

## University of Glasgow

## Academic Standards Committee - Friday 8 October 2010

Report on Programme Proposals approved under Summer Powers -  
For Noting

Ms H Butcher, Clerk to the Committee

**1. Proposals Approved under Fast-Track Procedures**

Academic Standards Committee is invited to **note** that the following programme proposals were recommended by the relevant Fast-Track Approval Group (see **Appendix 1**) and **approved** by the Convener of Academic Standards Committee and Clerk of Senate under Summer Powers for introduction in September 2010:

*College of Arts*

MLitt Dress &amp; Textile History

MPhil Textile Conservation\*

MRes Arts

\* This two year programme also includes an MSc exit point after one year. Following the 120 taught courses, students who successfully undertake a 60 credit summer placement, which is assessed as independent work, can exit with an MSc (180 credits).

*College of Social Sciences*

MEd Children's Literature and Literacies

MRes Criminology for ESRC

MRes Equality and Human Rights for ESRC

MRes Human Rights and International Politics

MRes International Politics [retitled from MSc in International Politics (Research)]

MSc International Politics (China) [replacing MSc China in the International Arena]

MRes Political Communication

MSc Financial Modelling

PgCert Strategic Leadership

**2. Items Carried Forward from 2009-10 Programme Approval Groups**

The following new programmes were approved under Summer Powers following completion of actions requested by the relevant Semester 2 PAG:

*College of Medical, Veterinary & Life Sciences*

Graduate Certificate in Burns and Plastic Surgery Care for Adults and Paediatrics

CPD Diploma in Oral Maxillofacial Surgery

CPD Diploma in Fixed and Removable Prosthodontics

*College of Science & Engineering*

MSc Applied Population & Statistical Mapping

MSc Astrophysics

MSc Landscape Monitoring & Mapping

MSc Physics: Advanced Materials

MSc Physics: Energy & Environment

MSc Physics: Life Sciences

MSc Physics: Global Security

MSc Theoretical Physics

*College of Social Sciences*

LLM Contemporary Law and Practice

MEd Religious Studies

MSc International Planning and Urban Policy

### **3. Proposal Approved under Summer Powers**

*College of Medical, Veterinary & Life Sciences*

Introduction of Exit Award from the Bachelor of Nursing

Bachelor of Health Studies

### **4. Validation Events – Glasgow School of Art**

Following full validation events in June 2010 the following programmes were approved under Summer Powers for September 2010 (for a period of six academic sessions).

New Programmes

BDes Fashion and Textiles

MDes in Communication Design / MDes in Graphic Design / MDes in Illustration / MDes in Photography

Revalidation

BA (Hons) Design, Ceramics

BEng / MEng Product Design Engineering

Approval has also been granted for a part-time route to be introduced on the **MRes Creative Practices**. This will be reviewed as part of the full-time MRes Creative Practices revalidation in 2011/12.

The re/validation reports for each of the above events are provided in Appendix 2.

## **5. Regulatory Amendment: Independent Work in Undergraduate Degrees**

The Clerk of Senate and Convener of ASC also gave approval under summer powers to extend the previously agreed requirement of a minimum grade D3 in independent work in order to qualify for an honours degree, to Integrated Masters degree regulations. The principle of requiring a minimum of D3 in the Honours dissertation or other independent work was agreed by Senate in June 2009 and was incorporated into the generic undergraduate regulation where at least 20 credits of independent work are required at D3 or above. It was agreed that this principle should also have been applied to Integrated Masters degrees (MSci, MEng) and therefore generic undergraduate regulation 17.1 has been amended to reflect this.

## **6. Items Raised by Social Sciences Fast-Track Programme Approval Group**

The following items were referred to the Senate Office by the Social Sciences FTPAG:

1. The PAG noted a general tendency for the content of section 15 of the Programme Specification to be of variable relevance. Members were of the view that, for the most part, the standard reference to student support services was sufficient. One option could be to include the student support information as a default within PIP, as it was generic and appropriate to all programmes. The PAG resolved that this section of the programme specification could usefully be reviewed by the Senate Office.
2. In section A5 of the Programme Support document, there is a check box for confirmation that there has been consideration of equal opportunity, employability, disability and ethnic issues. The Programme Support form does not currently invite any elaboration as to how such issues have been given consideration and PAG members observed that although the box is always checked, there was a risk of a tokenistic response. The PAG resolved that the Senate Office should be asked to reconsider how this aspect of the Programme Support document could become more meaningful.

