

University of Glasgow**Academic Standards Committee – Friday 25 November 2016****Report from the Joint Board of the University of Glasgow and
Christie's Education held on 7 July 2016****Jackie McCluskey, Academic Collaborations Office****For Approval**

There were no items for approval.

For Noting**1. Matters Arising****1.1. Action Plan Template**

Members were reminded that a template action plan had been developed. The intention would be to detail the outstanding issues and monitor progress against actions identified at the autumn meeting (October). This would mean that CEDU would no longer need to submit an interim report at the spring meeting (April).

1.2. PGDip, Art, Law & Business

CEDU had previously been invited to review the aims of the standalone PGDip Art, Law & Business programme to identify how they aligned with the Masters programme. CEDU members were advised that although the programme was now included in the University Calendar for 2016-07, this feedback was still needed to allow the University to include it in the relevant system to enable the parchment to be prepared at the appropriate time.

2. Student Report

The CEDU Student Representative, Ms Fabbri, had provided a written report which was circulated to the Board. The members agreed that it was very positive and that there were no serious concerns highlighted. The Board formally accepted Ms Fabbri's report.

3. Exit Plan

Members considered the draft exit plan (attached) which had been prepared by the ACO in consultation with CEDU. The Board was advised that this was intended to be a working document which could help to monitor progress with the identified actions. Earlier discussions between ACO and CEDU had identified three key areas for discussion, namely, 1) the need for a jointly developed and agreed communications plan; 2) consideration of the available options for any students who might defer; and 3) the plan for annual monitoring during the "teach-out" period.

After detailed discussions the Board agreed the following:

3.1 Communication Plan

The students should be made aware of the situation as soon as possible – both CEDU students and students who had transferred to Glasgow. A communication plan would be developed by CEDU in liaison with the ACO with a view to issuing a jointly prepared notice to the students on Friday 22nd July 2016. CEDU would communicate with CEDU students and the University with those students in Glasgow. As well as communicating with the students in Glasgow, the University would undertake to advise other relevant stakeholders within Glasgow such as

Registry; Admissions; Marketing and Recruitment; and relevant academics. In addition, a note would be prepared for CEDU staff regarding the impact on their Associate University Teacher status. The Board recognised that a number of external parties should also be informed, for example, HEFCE; QAA: UKVI and UCAS. It was agreed that the initial communication to staff and students within each institution, should, as far as possible, be coordinated.

3.2 *Deferred Students*

The Board was advised that the situation regarding deferred students, if any, was potentially problematic. Previous discussions had taken place between ACO and CEDU regarding options for any undergraduate students who might defer in level 2 at CEDU. One possible solution previously proposed by CEDU, namely identifying local transfer opportunities, was no longer feasible. There were difficulties associated with fees as well as the differences in the degree structure between England and Scotland. CEDU proposed that the University consider options for deferred students within Level 2 in Glasgow.

The Convener outlined difficulties with deferred students entering level 2 of a general honours programme. There were progress requirements that the CEDU students were unlikely to be able to meet. He undertook to discuss this further with colleagues in the Senate Office and academic staff in the School to try to identify a possible way forward.

The situation with the postgraduate students was less challenging. The OU had agreed to recognise the UoG credit undertaken at CEDU toward an OU award. Where students expressed a desire for a UoG award, UoG would reciprocate, subject to a minimum 50% credit threshold having been achieved.

It was agreed that CEDU would attempt to be clear to students about deferrals and any impact on students in that category. They would also aim to try and limit the circumstances whereby a student could request a deferral.

3.3 *Annual Monitoring*

The Joint Board would continue to operate throughout the teach-out period (until the end of academic session 2018-19). CEDU was keen to explore opportunities to reduce the costs and proposed that the membership might be reduced. Similarly approval was requested, and granted, to undertake the meetings via video-conference. The Convener confirmed that the University was mindful of the cost implications for CEDU and that staff would make every effort to identify ways to reduce costs associated with the Joint Board. The Board agreed that it should be possible to reduce the reporting burden on CEDU in academic session 2017-18 when CEDU was due to submit its first annual report to the Open University. It was agreed that a mapping of UoG and OU's reporting requirements be undertaken to highlight any significant differences with a view to CEDU preparing a single report for OU and UoG.

In addition to the issues highlighted above, the Board considered the issue of future requests from former students (pre September 2016) for copies of parchments and/or transcripts. The University would continue to produce replacement parchments for all students, however, it was agreed that as the detailed marks for postgraduate programmes and levels 1 and 2 of the MA(Hons) would not be available to the University, CEDU would undertake to honour any future requests for detailed records of academic performance in relation to postgraduate students or those related to levels 1 and 2 of the undergraduate MA(Hons) programme.

