team should undertake an Equality Impact Assessment on the programme in session 2015/16.

[Action: **Head of Department, Fashion and Textiles**]

3.2   In line with 1.13 above, the Programme Team should develop course approval documentation for courses which would be offered to incoming exchange and study abroad students.

[Action: **Head of Department, Fashion and Textiles**]

Outcome

4.1   UPC **approved** the amendments to the BA (Hons) Fashion Design and BA (Hons) Textile Design programme to Academic Council, subject to the above conditions being met.

4.2   Subsequent to approval by Academic Council and the University of Glasgow's Academic Standards Committee, the School of Design is required to write to all applicants holding offers to advise them of the change to the programme.

[Action: **Deputy Head of the School of Design**]

4.3   Subsequent to approval by the University's Academic Standards Committee, the School of Design would be required to obtain each student's written consent to their transfer to the new programme structure.

Panel Decision

The Panel **agreed** to recommend to Academic Council that the amendments to the BDes (Hons) Fashion and Textiles programme be approved subject to the above conditions.

Mr Jimmy Stephen-Cran: *Jimmy Stephen-Cran*

Professor Paul Anderson: ....

Please e-mail a copy of this document (typing a signature will suffice) to the Panel Convenor (p.anderson@gsa.ac.uk) and Academic Registry (l.davidson@gsa.ac.uk), by **24 February 2015** to ensure subsequent consideration by Academic Council and the University of Glasgow Academic Standards Committee.

Explanation of Terminology (as approved by Academic Council)

Conditions: All conditions must be satisfied before the programme can be validated.

Recommendations: The Programme Team is asked to report after one year, unless otherwise specified, on the progress made in addressing these.

MAJOR PROGRAMME AMENDMENT

Consideration of BDes (Hons) Digital Culture

Approval Panel: Professor Paul Anderson (Convenor), Ms Janet Allison, Mr John Ayers, Ms Jill Hammond, Mr Will Judge, Dr Daniel Livingstone, Professor Irene McAra McWilliam, Professor Elizabeth Moignard, Professor Ken Neil, Mr Nicholas Oddy, Dr Alistair Payne, Mr Jimmy Stephen-Cran.

Attending: Dr Tim Sharpe, on behalf of MSA

Programme Team: Ms Inga Paterson (Programme Leader), Ms Barbara Ridley (Deputy Head of the School of Design), Dr Magnus Moar (Senior Lecturer, Media Arts Practice, Middlesex University External Examiner (written input only)), Mr Pawel Kudel (BDes (Hons) Digital Culture Student Representative), Mr Alex Michie (BDes (Hons) Digital Culture Student Representative).

Secretary: Ms Lisa Davidson, Academic Registry

Consideration

1.1   The Convenor welcomed the Panel and Programme Team and outlined the schedule of the meeting for UPC Programme Approval. The Convenor confirmed that any conditions set by the Approval Panel must be addressed by **24 February 2015**.

1.2   Further, the Convenor confirmed that, following consideration by the Approval Panel, any amendments deemed necessary to the approval documentation must be addressed in full, highlighted as appropriate and submitted to Academic Registry by **24 February 2015**.

1.3   The Programme Leader for the BDes (Hons) Digital Culture provided the context for the proposed amendments, in particular noting that subsequent to the integration of Digital Culture into the School of Design at the end of 2013/14, it was apparent that the programme would benefit from modification to achieve greater parity with the other Design Undergraduate programmes.

1.4   The Programme Leader provided an overview of the proposed amendments which included:

- Formalisation of the relationship between Forum for Critical Inquiry and Digital Culture;
- Restructuring of the courses in line with other School of Design programmes;
- Introduction of Design Domain to provide a mechanism for inter-disciplinary collaboration;
- Modification of the formative and summative assessment strategies to reflect Design School procedures and to integrate Digital Culture into the Design School assessment timetable;
- Modification of some intended learning outcomes to reflect the inclusion of Forum for Critical Inquiry and Design Domain Learning Outcomes.

1.5   The Approval Panel noted that the External Examiner, who was unable to attend in person, had provided detailed feedback to the Convenor in advance of the meeting.

