

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

Academic Standards Committee – Summer Powers

Periodic Subject Review: Report of the Review of Theatre and Film and Television Studies and Centre for Cultural Policy Research held on 16 and 17 March 2015

Ms Fiona Dick, Clerk to the Review Panel

Review Panel:

Professor Frank Coton	Vice Principal (Learning and Teaching), Convener
Professor Paul Younger	Senate Assessor on Court
Professor Stella Bruzzi	University of Warwick, External Subject Specialist
Dr Jane Milling	University of St Exeter, External Subject Specialist
Dr Jeremy Huggett	Head of School of Humanities, Cognate member
Mr Bram Reitsma	Student Representative
Dr Jane MacKenzie	Learning and Teaching Centre
Ms Fiona Dick	Senate Office, Clerk to the Review Panel

1. Introduction

1.1 Theatre and Film and Television Studies (TFTS) and Centre for Cultural Policy Research (CCPR) are two of four Subject Areas (also including Music and the History of Art) that form the School of Culture and Creative Arts, in the College of Arts. It was noted that CCPR was established in 2007, and that Theatre Studies, Film and Television Studies (FTVS) and CCPR have operated on an autonomous basis since re-structuring of the University in 2010.

1.2 The previous review of TFTS carried out by the University was the Departmental Programmes of Teaching, Learning and Assessment (DPTLA) review in February 2007. The Panel noted that provision was of a high quality overall, and staff and students were committed and positive about its future. The Scottish Funding Council (SFC) agreed to defer the next scheduled review in 2012-13 until 2014-15 due to remedial building work being carried out at the Subjects' accommodation at Gilmorehill Halls, which had created additional workload for staff in minimising the impact of the disruption on the students' experience and limited their capacity to fully engage with Periodic Subject Review (PSR). SFC noted and welcomed the

commitment to undertake additional monitoring of the quality of learning and teaching in the interim period, which was monitored through the Senate Office.

1.3 The Self Evaluation Report (SER) was coordinated by Dr Anselm Heinrich, Theatre Studies, Dr Ian Craven, FTVS, Dr Ian Garwood, FTVS, Professor Raymond Boyle CCPR, with input from Dr Don Spaeth, Dean for Learning and Teaching, College of Arts, and Mr Michael McEwan, Academic Development Unit, Learning and Teaching Centre. PSR progress and SER drafts were considered at staff meetings, and all staff, Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTA), University Teachers (UT) and students were given the opportunity to comment on the SER prior to submission. Commentary from extraordinary meetings of the Staff Student Liaison Committee (SSLC) was fed into the SER.

1.4 The Review Panel met with Dr Don Spaeth, Professor Dimitris Eleftheriotis, Head of School of Culture and Creative Arts, Dr Anselm Heinrich, Dr Ian Garwood, Professor Raymond Boyle, seventeen members of staff including three early career, eleven GTAs/UTs on a fixed term contracts, twenty-two undergraduate students from Levels 1, 2, 3 and 4 and nine postgraduate taught students.

2. Background information

2.1 Students

Student numbers (2014-15) were as follows:

Theatre Studies

Level	Headcount	FTE
Level 1	131	43.6
Level 2	74	24.6
Junior Honours	44	26
Senior Honours	28	17
Undergraduate Total	277	111.2
PGT	31	77.4% ¹

Film and Television Studies

Level	Headcount	FTE
Level 1	118	39.3
Level 2	80	26.6
Junior Honours	41	27.5
Senior Honours	36	27.5
Undergraduate Total	275	120.9
PGT	24	79.2%

¹ Percentage of postgraduate students

Centre for Cultural Policy Research

Level	Headcount	
PGT	48	

2.2 Staffing

Staff	TS	FTVS	CCPR
Professor	3	3	2
Senior Lecturer	1	2	
Lecturer	6	4	2
Research Associate	1	1	
University Teacher		5	
Teaching Assistant ²	7	9	
Professional Practitioners	7		
Administrative/Technical ³	1.5	1.5	1

2.3 Range of provision

The following range of provision offered by the School was considered:

Undergraduate Programmes:

MA in Film and Television Studies (Single and Joint)

MA in Theatre Studies (Single and Joint)

Postgraduate Taught Programmes⁴:

MLitt in Playwriting and Dramaturgy

MLitt in Theatre Studies

MLitt in Theatre History

MLitt in Theatre Practices

MLitt in Film and Television Studies

MLitt in Film Journalism (2012-2014, suspended 2014-15)

² TS have two fixed term Teaching Assistants. The rest are GTAs.

³ 3 Administrative Assistants from School of Culture and Creative Arts also provide support for three areas.

⁴ On all taught MLitt programmes, our students have the possibility of intermediate exit points, with the awards of relevant Postgraduate Certificates (60 credits) or Postgraduate Diplomas (120 credits). Such provision is standard within the College of Arts.

MSc in Filmmaking and Media Arts (this programme is in its first year)

MSc in Media Management

3. Context and Strategy

Context and Vision

3.1 The SER provided a comprehensive statement of context and vision and described how, given finite resources, the Subject (TS, FTVS and CCPR) were working closely together, and across the School, to enhance provision. The Review Panel was keen to explore with staff the natural synergies, in terms of how the subjects functioned relative to one another and to the School, in the development of a coherent strategic vision. It was noted that strategic issues around curriculum design and development were considered on a regular basis through the School Learning and Teaching Committee, to reflect on teaching and learning for a wide range of student experiences. Staff also attended Away Days in early June to take stock and identify potential and emerging areas for development.

Strategic approach to enhancing learning and teaching

3.2 The Review Panel was satisfied that the Subjects' strategic approaches to learning and teaching detailed in the SER were appropriate, however members would have liked more detailed linkage to the University's Learning and Teaching Strategy and College plans, although these links were clearly made in relation to collaborative activities. There was evidence within TS of a close relationship to professional theatre and arts practice, which was embedded within the curriculum and through work placement opportunities. Panel members were also encouraged by investment in resources for CCPR.

3.3 The Head of School reported that the School of Culture and Creative Arts' Strategy document was currently being reviewed to develop an overarching strategic plan regarding future growth and range of provision that the Subjects had been invited to contribute to. It was noted that as part of the review process, the School of Culture and Creative Arts' Management Team were considering current and future provision within the context of the University's 2020: A Global Vision. The Head of School confirmed that a key factor would be to clarify: the distinctive characteristics of the University in terms of the broader development (REF, subject benchmarking and to lead the field where appropriate); and TS, FTVS and CCPR in the way programmes/courses aligned with the discipline, in the development of a coherent strategy that harmonised their strengths and specialities, emphasising methodologies and a more practice-based approach.