Members were keen to support continued collaboration with Christie's Education outwith the validation arrangement, for example, through continued involvement in PhD supervision.

4. Revalidation Event

The Board received a copy of the draft report from the recent revalidation of the undergraduate and postgraduate Art-History and Art-World Practice programmes. It had been agreed that it was not appropriate to include the MSc Art, Law & Business in the revalidation.

Members were advised that the outcome had been a positive one and that the Panel had recommended that the programmes be revalidated for a further three years. The Panel had outlined some advisory recommendations but these were not conditions of revalidation. The report was subject to final approval by the Panel and the Academic Standards Committee, however, this would be concluded over the summer. Following a request from CEDU, it was agreed that UoG would provide a letter to confirm the revalidation in time for CEDU to submit an application for course designation to HEFCE in September.

5. Immigration and Visas

The Board heard that CEDU had been successful with its application for a Tier 4 licence. As part of the application process CEDU had undergone two inspections. At the second visit the Home Office had expressed concerns that CEDU was not following the UoG process for attendance monitoring. The UoG Tier 4 Compliance Manager had clarified to the panel that UoG had approved CEDU's process as being more appropriate to the nature of their provision. Members were reminded that UoG would, as previously agreed, sponsor students entering CEDU in September 2016.

6. Publications/Publicity Materials

The Board received a paper reminding members of the requirement of the University to effectively monitor use of its identity, marque and references to its awards.

7. Any Other Business

The Convenor updated the Board on a number of strategic issues and policy developments including the University's position on EU students in light of the recent referendum result and it's response to the Government's strategy to protect your people from radicalisation - Prevent. Both institutions confirmed that policies had been introduced in response to the guidelines and staff had undergone appropriate training. The position re the funding of EU students was less clear, however, the University had confirmed that until further notice, and for the next two years at least, the current fee situation would apply to EU students, including those with an offer to study.

8. Reserved Business

There was no reserved business.

9. Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Board would be arranged for November 2016.

Action Plan

Termination of the validation arrangement between University of Glasgow and Christie's Education

		Complete Y/N?	Comment	Responsible	Target Date
Formalities					
	Acknowledge CEDU notice of termination	Y	David Newall has written to Jane Hay	UoG	Complete
	MoA	Y	Agreed that no extension/amendment required. Teach Out period covered by Clause 23.7	UoG/CEDU	Agreed
	Agree Effective Date of Termination	Y	Last intake of students in session 2016-2017	CEDU/UoG	Agreed
	Notify Professional Bodies		N/A	N/A	
Communication					
	Communication Plan		CEDU to develop a plan for communicating with students. Information sheet will be developed by mid-July at the latest (post UoG and OU validation events). CEDU will liaise with UoG on the wording.	CEDU	Letter to Students issued 1 week commencing 1 August 2016
			UoG will develop plan for communicating to relevant stakeholders in UoG (e.g. Joint Board members (including, where relevant, staff attending CEDU committees); <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Admissions; - Marketing and Recruitment; - Head of College/Vice-Principal; 	UoG	All relevant UoG parties advised by end of August. University Services emailed on 26 July 2016

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - College Graduate School; - College HR Manager; - College Head of Finance; - Director of College Professional Services; - Head of Academic and Student Administration; - School staff (Academic and Admin); - Senate Office; - University Services Finance; - Planning Services; - Registry; - Library; - Corporate Communications; - SRC; - IT services; and - ASC 		Further contact with others completed (October).
			UoG to develop a statement for CEDU staff clarifying the position regarding their Associate University Teacher status.	UoG	Contingent on Action 33
			Both to consider process and nature of communication with external stakeholders. e.g. QAA; UKVI; SAAS; HEFCE; UCAS; OIA (possibly SPSO).	UoG/CED U	QAA; UKVI; HEFCE; and UCAS have been informed. Possible action needed re OIA/SPSO
	Marketing		Ensure that advertising and marketing of the programme(s) ceases. This includes removing information in prospectuses; on websites and informing UoG recruitment staff.	UoG/CED U	Complete
	Public Information		Public information will remain accurate throughout the teach-out period, particularly with respect to the relationship with the University.	UoG/CED U	Agreed


