

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 25 May 2018

**Report from the Periodic Review (2017/18) of the School of Fine Art
held in March 2018 at the Glasgow School of Art**

Review Panel

Professor Ken Neil (Convenor), Mr Iain Aitchison Ms Janet Allison Dr Sarah Bennett	Deputy Director (Academic) Programme Director, Innovation School Deputy Registrar External Subject Specialist, Head of The School of Art and Architecture, Kingston School of Art
Professor John Butler Professor Vicky Gunn Ms Laura Glennie Ms Jill Hammond Professor Elizabeth Moignard Professor Nick Pearce	External Subject Specialist, CEO, EQ-Arts Head of Learning and Teaching President of the Students' Association Head of Student Support and Development University of Glasgow Senate Representative University of Glasgow Senate Representative

Secretary Ms Jill Brown, Senior Policy Officer, Policy and Governance

The Review Event was held on Thursday 8 March and Friday 9 March 2018.

1. INTRODUCTION

Background Information

- 1.1 Within the Self-Evaluation Report, the School of Fine Art reflected on a period of change (following the Mackintosh fire, 2014) and resulting challenges which have shaped the current context and vision, remarking positively on the School's resilience and growth during a turbulent time.
- 1.2 The School detailed its commitment to building as a global leader in studio based learning and creative education by providing research-led, practice based teaching of the highest standard through all of its disciplines, striving to provide an excellent learning experience of the highest calibre for all students.
- 1.3 The Mackintosh Fire and the immediate, mid-term and long-term effects of this are detailed in the Self-Evaluation report, which highlights the resulting complex challenges for both staff and students; the current estates issues are detailed with vision for the School following the planned move to the Stow building in September 2018.
- 1.4 Since the School of Fine Art Periodic Review 2011/12, the School has introduced three new Masters Programmes: Masters of Letters in Curatorial Practice (Contemporary Art); Masters of Research in Creative Practices; and Masters of Letters in Art Writing (launching in 2018/19).
- 1.5 The closure of the Graduate School in 2014 resulted in the transfer of a number of PhD students to the School into their area of study/research; the School of Fine Art has a large PhD student cohort as a result of this, and continues to strive to build a strong community for these students.
- 1.6 In January 2016, the management and oversight of the provision formerly provided by the Forum for Critical Inquiry (FoCI) was disaggregated to the School of Fine Art and the School of Design; this resulted in the creation of the Fine Art Critical Studies (FACS) in the School of Fine Art.

- 1.7 The BA (Hons) Fine Art and International Foundation Programme had major changes approved in session 2017/18 to align with the introduction of the First Year Experience and new Mack 1 and Mack 2 courses (launching September 2019).

Periodic Review

- 1.8 Appendix A to this report provides a list of the provision offered and overseen as part of the Periodic Review.
- 1.9 Preparation of the Self-Evaluation Report was led by the Deputy Head of the School of Fine Art in conjunction with the Head of School. Programme Leaders and Heads of Department worked closely with the Head and Deputy Head of School to develop the School's Mission and acted as key conduits for the flow of information to and from the Programme Teams. The School informed students of the process in 2016/17, with an initial briefing session in September 2017, and multiple sessions for feedback thereafter. Meetings were also held with the Students Association and Lead Representatives to ensure that engagement with students was meaningful and that the purpose and context of the Periodic Review was clear.
- 1.10 The Review Panel commented that the Self-Evaluation report is comprehensive, reflective and thorough; however, it was noted that a more succinct document would be more accessible and useful as a working document for the School.
- 1.11 Having scrutinised the Self-Evaluation report, and supporting documentation, the Review Panel identified themes and topics for further exploration during the Review event. These included, but were not limited to:
- Grand ambition for the School of Fine Art, including the synthesis of the School with the move to Stow Building
 - The Student Voice and response to NSS outcomes
 - Integration of Fine Art Critical Studies
 - School curriculum and alignment with the introduction of the First Year Experience and PGT Credit Reform
 - Research Enhancement and Strategic partnerships
 - Internationalisation and diversity of curriculum and impact on all students
 - Leadership and Management of the School
 - Assessment and Feedback
 - Sharing of Good Practice
 - Learning and Teaching Enhancement Strategy
 - Graduate Attributes and Professional Practice
 - Enhancement of Digital Space
- 1.12 During the Event on 8 and 9 March 2018, the Review Panel met with the following staff and student groups:
- Head and Deputy Head of the School of Fine Art
 - The Stow Project Manager
 - Undergraduate Students
 - Postgraduate Students
 - Programme Leaders and Heads of Departments
 - Course Tutors and Technicians
- A list of the staff and students who met with the panel is provided in Annex B.
- 1.13 In addition to meeting with staff and students, the Review Panel undertook a tour of the Stow Building to gain a greater understanding of the changes that are to be made as part of the planned move to that site in September 2018.