Leadership

3.4 Although the SER made reference to Heads of Subjects, the leadership roles within TS, FTVS and CCPR in relation to School were not formally defined (although the Head of School has introduced a job description), nor recognised by the College, who viewed them more as Directors of Programmes. It was noted that prior to re-structuring there had been a Head of Department of TS, FTV and

CCPR but that the financial operation in the creation of the School, and in particular the ring-fencing of CCPR funds, had limited the leadership role. The then Head of College of Arts, cognisant that subjects would function more effectively independently, had therefore agreed to an informal arrangement with devolved power. The Head of School noted the selection of sub-panels through the Senior Management Group in the Research Exercise Framework (REF) exercise demonstrated the dysfunction of the previous structure. Meanwhile staff confirmed that while the day to day management/job descriptions reflected the former structure, TS, FTVS and CCPR worked collegially and the roles of the subject areas' leads were negotiated through a consensual process and rotated to facilitate progression and research leave. However it was noted that their preference would be for leadership roles to be formalised and that the matter had been discussed at the last staff Away Day.

3.5 While the Review Panel acknowledged the budgetary reasons for the decision to operate without a Head of Subject, there was some concern that this had in effect separated teaching oversight from the subject areas and that in order to communicate and collaborate effectively across the subject areas, staff required clear leadership. Formal articulation of leadership roles would also benefit staff and students from TS, FTVS and CCPR in terms of planning and vision, providing a cohort identity and a coherent voice in taking the School forward. Furthermore subject managers needed feedback in terms of credit in promotion and recognition of professional status. The Review Panel **recommends** that the School of Culture and Creative Arts in consultation with Theatre Studies, Film and Television Studies and the Centre for Cultural Policy Research, liaise with the College of Arts in a review of the management structure that supports teaching and curriculum development and, if appropriate, formalises academic leadership roles at subject level to provide greater coherence in the development and delivery of teaching across the School.

School collaborations

3.6 The Panel was pleased to note that in addition to PhD supervision, particularly with CCPR, the School was developing new opportunities to foster cross-School collaborations. This included the introduction of four courses: two undergraduate honours options: 'Inter-War Cultures' covering music, arts, architecture and film; and 'Genders' and two postgraduate masters options: 'Festivals' which spanned all art forms and the proposed 'Time' which was more theoretical. The Head of School explained that the Subject's ambition to develop collaborations had to some extent been thwarted in the transition to a School structure, which had undermined confidence. It was noted from staff who met with the Panel that they welcomed the opportunity for future growth which would strengthen the School identity. A series of residencies organised by Dr Simon Murray also realised plans in the development of their relationship with cognate areas. While there were challenges of working in a cross-discipline environment, particularly in terms of ensuring the relevance and appeal of provision for students from diverse backgrounds and disciplines, and the School's physical split location-wise, staff were confident that there was a natural synergy between the subject areas which they were keen to develop. The Review Panel **commends** the introduction of

cross-discipline undergraduate and postgraduate courses in the School of Culture and Creative Arts.

PGT portfolio

- 3.7 It was noted from the SER that plans for expansion across the College of Arts in postgraduate taught programmes were explicitly linked to the creative industries, and Panel members reflected on an impressive rise in postgraduate student numbers in TS and CCPR, given the current financial climate. The Panel were particularly interested to hear from staff members of a proposal to offer a postgraduate taught programme in Film Curation, involving a shared appointment with the Scottish Screen Archive. However Panel and staff members were disappointed that the Festivals option introduced in 2014-15 had recruited 22 students from only two of subject areas within the School. Although staff and students were enthusiastic about the course, and acknowledged that the course was still bedding in, the Panel was not convinced of the coherence of the provision in terms of curriculum development and managing student expectations.
- 3.8 Staff members pointed out that there had been scheduling issues in relation to the Festivals course, due to timetable clashes and despite the disappointing uptake, there had been real benefits in terms of the student experience and employability. The drive to grow practice-based postgraduate taught provision had also impacted on staff workload and resources and there was a sense from some staff that their efforts were not always recognised. The Head of School reported an undertaking in support of the Kelvinhall project to grow the School PGT by £800k, which was a significant challenge given the need for sustainable growth and which made it difficult for the development of cross-subject synergies. However staff members who met with the Panel described how the application of methodologies and specific tools utilising different hooks for different courses could be utilised in an inter-disciplinary approach. Theatre Studies was adopting a more performance, practitioner-based approach in some courses, which was feeding off a thriving cultural scene in city of Glasgow. Meanwhile, in Film and Television Studies, they were using the piloting experience from the Festivals option and obtaining specific feedback from course conveners and students to inform the design of future courses.
- 3.9 Panel members perceived an ideal opportunity for the School to reflect on their portfolio given that staff and students were clearly supportive of the cross-discipline postgraduate provision and the School's future expansion plans (including a MA Film Curation). It was suggested that the School might consider a holistic approach based on a hub and spoke model that utilised numerous opportunities (good practice, CCPR visiting speakers, local links with creative industry, work placements etc), and addressed logistical and staff development issues (timetabling between lectures/modules, rewarding staff effort). The Review Panel **recommends** that the School of Culture and Creative Arts form a short-life Working Group, in consultation with the Dean of Graduate Studies, to consider

future cross-discipline postgraduate provision, which responds to student needs and builds on the strengths of the Subjects.

Marketing

3.10 Postgraduate students who met with the Panel raised an issue regarding the accuracy of descriptions in the course catalogue in terms of availability and content, in relation to the proportion of practice-based teaching and learning. Staff members explained that while it was important for the Subjects to be able to offer students flexibility, with a wide range of honours/postgraduate taught course options, this impacted on class size and staff workload. Therefore options were offered on alternative sessions, with course catalogue entries deliberately kept dormant (and therefore inaccurate) in between. This allowed the Subject to retain its distinctiveness while keeping teaching fresh through research-led interests of staff. The issue of the practical course content is addressed further under curriculum review (see Section 5.1.4), and staff pointed out that provision could not compete with Film Schools.