	UoG Calendar		CEDU's programmes to be removed from the UoG Calendar after session 2016-2017	UoG	June 2017
	Student Related				
	Student Transfer Arrangements		N/A		
	Deferrals		<p>CEDU to liaise with local institutions (UCL/Courtauld?) to discuss a way forward for UG students who defer (either through enforced deferral/repeat year) or for other reasons.</p> <p>[CEDU option was not feasible. UoG to clarify UoG solution]</p>	CEDU/UoG	<p>UoG confirmed offer on 4 August 2016 (accepted by CEDU on 11 August).</p> <p>UoG will provide a suitable pathway for students in Years 1 and 2.</p> <p>Students have been informed.</p>
	PGT Student Deferrals		<p>Agreed preferred position for PGT student deferrals beyond September 2017 is that students will transfer to the relevant OU-validated programme via the CEDU/OU RPL procedures. However, it is recognised that this would be subject to student preference. UoG to investigate fall-back position – i.e. that students are allowed to complete with a UoG award.</p> <p>[Confirmed that, in line with the OU, UoG</p>	UoG	Agreed

			will recognise credit subject to the completion of a minimum of 50% UoG credit]		
	Student Representation and Feedback		Current arrangements will continue to operate.	CEDU	Agreed
	Academic Appeals, Complaints, Conduct		CEDU will continue to operate these as outlined in the MoA.	CEDU	Agreed
	Student Support arrangements		Both institutions will continue to provide the appropriate and current level of access as specified in the MoA.	CEDU/UoG	Agreed
	Teaching Facilities		CEDU will continue to provide appropriate teaching space.	CEDU	Agreed
	Rectorial Elections		If relevant during teach out, check students' eligibility to vote if appropriate.	UoG	Elections will take place in February 2017. CEDU students will be eligible to vote.
	Staff Related				
	Appropriate levels of staff		CEDU will ensure there is consistency and appropriate levels of staff to support the programmes during the teach-out period.	CEDU	Agreed
	Admissions and Registration				
	Admissions		CEDU will manage the admissions process for 2016-2017.	CEDU	Agreed
	Registration		CEDU will continue to register students throughout the teach-out period	CEDU	Agreed
	Withdrawals/Change of		CEDU will continue to liaise with Registry	CEDU	Agreed

	Status		on this.		
	Assessment				
	External Examiners		Extend the duration of the appointment of the Ex Ex for the UG programme (P Dent) to cover the teach out period. The tenure of the PGT Examiners will cover the teach out period.	UoG	Complete
	Assessment Process		The current assessment process will continue during the teach-out period.	CEDU	Agreed
	Monitoring				
	Joint Board		The Joint Board (7/7/16) agreed that current monitoring arrangements will apply throughout the teach out period subject to the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Joint Boards will take place by video-conference 2. Current Annual Report required for 16/17 3. CEDU will provide UoG with information on the OU requirements. UoG will undertake a mapping of the UoG and OU requirements to highlight any significant differences with a view to minimising impact on CEDU. Otherwise the same report will be acceptable to UoG in session 2017-18. 	CEDU/UoG	Academic session 16/17 (First meeting confirmed for 1 November 2016) Information received. Mapping to be completed early October 2016.
			ACO to advise CEDU of ASC dates for 2016-17		

	Finance				
	Validation Fee		The current Validation Fee structure will continue until the end of the relationship. Charges will reflect the diminishing levels of activity. [Note: An invoice has been issued for the Validation Fees for academic session 2015-16]	UoG	Agreed
	Programme Validation or Amendments				
	Check Validation Period	Y	The programmes are due to be revalidated in July 2016 so the teach-out period will be covered.		Validation Report submitted to ASC for final approval under summer powers (July 2016) Validation confirmed 25/7 - HEFCE letter provided to CEDU 25/7
	Programme or Course amendments		No major course or programme amendments anticipated post validation in July 2016.		
	Graduation				
	Membership of General Council		All UoG graduates of CEDU shall continue to pay the GC fee.	CEDU	Agreed
	Attendance at UoG ceremony		CEDU students will continue to be offered the opportunity of attending the relevant ceremony in Glasgow.	UoG	Agreed
	HEAR/Transcripts		CEDU will be responsible for providing detailed results to former Students prior to 16/17 intake (UoG will only have this	CEDU/UoG	Agreed

			information post validation of the programme in July 2016). UoG to produce parchment.		
	Other				
	Data Protection		Check on any potential issues with UoG's DP Office.	UoG	By October 2016
	Library/IT Access		CEDU to clarify position regarding student and staff access to Library/IT access.	CEDU	By October 2016
	Impact on UoG's Sponsor Licence		Liaise with UKVI on any action required.	UoG	No major impact. Any deferred students will be required to apply for new CAS for Glasgow.
	American Loans (including Sally Mae)		Advise, if required	UoG	No major impact
	Impact on any other UoG activity with Christie's		Agreed that Co-Supervision of UoG PhD students by Christie's staff could continue. This is managed by Graduate Schools.	UoG	Agreed
	Statutory Returns		CEDU will continue to submit any relevant returns.		Agreed