Item 1 is being reviewed by the Senate Office. Item 2 will be referred to the Programme and Course Approval Working Group for consideration.

## **Fast-Track Approval Groups - Summer 2010**

The membership and dates of the individual Fast-Track Approval Group meetings which considered the proposals outlined in section 1 are noted below for information:

*Fast-Track Approval Group for the College of Social Sciences - Meeting held on 7 June 2010*

### Membership

Dr Phil Cotton (Convener); Dr Quintin Cutts; Professor Alice Jenkins

*Proposals considered:*

MEd Children's Literature and Literacies

MRes Criminology for ESRC

MRes Equality and Human Rights for ESRC

MSc Financial Modelling

MRes Human Rights and International Politics

MRes International Politics [retitled from MSc in International Politics (Research)]

MSc International Politics (China) [replacing MSc China in the International Arena]

MRes Political Communication

PgCert Strategic Leadership

*Fast-Track Approval Group for the College of Arts - Meeting held on 5 July 2010*

### Membership

Professor Bob Hill (Convener); Professor John Davies; Dr Paul Skett

*Proposal considered:*

MLitt Dress & Textile History

MPhil Textile Conservation

MRes in Arts

## **The Glasgow School of Art**

### **Validation Report: BDes Fashion and Textiles, Tuesday 15 June 2010, Design School Seminar Room**

**Approval Panel:** Professor Roger Wilson, Head of School of Fine Art (Convenor), Dr Ken Neil, Head of Historical & Critical Studies, Dr. Charles Neame, Undergraduate Co-ordinator, Dr Craig Williamson, Head of Academic and Student Services, Mr Archie McCall Programme Leader – BA Hons (Design), Mr Nicholas Oddy, Senior Lecturer, Professor Elizabeth Moignard, University of Glasgow, Mr David Mullane, Proprietor W2 Store

**Programme Team:** Mr Jimmy Stephen-Cran, Head of Textiles, Helena Britt, Subject Leader – Print and U/G Pathway Co-ordinator, Elaine Bremner, Subject Leader – Weave, Susan Telford, Subject Leader – Embroidery, Leigh Bagley, Subject Leader – Knit, Jo Barker, 1<sup>st</sup> Year Tutor, Helen McGilp, DPP Tutor

**Attending:** Ms Fiona Neame, Academic and Student Services

#### **1. Issues to Explore with the Development Team**

The Convenor welcomed the Panel to the Validation Event. Concerns raised by the Panel for clarification by the Team included:

- The documentation does not mention menswear, which if it is correct would send out the wrong message to the industry regarding the Programme, also the relationship of the Programme to existing programmes is not articulated.
- The Panel need clarification of the formative and summative assessment, aims and learning outcomes of the Programme and the documentation needs some work to take out information duplicated by APM documentation.
- The IELTS score for international students is not specified.
- The Panel would like to investigate how the transition into the Programme would take place and whether there is capacity to insert alternative 10 credit courses, in line with School of Design's model for the future.
- The Panel also noted that a placement was mentioned in the documentation and they would seek further clarification.

#### **2. Meeting with the Development Team**

2.1 The Development Team confirmed that they had every intention of including menswear. The Fashion pathway would continue to grow to include all aspects of fashion e.g. menswear, knitwear, childrenswear and accessories. 2.2 It is hoped that students from Fashion will work on projects collaboratively with students from Textiles, however the documentation does not reflect this, the Panel wondered if specificity in learning outcomes could draw this out and clarify how the collaboration would be assessed. The Team responded that once they understood how the collaborative relationship worked, they would also consider extending it to other departments. The collaboration process would be witnessed throughout, it would not just be marked on the end product.

2.2 The Panel noted that whilst it was clear how students would be summatively assessed in non-studio courses, it was not clear how the studio based courses would

be assessed. The Team confirmed that they were still finalising this detail and will include the outcome in the document revisions.