3.11 Postgraduate students were disappointed that course availability was often only confirmed at the point of registration through the Course Catalogue, which limited choice and flexibility. Staff members reported that course options were subject to staff availability and finalised in April and then following 'checking' were included on the Course Catalogue. However submissions to the University's Postgraduate Prospectus closed in January and the Subject had limited access to the Prospectus' website landing pages moderated through the Recruitment and International Office (RIO). The Panel noted an option to temporarily suspend entries, which would allow the Subject/School a more reflexive response to programme changes. Dr Garwood reported that 1) he would be liaising with the administrators of the course catalogue to make sure only 'live' courses were visible; and (2) the desire to reform the FTV postgraduate options to make the offer more consistent – and therefore marketable – year by year, whilst also providing courses that were at the cutting edge of developments in the field. The Review Panel **recommends** that the Subject liaise with Recruitment and International Office to ensure that prospective postgraduate students are provided with accurate information regarding the availability of course options.

4. Enhancing the Student Experience

4.1 Admissions, Retention and Success

4.1.1 Revised student admission figures submitted to the Review Panel shortly before the review visit showed a relatively stable position; with a slight decrease or equivalent rates for TS and FTVS over the last 3 to 4 years. Panel members were however pleased to note some growth in the postgraduate taught provision in TS and CCPR during this period. Accompanying narrative stated that intake included more international students, particularly in CCPR which was on average 70% of the postgraduate taught student cohort.

4.1.2 The SER had detailed positive rates of retention and progression, noting that students felt welcome from the outset. This was evident from students who met with the Panel who were very enthusiastic about the friendliness and approachability of staff pre-admissions and throughout. Theatre Studies' students described the atmosphere at Gilmorehill Halls as energising, inspirational and made them feel 'at home'. The Review Panel **commends** the proactive approach to admissions taken by the Subjects, which includes advertisements, school visits and social media platforms such as Facebook and Twitter sites. The Review Panel **commends** the accessibility of academic, administrative and technical staff for engendering a sense of community.

Student attendance

4.2 The previous internal subject review in February 2007 had highlighted an issue regarding student attendance and the Panel explored with staff how the various approaches to attendance monitoring proposed by the Subject (participation mark for seminars at Levels 1 and 2, recording attendance during lectures, and reviewing course design so that it becomes more difficult for certain students to adopt a pragmatic strategy) had evolved during the review period. Dr Heinrich reported that attendance was still a problem in Theatre Studies, particularly around essay submissions for undergraduate students in Levels 1 and 2. It was noted that the School was also sending out email reminders and were considering penalising students to address the issue. The Convenor stated that University regulations allowed for attendance to be included in grading for practical sessions, where attendance at the sessions is essential to the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. The University does not support a punitive approach to non-attendance in cases where attendance is not essential to advancing student learning. He advised that, as the Subjects moved towards practice-based teaching, they might need to think carefully about future attendance monitoring arrangements.

4.3 Equality and Diversity

The Panel was reassured that the Subject's monitoring of equality and diversity was effective and appropriate, noting that many courses featured gender, sexuality and inter-culturalism. Student engagement through the Staff Student Liaison Committee also addressed issues of diversity in curriculum development. It was also clear that arrangements to support students with disabilities were effective and had been carefully considered in plans in the recent refurbishment of the teaching space.

4.4 Supporting Students in their Learning

4.4.1 The SER stated that all staff had an informal advising role and this was reflected in the views of undergraduate and postgraduate students who met with the Panel. Staff were described as responsive, approachable and

generous with their time, and that the support provided was well structured and effective. Indeed some of the Theatre Studies students who met with the Panel indicated that they had not needed to meet with their Advisor of Studies during their studies, as they preferred to go to their course tutors, who were willing to address their queries, which included pastoral issues. The Panel noted College of Arts plans to introduce a new Advising model, which would build on current support.

Support for transition and induction

4.4.2 The Panel were pleased to note that staff provided a considerable investment of their time for induction and transition by offering personalised support and information resources, both for incoming students and between levels of study. The Review Panel **commends** staff support for students in transition to Honours levels and orientation meetings, and induction meetings aimed at international students.

4.5 Student Engagement

4.5.1 External examiners had commented positively on student contributions to public-facing events, which included the student television service, student theatre, Screens society, and the University's student newspaper the Guardian. The SER also provided details of weekly tutorials and special events which students from all courses were invited to attend involving short film and theatre festivals, student performances, workshops, lectures and seminars by industry practitioners. Theatre Studies also offered a weekly slot for students to interact with lecturers on an informal drop-in basis. Undergraduate students from Theatre Studies who met with the Panel appreciated the networking opportunities provided by facilitating relationships with staff within the subject area to develop their understanding of individual staff research interests and their connections across the Subject and School.

Employability

4.5.2 HESA statistics (2013) circulated to the Panel prior to the review visit indicated that the Subject was slightly below (93.6%) UK sector average (94.2%) for employment on graduation, with graduates securing work in a wide range of employment destinations. The SER also provided details of the Subject's current and proposed links with creative industries, within and beyond Glasgow including: part-time Teaching Assistant position (shared with Scottish Screen Archive); working relationship with Media Production Unit from the Learning and Teaching Centre; a programme of visiting speakers and lectures by internationally acclaimed professional practitioners. It was also evident that employability was appropriately embedded within the curriculum and that industrial links were utilised to feed into course/programme development. The Review Panel **commends** the Subjects' exciting relationships with creative industries and external professionals and encourages continual development of these relationships.

4.5.3 Postgraduate students who met with the Panel had indicated that it was not always easy to arrange appointments with the Careers Service and they would benefit from careers advice on job applications and the work environment. However Theatre Studies students had been very impressed and appreciative of the support provided from Dr Victoria Price (College of Arts Graduate Attributes Champion) which included offers of help with curriculum vitae preparation and interview technique workshops. The Panel welcomed the Subject's proactive approach to employability and encourages further collaboration to develop work-based learning opportunities (careers guidance and visiting speakers) for all students.

Internationalisation

- 4.5.4 It was evident to the Panel that the Subjects had an effective and proactive approach to internationalisation, which aligned with the University's Strategic Plan: 2020 Global Vision. This was clearly reflected in the diverse range of cultural backgrounds of students and staff, and was embedded throughout the curricula and through other enhancement activities such as work placements and promotion of student exchange opportunities; Erasmus Exchange and Junior Year Abroad (JYA). In particular the Panel noted the availability of specialist study abroad and exchange convenors and details of established links with: Queen's University in Ontario, the University of Stockholm, University of California and Free University in Berlin; and recent exchanges with Boston College, the University of Vienna, the University of Maryland, and the National University in Singapore. Staff members were also keen to take up opportunities offered through the Erasmus mobility programme, and new international links were being developed with Ngee Ann Polytechnic in Singapore and with Chile's Catholic University.
- 4.5.5 The SER had highlighted an increase in student mobility figures, which was balanced in terms of incoming and outgoing activity, with Erasmus Exchange and Junior Year Abroad (JYA) arrangements detailed above. The Panel was also interested to hear from staff, about a recent visit by MSc Media students to the Berlin Film Festival to attend a series of master-classes. Staff members reported that while students were clearly motivated for study abroad, there were the usual deterrents of cost, language and grading and that students were moving towards one semester visits (Prague, Vienna and Stockholm). Undergraduate students from both TS and FTVS who met with Panel spoke very highly of Dr Heinrich who provided advice and support on study abroad, although there was some concern that support could be more consistent across the subject areas and there were particular challenges finding study abroad opportunities for joint honours programmes. The Panel were pleased to note the Subject's efforts to address performance quality and grading compatibility concerns, in the development of 'settled bases' for the conversion of marks for returning JYA students. The Panel welcomed plans to disseminate this practice across the College of Arts, which was recognised as **good practice**.