2. OVERALL AIMS OF THE SCHOOL OF FINE ART PROVISION

- 2.1 The Self-Evaluation report and discussion with the Head and Deputy Head of the School of Fine Art demonstrated that the move to the Stow building is a significant step for the School; for the first time, all departments and programmes will be together in one location. The academic, student experience and physical challenges are significant and the Review Panel were keen to explore plans for this during the Periodic Review event.
- 2.2 The Self-Evaluation report articulates the overall aims of the School of Fine Art provision, however, having reflected on the report and discussion with the Head and Deputy Head of School, the Review Panel concluded that a clear and succinct statement of the Schools vision and strategy was required which details: action plans for staff development; an internationalisation and diversity strategy; plans for the enhancement of the digital space; and plans for managing the growth in PhD cohort and the impact on space. (**Condition 1**).
- 2.3 Having met with the Head and Deputy Head of the School, and from the detail given in the Self- Evaluation report, the panel were satisfied that each discipline in the School has a clear vision; however, there was a sense that an overarching and succinct strategic plan for the School curriculum as a whole, underpinning the individual strategies set out by the programmes, would support the strategies of each programme laid out in the Self-Evaluation report (**Condition 2**).

3. EVALUATION OF THE QUALITY OF THE PROVISION UNDER REVIEW

Programme Aims, Intended Learning Outcomes and Assessment Criteria

- 3.1 The Self-Evaluation Report clearly expresses the individual aims of the programmes in the School, detailing their ethos and commitment to establishing a strong base to facilitate and develop understanding of the student's chosen discipline.
- 3.2 The Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) of the undergraduate programmes have recently been reviewed with both the BA (Hons) Fine Art and International Foundation Programme going through major amendments to align with the First Year Experience and to integrate Fine Art Critical Studies. The Self-Evaluation Report details that close attention has been paid to QAA Benchmark Statements and SCQF level descriptors during the curriculum enhancement process. There has also been development to assessment and feedback mechanisms with changes to align with semesterisation; this has been developed with feedback from students and aligns with the Learning and Teaching Enhancement Strategy (LTES) and relevant benchmark statements.
- 3.3 All of the postgraduate programmes have recently been through minor, or in the case of the MLitt Curatorial Practice (Contemporary Art) major, amendments in order to align with the new GSA credit structure, as laid out in the Self-Evaluation Report. Through this, all programmes took the opportunity to make minor amendments to programme and course specifications, and the School has developed a new Core Research Methods Course, presenting an opportunity to bring all of the postgraduate students within the School of Fine Art together in Stage 1. These changes will be implemented from September 2019.
- 3.4 The Self-Evaluation Report details that the undergraduate departments have extended and developed their working relationship with the Portfolio Preparation Course resulting in a significant increase in the success rates of students applying from the Portfolio Preparation Course to the Fine Art Photography degree programme. The Portfolio Preparation Course was commended by students during the Periodic Review event.
- 3.5 During the Periodic Review event, it was referenced by both staff and students that Programmes run jointly with University of Glasgow provide an opportunity for cross-institution working and are operating well.

Learning and Teaching Enhancement Strategy

- 3.6 The Self-Evaluation Report responds to the core objectives of the Learning and Teaching

Enhancement Strategy (LTES), stating its commitment to the LTES agenda and the GSA Strategic Plan (2015-18). The Deputy Head of School advised that all actions are live within the School and are being addressed using student feedback, External Examiner Reports and NSS outcomes. Both the Head of School and Deputy Head of School show commitment to enhancement by aligning with the GSA LTES strategy through engagement with the Learning and Teaching Committee, and by monitoring progress through the School of Fine Art Learning and Teaching Forum.