- 2.3 The Panel also requested clarification in the documentation of the option to produce a dissertation or essay rather than studio work. The Team explained that they were aiming to offer more choice. With all the above queries on assessment the Panel were keen to ensure that it was clear to students what was expected of them.
- 2.4 The Team confirmed that they were very experienced and able to absorb change, they view the new Programme and disaggregation as a transition, with the BDes being phased in as the BA Hons Textiles is phased out. The new Programme is perceived to be very positive, however it was developed before the School of Design's proposed model of common credits across the School was introduced and now needs to be adapted to include this, once it has been finalised.
- 2.5 The Team confirmed that IELTS Level 6 would be the minimum requirement for International students in line with the level set by the School. The Panel proposed that the Level could be set higher and the Team will consider this, although it may be a question for the whole School to debate.
- 2.6 Regarding placements, the Team outlined their proposal to introduce 40 credits within Year 3 for students to do a live studio project, or an exchange or a placement. Placements have previously been over holiday time, outside the course and not assessed. The Team confirmed that this was being developed in conjunction with the Lecturer (Work-related Learning). The Panel urged the Team to be cautious in how Placements are positioned to students, as the experience cannot be guaranteed.
- 2.7 The Team confirmed that they had approval to create a new post, once the Programme has been validated.

### **3. Conclusions**

The Convenor thanked the Development Team for a very positive programme, which was linked to GSA-wide developments. The Panel would recommend that the programme should be approved and validated for six years, subject to the following requirements and recommendations being addressed.

Requirements:

- 3.1 The examination arrangements and regime need to be completed with exact descriptors as per CAF.
- 3.2 Collaborative working and submissions need to be clarified in the student handbook.
- 3.3 The IELTS score for overseas student admissions needs to be set.
- 3.4 Documentation and all revisions in relation to CAF need to be concluded.

Recommendations:

- 3.5 The Panel recommended that the identity of the course should be clarified, in particular to include menswear and to emphasise the relationship between fashion and textiles, which is unique and should not be undersold.
- 3.6 The Team should consider how the flexibility of CAF will allow H&C and other courses to be introduced to enhance the student experience.

- 3.7 The matching of aims and learning outcomes is to be noted and, over time, clarified with assistance from the Undergraduate Co-ordinator.
- 3.8 The Team should give consideration and clarification to how placements are framed and fulfilled.

The Development Team and Head of Academic and Student Services are to discuss timelines for the above requirements and recommendations, which should be submitted in the documentation with the changes highlighted.

## **The Glasgow School of Art**

### **Validation Report: Taught Postgraduate Programmes in Visual Communication, Monday 14 June 2010, Design School Seminar Room**

**Approval Panel:** Professor Naren Barfield, Head of Research and Postgraduate Studies (Convenor), Professor Elizabeth Moignard, University of Glasgow, Ian Noble, University of the Arts, London, Ms Catherine Nicholson, Head of Learning Resources, Dr Craig Williamson, Head of Academic and Student Services, Ms Helen Marriott, Joint Head of Department Silversmithing and Jewellery

**Development Team:** Mr Paul Stickley, Head of Visual Communications, Mr Andy Stark, Lecturer P/T, Mr Dan Williams, Lecturer, Mr Neil McGuire, Lecturer, Ms Kerry Aylin, Senior Technician, Mr Brian Cairns, Lecturer

**Attending:** Ms Fiona Neame, Academic and Student Services

#### **1. Issues to Explore with the Development Team**

The Convenor welcomed the Panel, outlined the format of the Validation event and invited tabling of issues to discuss with the Development Team. The Team had produced a distinctive document that made the nature of the programme very clear. Operational issues for clarification by the Team included:

- The use and role of a Critical Reflective Journal
- A description of collaborative assessment
- How do students apply for the programme?
- Are there too many learning outcomes at Stage 3?
- Contextualising practice, who do the team envisage as the audience?
- Verbal presentation v. viva: what is the process of assessment?
- Research and Teaching linkages - if coursework is proposal led and not a set project, will it be hard to support?
- Nomenclature – can MDes be used for both a one year and a two year programme?

#### **2. Meeting with the Development Team**

2.1 The Development Team confirmed that there would be no thesis. Students would be required to produce a critical reflective journal, an informed and reflective sketchbook which collated textual and visual materials, using primary and secondary source materials to create a narrative on the development of their work. In the 1 year programme this would have a continuous timeline, in the 2 year programme there would be more focus points. The Panel requested clarification on how a student could identify if they were achieving the required standard. The Team responded that students' work would be considered in group feedback sessions and there would also be smaller group or individual meetings with tutors.