4.5.6 The Panel acknowledged that the University was aware of the various challenges for study abroad and was actively pursuing opportunities beyond the European Union, including many Asian countries now teaching in English, although there were cost implications. Plans were also under development, for the provision of University-level online training, to assist students develop language capabilities, and that shorter cultural immersions would decrease students' financial commitment. It was noted that, despite a willingness from staff and an increase in the number of international links, there was an impact on staff workload that required support from the College. It was noted that the College had identified the development of international partnerships as a strategic priority and encouraged the development of the Subject's links with Prague, Ngee Ann Polytechnic in Singapore, and Chile's Catholic University in particular. The Head of School suggested that while the current strategy would benefit from a more coherent approach, the School were in a good position to review as part of wider collaborative plans. The Review Panel encourages the Subject to continue to progress internationalisation plans and the promotion, support and facilitation of outgoing student mobility opportunities, including consideration of shorter-term study abroad and potential exchange opportunities to offset financial impact.

Effectiveness of Feedback mechanisms

4.5.7 Meetings of Staff Student Liaison Committees (SSLC) were held regularly (usually once per semester) and scheduled on an ad-hoc basis. However formal records forwarded as part of the PSR supporting documentation were incomplete (e.g. no minutes from CCPR). Staff and students who met with the Panel described SSLC as a lively process and confirmed that agendas and minutes were posted on Moodle, and discussed at the end of lectures. It was noted from the meeting with postgraduates that included one CCPR student, that as staff were responsive and student cohorts tended to be small, students were more likely to engage directly with academic and administrative staff members. The Panel were concerned to note from the minutes provided, that 1) some issues were re-occurring (i.e. Moodle, MyCampus) 2) the quality of the minute-taking varied quite significantly and 3) there was no clear evidence that feedback loops were being closed. Dr Garwood confirmed that there had been an issue regarding recording minutes and there were plans for improvement. The Review Panel **recommends** the School undertake a review of the operation of the Subject's Staff Student Liaison Committees, to ensure that actions are clearly identified and progressed, and outcomes reported back to students.

4.5.8 Film and Television Studies students welcomed opportunities to reflect on their teaching and learning experience through feedback sought mid-way and at the end of session. Feedback was also sought on new course proposals, and it was evident from discussion with students that course provision was continually reviewed. They described how their participation in this process imbibed a sense of worth and that academic staff valued

their views. Theatre Studies students confirmed that in addition to the completion of course evaluation questionnaires to academics, there were formal (SSLC) and informal channels to provide feedback to staff members, who took a proactive approach to ensure that any issues were addressed promptly and in a professional manner, which was regarded as **good practice**.

5. Enhancement in Learning and Teaching

Reflect on effectiveness of approaches to enhancing the student learning experience.

5.1 While there was evidence of reflection on a wide range of theoretical and practice-based student learning experiences, references were mostly based on external examiners' and SSLC comments and Panel members would have liked more discussion in terms of proposed solutions for teaching and learning issues raised. However the Panel was content that the Subject's engagement with curriculum development was appropriate and there was effective use of ILOs, placements and technology-enhanced teaching. The Review Panel **commends** the strong culture of research-led practice-based teaching.

Curriculum design and development

5.1.1 Details of flexible curricula were provided at all levels with examples of varied modes of teaching delivery, including giving students 'multi-platform' experience, and curriculum design that balanced research-led core, optional and professionally-linked opportunities. The Review Panel **commends** the breadth and variety of curricula. The Panel was also pleased to note that the curriculum in all three areas was lean and efficiently organised for the relatively large number of students taught by small staff teams, while providing an adequate range of options. However such curriculum development should have been visible through staff meetings/SSLC /School Learning and Teaching from minutes provided.

Intended Learning Outcomes

5.1.2 The Review Panel noted that statements on course-level Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) were provided to students via course handbooks and through the Moodle site. The ILOs for two modules detailed in the SER were clear, effective and in accordance with University e-learning strategy, featuring an increased range of technological methods of learning adopted across the three subject areas. However some Level 1 and 2 course handbooks still referred to 'learning objectives' and required updating. The Review Panel **recommends** that the Subjects engage with the Learning and Teaching Centre and utilises their online support to ensure a consistent approach in the communication of assessable Intended Learning Outcomes to students.

5.1.3 The FTVS undergraduate students who met with the Panel noted that the courses were very well organised and intelligently thought out, with a progressive learning structure that covered theory appropriately and encouraged critical analysis within a broader and international context. It

was also clear from students that the teaching staff were passionate about their respective research interests which was reflected in the choice of films selected. They also appreciated the model of integrated tutorials and lectures, which they thought worked well with consolidated learning. It was noted that there were opportunities for discussion with fellow students in Junior Honours tutorials with staff providing 'space for thinking and understanding'. The review Panel **commends** the tutorial provision, offered on a weekly basis and the opportunities for informal discussion for Honours students.

5.1.4 Postgraduate students suggested that the MLitt in Film and Television Studies curriculum included too much emphasis on the preparation for PhD study, particularly as there were now fewer students continuing their studies to doctorate level. Staff reported that delivery was in line with programme aims as described on the Subject's website/ Moodle regarding the development of PhD preparation skills. However although staff were keen to retain this element, they recognised the need to refine the focus to reflect student needs and expectations. The Panel noted that the programme was currently being reviewed to revise core course curriculum and include additional options.

5.1.5 Some postgraduate students expressed disappointment as it was their understanding that there would have been more practical experience in the MLitt Playwriting and Dramaturgy programme, and that it should have been marketed differently. Staff members noted that academic credibility was a key factor in attracting students, and it was therefore important to get the right balance between theory and practice. The Review Panel, **recommends** the Subjects continue with their review of curricula, and in particular the MLitts in Film and Television Studies and Playwriting and Dramaturgy to ensure programme aims meet student needs and expectations.