 Action Completed



University of Glasgow

Senate Office

Report on the revalidation event for Christie's Education Programmes

Revalidation Panel:

University of Glasgow: Dr Donald Spaeth (Dean of Learning and Teaching, College of Arts, Convener), Dr Dominic Paterson (Lecturer, History of Art, Subject Specialist), Ryan Reed (Senior Academic Collaborations Manager, Senate Office, Clerk to revalidation)

University of Loughborough: Professor Alison Yarrington (Dean of the School of the Arts, English and Drama, External Subject Specialist)

1 Introduction

Christie's Education (CEDU) is a Validated Institution working in partnership with the University of Glasgow (UoG). Its degree programmes lead to an award of UoG. A Joint Board, comprising members of staff from CEDU and UoG, oversees the academic and quality assurance aspects of the programmes offered by Christie's Education. The Joint Board meets twice during each academic session and receives an annual report from CEDU and a report from a Student Representative. The Joint Board oversees, on an ongoing basis, the processes applied by CEDU in respect of quality assurance and enhancement.

The purpose of revalidation is to periodically assure that the programmes offered by CEDU and leading to a UoG award remain of the appropriate academic standard and quality. This is achieved by undertaking a more comprehensive review of their content and currency than can be expected to be undertaken as part of the work of the Joint Board. Whilst the standards and quality of the programmes must be assessed against the context of the delivery, facilities and student experience at CEDU, the purpose of revalidation is not to inspect or review CEDU as an institution or organisation. Rather, the programmes and their component courses are the focus. It is also important to recognise that whilst the University did undertake an institutional review at CEDU at the establishment of the validation relationship, CEDU is now subject to direct oversight by the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) in its own right. CEDU was the subject of a very positive report from the QAA after they undertook a Higher Education Review (Alternative Providers) (HERAP) in October 2015.

The revalidation event took place remotely (by agreement of the Clerk of Senate and Vice Principal, Convenor of the Academic Standards Committee, and the Director of the Senate Office) and consisted of a review of programme and course specification documents. The revalidation process was further supported by a review of the Self-evaluation Document (SED) submitted to the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) by CEDU in August 2015, and the subsequent HERAP report from the QAA which was published in November 2015. Questions and issues which arose as part of the revalidation process were submitted to CEDU for a response which has in turn informed the content of this report. Where necessary further evidence was requested and was submitted to UoG by CEDU.

2 Christie's Education Programmes

CEDU offers the following undergraduate and postgraduate programmes which are validated by UoG and which were the subject of the revalidation event.

Undergraduate:

- MA (Hons) History of Art and Art-world Practice

Postgraduate:

- MLitt and PgDip History of Art and Art-world Practice: Art and Architecture from Antiquity to the Middle Ages and Renaissance
- MLitt and PgDip History of Art and Art-world Practice: Fine and Decorative Art From Renaissance to Modern
- MLitt and PgDip History of Art and Art-world Practice: Modern and Contemporary Art
- MLitt and PgDip History of Art and Art-world Practice: Arts of China

CEDU also offers an MSc and PGDip in Art, Law and Business. Whilst these programmes are validated by the University it was decided not to include them in the review due to them being validated in 2013 and therefore not requiring periodic review at this time (the period of validation is typically 6 years).

3 Revalidation process

The Panel was provided with all programme and course specifications which were then reviewed in light of the aims of the revalidation process. The Panel was also provided with the SED which CEDU had submitted to the QAA, and the report which the QAA had produced in light of the Higher Education Review (Alternative Providers) (HERAP) that took place in October 2015.

As part of the revalidation process the Panel reviewed the overarching quality assurance and enhancement processes and procedures (as presented in the SED and the QAA

HERAP Report) and also the academic content and coherence of the programmes and their constituent courses.

The comment of the panel was collated by the Academic Collaborations Office (ACO) and a request for further information and evidence was made to CEDU in order to clarify a number of issues. Using the comments of the Panel and the responses and further evidence provided by CEDU the ACO drafted this report and the recommendations included herein. The final draft of the report was agreed by the Panel and checked by CEDU for factual accuracy.

4 Conclusion

The Panel **recommends** that the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) **approve** the revalidation of all CEDU programmes (as detailed at 2) for a period of 3 years. The Panel's conclusions about the programmes are expanded upon below. The Panel has made a number of recommendations for enhancement of the programmes offered by CEDU, but the panel **recommends** that responses to these should not be considered a condition of validation.

