

THE GLASGOW SCHOOL OF ART	Major Programme or Course Amendment Proposal
--------------------------------------	---

This proposal for a major Programme or Course amendment should be approved by the Executive Group via Policy and Governance.

Submitted by: (Proposer)	Mónica Laiseca
Date	05/05/2017

Confirmed by: (Head of School)	Prof Alistair Payne
Date	05/05/2017

1. Please indicate whether the amendment (s) proposed are to a course or programme (or both):	
Course	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

2. If the major amendment is to a programme, please confirm the following details <i>(highlighting any amendment as appropriate)</i>						
2.1 Programme Title	Master of Letters in Curatorial Practice (Contemporary Art)					
2.2 Award	Master of Letters					
2.3 Exit Awards	Stage 1 – PG Cert in Curatorial Practice (Contemporary Art) Stage 2 – PG Diploma in Curatorial Practice (Contemporary Art) Stage 3 – MLitt in Curatorial Practice (Contemporary Art)					
2.4 Length of Programme	12 Months FT					
2.5 Programme Level	Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Postgraduate Taught	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Postgraduate Research	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.6 Mode of Delivery	Full time	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Part time	<input type="checkbox"/>	Distance Learning	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. If the major amendment is to a course, please confirm the following details <i>(highlighting any amendment as appropriate)</i> More than one course is affected	
3.1 Course Title	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curatorial Practice 1 (PCUR101) – change to ILOs, teaching methods and assessment • Research Methods in Practice (PCUR102) – course replaced • Curatorial Practice 2 (PCUR201) – change to credit structure, ILOs, teaching methods and assessment • Master’s Project in Curatorial Practice 1 (PCUR 301) – change to assessment (word-count) • Master’s Project in Curatorial Practice 2 (PCUR 302) – change to assessment (word-count) and review of course descriptor • Dissertation (PCUR 303) – change to assessment (word-

	count) and review of course descriptor					
3.2 SCQF Credits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curatorial Practice 1 (PCUR101) – 40 credits • Research Methods in Practice (PCUR102) – 20 credits • Curatorial Practice 2 (PCUR201) – 45 credits • Master’s Project in Curatorial Practice 1 (PCUR 301) – 60 credits • Master’s Project in Curatorial Practice 2 (PCUR 302) – 60 credits • Dissertation (PCUR 303) – 60 credits 					
3.3 Length of Course	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curatorial Practice 1 (PCUR101) – 15 weeks • Research Methods in Practice (PCUR102) – 10 weeks • Curatorial Practice 2 (PCUR201) – 15 weeks • Master’s Project in Curatorial Practice 1 (PCUR 301) – 15 weeks • Master’s Project in Curatorial Practice 2 (PCUR 302) – 15 weeks • Dissertation (PCUR 303) – 15 weeks 					
3.4 Course Level	Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Postgraduate Taught	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Postgraduate Research	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.5 Mode of Delivery	Full time	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Part time	<input type="checkbox"/>	Distance Learning	<input type="checkbox"/>

4. Please re-confirm Entry Qualifications <i>(highlighting any changes as appropriate)</i>	
3.1 Highers	N/A
3.2 A Levels	N/A
3.3 Other	A good Undergraduate Degree in a relevant subject (normally 2:1 or higher) or equivalent professional experience.
3.4 IELTS Score Required on Entry	6.5 (5.5. or above in each component)

5. Planned date for implementation of the amendments.	01/09/2018
--	------------

6. School	Fine Art
------------------	----------

7. Department	Curatorial Practice (Contemporary Art)
----------------------	--

8. Subject Area of the Programme (e.g. Interior Design)	Curatorial Practice (Contemporary Art)
--	--

9. Source of Funding (e.g. SFC)	Self-funded and SFC
--	---------------------

9.1 Indicative Tuition Fees (Home/RUK/Overseas)					
Home	£6,480	RUK	£6,480	Overseas	£15,840

Though not part of the amendments being presented in this proposal, a parallel review of the programme’s Tuition Fees is currently underway following discussions held in the context of

Periodic Review and in response to student feedback. The review will address the need to allocate a budget of £500 to each student for their final project, in order to cover artists' fees, transport of art works and other costs. This amount is based on what other curatorial programmes world-wide are offering and the levels of spending incurred by the first three cohorts of the programme. The degree classification for the programme is based on the mark achieved in the final project, thus quality of production is paramount.