Learning and Teaching Forum

- 3.7 The Self-Evaluation Report outlines the remit of the Learning and Teaching Forum, detailing that it receives feedback and updates from the Learning and Teaching Committee (formerly the Learning and Teaching Enhancement Working Group), the BA Team and the School of Fine Art Senior Management Team. It is an open forum for sharing good practice, identifying sectoral good practice and for discussing solutions to problems arising from a variety of feedback mechanisms (including students, staff and External Examiners). The Deputy Head of School, who chairs this forum, highlighted that the Personal Tutor Scheme, recently piloted in the Painting and Printmaking Department, was discussed at the Learning and Teaching Forum; feedback and good practice were shared and rolling this out in other departments will now be considered.

Sharing good practice

- 3.8 In both the Self-Evaluation Report and from the meetings with staff, it was identified that the Learning and Teaching Forum is a key conduit for sharing good practice and that having an open forum for Heads of Department, Programme Leaders and Course Tutors to meet is useful for sharing successes. The Review Panel commended this forum and recommended that students should be invited to attend.
- 3.9 Staff groups expressed that the annual Fine Art Away Day is an excellent opportunity to share good practice and present on individual research.

Curriculum Design, Development and Content

Interdisciplinarity in the School of Fine Art

- 3.10 The Review Panel were interested to explore the discipline focused nature of the School, to consider the strengths and weaknesses and the impact on the student experience. During the event, the Review Panel chose to discuss this with the Head and Deputy Head of School and both student and staff groups to gain a clear understanding of the experience of this structure.
- 3.11 From the Self-Evaluation report it was clear that each discipline has a strong identity. The Head of School was keen to preserve this, highlighting the importance of students having a broad knowledge of their discipline before exploring others. The Head of School further advised that the evidence of the strength of a discipline based approach is clear in the accomplished nature of the graduate work.
- 3.12 A desire for increased opportunity for interdisciplinary working became clear during the student meetings, with disparity between the tutor approach to interdisciplinary working and that of the School. The students recognised that one of the key issues is workshop space and the priority system in place can restrict student access; some students expressed a resultant feeling of being 'siloes' in their discipline.
- 3.13 The student groups highlighted that tutors are very supportive, encouraging exploration beyond their discipline, but there are degrees of difficulty in accessing facilities and tutors in different areas. It was recognised that it is possible to write a project proposal to gain access to different workshops, however this can take time and the wait for induction can be extensive. Students were clear that they are not stopped from working in an interdisciplinary manner, but that its challenging practically to make this happen.
- 3.14 The Review Panel summarised that if the vision for the School is interdisciplinarity, a clear

strategy and guideline are required. The Review Panel recommended that the move to Stow building should be used to review how course ethos maintains disciplinary distinctiveness while supporting student's desire for both disciplinary-led conceptual and making skills and interdisciplinary approaches. This should include a review of how technical workshops operate the priority scheme and managing student expectation around access to workshops (**Recommendation 3**).