1.6   The Approval Panel received positive feedback, in particular regarding the greater input of Forum for Critical Inquiry to the programme, from the Student Representatives who considered that the proposed changes would enhance the student learning

experience.

1.7 The Approval Panel noted the strong student support for the changes and that the Programme Leader was anticipating that all the students currently on programme, would elect to move to the new programme structure. The Programme Leader confirmed that, in the event that some students did not wish to transfer to the new programme structure, adjustments would be made to run both structures concurrently. The Approval Panel highlighted that, subsequent to approval by the University's Academic Standards Committee, the School of Design would be required to obtain each student's written consent to their transfer to the new programme structure. Academic Registry would be able to provide a list of students together with the relevant contact details on request.

1.8 The Approval Panel emphasized the importance of ensuring that current applicants were made aware of the proposed amendment to the programme. The Programme Leader confirmed that the proposed changes would be highlighted to applicants at interview stage. It was reiterated that, subsequent to approval by the University's Academic Standards Committee, the School of Design would be required to write to all applicants holding offers to advise them of the change to the programme. Academic Registry would be able to provide a list of applicants together with the relevant contact details on request.

1.9 The Approval Panel noted that the documentation reiterated the original ambition for interdisciplinary collaboration. This was welcomed, in particular by representatives from the Digital Design Studio who considered that there was significant scope for collaboration in a number of areas.

1.10 The Programme Leader reported that in the course of discussions, it had been agreed that it would be beneficial in terms of marketing and to clarify the affiliation with Design, for a re- consideration of the nomenclature of the programme, with one possibility being *BA (Hons) Interaction Design*. The Approval Panel noted that discussion on this point was still underway, and that, if the School of Design wished to pursue a change to the nomenclature, appropriate approval processes would apply. The Programme Leader, DDS Programmes, highlighted that the DDS was currently developing an undergraduate programme, the working title of which was BSc/BA Digital Interaction. The Approval Panel agreed that representatives from the School of Design should consult with the Digital Design Studio, as appropriate.

[Action: **Deputy Head of the School of Design**]

1.11 In the course of the discussions outlined in 1.10, and in relation to the nomenclature of programmes, the Approval Panel agreed that it was important to ensure that the programme title accurately and clearly reflects the content of the programme.

1.12 The Approval Panel noted that there were a number of typos in the documentation which would require to be addressed in the final documentation submitted to Academic Registry.

1.13 The Approval Panel noted that there were a number of sections in the Programme Information Document and the Programme Specification, in particular relating to the Aims and the Intended Learning Outcomes of the *Design Domain* Courses which were missing or were incomplete. The Approval Panel agreed that this would require to be addressed in the final documentation submitted to Academic Registry.

1.14 With regard to section 29 of the Programme Information Document, the Head of Student Support and Development confirmed that an Equality Impact Assessment on the impact of the proposed programme amendments would be required to be

undertaken.

1.15   In response to discussions relating to a number of the Intended Learning Outcomes, the Approval Panel agreed that the Programme Leader, DDS Programmes would provide detailed feedback to the Programme Leader BDes (Hons) Digital Culture.
[Action: **Programme Leader, DDS Programmes**]

1.16   Subsequent to the provision of the feedback from the Programme Leader, DDS Programmes, the Programme Leader for BDes (Hons) Digital Culture was invited to reflect on this and make adjustments to the final documentation as appropriate.

1.17   With regard to Section 21 in each of the Course Specifications, the Approval Panel considered that the table detailing the formal contact hours and notional learning hours should be amended to more accurately reflect the various learning and teaching methods employed (for example seminars, group tutorials etc). The Approval Panel also highlighted that the total column required to be completed.

Commendations

2.1   The Approval Panel noted the detailed and extensive consultations held with current students and the President of the Students' Association regarding the proposed changes to the programme.

2.2   The Approval Panel also commended the students for their engagement in the process, noting that the consultation meetings held to discuss the changes had been well attended.