4.1 Overall Approaches to Quality Assurance and Enhancement

The Panel reviewed evidence of CEDU's approach to quality assurance and enhancement, mainly in the form of the QAA HERAP report. Further context was provided based on an understanding of the operation of the Joint Board of Management which operates to oversee the relationship between CEDU and UoG in relation to the validated programmes and through requests for further evidence directly from CEDU where this was required.

The QAA HERAP report judgement was very positive, finding that all expectations were met, with a low level of risk being associated with CEDU. The QAA review team had identified three features of good practice, all of which were associated with vocational context and employability. There was one recommendation and no requirements.

Given that the revalidation event was taking place remotely, the Panel relied to a significant extent on evidence based statements made by the QAA in the HERAP report, where necessary referring to documentary evidence supplied by CEDU on request.

There were 14 references¹ to evidence-based statements, including:

- The nomenclature used in course handbooks is in line with SCQF guidelines and relevant subject benchmarks. (1.4)
- The design of the academic framework for setting and approving standards maps to the University's. (1.5)
- Governance arrangements through the JBCE [Joint Board of Management] were appropriate and effective. (1.11, 1.12)
- Programme specifications are used to plan teaching and assessment. (1.16)
- External examiner reports are distributed to staff for discussion and there is

¹ Numerical references below refer to paragraph numbers in the QAA HERAP report

- active involvement by external examiners in Examination Boards. External examiners inform course learning outcomes in course assessment and have engaged in a rich and meaningful way with teaching teams. External examiners' reports are used systematically in the annual monitoring process. (1.57)
- Staff from Christie's and the University work effectively together in programme development and validation. (2.6)
 - The recruitment, selection and admissions process is effective. (2.13)
 - Student self-reflection is used to encourage student learning. (2.21)
 - Students are informed about and satisfied with resources, at all stages of their studies. (2.27)
 - The vocational context of learning and assessment is highly effective. (2.22)
This is cited as an example of good practice. (See below.)
 - Students experience a wide range of professional development activities. They are provided with feedback and guidance on improving employability skills. (2.30)
 - The appointment the Development Officer has led to the systematic establishment of presentations, workshops, external opportunities, and professional development opportunities, including internships and work experience. (5.3)
 - The complaints and appeals process is effective, well managed and fair. (2.78)

Other strengths were also mentioned, including:

- Students are clear about the purpose of module learning outcomes. (1.40)
- External examiners confirm that learning outcomes are appropriate. (1.43)
- Christie's robustly implements procedures for annual monitoring, so that it is much more than a paper exercise. The Annual General Meeting, followed by an Annual Conference, is a key strength of the process. (1.50)
- The newly approved Assessment Strategy is providing a solid base for effective assessment. (2.46)
- The rich variety of assessment methods (underpinned by the link to employability) is a strength of the approach. (2.47)
- There have been a number of enhancement initiatives, and those related to employability have had demonstrable success in enhancing employability skills. (4.11)

Employability was identified as a key strength of the CEDU provision and the SED detailed statistics on employability that reinforced this conclusion. Indeed, one of the unique aspects of Christie's programmes recognised by the QAA HERAP report was the wide range of professional development activities that are embedded in the academic content of the programmes and courses, through the students' engagement with the auction house and art market environment. This includes the opportunities all have to work closely with the Christie's specialist staff and with collections and specialist curators to develop their intellectual and practical skills.

Annual monitoring is the subject of the only recommendation made by the QAA. The QAA HERAP report recommends that Christie's 'takes a more systematic approach to action planning, to review oversight and evaluation of annual monitoring'. (2.68)

Although the approach to annual monitoring is 'generally satisfactory', the QAA review team noted that reports include no specific reference to how matters raised in the

previous year's report have been addressed. (2.64) The QAA review team also found that the previous Academic Board did not appear to have systematically monitored actions arising from annual monitoring reports. (2.66) A new committee at CEDU, a Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee (QAEC) was recently established and is intended to maintain strategic oversight of the process. The QAA review team noted that the revised process had the potential for more in-depth consideration of reports and agreement of specific actions.

The panel made enquiries to CEDU about progress against this recommendation and about the operation of the QAEC. CEDU provided further evidence which confirmed the remit and membership of the newly formed committee. Minutes were provided to the revalidation Panel confirming that the QAEC was now in operation and was addressing its remit. The Panel also received sample Annual Monitoring documents. Although some of these did report on actions from previous reports, they often did not recommend issues for action.

The panel **recommends** that CEDU review the format and focus of annual monitoring documentation and adopt an approach that places more emphasis on reflecting on aspects of provision that could be enhanced and identifying actions to address them. The UoG has recently updated its annual monitoring forms, which place greater emphasis on reflection while being 'lighter touch', and CEDU may find it helpful to adopt the new format.