2.2 Regarding collaborative assessment the Team expanded on the concept of using peer review and a supervisor to assess who has made the most contribution and on how the critical reflective journal would aid students to self assess; however the Panel felt this needed to be made more transparent and explicit in order for students to have a clear understanding of what was required.

- 2.3 Prospective students would apply for the programme with a written statement. The Team would hope to link the prospective students' projects with staff academic interests. Where there were no existing links they would look outside the department to find others in the School who could take on a supporting role and they had also already started sharing resources at University of Glasgow level. In the short term they would use existing resources, but were expecting to grow resources out of what they achieved. A broader student base could be achieved if the majority were 'visual thinkers', however, it would be possible to support the minority interests of say philosophers or musicians.
- 2.4 The Team reported that they have not yet fully addressed 'contextualising practice' and that the paperwork was inconsistent in places. The table on Page 22 at Stage 3 would be amended as there is no elective: it should read 'consolidated studio practice 90 credits', 'critical reflective journal 30 credits'. They would seek assistance to review and clarify the number of learning outcomes at Stage 3.
- 2.5 The Team confirmed that the verbal presentation would be an assessed requirement for all students and not a viva (i.e. it would not be an assessment for borderline or plagiarism cases). The verbal presentation would be an opportunity to demonstrate the knowledge that had informed the student's final piece of work; it would not be to 'sell' the work and it would be possible to fail the verbal presentation. The Panel recognised that the Programme is still evolving, but felt that further clarification would be required.
- 2.6 The correct nomenclature for the programmes are: MDes Graphics, MDes Illustration, MDes Photography - 1 year programmes; MDes Communication Design (MCD) - 2 year programme. Students on the 1 year programme follow one pathway and the 1<sup>st</sup> Year of Communication Design is taught with the 1<sup>st</sup> two stages of the Graphics Illustration and Photography pathways. The Panel noted that the University of Glasgow may want to consider the appropriateness of the nomenclature.

### 3. Conclusions

- 3.1 The Panel reported that the Programme represented a very positive development for the School of Design and GSA. It was a long overdue programme which was very exciting and the result of a lot of hard work and vision.
- 3.2 The Panel made the following recommendations:
- Revisit the Critical Reflective Journal to articulate more explicitly the rationale and assessment criteria to provide guidance for students, to ensure thorough understanding of how they are assessed and what level they attain.
  - Process of collaborative assessment – to consider appropriate models and examples in operation in a way that gives guidance to students.
  - To consider appropriately the balance and purpose of verbal presentations and to clarify them in relation to other assessable work.
  - The programmes are anticipated to grow and there is a need to consider management of pathways and student management and support, including future staffing levels.

- To collaborate with the Undergraduate and Postgraduate Coordinators regarding the Learning Outcomes for consistency of documentation across the CAF.

The Panel would recommend to Academic Council for the consideration of the Senate of the University of Glasgow that the programme should be approved and validated for 6 years.

The appropriate revisions to the documentation should be made and sent to the Convenor and Head of Academic and Student Services, with the changes highlighted, by the end of August 2010.

## **The Glasgow School of Art**

### **Revalidation Report: PT Ceramics, Tuesday 15 June 2010, Room 9 Mackintosh Building**

**Approval Panel:** Dr. Charles Neame, Undergraduate Co-ordinator, (Convenor), Dr Craig Williamson, Head of Academic and Student Services, Ms Helen Marriott, Joint Head of Department, Silversmithing and Jewellery

Apologies: Mr David Binns, University of Central Lancashire

**Programme Team:** Mr Archie McCall Programme Leader – BA Hons (Design), Mr Nicholas Oddy, Senior Lecturer, Mr Bill Brown, Head of FT Ceramics

**Attending:** Ms Fiona Neame, Academic and Student Services

#### **1. Issues to Explore with the Programme Team**

The Convenor welcomed the Panel and confirmed that this was a revalidation event for a part-time course that was no longer recruiting and had a further 3 years to run, so the focus of the revalidation was to confirm with the Programme Team that the remaining students were being supported and were receiving the experience and outcomes that they were expecting. The Convenor reported that no comments for the Panel had been received from the External representative who was unable to attend the revalidation event in person.

#### **2. Meeting with the Programme Team**

2.1 The Convenor welcomed the Programme Team to the revalidation event and thanked them for the thorough and reflective paperwork provided for the Panel.