The review of Tuition Fees is being led by Scott Parsons (Director of Marketing and Strategy), and appropriate consultations have taken place with Prof Alistair Payne (HoS, Fine Art) and Sandi Galbraith (Deputy Director of Finance and Resources). At UoG appropriate consultations have taken place with Lesley Young (University Teacher, Curatorial Practice), who is a Tutor in the Programme, and Prof Dimitris Eleftheriotis (HoS, School of Culture and Creative Arts), Prof Nick Fells (Professor, Sonic Practice) and Dr Sally Tuckett (Lecturer, History of Dress and Textiles), who are members of the MLitt CPCA Joint Programme Board.

10. Please provide a description of the amendments, including impact on course/programme level Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs):

The five amendments outlined below are being proposed in the context of Periodic Review and in response to student feedback gathered in the first three years of running the programme. A number of consultations have informed the development of this proposal, including with SoFA's Head of School, our External Examiner, Joint Programme Board, Advisory Group, students, colleagues at GSA and Visiting Tutors.

The **amendments** are:

- 1. Replacing the unit Research Methods in Practice (PCUR102, 20 credits, UoG), with SoFA's upcoming Core Research Skills and Methodologies course (20 credits, GSA).** This course will begin running in 2018-19 and explores research as central to the development of contemporary arts practice.
- 2. New credit structure.** From 2019/20 all PGT courses are required to be multiples of 10 credits. Only Stage 2 is affected, where the credits of Curatorial Practice 2 (PCUR201) will be reduced from 45 to 40 credits, whereas GSA's elective courses will increase from 15 to 20 credits.
- 3. Adapting the learning narrative and teaching methods in the core units Curatorial Practice 1 (Stage 1, PCUR101) and Curatorial Practice 2 (Stage 2, PCUR201), in order to enable a more productive balance between theory and practice.** In the original programme document, Curatorial Practice 1 (PCUR101) is designed to give a broad introduction to curating, including historical, whereas Curatorial Practice 2 (PCUR201) focuses primarily on professional skills and project-based work. Maintaining a balance between theory and practice across both units seems more engaging for students, and a better way to integrate different perspectives and learning situations to support the development of students' curatorial practices.

We are seeking to review the **learning narrative**, so that:

a) PCUR101:

- Provides a historical introduction to curating and explores different curatorial positions in relation to specific local, socio-demographic and institutional contexts, including Glasgow;
- Students will be asked to work in groups to curate self-initiated projects that engage with the contemporary in their immediate environment.

b) PCUR201:

- Shifts the focus towards curating as a form of research and the exploration of a broad spectrum of modalities of practice;
- Students will be supported to either individually curate self-initiated projects or to undertake live briefs at partner institutions (such as The Hunterian Art Gallery and Museum, GoMA, Platform...), tailored to their individual interest, and to position their own work in relation to a wider field of practice.

Upon approval of this proposal from the Executive Group, individual course descriptions and ILOs will be revised, following this rationale.