Technology Enhanced Learning and Teaching

5.1.6 The SER described how the FTVS collections had been digitised and were available to students and colleagues across the School and beyond via the Online Digital Archive (compiled by Mr Michael McCann). It was noted in the SER that this resource could be developed across other subject areas and shared widely and that promotion of the TFTS Online Archive would increase interest.

5.1.7 Students who met with the Panel praised the Subject's engagement with the University's Virtual Learning Environment Moodle, which included course reading lists/electronic books and details of lecturers' suggestions of forthcoming cultural events.

5.2 Assessment and Feedback

Range of assessment methods

5.2.1 The Subjects' sense of achievement regarding the diverse range of, and often innovative assessment modes, was clearly evident in the SER, which was affirmed by the Dean of Learning and Teaching and by staff and students as commendable. Students were particularly enthusiastic about the worked essay examples provided by the Subjects and the use of differential continuous learning log in the 'Feminist Film Theory' course. The Panel was also interested to learn from students about the inclusion of a self-reflective statement in the first piece of assessed work for Level 1 Theatre Studies to identify strengths and opportunities for development. Dr Garwood described how audio visual essays, which had been facilitated through the Learning and Teaching Development Fund in 2013-14,⁵ developed students' practical and creative skills in handling digital materials and featured an advocacy element, which could be shared with colleagues engaged in screen media. The Review Panel **commends** the wide range of assessment methods employed by the Subjects to measure the achievement of the breadth of student abilities which are aligned with intended learning outcomes.

Good practice

5.2.2 Although the SER contained examples of innovative assessment and teaching, it was not clear how good practice was shared across School, College and University. The Panel reflected on the Subject's use of audio visual essays and noted a practice-based teaching initiative used in the School of Engineering that also simulated the working environment but through presentations/reports which highlighted the need to balance student expectations between assessment levels. The Review Panel encourages the Subjects/School to share good practice in a continual process by identifying teaching and learning innovation across the University to inform the development of curricula and assessment modes.

30 credit options

5.2.3 In 2012-13 following widespread consultation across the School and College, Theatre Studies introduced 30 credit Honours' options in place of 20 credit due to concerns that the 20 credit model did not allow for appropriate breadth and quantity and also limited the potential for variety in assessment modes as sought by staff and students. The Panel noted from the SER and from correspondence received from the Dean of Learning and Teaching prior to the review visit, that the College of Arts had agreed to standardise by offering 20 credit courses, and Theatre Studies had been given an extra year to implement the change.

5.2.4 The Panel explored with staff their response to the College of Arts' directive. The Head of School reported that an important motivating factor in the move to the 30 credit based system, had been student feedback, which had indicated that modules were under-credited. Furthermore subsequent input from external examiners, students and other colleagues had been extremely positive, and the 30 credit model had been hailed a

⁵ LTDF funded Dr Garwood's training in editing to develop resources that allowed the teaching to take place.

success. The Panel noted from Theatre Studies staff that the 30-credit course rewarded students for the learning undertaken in relation to assessment variety introduced which were linked to practice and critical theory. FTVS described how practice from a predominantly critical academic base had developed to include performance as well as facilitating critical reflection. The Subjects acknowledged College concerns regarding collaboration and the need to use 20 credits by FTVS at undergraduate level noting that: the subject areas had operated as two distinct subjects and never jointly taught any courses. However, collaboration was occurring and student numbers on joint honours pathways had increased after the introduction of 30 credits, including TS/FTVS joint honours; and staff collaboration was also increasing with new cross-School Honours and PGT courses.

- 5.2.5 Although it was evident that the 30 credit system was working well and there were perceived benefits for students, the Panel recognised the College of Arts perspective that sought standardisation to facilitate further collaboration between the subject areas. However, the credit issue had been on-going for some time and required to be resolved quickly to avoid compromising the student experience. It was apparent to the Review Panel that further dialogue with the College of Arts was required, and **recommends** that the School continue discussion with the College of Arts to reach a final agreement on the continuation, or otherwise, of the 30 credit model. Depending on the outcome of these discussions, the School should develop an appropriate implementation plan for any agreed changes and communicate this clearly to staff and students.

Feedback on assessment

- 5.2.6 While National Student Survey scores for the Subject area showed overall satisfaction was above the institutional benchmark, figures suggested there were issues concerning assessment turn-around, although there had been some improvement over the past three years. However these concerns had not reflected in course evaluation feedback, SSLC documentation or in discussions with the various student groupings who met with Panel. In particular, Level 1 and 2 students from FTVS and TS reported that feedback on assessment was mostly within the three-week period recommended by the University's Code of Assessment and there were no issues with quality of feedback. Students also felt supported through a variety of informal and formal mechanisms that included an open door policy by staff (lecturers, GTAs and University Teachers). Staff were considered very approachable who actively sought student views on assessment methods and provided assessment surgeries (i.e. essay), which students found very useful. Honours and postgraduate students described feedback on assessment for most courses in TS/FTV and CCPR as clear, which was returned promptly and staff were also happy to discuss feedback. The Review Panel **commends** the quality of feedback on assessments and prompt turnaround in return that is mostly within the three week recommendation.

- 5.2.7 Theatre Studies Postgraduate students however flagged up an issue regarding the return of feedback in relation to the Approaches to History course (an outside course delivered by History). Staff acknowledged students had been subject to an unacceptable delay in presentation feedback in Approaches to History, which had been partly due to staff absence in History and ineffective communication from History to the students concerned but this had now been resolved through the PGT Convenor and SSLC. It was also noted that students on the Playwriting 1 course had been confused by advice offered by staff on the script report component of assessment; students had received both an assessment briefing session by the course tutor and a workshop on script reports by a professional practitioner so as to discuss and demonstrate a variety of different approaches to compiling a script report. Due to the nature of professional practice in relation to script reports it is important to retain an element of flexibility/openness. Staff explained that the workshop on script reports with a professional dramaturge was a new element of the course and they had intended to convey to students that there was not a single model or fixed template in terms of composing a script report. There were also challenges due to the University's ambition to enhance links with industry while meeting assessment feedback requirements undertaken by external practitioners with competing work commitments and variable teaching abilities. However the Subject was aware of the problem and confirmed plans to address the issue. The Panel accepted that there were challenges collaborating with other Subjects and using professionals/external practitioners, in terms of controlling the turnaround, quantity and quality of feedback on assessment. The Panel could also understand why teaching staff wanted to retain flexibility around the return of assessment. The Review Panel encourages the Subject to ensure that communications with students are consistent and clear to manage their expectations of feedback.
- 5.2.8 There was some concern raised by Level 1 Theatre Studies students that feedback on examinations was too generic and feedback had not been provided on individual scripts. The Panel noted that a non-prescriptive policy on Feedback Following Summative Examinations was introduced in 2014-15 (Spring diet) by the University's Learning and Teaching Committee which invited Schools to devise and publish a set of minimum standards. The policy stated that while individual feedback to all students was not expected to be the norm, the School should indicate the degree to which individual feedback would be available and that individual feedback should be made available on request. It was noted from the Subject that there were challenges around staff workload, as well as staff and student awareness of entitlement in terms of feedback on examinations. The Review Panel **recommends** that the School communicate with teaching staff and students to ensure that advice and provision of feedback on examinations is consistent and in accordance with University policy on Feedback Following Summative Examinations