Integration of Fine Art Critical Studies

- 3.15 The Review Panel were keen to explore the disaggregation of the Forum of Critical Inquiry (FoCI) into the new Fine Art Critical Studies (FACS) courses and the integration with studio, noting the differences in approach to dissertation between departments and programmes.
- 3.16 The Head and Deputy Head of the School of Fine Art advised that the FACS courses currently sit independently from studio, however, the School's aim is to develop a curriculum where studio and theory are holistically blended. The External Examiner visit for FACS has been integrated with the External Examiner visit for studio; this was well received and is practice that will continue.
- 3.17 During the undergraduate student meeting, it was raised that the theory element is not consistent across year groups, with varying levels of support available. Some students expressed disappointment that the theory element felt like an afterthought; extra-curricular reading is encouraged by some tutors but is not consistently supported across all years.
- 3.18 Students further commented that the FACS tutors are "excellent, supporting the influence of theory on studio practice through seminars and tutorials" but that time and space for these tutorials is limited resulting in themes from FACS, at times, being discussed in a more informal manner. With the disaggregation of FoCI and introduction of FACS, student groups commented that engagement with theory has improved, and cohesion is being encouraged, though it can still feel rushed and 'squeezed' into the curriculum, which doesn't allow time for critical engagement with the reading.
- 3.19 Postgraduate students commented that critical studies/theory are well integrated with some programmes, encouraging the exploration of different topics and ways of thinking critically and creatively; conversations are happening in tutorials, but moving theory into practice is inconsistent and can depend on the tutor. Students expressed that Studio crits are useful and would welcome more opportunity to engage with them, and with the critical studies/theory tutors.
- 3.20 The postgraduate student group made the Review Panel aware of a student led club in the MFA called 'Crit Club'; tutors encourage students to engage with this, but do not directly get involved. It was apparent to the Review Panel that this builds a strong student community, supporting critical thinking and collegial working. The Review Panel commended the students for this approach and the School for supporting.
- 3.21 At the time of the Periodic Review event the FoCI curriculum was still being delivered, while the FACS curriculum is in development. The group of Programme Leaders and Heads of Department see this as an opportunity to iron out practical challenges that have arisen from the disaggregation of FoCI and the development of theory, especially in year one and two of the curriculum. Both groups commented they have been included in consultation for input on the development.
- 3.22 The Review Panel commended the ambition of integrating FACS with studio and considered that it should be a condition that the curriculum development for the FACS programme is complete prior to the start of Session 2018/19 (**Condition 2**).

Mack 1 and 2

- 3.23 The cross-school interdisciplinarity of the First Year Experience has been embraced by the School of Fine Art, with the management team taking active involvement with the First

Year Experience Project Board. Consultation with staff and students in some areas has taken place, but there remains a lack of clarity on how this will affect the curriculum.

Electives

- 3.24 It was clear from the student meetings that electives focusing on proposal writing, CV writing and website creation are a high priority, but that access to the small number available can be challenging. Further, it was noted that a number of electives clash with the timing of 'The Friday Event'.

Research Enhancement

- 3.25 The Review Panel were keen to understand the development of the research culture, how this feeds back into teaching and how research fits into the School of Fine Art curriculum. The Head of School advised that the School is advancing notions of artistic research as a European construct, within this looking at the development of ideologies through artistic research as a mode of thinking towards REF 2021, which interlinks with the School of Fine Art partnerships.
- 3.26 The Self-Evaluation report clearly details developments of research culture in the School with the implementation of: robust internal peer review and mentoring processes, focusing on Research Development Fund submissions, external bid writing and the Annual Research Plan process; the invitation of distinguished experts to present talks to assist in preparation for REF 2021; and the development of links with organisations such as Society for Artistic Research and the College Art Association through the School of Fine Art Research Committee.
- 3.27 Feedback in the student meetings highlighted clear interest in hearing more from tutors and staff about their individual areas of research and that increased cross-over between the BA and PhD would be beneficial. In some departments, PhD students act as Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs), but this is not consistent across the School. Guest talks and tutorials proved very popular with students. It was evident to the Review Panel that the School's research strategy was not a deciding factor for students when applying to study at GSA, however, students were keen to know that staff and tutors were practicing artists at the time of application. The Review Panel concluded that increasing the number of seminars by GTAs, PhD Students, tutors and staff on their personal practice would enhance the student experience (**Recommendation 4**).
- 3.28 Programme Leaders and Heads of Department expressed that the research culture in the School had been revived, with research events taking place each semester (open to all levels) supported by the Head of the Fine Art Critical Studies taking up the position of Chair of the School of Fine Art Research Committee. The Reading Landscape group has been founded, to create a space to talk about art; there is an increased sense that instead of research culture being 'imposed' from the top, it's now forming holistically. Working in this way and changing the critical dialogue cross-school has resulted in successful bids and has been instrumental in increasing the number of PhD students.
- 3.29 It was highlighted by the staff groups that research support and resource from the institution is very good (The Research Development Fund) and that the research office are very supportive. However, during discussion it became apparent that staff find it challenging to make time for research on top of other commitments. Time for research isn't made at a contractual level, but it is part of the appraisal process. Annual research plans are peer reviewed and are viewed as a good way forward but are challenging to schedule.
- 3.30 The Review Panel concluded that the mechanism for staff research time is available and that the culture in the School supports this; the Review Panel recommended utilising the GSA Activity Planning Suite to increase capacity for research and to enhance the research culture (**Recommendation 2**).