As far as **teaching methods** are concerned, in order to ensure a more productive balance between theory and practice, there needs to be a mix of lecture-based and workshop teaching across PCUR101 and PCUR201. At the moment there are only 5 hours for lectures in PCUR101, and no lectures programmed in PCUR201. We propose to review the contact time pattern for both units, as follows:

CURATORIAL PRACTICE 1 (PCUR101)

Method	Formal Contact Hours	REVIEWED Method	Formal Contact Hours
Lecture	5	Lecture	4
		Professional Skills Training	4
Studio	-	Studio	10
Seminar/Presentation <i>Inc. Studio Critique</i>	5	Study Day	4
Tutorial	6	Tutorial/Crit	4
Workshop <i>Induction/Instruction</i>	18	Workshop <i>Induction/Instruction</i>	3
Independent Study (Guided)	3	Independent Study (Guided)	4
Private Study/Fieldwork	3	Fieldwork	7
TOTAL	40		40

CURATORIAL PRACTICE 2 (PCUR201)

Method	Formal Contact Hours	REVIEWED Method	Formal Contact Hours
Lecture	-	Lecture	4
		Professional Skills Training	4
Studio	7	Studio	10
Seminar/Presentation <i>Inc. Studio Critique</i>	10	Study Day	4
Tutorial	6	Tutorial/Crit	4

Workshop <i>Induction/Instruction</i>	18	Workshop <i>Induction/Instruction</i>	3
Independent Study (Guided)	0	Independent Study (Guided)	4
Private Study/Fieldwork	4	Fieldwork	7
TOTAL	45		40

4. **Reviewing course descriptors for the units Master’s Project (Option 1 – PCUR301, Option 2 – PCUR302) and Dissertation (PCUR303).** This will be a light edit, which looks to establish the parity of both options and how they are used to assess learning in the field of curatorial practice.
5. **Simplifying assessment.** Currently students are asked to produce **three** summative assignments for PCUR101 and PCUR201, respectively: a curatorial project (which counts 50% towards the final mark) and two written assignments (with word-counts ranging from 2,000 to 3,500 words).

We are looking to propose a simplified assessment pattern with **only two** summative assignments per course, one being a project and the other a piece of writing, and introduce a formative point for each so students can receive feedback while their ideas are still developing and learning taking place.

In Stage 3, we are looking to **reduce the word-counts** for the Dissertation and the Master’s Project Essay in order to match the word-counts used in MLitt programmes at UoG’s School of Art and Creative Cultures.

The reviewed assessment pattern is as follows:

STAGE 1			
CURATORIAL PRACTICE 1 (40 credits)	Assessment: - Project -Symposium 1 report (2,000 words) - Context review (2,500 4,000 words)	CORE RESEARCH SKILLS (20 credits)	
GSA/UoG		GSA	
STAGE 2			
CURATORIAL PRACTICE 2 (45 40 credits)	Assessment: - Project -Symposium 2 report (2,000 words) - Master’s Project or Dissertation Proposal (3,500 4,000 words)	PGT ELECTIVE (20 credits)	
GSA/UoG		GSA/UoG	

STAGE 3			
MASTER'S PROJECT (60 credits) GSA/UoG	Assessment: -Option 1: Exhibition and Portfolio (100%) -Option 2: Exhibition (50%) and Essay (50%) (10,000 7,500 words)	OR DISSERTATION (60 credits) GSA/UoG	Assessment: Dissertation (15,000-20,000 15,000 words)

11. Please outline the rationale for the amendments:

- 1. Replacing the unit Research Methods in Practice (PCUR102, 20 credits, UoG), with SoFA's upcoming Core Research Skills and Methodologies course (20 credits, GSA).**

The unit Research Methods in Practice (RMP) at UoG is offered to postgraduate students across the History of Art department coming from programmes as diverse as the MLitt Dress and Textile Histories, MSc Museum Studies, MLitt Renaissance in Modern Europe and Italy and MLitt CPCA. Every year students in our programme have reported that they found the content too broad and not entirely relevant to their studies, even if interesting and well delivered.

The School of Fine Art at GSA is currently developing bespoke research training for PG students in Fine Art, which will run from 2018-19. Following discussions with Alistair Payne (HoS, SoFA) and Ranjana Thapalyal (PL, MRes Creative Practices), who are developing the new course, we are confident that it is better suited to MLitt CPCA than RMP as the emphasis is on practice-based research, which is more closely aligned with how curating is conceptualised in the programme.