4.2 Programme Content, Structure, Coherence and Academic Standards

4.2.1 Overview

The suite of programmes and courses offered by CEDU were well conceived and carefully structured. They covered a suitable range of material to initiate undergraduate students in the study of art and art history, and to help postgraduate students deepen and develop their knowledge of specialist subjects in the field. The documentation detailing the programmes and courses makes their aims and objectives clear, and in the vast majority of cases sets expectations of students at appropriate levels.

The SED and QAA HERAP report further strengthened the impression of rigorous and appropriate practices and policies being applied to the design and delivery of programmes. The attention to the overall student experience and in particular to the vocational aspects of the programmes was an obvious strength. The ability of CEDU to draw on professional expertise of international calibre, and to offer students invaluable access to direct experience of art and the art market was also a defining feature of the CEDU offering.

4.2.2 Programme Structure

CEDU Programmes were appropriately structured and in line with the standard practices and requirements of UoG. The exception to this was the duration and credit value of the MSc in Art, Law and Business which spanned a full calendar year and consisted of 200 credits (140 of taught courses and 60 of independent project). However, this programme was validated previously and this model approved by ASC. All programmes

were complaint with the expectations set out in the Framework for Qualifications of Higher Education Institutions in Scotland (FQHEIS) as incorporated into the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework and the QAA Quality Code.

The undergraduate MA (Hons) History of Art and Art World Practice programme is unique in its structure in that, whilst being a four year undergraduate programme with 480 credits associated, the first two years take place in London and the final two years are taught at UoG. This model relies on an appropriate progression being in place across the four year programme and in particular between the curriculum delivered in London and that in Glasgow. The preparation of undergraduate students for Honours study might be aided by careful consideration of how a progression from Level 1 to 2 is conceived and enabled. It may be beneficial to reflect on whether the student-led Level 2 'Sources in Context' option could shift from a student-led seminar to a more formally taught option to facilitate this. Further comment on the subject of progression across level 1 and 2 of the undergraduate programme is included at 4.2.4.

4.2.3 Programme Aims

The Panel agreed that programme aims were in general clearly stated and that there was a clear alignment between the aims of each programme, the intended learning outcomes and the assessment strategies employed.

The MA (Hons) History of Art and Art-world Practice degree is supported by a very detailed and clear rationale that establishes its aims and objectives and relates these to the programme design, its stages and progressions and its assessment protocols.

The stated aims of the four postgraduate programmes are more generic and the Panel concluded that further specification of the aims of each programme, related to the particular aspect of the study of History of Art may be helpful. Further, the postgraduate programme aims may be further enhanced by raising the level of aims to ensure these were aspirational and reflected the expected outcomes of Masters level (SCQF Level 11) study. Whilst these programmes had previously been viewed as different options of the same programme, and perhaps this had led to the generic nature of the stated aims, this was no longer the case and the aims should reflect the particular focus of each individual programme. The Panel **recommends** that CEDU review the programme aims in relation to the postgraduate programmes to ensure that they are clearly related to the specialist nature of each programme and to ensure that those aims are appropriate to Master's level (SCQF Level 11) study.

4.2.4 Course level aims and Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs)

Course ILOs are highly detailed and specific (particularly in the case of Masters level courses), match the overall aims of the programmes and are generally well aligned with relevant credit frameworks.

CEDU might consider how a further degree of specificity could be given in terms of exactly how students will demonstrate the knowledge and skills they gain from courses, i.e. to detail whether this will be via written essays, oral presentations, exams, or through application of critical concepts. Such specificity was indeed found in many courses and

course ILOs, but greater consistency could be achieved. The Panel **recommends** that CEDU review the ILOs of courses on postgraduate programmes to ensure they are consistently indicative of how students will demonstrate their knowledge and skills. Whilst it is acknowledged that this will be set out in assessment approaches, it is helpful to students to understand what will be required of them from an early stage.

With regard to the year one undergraduate courses, a great many of the course aims were given in the form of an 'introduction' to various themes or topics. Given the wide variation in contact hours amongst these courses it might be suggested that certain courses could have their greater depth reflected in more ambitious ILOs. For example, Histories of Art: Antiquity to Renaissance, with 90 hours of lecturing. This might also be addressed in relation to the distinction between expectations at year 1 and at year 2, so as to more clearly differentiate the latter. This is already done with the two 'display contexts' options, but might be made more consistent across the year 2 offerings. The Panel **recommends** that CEDU review undergraduate course ILOs to ensure that they accurately reflect the increasingly specialised nature of courses, particularly at level 2 (SCQF Level 8) and in doing so consider the appropriate progression between level 1 and level 2 of the MA (Hons) programme.