Leadership and Management of Change

- 3.31 The Review Panel recognised the strength and ability of the School to manage change, and that this has been positively maintained by staff and students throughout a turbulent period. The Review Panel, however, wanted to gain deeper understanding of strategic planning in the School with particular reference to the large fractional staff cohort, how this is managed, how staff are developed and how new appointments support the strategy and vision of the School.

Staff Development

- 3.32 The Self-Evaluation report outlines that access to information about staff development, CPD and other qualifications was difficult. It further detailed that although the School operates a Career Review Scheme, in line with the GSA model, it can be challenging to support CPD for the large number of fractional staff within the School.
- 3.33 The staff panels praised the introduction of the PG Certificate, which has helped in reassessing interaction with students; however, it was highlighted that there has not been a lot of staff development opportunities in the past few years.
- 3.34 Both staff panels highlighted that having fractional and practicing artists is extremely positive for the School, however, it was expressed that staff development and delegating responsibility for fractional staff can be challenging as their focus is primarily on delivering the course.

NSS Outcomes and Approach to Student Feedback

- 3.35 The Self-Evaluation report outlines the School of Fine Art's engagement with sector, institutional and School led surveys. In discussion, the Deputy Head of the School of Fine Art confirmed that reflection on student feedback led to the successful piloting of the Personal Tutor Scheme in the Painting and Printmaking Department.
- 3.36 During the student meetings, it was evident that the volume of emails regarding different surveys can be off-putting which could affect response rates. Students were positive about local level surveys, e.g. tutor led surveys, as they feel there are tangible results and that it's less 'faceless' than an online survey. Students expressed that larger-scale surveys feel as if they fall into an 'institutional void' and that they are a bureaucratic exercise not worth completing.
- 3.37 Students fed back that timetabling was an issue that could be addressed quickly. The Deputy Head of School was clear that an improvement in timetabling was imperative to improving the student experience and a key priority for the School.

Internationalisation and Diversity

- 3.38 The Head of the School advised that the School is committed to understanding teaching beyond the Western canon and decolonising the curriculum. This is evident in the programme specific aims identified in the Self-Evaluation report. Students were very positive that they were invited to give their feedback on decolonisation of the curriculum.
- 3.39 Heads of Department and Programme Leaders advised that a more diverse cohort has created a richness in seminars and that decolonising the curriculum will be a positive development underpinning ad hoc discussions that currently take place.
- 3.40 Discussion with student groups identified a desire to increase support currently available for international students. Students were extremely positive about the benefit of a diverse cohort, but have concern that international students can feel isolated, expressing that a School level induction could be put in place to assist with integration. A lack of diversity within the staff community was highlighted during this discussion.

4. ASSURING THE STANDARDS OF AWARDS AND QUALITY OF PROVISION

External Examiner Feedback and Programme and Annual Monitoring (PMAR)

- 4.1 The Review Panel noted that dissemination of External Examiner feedback to staff was not clear from the Board of Studies minutes or the Programme and Annual Monitoring Reporting and looked to gain further understanding of this mechanism. The Deputy Head of School advised that responses are formulated by the Programme Leaders, Heads of Departments and the undergraduate team and are disseminated through the departments. This is part of the departmental structure and the Learning and Teaching forum is utilised to discuss External Examiner feedback.
- 4.2 The Review Panel commented that the Programme and Annual Monitoring Reports are comprehensive and valuable, but not always summarised. It would appear that at a programme level feedback from External Examiners is explored, but not at a more strategic level.
- 4.3 The External Examiner reports and responses are disseminated at a programme level, by email to all staff, and the Quality Enhancement Action Plans (QEAPs) are on the agenda for every Programme Team meeting for discussion and progression. The Heads of Departments and Programme leaders expressed that more engagement with QEAPs would be preferable, however, it can be challenging when consistently in 'reactive' mode during a significant period of change and that addressing immediate day to day issues takes priority.
- 4.4 Course tutors and technicians advised External Examiner feedback and outcomes from PMAR are disseminated from Heads of Department and Programme Leaders, but that fully engaging with this information over and above teaching responsibilities can be challenging.
- 4.5 During the event, it was clear to the Review Panel that new staff members have been consulted regarding changes and improvements that could be made to the External Examiner feedback loop.

