

**University of Glasgow**

**Academic Standards Committee – Friday 24 November 2017**

**Major Programme Amendment Approval 2016-17: Update on  
Recommendations for the MLitt Fine Art Practice – Performance  
Pathway at The Glasgow School of Art**

In September 2016, the UPC: Programme Approval Meeting considered and approved an additional pathway in Performance for the MLitt Fine Art Practice programme. Academic Council recommended the pathway to the University of Glasgow's Academic Standards Committee, which subsequently validated the pathway for a period of six years commencing in September 2017.

The following recommendations were made at the meeting of 21 September 2016, and it was agreed that these should be considered and a report with regard to progress against the recommendations made to the Committee, via Boards of Studies within twelve months.

The following is an extract from the relevant Programme Approval report:

*The Programme Leader should report any updates on recommendations in the appropriate comments box and return to Academic Registry following Boards of Studies.*

**Recommendation 1**

The Approval Panel recommended that the Programme Leader consider the feedback provided by Professor Stockham with regard to the assessment of performance work, and that this is reflected in the Submissions Guidelines, currently in development, for undergraduate and postgraduate students in the School of Fine Art.

We would like to thank Professor Stockham for her input into the approval process as she has given us very valuable contributions. The submission guidelines contain relevant information for students from all pathways and already discuss the notion of documentation of work (both photographic and moving image) where necessary for all students, including those working with performance. We do have times when students will arrange *live* performances for both assessment and exhibition and these are scheduled at the appropriate times during the assessment period for all assessing staff from across all the Pathways to see; (the moderation process across the programme facilitates the need for *all* programme staff to be involved in *all* live performances at the 3 assessment stages). This is very important as the *liveness* of the performance may be completely different or altered from the *documented* performance and this is a practice which we have been following for many years (mirrored in the undergraduate assessment also). There may be times when it is not possible (or even desired) for the live performance to be witnessed by an audience and/or assessing staff and it is at this time that the work may only ever exist as documentation at assessment.

**Recommendation 2**

The Approval Panel recommended that the Programme Leader should consider the bibliography for each of the course specifications and, where appropriate, update these to include more recent publications. This should be undertaken in consultation with the Head of Learning Resources. The Financial Rationale should be updated accordingly following that consultation if necessary. Bibliographies in course specifications should be presented in the Harvard style.

After feedback from the Approval panel we expanded the bibliography to make this more up to date with more recent texts. It was also re-written into Harvard style for compatibility. I liaised with both Duncan Chappell and Alison Stevenson with regards to checking the availability of these texts and where possible, to order in any new additions. Duncan also added a Performance subject guide to the Library website and has also ordered e-book versions of texts where these were available. Given that these were additions to an existing Reading List, Alison was happy that this would not have any impact on the financial rationale which had already been prepared. We will continue to check the Pathway specific reading lists frequently and liaise with Learning Resources to add any new and/or relevant texts to these as they become available.

### Recommendation 3

In conjunction with the Head of Academic Registry and the Senior Policy Officer, the Programme Leader should revisit Questions 19 and 20 in the Programme Specification to clarify the opportunities for students to transfer in and out of the programme and for advance entry.

This recommendation was addressed after conversation and clarification between The Head of Academic Registry, the Senior Policy Officer and myself. It was deemed necessary to have absolute clarity on the wording in these sections to ensure that there was no vagueness around the conditions of advanced entry to the Programme and also the relevance and appropriateness of any previous postgraduate study which may affect transfer or advanced entry to the Programme.