(See:

<http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/senateoffice/policies/assessment/feedbackfollowingsummativeexaminations/>)

5.3 Engaging and Supporting Staff

Probationer and early career support

5.3.1 The Review Panel met with three Early Career Development Programme (ECDP) participants including one member who was currently attending the Postgraduate Certificate on Academic Practice (PgCAP) provided by the Learning and Teaching Centre. The PgCAP was described as a useful opportunity to consider the methodology of teaching and meet with other early career staff from across the University. It was well taught and effectively administered. However there was a clear view from the ECDP participants that the one month turnaround from commencing the programme to objective setting was unrealistic and that a period of three months would be more sensible. The Panel noted that:

- orientation on and pre-entry was well structured and supportive, and induction events had provided opportunities to meet with relevant Subject/School colleagues (including programme leads, convenors of school committees, research staff and administrative support);
- mentoring operated on a formal and informal basis, through regular meetings and flexible access providing advice and support in relation to teaching, research and integration to the Subjects/School;
- the positive approach of staff operating within a research-led and practice-based teaching environment, who encouraged them to think strategically and make connections for trans-disciplinary teaching which enhanced the effectiveness of the School;
- internal and external collaborations with industry which provided additional teaching and learning opportunities such as work placements and weekly master-classes by practitioners who enjoyed the academic experience;
- while there were endemic challenges to manage appropriate balance between research and teaching in terms of career development, workloads were fairly distributed and negotiated with staff sensitive to their respective commitments.

The Review Panel **commends** the Subjects' support and mentoring arrangements to integrate and develop early career staff.

Support and training for hourly paid staff members

5.3.2 The Review Panel met with 11 postgraduate research students and postdoctoral researchers, who had taken on roles as Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) and University Teachers. They confirmed that while two of the University Teachers had more developed roles as course convenors, most were involved in leading seminars at Levels 1/2, Honours and PGT

with some marking. A typical load for postgraduate research students was three to four hours a week, with an increased load during marking. It was noted from the SER, that teaching loads for GTAs were negotiated to ensure work commitments were appropriately balanced and productive and subject to approval by their PhD supervisors; TFTS did not normally employ them during their third year as PhD students; and the average maximum weekly allocation was six hours including preparation. University Teachers, who were usually post-doctorate, also had the opportunity to lead an honours course in their specialist research area. GTAs and University Teachers who met with the Panel regarded their experience of teaching as invaluable in terms of job training and employability, which enhanced their graduate attributes.

5.3.3 Panel members were pleased to note that GTAs/University Teachers on a fixed contract reported that they had received excellent support from staff members which included:

- assigned mentors (honours convenors), who provided feedback on teaching and marking, including a short report which could be used in future job applications;
- regular contact for FTV GTAs/University Teachers with staff during weekly meetings and email correspondence on an ad-hoc basis;
- a close working relationship between TS GTAs/University Teachers and their course convenors albeit in a less formal arrangement;
- Ms Julie Smith, the TFTS administrator was accessible and very helpful.

The SER made reference to the benefits of peer support amongst GTAs/University Teachers, however it was clear from the discussion with them, that the lack of a dedicated space/social hub and remote physical location of individual offices across campus, was limiting opportunities to share experiences.

5.3.4 GTAs/University Teachers on a fixed term contract who met with the Panel had attended workshops provided by the Students' Representative Council, the College of Arts Graduate School, and the Scottish Graduate School of Arts and Humanities, as well as the statutory training offered by the Learning and Teaching Centre (L&TC). However, it was suggested that future training provision might also usefully include practical advice around students' pastoral care requirements and how to deal with students presenting learning and mental health issues. Staff guidance on marking assessments could be also be front-loaded for new GTAs, although they were aware of the University's Code of Assessment which helped articulate assessment requirements. It was noted that guidance on assessment was a core element of L&TC training and that online training concerning equality and diversity was also available to all staff and students. GTAs/University Teachers also appreciated the accessibility and expertise available through their course/honours convenors. The Review

Panel **commends** the support provided and teaching opportunities available for GTAs and University Teachers.

5.3.5 There was also a suggestion that training could include course design and practice-based teaching techniques, to meet the needs of University Teachers with convenor roles. One of the University Teachers present reported that they had been offered training on a PgCAP in an associated institution. The Review Panel **recommends** that the School consult with Human Resources so that, where appropriate, University Teachers are conferred with early career status and benefit from relevant training.

5.3.6 The Review Panel noted at the meeting with GTAs/University Teachers, that although there were formal and informal processes to which they could contribute (course/honours conveners, programme leads, staff meetings, committees), the opportunity to contribute to the enhancement of teaching and learning, was considered limited. While they recognised that their close contact with students was a valuable resource and welcomed the TFTS environment which fostered an inclusive and proactive culture, they wanted the experience of curriculum development and assessment review. They considered these opportunities were unavailable with earnings not commensurate with workload and confusing terms of employment that made it difficult to manage work commitments. It was noted that:

- University teachers present had been invited and attended staff meetings (including subject group/SSLC/exam board);
- payment rates (including half hour preparation for every one hour of new teaching and four essays per hour for marking) appeared not in line with School/College arrangements and Universities and Colleges Union guidance;
- GTA policy was currently being developed by the College of Arts to rationalise practice.

Panel members also pointed out that the University's Extended Workforce Policy introduced in December 2014 would be more relevant to University Teachers. The Panel expressed concern that there was a lack of clarity of expectations around the roles, support and reward structure for GTAs/University Teachers and **recommends** that the School clarifies the roles of Graduate Teaching Assistants and University Teachers, to ensure consistency of support from staff and that reward in pay and personal development aligns with College and University policy.