2.2 The Programme Leader confirmed that there were 3 calendar years remaining to deliver. The programme continues to adhere to the original principle of blended learning with highly successful residential schools at which a large proportion of the course is summatively assessed, both for Studio and Historical and Critical Studies. For the remainder of the programme, 2 residential courses are proposed in August/September 2010 at the International Ceramics Studios, Kecskemét, Hungary and March 2011 at GSA, with guest tutors from the programme's extensive International network.

2.3 Beyond 2011 the programme would only have students at Level 4, who would be involved in negotiated programmes of independent study, having access to facilities within GSA for example during Easter, August and September when there would be no full-time students in the Studios. There would be no students on the full-time course from September 2011, so there will not be any shared experience and no opportunity for mobility between the full-time and part-time options. Also there is a need to ensure that GSA can meet the expectation that Studios will be available for up to 4 weeks per year if required by a student.

2.4 The Panel confirmed that the CAF will not restrict the delivery of the Programme once the final cohort reach Level 4, as there are no electives at that stage.

2.5 The Panel asked the Team to explain how they would identify students in need of guidance. The Team responded that students are mainly mature, with many different working practices and self motivated study, with tutorials conducted by email and VLE. The student cohort is fairly small (9), so the tutors are in regular contact, usually by email, to check progress, however this is time consuming and not within set hours, as many of the students are employed during regular working hours.

- 2.6 The Team expressed concerns that should a student need to defer due to mitigating circumstances, they were not sure if there would be either the staffing or facility to meet their needs once the main cohort had concluded. This was not an issue for the H&C side of the Programme which could continue to meet their commitment. The Panel recognised that this is a valid concern and noted the need for the School to adopt an equitable approach to all students.
- 2.7 The Team reported that they have continued to investigate techniques to aid remote learning, the most recent being Adobe Connect, with short projects and workshops to familiarise students with the technology. PowerPoint presentations have been used very successfully in conjunction with an A4 one page summary document to present work, which had been examined in the Studio, to the External Examiner.

### **3. Conclusions**

The Panel concluded that the Programme Team had provided evidence that:

- The course is planned to continue largely as before for the remainder of the validation period.
- The students who have yet to complete the course are being supported appropriately, however some risks have been identified and the School needs to formulate contingency plans for these risks, should students not complete the course within the normally expected timescale. The Programme Leader is to discuss this with the Head of the School of Design.

The Panel recommend that the programme should be revalidated for 6 years.

## **The Glasgow School of Art**

### **Revalidation Report: BEng/MEng Product Design Engineering, Monday 14 June 2010, Design School Seminar Room**

**Approval Panel:** Professor David Porter, Head of Mackintosh School of Architecture, Dr. Charles Neame, Undergraduate Co-ordinator, Mr Archie McCall Programme Leader – BA Hons (Design), Mr Nicholas Oddy, Senior Lecturer, Ms Catherine Nicholson, Head of Learning Resources, Dr Craig Williamson, Head of Academic and Student Services, Dr Donald Ballance, Head of Department, Mechanical Engineering, University of Glasgow, Dr Graham Green, Head of Teaching, Mechanical Engineering, University of Glasgow, Dr Jon Rogers, Lecturer, University of Dundee, Mr Ashley Hall, Deputy Head of Department, Royal College of Art

**Development Team:** Mr Craig Whittet, Head of Department, Stuart Bailey, Lecturer, Ben Craven, Lecturer, Nick Bell, Lecturer, Mike Sharp, Academic Co-ordinator

**Attending:** Ms Fiona Neame, Academic and Student Services

#### **1. Issues to Explore with the Development Team**

The Convener welcomed the Panel and outlined the format for the revalidation event and invited tabling of issues to explore. The Panel expressed concern that the paperwork submitted was incomplete and not of the required standard. The Head of Academic and Student Services agreed with the Convenor that the Panel at this revalidation event could discuss the programme content and clarify any issues arising, with the assurance that the paperwork would be re-drafted to match the standard with guidance from the Head of Academic and Student Services and the Undergraduate Co-ordinator.

The Convenor and Panel proposed to discuss the following with the Development Team:

- 1.1 The evolving nature of the discipline and its affect on the programme in the future.
- 1.2 Research led teaching, research staff and wider support from GSA and the University of Glasgow.
- 1.3 The management of workload.
- 1.4 The relationship with the University of Glasgow.
- 1.5 Compliance with UG:CAF.
- 1.6 The future.