5. ASSURING AND ENHANCING THE QUALITY OF THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE

Student Voice

- 5.1 At the student meetings and from the Self-Evaluation report the Review Panel was assured that students were aware of the Periodic Review event and had been consulted during the process of compiling the Self-Evaluation report.
- 5.2 Students were clear that there has been a demonstrable improvement in engagement and transparency between the student body and the institution, but that there remains room for improvement. The recently launched Student Rep initiative has made a significant impact; however, students expressed they would rather this was an enhancement to feedback and that there was an increase in feedback from the institution directly, rather than relying on the Lead and Class reps to disseminate information.
- 5.3 Students expressed that the role of Lead or Class Rep can feel like a large responsibility; the student panel commended the use of SPARQS for reps training and requested further training, where possible.
- 5.4 Students felt that their feedback is heard and accepted, and that there is a clear willingness to help, but that implementation and change is slow. Larger issues can be taken to the Board of Studies, however, there is a sense that smaller issues can get lost.
- 5.5 Both student groups were very complimentary about the Students Association and cited it as instrumental in improving the student voice and the Directors Forums; it was described as a strong and supportive community.
- 5.6 Students advised that the School utilise Canvas well for both dissemination of assessment feedback and as a mechanism for feeding back information regarding enhancements.

Graduate Attributes

- 5.7 The Review Panel were keen to explore professional practice in the School and the development of graduate attributes. The Course Specifications show there is a percentage of weighting of ILOs mapped against professional practice.
- 5.8 The Head of School expressed that the School aim is for students to be able to understand the creative space they wish to occupy, and how they wish to work within it. Further, the School wants to demonstrate a specific understanding of what Fine Art graduate attributes are and how these can be articulated to potential employers.
- 5.9 The student panels were positive about the enthusiasm and passion of tutors about life beyond art school, but that it feels like there is very little professional practice built into the curriculum. At the staff meetings, it became apparent that a lot of professional practice takes place across all years, but that it is not explicitly stated until Year 4; it needs to be made clearer to students that the skills they are developing are transferable and that they are continually developing graduate attributes. Change in documentation is underway to make it more transparent for students, and students are to be involved in this discussion.
- 5.10 The Review Panel concluded that professional practice is embedded in the approach to the curriculum, but it needs to be made clearer to students. The Review Panel advised that it may be helpful to include practical skills as an entry point in the first year to allow time for this skill to develop.

6. SUMMARY OF PERCEIVED STRENGTHS AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Conditions

- 6.1 The Review Panel made the undernoted conditions:

Condition 1

- 6.2 After reflecting on the significant change that the School of Fine Art has been through, and the upcoming move to the Stow building, the Review Panel considered that it should be a condition that the Head of the School of Fine Art produce a concise vision statement – contextualised around the move to Stow – which includes (though is not limited to): action plans for staff development; an internationalisation and diversity strategy; plans for the enhancement of the digital space; and plans for managing the growth in PhD cohort including the impact on space. This condition must be completed by the start of Session 2018/19.

Condition 2

- 6.3 Following on from *Condition 1*, the Review Panel further considered that it should be a condition that the School of Fine Art creates a plan for the development of the curriculum which includes: alignment of Fine Art Critical Studies (FACS) and Studio with Intended Learning Outcomes; decolonisation of the curriculum and consideration of curriculum delivery to diverse student cohorts; impact on the School of the new Mack 1 and Mack 2 courses; plan for the central curriculum; PGT electives; and professional practice provision. This condition must be completed by August 2018.

Condition 3

- 6.4 Underpinning both *Conditions 1 and 2* is engagement with students at all stages, evidencing involvement with decisions taken, student enhancement and consultation throughout all processes. This condition must be completed by the start of Session 2018/19.
- 6.5 The Review Panel confirmed that all conditions should be addressed prior to the start of Session 2018/19. These conditions do not affect the validation of the Programmes as laid out in item 7.1

Recommendations

- 6.6 The Review Panel made a number of recommendations, as set out below. All recommendations must be completed within 12 months and be formally reported by the Head of the School of Fine Art to each Board of Studies, Undergraduate and Postgraduate Committee and Academic Council:

Recommendation 1

- 6.7 The Review Panel recommended that the School of Fine Art develop an action plan for sharing good practice across the school to retain consistency across departments.