The new course will examine how research informs artistic practice and may include sessions such as 'Drawing as Research', 'The Artist as Ethnographer', etc. Hearing artists discuss their work from this perspective will be hugely beneficial to our students as emerging curators with a Contemporary Art specialism. At the same time, the course will also cover curatorial research and provide an introduction to core research skills, so students willing to pursue PhD study will have a good preparation.

This amendment has been discussed at length with our colleagues at UoG through MLitt CPCA's Joint Programme Board, and they have agreed this is a helpful change for the programme.

- 2. New credit structure.** In line with current practice at UoG and other HEI, all post-graduate programmes at GSA have been asked to review their credit structure so that all courses are multiples of 10 credits. This will facilitate collaboration with other HEIs in the future, including sharing of elective courses.
- 3. Adapting the learning narrative and teaching methods in the core units Curatorial Practice 1 (Stage 1, PCUR101) and Curatorial Practice 2 (Stage 2, PCUR201), in order to enable a more productive balance between theory and practice.**

Learning Narrative

The original programme document separates the teaching of curatorial theory and history in Stage 1, from professional practice training, which takes place in Stage 2. Students, however, begin curating projects from the very first weeks of joining the programme and need to acquire professional skills early on. At the same time in Stage 2, as their curatorial practice develops, they can see the application of theoretical learning within their own work, so the potential for deep learning is much higher at this point.

A light revision of course descriptions and ILOs will be needed to implement this rationale, and brings also an opportunity to better communicate the identity of the MLitt CPCA programme and highlight what makes it different from competitor programmes, particularly: the embedding of the programme within Glasgow's art scene, the possibility given to work closely with artists, and the focus on individual practice. This is summed up in the **Positioning Statement** that was written to initiate the Periodic Review reflection process:

"A One-Year Curating Course Set Within Glasgow's Art Community

This programme offers students the opportunity to study curatorial practice in Glasgow, a city with one of the most vibrant and distinctive art scenes in Europe. The programme is embedded within the city, drawing on its community of artists, curators, institutions and international connections, and guides students to undertake curatorial work and develop approaches to practice which stem from a **strong awareness of context** and participation within it.

Jointly run by The Glasgow School of Art and the University of Glasgow, the programme takes the link between curator and artist as the starting point from which to explore curatorial practice. Curating is thus presented as an activity that is reliant upon close and on-going contact with artists and a considered understanding of their work. A central tenet of the programme is that students undertake self-initiated curatorial work that reflects their **individual interests and aspirations**. Working in different contexts, including a dedicated studio space at the heart of the School of Fine Art, participants develop individual research, hone their thinking and acquire practical professional skills whilst initiating and producing real exhibitions, projects and events."

Teaching Methods

A balance between theory and practice across PCUR101 and PCUR201 seems more productive in order to support the development of practice and is something that students have consistently raised in their feedback as being needed in the programme. Preempting this, over the last year we have scheduled additional sessions in both units, and it is clear that students have benefitted from this. The proposed revision of teaching methods is informed by this experience and looks at timetabling taught sessions in 3-4 week blocks, interspersed by the presentation of students' projects and crits.

It should be noted also that there is an error in the original programme document as the 18 hours allocated to 'Workshop' were intended to be utilised to run a 2-day Symposium, one per Stage. The Symposium format, however, has proved to be problematic in that it leaves very little time for students to deepen their understanding of Visiting Tutors' individual work. Instead, we are proposing to timetable more taught sessions, such as lectures and professional skills training, yet adding up to the same overall contact time, and invite Visiting Tutors to lead full

sessions.

The increased contact time in the Studio reflects the time allocated to the presentation and critique of student-initiated curatorial projects.