#### **2. Meeting with the Development Team**

- 2.1 The Convenor welcomed the Development Team to the revalidation event.
- 2.2 When asked about the evolving nature of the discipline the Team responded that they regard it as an opportunity for future growth, particularly in light of the restructuring taking place in the University of Glasgow School of Engineering. The degree show demonstrates that PDE students are looking at medical, electronic and renewables as well as mechanical engineering and the department is maintaining a good relationship with industry to assist this growth and looking for association with

Institute of Engineering Designers, in addition to the current association with Institute of Mechanical Engineers. The Team are introducing students to the techniques and methodologies of service and application, with reference to human behaviour. The Team are looking outside the department to bring in wider industry expertise e.g. a member of the Team is from an industrial background in California, students are now outsourcing prototype production to the Far East.

- 2.3 The Panel asked the Team to clarify how, coming from mainly industry based backgrounds, they were able to respond to the requirement for research led teaching. The Team reported that there is a direct correlation to research projects at the University, which needs to be documented. In addition a number of companies want to support a PhD and masters programme at GSA and there is an MSc programme already in development, which it is hoped will start to build a research culture. At present only one member of the Team is taking the PG Cert, although others have expressed an interest.
- 2.4 The Panel then invited comments from the Team on workload issues, which have been a recurring theme in PDE, both from a staff and student perspective. The Head of Department/Programme Leader is the only full time member of staff and also teaches on the programme, as well as having to maintain the joint resources e.g. IT, studios and the relationship with the University of Glasgow. Student workload is monitored through the Joint Board of Study, although it was reported that some find it difficult to manage until 3<sup>rd</sup> year. Studio time is managed carefully as it requires 2 members of staff and might only take place once per week for the cohort, so the staff need to endeavour to see all students in that time. By Year 4 and 5 studio time represents 50% of teaching and learning time.
- 2.5 The Team were asked by the Panel to evaluate the potential of the relationship with the restructured School of Engineering at University of Glasgow. The Team replied that they hoped to use this opportunity to ensure that PDE was a strong part of the new organisation and to protect the relationship. It should become easier for students working across disciplines to access the help they require at the University, as at present they only have Mechanical Engineering supervisors.
- 2.6 The Panel asked for evidence that the Team were working within UG:CAF in PDE. The Team responded that for 1<sup>st</sup> year students, the 10 credit CAF course would represent 50% of the GSA side of the PDE experience and it was difficult to justify giving up this time, unless there was something demonstrably better to offer to students. The team fully support UG:CAF in terms of assessment, although it should be noted that PDE credit splits were in units of 10 in line with University of Glasgow, rather than units of 15 in line with GSA. The only way for PDE timetabling to allow access to courses within other departments would be via events outside normal student hours. The Panel asked what courses PDE could offer CAF. The Team identified Human Factors and Design Technology as of most interest to other disciplines, however expressed reservations about whether the system of cross school charging would make it worthwhile for PDE to consider offering these courses.
- 2.7 The Panel asked the Team to explore the vision and strategy of the documentation, which appears to reflect the current situation for PDE, but not the strategic goals which would be relevant in 5 years time when the programme was next due for revalidation, for example is the bio-medical elective a proposed broadening of the current degree or a more specialised programme. The Team confirmed that they were keen to explore new pathway materials, however the pressure on timetabling imposed by Engineering makes it difficult to know what can be cut out, whilst still keeping the programme at the cutting edge. Additional constraints are envisaged by

the Team during and after the new build, it may be that due to limited space the course will have to be timetabled with two pathways.

### **3. Conclusions**

The Panel reported that the academic content of the programme was good and that the Panel would recommend that the programme should be revalidated, however

- 3.1 The Panel required that the paperwork is made more focussed and reflective. To achieve this outcome the Development Team require guidance from the Head of Academic and Student Services and the Undergraduate Co-ordinator, in order that the paperwork can be signed off. This was a unanimous comment from the Panel and it was felt that the guidance received in this process would also be of help to the Development Team when they worked on the proposed MSc.
- 3.2 The Panel recommended that the PDE Development Team should determine how both the programme and the Team can be further supported by the School of Design, the Senior Researcher and the Research Office to develop an approach and strategy for research that can contribute to the strategy of the School of Design.
- 3.3 The Development Team should report back to the Convenor, Head of Academic and Student Services and Secretary with substantial revisions to the paperwork by 31 July 2010.