5.4 Resources for Learning and Teaching (staffing and physical)

Staffing strategy

5.4.1 Prior to the review visit, the Panel had sought further information from the Heads of Subject regarding their staffing strategy to understand how the subject area was prioritising staff appointments, to what extent it had evidenced its case through the School and College budget processes and

how their staffing strategy aligned to their vision for evolving taught portfolio, particularly in terms of the large number of Graduate Teaching Assistants and University Teachers. The Subject's response confirmed that for FTVS and Theatre Studies recent positions generally aligned with the University's commitment to research-led teaching and collaborate with external partners. New posts were therefore created to enhance existing provision in a particular specialist area or to expand the range of specialisms within the teaching and research team. The development of new postgraduate taught programmes in FTVS also enhanced industrial partnerships, which included a part-time professional practitioner to teach the core elements of the MSc in Filmmaking and Media Arts and the proposal to offer a PGT programme in Film Curation, in tandem with the School's involvement with the Kelvin Hall project that included the Scottish Screen Archive.

- 5.4.2 The Heads of Subject confirmed that staff on long-term or permanent contracts were central to the teaching of the core elements on each programme (Levels 1 and 2, Honours courses such as Film Analysis, Television Analysis and Media and Cultural Policy in FTVS, or Performance, Theory and Analysis in TS, supervisions of dissertations/long-form independently researched projects at UG and PGT levels, and teaching on the core courses for PGT programmes).

Accommodation

- 5.4.3 It was evident from the meetings with staff and students that the accommodation at Gilmorehill Halls was highly valued both by staff and students, providing a common access to teaching space and administrative support, and a spatial dynamic that benefitted the student experience. However the SER had highlighted a lack of practice and laboratory space in light of rising student numbers, an increase in practice-based delivery and increased recruitment to their new MLitt programmes. The Panel also noted from student feedback that the lack of practice space was a key concern and had been raised at SSLC and in annual monitoring reports. Undergraduate students raised additional issues that included: teaching space in the basement that they considered unsuitable for extended classes (up to 4 hours) due to lack of ventilation and daylight; low temperatures in the cinema and; the need for more social space. Postgraduate students pointed out that the carpentry laboratory was currently doubling as practice space and that there should be another dedicated practice space.

- 5.4.4 Following a tour of Gilmorehill Halls, the Panel sought clarification with the Head of School, how the Subjects' current use of space and future requirements, sat within the University's 10 Year Capital Plan to transform the estate. The Head of School reported that, while there was clarity of the Subjects' needs, the College of Arts had concerns regarding financial support and its ability to enhance current space, which was reflected in feedback from the REF subpanels (35, 36) which both explicitly referred to

an accommodation cost issue. The Review Panel **recommends** the School works with the College to review how teaching space and equipment requirements could be supported in the future, taking a creative approach, including examples of best practice, to ensure the Subjects' accommodation needs are reflected in the College of Arts and University estate plans.

Building access

- 5.4.5 The Panel heard from undergraduate and postgraduate students that they had difficulty accessing the Gilmorehill Halls building, after 4.15pm during weekdays and at weekends, as there was no janitorial provision. It was noted that this was a particular problem for 1) postgraduate students who sometimes had seminars scheduled outside normal hours and 2) undergraduate students who needed access to theatre or cinema for rehearsals, screenings and practical work. It was noted that the Subjects did allow postgraduate access after 5pm but involved a lengthy process of going to University's main gate, verifying their identity from a named list and confirming that they were familiar with the code for the security alarm, in order to obtain a key which then had to be returned. It was also noted that despite the issue being discussed regularly through SSLC, in external examiner feedback and included as a recommendation from the previous review in 2007 to install a swipe-card system, the problem has never been addressed.
- 5.4.6 The Head of School confirmed that a plan to enable access by providing keys to students had been discounted due to the prohibitive costs involved. Therefore controlled access via the main gate had seemed the only viable option to ensure the security requirements to safeguard valuable technical equipment. The Head of School reported that he had liaised more recently with Mr David Newall, Secretary of Court, regarding a swipe-card system, which would provide secure entry but again this had been ruled out due partly to concerns regarding the impact on limited resources and the potential relocation as part of estate development. The Panel Convenor reported on the estate 'master-plan' that included the building of a new Learning and Teaching Hub, featuring a radically different operating regime of facilities management that was likely to include swipe-card access. The Panel noted that Ms Dorothy Welch, Deputy Secretary, was currently engaged in a University-wide consultation exercise to update and rationalise swipe card access⁶. There was also a suggestion that the Subjects might consider a software app currently in use by a number of universities that linked students to security staff, which might address the access problem in the shorter term at relatively low cost. The Review Panel **recommends, as a matter of urgency**, the Senate Office liaise with Ms Dorothy Welch, Deputy Secretary, to reassess the viability of installation of

⁶ Clerk's note: A review of the standard access system (apparently now defunct) through E&B is likely to delay progress.

a swipe-card controlled system in Gilmorehill Halls, to provide evening and weekend access for staff and students.

Technical support

- 5.4.7 It was noted from the SER that the demand for practice space from increasing numbers of students requiring access to specialised facilities in Theatre Studies, was impacting on limited performance spaces and a part-time technical staff member who was finding it increasingly difficult to support student performance assessments.

Work Based Learning

- 5.4.8 It was noted from a statement from Dr Garwood provided to the Panel prior to the review visit that FTVS did not currently offer work placement opportunities as part of the curriculum, although the subject area was proactive in promoting extra-curricular work opportunities for students and FTVS was represented on the steering committee of a School initiative to organise School-wide work placements for PGT students.
- 5.4.9 The Panel had asked Theatre Studies to comment on the demands placed on and by students in diverse employment settings and how they supported students to ensure these experiences were enhancing. Dr Heinrich explained that students were fully briefed before selecting potential work placements and met with the host organisation at an early stage in the application. Once placement details have been agreed, students also submitted a placement plan which was agreed with the course convenor before the placement started. Students were supported by the subject area through regular contact with the course convenor throughout their placements and via email with individual tutorials. TS students who met with the Panel were very enthusiastic about the advice and support provided by staff, and that the subject area had excellent work contacts and opportunities, including a placement scheme at the Tron theatre. However postgraduate students felt less supported by staff and suggested that work opportunities could be better communicated and that courses would benefit from more work based learning. The Panel also heard from one postgraduate who had been disappointed with their work placement in the Scottish Theatre Archive, which was unsupervised and her experience was more like a visitor than a temporary member of staff. Dr Heinrich explained that the Scottish Theatre Archive was understaffed and that relationships with partners could be quite challenging and difficult to manage, which also impacted on staff workload. It was noted that work placements account for approximately 110-135 hours (for around 22 -27 students) a year for teaching staff.
- 5.4.10 The Panel acknowledged FTVS's concerns that work placements at undergraduate level were often labour intensive and sometimes did not add value to the student experience. They were also aware that the number of work placements was limited so it was important to be realistic

and honest with students regarding availability. Nevertheless, the Review Panel was of the view that the benefits generally outweighed the disadvantages and encourages the Subject to continue to develop cross-discipline work placement opportunities to ensure students were consistently supported in the enhancement of learning and employability to enrich the student learning experience.