- 4. Reviewing course descriptors for the units Master’s Project (Option 1 – PCUR301, Option 2 – PCUR302) and Dissertation (PCUR303).** This light edit seeks to clarify how the two options are used to assess students’ progress in curatorial practice and establish that whether pursuing a Master’s Project or a Dissertation as final assignment, student’s work will be assessed according to its relevance in relation to the growing canon of curating. This edit has been suggested by our External Examiner, with a view to clarifying also how a Dissertation in Curatorial Practice is different to dissertations in other fields, such as Art History.

5. Simplifying assessment.

The reason for simplifying assessment in PCUR101 and PCUR201 is that we are over-assessing. This is apparent to Tutors and students in the programme. The current assessment pattern leaves little room for introducing formative points as coursework develops. At the same time, the pressure generated by having to deliver a curatorial project and two pieces of writing in the space of 12 weeks is counterproductive to students’ learning. We are proposing instead to eliminate one of the written assignments, the Symposium Report, and increase the word-count of the second piece of writing which is research-based and directly linked with the development of students’ individual curatorial work. This means students will produce a curatorial project and a substantial piece of research per course, and we will assess their learning on the basis of advancements within their own practice, rather than through reporting methods.

The reduction of word-counts in Stage 3 has been suggested by our colleagues at UoG, in order to follow the parametres set for other MLitt programmes in the School of Art and Creative Cultures.

12. Does the proposed amendment create a substantive overlap in terms of subject provision at this level in GSA? *You may wish to comment in more detail below if there is inter-disciplinary overlap.*

Yes No

If yes, please provide details of the other programmes/courses below:

Programme	Click here to enter text.
School	Click here to enter text.
Programme/Course Leader	Click here to enter text.
Please confirm this overlap has been discussed with the relevant School	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
Further comment?	Click here to enter text.
Please confirm this overlap has been discussed with Student Recruitment	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
Further comment?	Click here to enter text.

13. Please re-confirm the minimum and maximum student numbers required to ensure that the provision is academically viable and appropriately resourced:

	Minimum	Maximum
Home/EU Students	4	7
RUK Students		

Overseas Students	2	5
<p>Please provide an explanation of the numbers given:</p> <p>These are the numbers given in the original course documentation in order to provide sufficient income for staffing levels and the consumables budget ('Statement of Intent', 18/10/2013).</p>		

14.1 Please confirm that you have discussed the proposed change with the Director or Deputy Director of Finance and Resources.	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
14.2 Does the proposed amendment impact on the financial rationale? No impact is foreseen, however we reserve the right to review the financial rationale in the future should there be any changes to core delivery of the programme.	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
14.3 If yes, please confirm that an amended financial rationale has been approved by the Director or Deputy Director of Finance and Resources. Any capital bids envisaged in the next four years for undergraduate programmes and three years for postgraduate programmes have been included in the financial rationale.				<input type="checkbox"/>
14.4 If yes, please confirm that the Director or Deputy Director of Finance and Resources has submitted the amended financial rationale to Policy and Governance.				<input type="checkbox"/>

15.1 Please confirm that you have discussed the proposed amendment with the Director of Marketing, Communications and Strategic Planning.	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
15.2 Does the proposed amendment impact on the marketing strategy of the programme? There is no need to review the marketing strategy. The proposed changes are coherent with the original programme vision and will contribute to give further clarity.	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
15.3 If yes, please provide an analysis of the potential market for the programme in the UK and internationally, carried out in consultation with Marketing & Communications, and leading to formulation of marketing strategy: <i>Please provide an overview of the current and future market conditions.</i>				
Click here to enter text.				
15.4 If appropriate, please confirm that a revised marketing strategy has been agreed.	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

16. Anticipated demand on staffing, resources and services (including English language support and welfare): <i>Please list the expected FTE required for teaching and tutorials, all accommodation and workshop requirements. Also, state any monetary costs that would not be routine.</i>
The proposed changes can be delivered within the current levels of staffing, as overall contact time has not changed. Studio accommodation and workshop requirements will also remain the same and no additional monetary costs are foreseen.