Conditions

3.1   The Approval Panel agreed that the documentation would benefit from further proof-reading and that any typos should be addressed in the final version submitted to Academic Registry.
[Action: **Programme Leader, BDes (Hons) Digital Culture**]

3.2   The Approval Panel agreed that the outstanding sections in the Programme Information Document and the Programme Specification relating to the Aims and the Intended Learning Outcomes of the *Design Domain* courses would require to be addressed in the final documentation submitted to Academic Registry.
[Action: **Programme Leader, BDes (Hons) Digital Culture**]

3.3   With regard to section 29 of the Programme Information Document, an appropriate statement should be provided to, and in consultation with, the Head of Student Support and Development, regarding an Equality Impact Assessment.
[Action: **Programme Leader, BDes (Hons) Digital Culture**]

3.4   The Approval Panel agreed that subsequent to the provision of the feedback from the Programme Leader, DDS Programmes, the Programme Leader for BDes (Hons) Digital Culture would reflect and make adjustments to the final documentation as appropriate.
[Action: **Programme Leader, BDes (Hons) Digital Culture**]

3.5   With regard to Section 21 in each of the Course Specifications, the table detailing the formal contact hours and notional learning hours should be amended to more accurately reflect the various learning and teaching methods employed (for example seminars, group tutorials etc) and the total column completed as appropriate.
[Action: **Programme Leader, BDes (Hons) Digital Culture**]

3.6   The Programme Leader for BDes (Hons) Digital Culture should provide an update on discussions with the Deputy Director for Finance and Resources regarding any financial

implications of the amendment to the programme in Section 1 of the Programme Information Document.

[Action: **Programme Leader, BDes (Hons) Digital Culture**]

Recommendations

4.1   The Approval Panel agreed that representatives from the School of Design and the Digital Design Studio should consult, as appropriate, regarding the proposed nomenclature of the BDes (Hons) Digital Culture.

[Action: **Deputy Head of the School of Design and Programme Leader, DDS Programmes**]

4.2   In line with 3.3 above, the Programme Team should undertake an Equality Impact Assessment on the programme in session 2015/16.

[Action: **Programme Leader, BDes (Hons) Digital Culture**]

Outcome

5.1   UPC **approved** the amendments to the BDes (Hons) Digital Culture programme to Academic Council, subject to the above conditions being met.

5.2   Subsequent to approval by Academic Council and the University of Glasgow's Academic Standards Committee, the School of Design is required to write to all applicants holding offers to advise them of the change to the programme.

[Action: **Deputy Head of the School of Design**]

5.3   Subsequent to approval by the University's Academic Standards Committee, the School of Design would be required to obtain the student's written consent to their transfer to the new programme structure.

[Action: **Deputy Head of the School of Design**]

Panel Decision

The Panel **agreed** to recommend to Academic Council that the amendments to the BDes (Hons) Digital Culture programme be approved subject to the above conditions.

Ms Inga Paterson: ....Inga B Paterson

Professor Paul Anderson: ....

Please e-mail a copy of this document (typing a signature will suffice) to the Panel Convenor (p.anderson@gsa.ac.uk) and Academic Registry (l.davidson@gsa.ac.uk), by **24 February 2015** to ensure subsequent consideration by Academic Council and the University of Glasgow Academic
Standards Committee.

Explanation of Terminology (as approved by Academic Council)

Conditions: *All conditions must be satisfied before the programme can be validated.*

Recommendations: *The Programme Team is asked to report after one year, unless otherwise specified, on the progress made in addressing these.*

MAJOR PROGRAMME AMENDMENT

Consideration of MLitt Curatorial Practice (Contemporary Art)

Approval Panel:	Professor Paul Anderson (Convenor), Ms Janet Allison, Mr John Ayers, Ms Jill Hammond, Mr Will Judge, Dr Daniel Livingstone, Professor Irene McAra McWilliam, Professor Elizabeth Moignard, Professor Ken Neil, Mr Nicholas Oddy, Dr Alistair Payne, Ms Barbara Ridley, Mr Jimmy Stephen-Cran.
Attending:	Dr Tim Sharpe, on behalf of MSA
Programme Team:	Ms Mónica Núñez Laiseca (Programme Leader, GSA), Dr Tina Fiske (Lecturer, History of Art, University of Glasgow), Ms Lesley Young (Programme Leader, University of Glasgow), Ms Sarah McCrory (Director, Glasgow International, External Subject Specialist), Mr Marcus Jack (MLitt Curatorial Practice Student Representative).
Secretary:	Ms Lisa Davidson, Academic Registry

Consideration

1.1   The Convenor welcomed the Panel and Programme Team and outlined the schedule of the meeting for UPC Programme Approval.