## The Glasgow School of Art

### Approval Report: MRes Creative Practices (Part-time), Thursday 27 May 2010, The Mackintosh Room

**Approval Panel:** Dr Charles Neame (Convenor), Undergraduate Co-ordinator; Mr John Calcutt, Acting Head of MFA, School of Fine Art; Ms Jill Hammond, Head of Student Support and Development

**Development Team:** Dr Damian Sutton, Acting Programme Leader MRes Creative Practices; Dr Glyn Davis, Academic Co-ordinator of Postgraduate Studies

**Attending:** Dr Craig Williamson, Head of Academic and Student Services; Fiona Neame, Academic and Student Services

#### 1. Issues to Explore with the Development Team

The Approval Panel welcomed the proposal for a part-time route to MRes Creative Practices, however the paperwork raised some points to address:

- 1.1 The flow diagram of the proposed part-time route requires clarification.
- 1.2 How and when will the Development Team decide the format of course delivery i.e. front loading, block teaching or evenings?
- 1.3 What additional paperwork exists in support of the proposal for Part-Time study?

#### 2. Meeting with the Development Team

- 2.1 The Convenor of the Panel invited the Development Team to introduce the proposal.
- 2.2 The Development Team advised that the full-time MRes had been validated in 2006, prior to the CAF, but the part-time route was being put forward now, for approval prior to revalidation, due to demand and because it is a requirement of the PGT:CAF. Students have deferred and withdrawn from the full-time course, but they might be retained if a part-time route is available from AY10/11, plus there was an opportunity to widen recruitment.
- 2.3 Re. 1.3 The Development Team confirmed that the content of the validated course would not be changed, as it was a very successful programme, just the scheduling of the delivery over two years. Year One - 60 credits from Sept to June, Year Two -120 credits from Sept to Sept, including 60 credits for the final research project. The proposal presented is supported by the DPD for the Full Time Course.
- 2.4 The Panel noted that the flow diagram states 15 weeks as the allocation for the final assessment, but would prefer to see this expressed as 600 learning hours, to equate to 60 credits.
- 2.5 Re. 1.2 The Development Team will use Monday and Tuesday for delivery of core courses, which for the Part-Time route might include one day of core teaching and one day of private study. Electives will be delivered Wednesday to Friday (with some provision at weekends if required). Evening classes will be scheduled at the end of the day and any final decision would be made on an ad hoc basis in discussion at a meeting with individual students, to establish what would best suit their needs and

when they can negotiate time out of their work. Should any part of course require second delivery, the financial implications would need to be considered. Front loading would take place in first 8 weeks of the semester.

- 2.6 It is expected that the Programme Leader for MRes will also lead MLitt Creative Education, which was revalidated with a part-time route, with experience gained here being used for MRes.
- 2.7 Students for part-time courses live mainly in the Central Belt, so recruitment and marketing focus reflects this. Recruitment would be on a 'one on one' basis to discuss the commitment required.
- 2.8 The Team confirmed that whilst the flow chart showed that the P/T and F/T routes both had to complete the research project in Stage 3, students on the P/T route would also have the 3 month period at the end of Year 1, to start planning their project, however, they cannot undertake the project until they have passed the PG Dip. Another requirement is that students have to take the Core Research Skills course before they can attain the PG Cert, in order that they can be fully integrated into the Methods, Methodologies and Techniques workshops in Year 2 with those on the F/T route.

### **3. Conclusions**

- 3.1 The Panel will recommend that the MRes Creative Practices (Part-time) is approved.
- 3.2 The Development Team will make the minor changes to the documentation and highlight them, for final approval by the Panel by July 30<sup>th</sup> 2010.
- 3.3 The Development Team should include details of the part-time course in the Student Handbook and make sure that the potential for negotiating flexibility is clear.
- 3.4 The Panel thanked the Team for explaining so fully how the part-time route can be developed and managed within the full-time route and recognised that, whilst a template approach may not work across the PGT:CAF, there were elements of good practice that should be noted and that part-time delivery leads to an interaction between the institution and the employer that should be encouraged.