17. If a collaboration with other institutions is proposed, please provide the following:	
Partner Institution:	University of Glasgow
Nature of Collaboration (please tick)	

Joint programme – single awarding institution – University of Glasgow	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Joint programme – single awarding institution – other than UoG	<input type="checkbox"/>
Joint Programme – GSA delivery to UoG programme (Awarding institution: UoG)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Joint Programme – UoG delivery to GSA programme (Awarding institution: UoG)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Delivery of GSA programmes overseas	<input type="checkbox"/>
Articulation to a GSA programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
If a Joint Programme, please state the administering institution: GSA	

18. Please confirm the following consultations have taken place: <i>(space is provided below to detail any comments or feedback from the consultations)</i>	
18.1 The proposal and any resource implications have been discussed with the Head of Technical Support Department.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
18.2 The proposal has been discussed with the Head of Learning Resources and <i>the</i> attached ‘Implications for Library/Learning Resources Provision’ form has been completed.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
18.3 The proposal has been discussed with the Estates Manager and the attached ‘Implications for Estates Provision’ form has been completed.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
18.4 The proposal has been discussed with the Director of IT and the attached ‘Implications for IT Provision’ form has been completed.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
18.5 Please confirm that the proposal has been discussed in detail with the Head of Learning and Teaching.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
18.6 The proposal has been discussed with the current student cohort.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
18.7 The proposal has been discussed with the current External Examiner.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
18.8 If the proposal relates to postgraduate provision, please confirm that the proposal has been discussed in detail with the Head of Research and the Senior Academic Fellow for Digital Learning.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
18.9 If the proposal relates to joint provision with the University of Glasgow, please confirm that the proposal has been discussed in detail with staff at an appropriate level in the relevant School/College.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
18.8 Please provide any relevant details from the above consultations:	
<p>The proposal was discussed with Gordon McLoughlin (Director of IT) and Duncan Chappell (Academic Liaison Librarian) at the March MLittCPCA SSCC meeting. Mike Quigley (Head of Estates) provided input and comments by email. See details of consultations with IT, Library and Estates Departments in pages 12-14.</p> <p>Additionally, consultations were conducted with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Will Bradley (Artistic Director at Kunsthall Oslo, External Examiner). The proposed changes were discussed at length with Will Bradley by the MLitt CPCA Programme Team (Mónica Laiseca, GSA and Lesley Young, UoG) during his interim visit in January. The proposed simplified assessment pattern was considered of particular benefit to the programme by Bradley, in that it would enable students to carry out more sophisticated research. He suggested asking students to write a ‘conclusion’ as part of the 4,000 word-written pieces being introduced in CP1 and CP2 and having a formative point for each of these assignments. Bradley also proposed clarifying how the Master’s Project and Dissertation options correlate as methods of assessment, which has been addressed in this proposal. (18th January 2017) 	