Recommendation 2

- 6.8 The Review Panel recommended that the School of Fine Art has greater engagement with GSA's Activity Planning Suite.

Recommendation 3

- 6.9 The Review Panel recommended that the School of Fine Art use the move to Stow to review how course ethos maintains disciplinary distinctiveness while supporting student's desire for both disciplinary-led conceptual and making skills and interdisciplinary approaches. This should include a review of how technical workshops operate the priority scheme and managing student expectation around access to workshops.

Recommendation 4

- 6.10 The Review Panel recommended that the School should encourage staff to present on personal practice in all departments.

Commendations

- 6.11 The Review Panel commended the School of Fine Art on the following, and identified that these were areas of good practice for dissemination across GSA:

Commendation 1

- 6.12 The Review Panel commended the strength of the student and staff community in the School of Fine Art: in particular, the resilient positive attitude of staff during a period of sustained change and the student led initiatives (e.g. MFA Crit Club)

Commendation 2

- 6.13 The Review Panel commended the introduction of the Learning and Teaching Forum in the School of Fine Art, which is acting as the vehicle for strategic alignment. It further commended the development of new methods of communication in departments (e.g. the weekly newsletter in Painting and Printmaking).

Commendation 3

- 6.14 The Review Panel commended the School of Fine Art's engagement with the City of Glasgow and embedding the City Culture in its ethos.

Commendation 4

- 6.15 The ambition of Fine Art Critical Studies was commended by the Review Panel, noting it was a positive development that the School of Fine Art is looking to embed this structure within the undergraduate programme.

Commendation 5

- 6.16 The School of Fine Art inviting Graduate Teaching Assistants and Masters Students to teach was commended by the panel.

Commendation 6

- 6.17 The Review Panel commended the School of Fine Art staff cohort for their efforts in establishing a strong research culture in the School.

7. REVALIDATION OF PROGRAMME PROVISION

- 7.1 As an integral part of the Periodic Review process the Review Panel considered the revalidation of individual programmes. The Self-Evaluation report explicitly and frequently referenced individual programme provision, and the Review Panel considered the student experience and individual programme provision throughout the process.
- 7.2 The Review Panel invited Academic Council to recommend to the University of Glasgow that the following degree programmes should be revalidated for a period of six years from September 2018, these being:

Master of Fine Art
MLitt Curatorial Practice (Contemporary Art)
MLitt Fine Art Practice
MRes Creative Practices
BA (Hons) Fine Art
International Foundation Programme
Portfolio Preparation

*MLitt Art Writing was validated by University of Glasgow for a period of six years commencing 2018/19.

8. GENERAL REFLECTIONS OF THE REVIEW PANEL

- 8.1 During the Periodic Review event the Review Panel identified a need for staff development to support the increase in international students at GSA. From a technical perspective, ensuring that all students are fully conversant with health and safety requirements in workshops can be difficult and it's not clear that all staff have had training to handle these situations. Further, the Review Panel considered that the level of IELTS required is assessed and potentially raised.
- 8.2 The Review Panel advised that unconscious bias training could be made available for all staff to support the GSA Internationalisation Strategy.
- 8.3 During discussion with staff panels, the Review Panel recognised the issue of remuneration for staff promoted to Reader or Professor and that career routes at the GSA should be considered.
- 8.4 It was agreed that the Convenor of the Review Panel would take these actions forward with the Director of the GSA.