1.2   Further, the Convenor confirmed that, following consideration by the Approval Panel, any amendments deemed necessary to the approval documentation must be addressed in full, highlighted as appropriate and submitted to Academic Registry by **24 February 2015**.

1.3   The Programme Leader, GSA introduced the amendments to the MLitt Curatorial Practice, namely to change the assessment for *Curatorial Practice 1* (45 credits) delivered in Stage 1 and *Curatorial Practice 2* (45 credits) delivered in Stage 2 in order to allow for 20 credits in each course to be assessed through Studio work.

1.4   In outlining the rationale for the change, the Programme Leader, GSA highlighted that the amendments would simplify the programme and align the MLitt Curatorial Practice (Contemporary Art) with the MLitt Fine Art Practice programme. Further, by enhancing the 'practice' element of the programme this would help position the MLitt Curatorial Practice (Contemporary Art) more distinctively within the landscape of curatorial programmes offered in the UK and internationally.

1.5   The External Subject Specialist considered that the amendment allowed students to be assessed more effectively, and would now include the practical application of other aspects of the programme. Further, that by encouraging the demonstration of applied skills, students would be able to utilise and learn from their theory-led teaching.

1.6   The External Subject Specialist also considered that the changes to the programme would allow the course a unique platform for students to apply theory-led learning and test ideas within a supportive structure and that this emphasis on practical work was crucial in terms of keeping the programme competitive.

1.7   The Approval Panel received positive feedback from the Student Representative who considered that the proposed change would enhance learning and stimulation and seemed better equipped to activate students in their own practice whilst not losing the

academic quality required.

1.8   The Approval Panel noted that the current Studio space was also utilised as a gallery space which allowed a range of exhibitions and events to be programmed. The Programme Team clarified that a Studio Project in this context is a curatorial project that is programmed and presented in the Studio. The Studio Project would be assessed via submission of evidence of the practice and documentation of that practice, and would include a written reflection on the project, its aims and how these have been achieved.

1.9   The Approval Panel emphasized the importance of ensuring that current applicants were made aware of the proposed amendment to the programme. The Programme Team reported that the proposed changes were communicated to potential applicants at the Graduate Open Day and would also be highlighted at interview stage. It was reiterated that, subsequent to approval by the University's Academic Standards Committee, the School of Fine Art would be required to write to all applicants holding offers to advise them of the change to the programme. Academic Registry would be able to provide a list of applicants together with the relevant contact details on request.

Commendations

2.1   The Committee commended the Programme Team on the high standard of the documentation submitted for consideration and approval.

Conditions

3.1   There were no conditions.

Recommendations

4.1   The Committee noted that one of the recommendations from the validation of the programme was that an Equality Impact Assessment should be undertaken in 2014/15. The Committee re-iterated that this must be undertaken prior to the end of 2014/15, and highlighted that this should also include consideration of the proposed amendment.
    [Action: **Programme Leader GSA, MLitt Curatorial Practice (Contemporary Art)**]

Outcome

5.1   UPC **approved** the amendments to the MLitt Curatorial Practice (Contemporary Art) and recommended it to Academic Council.

5.2   Subsequent to approval by Academic Council and the University of Glasgow's Academic Standards Committee, the School of Fine Art would be required to write to all applicants holding offers to advise them of the change to the programme.
    [Action: **Head of the School of Fine Art**]

Panel Decision

The Panel **agreed** to recommend to Academic Council that the amendments to the MLitt Curatorial Practice (Contemporary Art) programme be approved.

Ms Mónica Núñez Laiseca:

Professor Paul Anderson: ....

Please e-mail a copy of this document (typing a signature will suffice) to the Panel Convenor (p.anderson@gsa.ac.uk) and Academic Registry (l.davidson@gsa.ac.uk), by **24 February 2015** to ensure subsequent consideration by Academic Council and the University of Glasgow Academic Standards Committee.

Explanation of Terminology (as approved by Academic Council)

Conditions: *All conditions must be satisfied before the programme can be validated.*

Recommendations: *The Programme Team is asked to report after one year, unless otherwise specified, on the progress made in addressing these.*