- **Athena Gerakis** and **Fiona Allan** (Student Representatives, MLitt CPCA). Both welcomed the changes and corroborated that these were aimed at tackling issues previously raised by student feedback. It was agreed that a meeting with the whole class would be held in July, to inform the revision of individual course descriptors and ILOs. *(9th March 2017)*
- **Prof Ken Neil** (Deputy Director, Academic and Interim Director of Research). Prof Neil was supportive of the amendments progressing and encouraged active engagement of the Learning and Teaching team in the development of the paperwork. *(13th March 2017)*
- **Prof Dimitris Eleftheriotis** (Head of School, School of Culture and Creative Arts, UoG), **Prof Nick Fells** (Professor, Sonic Practice, UoG) and **Dr Sally Tuckett** (Lecturer, History of Dress and Textiles, UoG). The Programme Team (Mónica Laiseca, GSA and **Lesley Young**, UoG) discussed the proposed changes with colleagues representing the School of Culture and Creative Arts at UoG at the last MLitt CPCA Joint Programme Board meeting, chaired by Prof Alistair Payne (Head of School, Fine Art). It was a very productive discussion, which provided also an opportunity to learn about how other programmes at UoG approach the assessment of practice-based work, including collaborative work. Everyone attending the meeting agreed that the proposed changes were a positive development for the programme. Dr Sally Tucket pointed out that the Dissertation word-counts at the School of Culture and Creative Arts were shorter (15,000 rather than 20,000 words) and it was agreed that a reduction of the MLitt CPCA Dissertation and Master's Project 2 Essay word-counts would be included in the Major Amendments proposal. *(16th March 2017)*
- **Prof Vicky Gunn** (Head of Learning and Teaching). Changes were positively reviewed and the emphasis given to practice considered a key improvement. *(27th March 2017)*.
- **Dr Madeleine Sclater** (Senior Research Fellow for Digital Learning) and **Libby Anson** (Student Employability & Enterprise Manager). Both were supportive of the changes and thought the rationale for these was well developed and clear. The revision of course descriptors and ILOs was seen as an opportunity to highlight the employability work being done by the programme. *(27th March 2017)*
- **John Ayers** (Head of Technical Support). It was clarified that the use of workshop facilities and induction time remain the same. The programme has access to workshop facilities through a proposal system, and the class typically undertakes a general induction to the wood workshop and EMS at the beginning of the year. *(28th April 2017)*

IMPLICATIONS FOR LIBRARY/LEARNING RESOURCES PROVISION *(to be completed by GSA Library)*

DATE of this document	18 April 2017
COURSE / PROGRAMME	MLitt Curatorial Practice (Contemporary Art)

a. Position Statement
<p><i>To be covered in this section:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Review of current position of Library/Learning Resources in meeting the requirement of the amended course or programme</i> • <i>Outline of areas for development/expansion</i> • <i>Further relevant comments e.g. availability or cost of materials or preferred mode of delivery</i> <p>No change from statement on original course proposal. No implications for Library are posed by these amendments.</p>
b. Current Collection Strengths
The Library has already acquired the majority of the titles in the programme's reading list.
c. Current Collection Weaknesses
None as a result of amendments.
d. Indicative Costs for Addressing Collection Weaknesses
N/a

IMPLICATIONS FOR ESTATES PROVISION *(to be completed in liaison with Estates Management)*

DATE of this document	20/04/2017
COURSE / PROGRAMME	MLitt Curatorial Practice (Contemporary Art)

a. Would the proposed amendment impact the spatial area currently allocated to the programme or course?

No. Students will continue to use their studio in the same way - as an office and project space.

b. Would the proposed amendment to the course or programme require a new physical location?

No. The programme is currently housed in the Tontine building. The proposed studio space for MLittCPCA in the Stow building will accommodate the current recruitment target.

c. If the response to (b) is yes, how will the new location of the programme impact on or be impacted on by current co-located programmes?

d. If the response to (b) is yes, what are the potential physical challenges with the space for the new location? (Please see Estates for a room data check sheet to assist)

e. If the response to (b) is yes, what are the financial implications of refitting the current space to make it fit for purpose?

IMPLICATIONS FOR IT PROVISION *(to be completed in liaison with Director of IT)*

DATE of this document	11/04/2017
COURSE / PROGRAMME	MLitt Curatorial Practice (Contemporary Art)

a. What is the impact on IT to support this Major Programme and/or Course amendment?
No significant impact as proposed numbers are small.

b. What additional / replacement IT hardware is required?
None identified.

c. Is there additional / replacement software licenses required?
None identified.

d. Are there any operating systems required in addition to those currently supported?
No

e. What are the financial implications from an IT perspective to deliver this programme?
No additional requirements, can be supported from within additional resources and budget.