The 'Thesis' ILOs for each of the postgraduate programmes are generic, and might be strengthened to reflect a 60-credit unit at this level. It would be advisable to look at the often more subject-specific and more detailed ILOs which UoG M.Litts in History of Art use for the 60-credit Dissertation option. It was also noted that there is a relatively frequent use of 'introduce' within the M.Litt aims and the ILOs set a similarly modest tone in places and could be pitched more clearly at the level of aspiration appropriate to SCQF level 11. The Panel **recommends** that CEDU review the ILOs associated with the 'thesis' component of the postgraduate programmes to ensure that the full extent of what is expected of a student is reflected in the ILOs. Further, CEDU should ensure that the language used in the ILOs for postgraduate courses is reflective of study at Masters level (SCQF Level 11).

With reference to SCQF level descriptors for Masters study, one might interpret the section on 'knowledge and understanding' in the SCQF level descriptors as necessitating that students engage explicitly with the key historiographic and conceptual precepts of the discipline. The relevant section states that students at this level will: Demonstrate and/or work with:

- Knowledge that covers and integrates most, if not all, of the main areas of the subject/discipline/sector – including their features, boundaries, terminology and conventions.
- A critical understanding of the principal theories, concepts and principles.
- A critical understanding of a range of specialised theories, concepts and principles.
- Extensive, detailed and critical knowledge and understanding in one or more specialisms, much of which is at, or informed by, developments at the forefront.
- A critical awareness of current issues in a subject/discipline/sector and one or

more specialisms.

It would be worth considering whether this dimension is currently treated so as to enable such critical understanding. If students are not necessarily expected to enter the programme with this specific knowledge, a more focused and structured taught component might be introduced in order to ensure that all students are supported in attaining the kind of critical understanding and knowledge listed in SCQF. And more generally, there is scope to consider whether the Christie's M.Litt options are conceived as introductory and broad-based (as the ILOs often suggest), or aim to push the best students in their cohorts to engage with and in truly cutting-edge art historical work.

4.2.5 Learning and Teaching Approaches

As referenced elsewhere in this report, one of the unique features of Christie's programmes recognised by the QAA HERAP report is the wide range of professional development activities that are embedded in the academic content of the courses, through the students' engagement with the auction house and art market environment. Students have opportunities to work closely with Christie's specialist staff, with collections and specialist curators to develop their intellectual and practical skills. In this respect Christie's is in an enviable position to expose students to a world-leading commercial arts organisation, which undoubtedly adds value and coherence to the programmes on offer and which would be hard to replicate elsewhere

Appropriate fieldwork allows students to develop their understanding and analysis in different global and local locations. There is a high level of contact between CEDU academic staff and students, with many courses involving high levels of formal contact hours

The structure of the Art and Architecture and the Fine and Decorative Arts postgraduate programmes enable the acquisition of broad synoptic knowledge and understanding across a diverse historical and critical range. Within this the students can acquire an understanding of a specialist area as well as the intellectual principles of the discipline of art history and visual cultures.

An outstanding example of good practice is the MLitt History of Art and Art World Practice: Arts of China programme. This Programme enables a critical understanding and engagement with the most recent research in the subject area, developed through the presentation of written work in a variety of formats, combined with the practical skills of handling works of art, structuring catalogue entries, building an awareness of curatorial strategies and the development of an exhibition catalogue/thesis. In its structure it provides highly specialised training relating to the art market and the heritage industries, and is unlike other MAs, such as the Birmingham City University Masters in Contemporary Chinese Art or the SOAS Masters in East Asian Art and Architecture.

At the time of writing CEDU were undertaking a review of their Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy. A draft of this document was supplied and emerging strategic objectives that were identified included:

- Teaching and learning with a strategic focus on employability and entrepreneurship.

- Creating a learning environment which supports and challenges students.
- Teaching and learning which is informed and strengthened by staff research and professional practice.
- Developing innovative teaching, learning and assessment (including building on-line dialogue: tuition and feedback).
- Building a VLE [Virtual Learning Environment] as a vehicle for information (for students) about teaching, learning and assessment.
- CPD which strengthens and maintains staff currency.
- Collaboration between academic and support staff in the provision of an excellent learning experience.

Some of the excellent opportunities for innovation in learning and teaching, particularly in light of CEDU's access to the art-world and auction house environments, would be greatly supported by the completion of a coherent and widely understood strategy for the further development of learning and teaching practice. Further, the clear articulation of the already evident focus on employability and entrepreneurship in the art-world would strengthen the coherence of CEDU's offering to students. The Panel **recommends** that CEDU prioritise the completion of its Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy in order to create a clear and shared understanding of the key principles which underpin the CEDU approach and the strategic objectives which will provide a focus for continued enhancement.