ANNEX A: PROGRAMME PROVISION CONSIDERED AS PART OF THE PERIODIC REVIEW

The Review Panel considered the following provision offered by the School of Fine Art (including student numbers for 2016/17):

Programme		Student FTE in
Master of Fine Art	<i>A two year programme</i>	52
MLitt Curatorial Practice (Contemporary Art)	<i>A one year programme</i>	16
MLitt Fine Art Practice	<i>A one year programme</i>	48
MRes Creative Practices	<i>A one year programme</i>	15
Total		131
International Foundation Programme	<i>A one year programme</i>	12
BA (Hons) Fine Art Painting and Printmaking	<i>A four year programme</i>	233
BA (Hons) Fine Art Photography	<i>A four year programme</i>	107
BA (Hons) Fine Art Sculpture and Environmental Art	<i>A four year programme</i>	173
Total		525
OVERALL TOTAL		656

The Review Panel also considered the following provision, overseen by the School of Fine Art Board of Studies (including student numbers for 2016/17):

Programme		Student FTE in
Portfolio Preparation Course	<i>A one year course</i>	44
Total		44

ANNEX B: SCHOOL OF FINE ART PERIODIC REVIEW - STUDENT AND STAFF MEETINGS

1. Meeting with group of Undergraduate Students: Thursday 8 March 2018, 15:30 – 16:30, Principal Seminar Room 1

Name	Year	Programme
Student A	3	BA (Hons) Fine Art: Painting and Printmaking
Student B	3	BA (Hons) Fine Art: Fine Art Photography
Student C	1	BA (Hons) Fine Art: Painting and Printmaking
Student D	1	BA (Hons) Fine Art: Painting and Printmaking
Student E	3	BA (Hons) Fine Art: Painting and Printmaking
Student F	3	BA (Hons) Fine Art: Fine Art Photography
Student G	2	BA (Hons) Fine Art: Sculpture & Environmental Art
Student H	4	BA (Hons) Fine Art: Sculpture & Environmental Art
Student I	1	Portfolio Preparation

2. Meeting with group of Postgraduate Students: Friday 9 March 09:30 – 10:30, Principal Seminar Room 1

Name	Year	Programme
Student A	12month	MLitt Fine Art Practice
Student B	1	MFA
Student C	2	MFA
Student D	12 month	MLitt Fine Art Practice
Student E	12 month	MRes Creative Practices
Student F	12 month	MLitt Curatorial Practice (Contemporary Art)

ANNEX B: SCHOOL OF FINE ART PERIODIC REVIEW - STUDENT AND STAFF MEETINGS

3. Meeting with Programme Leaders/Heads of Department: Friday 8 March, 10:45 – 12:15, Principal Seminar Room 1

Name	Designation
Dr Sarah Smith	Head of Department, Fine Art Critical Studies and Reader, Visual Culture
Dr Karen Roulstone	Head of Department, Painting and Printmaking
Lesley Punton	Head of Department, Fine Art Photography
Paul Cosgrove	Head of Department, Sculpture and Environmental Art /Stow Project Manager
Sue Brind	Acting Head of Department, Sculpture and Environmental Art
Henry Rogers	Programme Leader, Masters of Fine Art
Monica Nuñez Laiseca	Programme Leader, Curatorial Practice (Contemporary Art)
Alexandra Ross	University of Glasgow representative, Curatorial Practice (Contemporary Art)
John Quinn	Academic Support Manager
Dr Ranjana Thapalyal	Programme Leader, Masters of Research

ANNEX B: SCHOOL OF FINE ART PERIODIC REVIEW - STUDENT AND STAFF MEETINGS

4. Meeting with Course Tutors/Technicians/VLs: Friday 9 March 2018, 13:30 – 14:30, Principal Seminar Room 1

Name	Designation
Michael Mersinis	Lecturer, Fine Art Photography and MLitt Fine Art Practice
Stephen Jackson	Technical Coordinator
Aoife McGarrigle	Pathway Tutor (MLitt Print Media) Team Leader, TSD
Christina McBride	Lecturer, Fine Art Photography and MFA
Stuart MacKenzie	Lecturer, Painting and Printmaking and Mlitt, Fine Art Practice
Dr Amanda Thomson	Lecturer, Painting and Printmaking
Dr Graham Lister	Lecturer, Painting and Printmaking
Sukaina Kubba	Lecturer, Painting and Printmaking and MRes Creative Practices
Dr Ben Greenman	Lecturer, Fine Art Critical Studies
Dr Ross Sinclair	Lecturer, Sculpture and Environmental Art and Reader in Contemporary Art Practice