4.2.6 Assessment

The Panel was satisfied that summative assessments were set at the appropriate level and were aligned to both the stated aims and intended learning outcomes at a course and programme level.

There were some references in staff student liaison meetings to a lack of clarity about expected standards and the relationship to assessment criteria at each grade on the marking scale. Wherever it is possible to do so, students would be well served by efforts to reference performance expected in individual pieces of assessed work (or by reference to past examples) against the grade criteria set out in the UoG code of assessment and the CEDU programme handbooks.

In the draft Learning Teaching and Assessment Strategy CEDU states that as part of developing innovative learning, teaching and assessment approaches it intends to ensure that, wherever possible, assessments 'reflect current working practices in the art world'. The Panel concluded that, whilst the variety of approaches to teaching and learning was a strength, there was scope to similarly widen and diversify the kinds of summative assessment used. Summative assessment tended to rely to a large degree on essay submissions. Whilst it was important to keep in mind that the awards being made were academic rather than purely vocational, the Panel agreed that there was greater scope to take advantage of the relatively small class sizes and access to a range of environments which could facilitate a range of assessment methods and which would enhance the value of assessment activity for students.

The Panel **recommends** that CEDU undertake a review of assessment methodology across all courses and programmes and plan for and implement a diversification of

assessment methods to ensure that assessment activity further supports the aims, ILOs and innovative approaches to learning and teaching employed on CEDU programmes.

5 Summary and list of recommendations

The Panel concluded that Christie's Education is providing a unique offering of highly relevant and current programmes to its students. These programmes and their component courses were underpinned by a sound approach to maintaining and enhancing academic standards and quality. CEDU continued to operate in accordance with UoGs code of practice for validated provision and, as evidenced by the QAA HERAP report, all external quality assurance and enhancement requirements which apply to it directly.

The Panel concurred with the findings of QAA as part of the HERAP that CEDU's practice in the area of employability, as enabled by the professionally and sectorally relevant content and delivery of its programmes, was a key and defining strength of CEDU as an institution. The Panel **commends** CEDU for its practice in this area.

The Panel reviewed the individual programmes and courses which were offered by CEDU and which were validated by UoG. The Panel was satisfied that programme and course aims, ILOs, learning and teaching approaches and assessment methods remained appropriate to ensuring the requisite academic standards and quality to lead to a UoG award. However, whilst satisfied that standards and quality were high, the Panel has made a number of recommendations which would further enhance the quality and coherence of the programmes on offer. These are set out below:

Recommendation 1:

The panel **recommends** that CEDU review the format and focus of annual monitoring documentation and adopt an approach that places more emphasis on reflecting on aspects of provision that could be enhanced and identifying actions to address them. The UoG has recently updated its annual monitoring forms, which place greater emphasis on reflection while being 'lighter touch', and CEDU may find it helpful to adopt the new format.

Recommendation 2:

The Panel **recommends** that CEDU review the programme aims in relation to the postgraduate programmes to ensure that they are clearly related to the specialist nature of each programme and to ensure that those aims are appropriate to Master's level (SCQF Level 11) study.

Recommendation 3:

The Panel **recommends** that CEDU review the ILOs of courses on postgraduate programmes to ensure they are consistently indicative of how students will demonstrate their knowledge and skills.

Recommendation 4:

The Panel **recommends** that CEDU review undergraduate course ILOs to ensure that they accurately reflect the increasingly specialised nature of courses, particularly at level 2 (SCQF Level 8) and in doing so consider the appropriate progression between level 1 and level 2 of the MA (Hons) programme.

Recommendation 5:

The Panel **recommends** that CEDU review the ILOs associated with the 'thesis' component of the postgraduate programmes to ensure that the full extent of what is expected of a student is reflected in the ILOs. Further, CEDU should ensure that the language used in the ILOs for postgraduate courses is reflective of study at Masters level (SCQF Level 11).

Recommendation 6:

The Panel **recommends** that CEDU prioritise the completion of its Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy in order to create a clear and shared understanding of the key principles which underpin the CEDU approach and the strategic objectives which will provide a focus for continued enhancement.

Recommendation 7:

The Panel **recommends** that CEDU undertake a review of assessment methodology across all courses and programmes and plan for and implement a diversification of assessment methods to ensure that assessment activity further supports the aims, ILOs and innovative approaches to learning and teaching employed on CEDU programmes.