6. Academic Standards

- 6.1 The Panel was confident that the Subject's setting, maintaining and reviewing of academic standards was appropriate, effective and characterised by disciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches. In particular the balance of achievement at undergraduate level was considered in line with national norms, given the entry qualifications of students and the intensive experience of the degrees. The high percentage of CCPR students achieving either a Distinction or a Pass was noted.

Subject Benchmark Statements

- 6.2 The Review Panel considered provision was aligned to Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) subject benchmarks (Communication, Media, Film and Cultural Studies 2008, and Dance, Drama and Performance 2007). It was noted that reconsideration of credit weightings for modules ensured a balanced workload and staff had contributed directly to QAA benchmarking statements.

7. Collaborative provision

The SER stated that collaboration was an intrinsic feature of TFTS and CCPR provision, which was embedded within curricula across all levels of study in an integrated approach, to provide a quality teaching and learning experience for students. Panel members were pleased to note that study abroad opportunities were valued and were enhanced by an additional range offered due to the collaborative nature and taught modules with international input enhanced the student opportunity and experience.

8. Summary of perceived strengths and areas for improvement

8.1 Key strengths

- Cross-discipline course options;
- Proactive approach to recruitment and conversion;
- Accessibility of staff and sense of community;
- Support for transition and induction;
- Responsiveness to student feedback;
- Relationships with industry and external professionals;

- Strong culture of research-led practice-based teaching;
- Breadth and variety of curricula;
- Weekly provision of tutorials;
- Wide range of assessment modes;
- Prompt turnaround in return and quality of feedback on assessments;
- Support in development of early career staff;
- Support and development of GTAs/University Teachers (fixed term).

8.2 Areas for improvement

- Clarification of leadership roles;
- Review of future cross-discipline postgraduate provision;
- Accuracy of course option descriptions in terms of availability;
- Operation of SSLC;
- Consistency of ILOs;
- Provision of generic feedback on examinations;
- Early career status for University Teachers;
- Payment of GTA/University Teachers;
- Development of work placement opportunities.

8.3 Conclusion

The Review Panel was impressed by the quality of support provided by teaching and administrative staff, whose goodwill and efforts were being used most effectively and much appreciated by students. The students who met with the Panel, particularly the undergraduates, were enthusiastic about their learning experience at Gilmorehill Halls and spoke highly of the vibrant and community atmosphere fostered by dedicated staff.

The Review Panel, guided by the views of the External Subject Specialists, confirmed that, at the time of the Review, programmes offered by the School were current and valid in light of developing knowledge in the discipline, and of practice in its application.

Commendations

The Review Panel commends TS, FTVS and CCPR on the following, which are **listed in order of appearance** in this report:

Commendation 1

The Review Panel commends the introduction of cross-discipline undergraduate and postgraduate courses in the School of Culture and Creative Arts [Section 3.6].

Commendation 2

The Review Panel commends the proactive approach to admissions taken by the Subject, which includes advertisements, school visits and social media platforms such as Facebook and Twitter sites [Section 4.1.2].

Commendation 3

The Review Panel commends the accessibility of academic, administrative and technical staff for engendering a sense of community [Section 4.1.2].

Commendation 4

The Review Panel commends staff support for students in transition to Honours levels and orientation meetings, and induction meetings aimed at international students [Section 4.4.2].

Commendation 5

The Review Panel commends the Subjects' exciting relationships with creative industries and external professionals and encourages continual development of these relationships [Section 4.5.2].

Commendation 6

The Review Panel commends the strong culture of research-led practice-based teaching [Section 5.1]

Commendation 7

The Review Panel commends the breadth and variety of curricula {Section 5.1.1}.

Commendation 8

The Review Panel commends the tutorial provision, offered on a weekly basis and featuring opportunities for informal discussion for Honours students [Section 5.1.3].

Commendation 9

The Review Panel commends the wide range of assessment methods employed by the Subject to measure the achievement of the breadth of student abilities and are aligned with intended learning outcomes [Section 5.2.1].

Commendation 10

The Review Panel commends the quality of feedback on assessments and prompt turnaround in return that is mostly within the three week recommendation [Section 5.2.6].

Commendation 11

The Review Panel commends the Subjects' support and mentoring arrangements to integrate and develop early career staff [Section 5.3.1].

Commendation 12

The Review Panel commends the support provided and teaching opportunities available for GTAs and University Teachers [Section 5.3.4].

Recommendations

The following recommendations have been made to support the Subject in its reflection and to enhance provision in relation to teaching, learning and assessment. The recommendations have been cross-referenced to the paragraphs in the text of the report to which they refer and are **grouped together** by the areas for improvement/enhancement and are **ranked in order of priority**.

For the attention of the Head of School of Culture and Creative Arts

Recommendation 1

The Review Panel recommends that the School of Culture and Creative Arts, in consultation with Theatre Studies, Film and Television Studies and the Centre for Cultural Policy Research, liaise with the College of Arts in a review of the management structure that supports teaching and curriculum development and, if appropriate, formalises academic leadership roles at subject level to provide greater coherence in the development and delivery of teaching across the School [Section 3.5].

For Action: Head of School

For information: Head of College

For Information: Professor Raymond Boyle, Dr Ian Garwood and Dr Anselm Heinrich

Recommendation 2

The Review Panel recommends that the School clarifies the roles of Graduate Teaching Assistants and University Teachers, to ensure consistency of support from staff and that reward in pay and personal development aligns with College and University policy [Section 5.3.6].

For Action: Head of School

For information: Professor Raymond Boyle, Dr Ian Garwood and Dr Anselm Heinrich

Recommendation 3

The Review Panel recommends that the School of Culture and Creative Arts form a short-life Working Group, in consultation with the Dean of Graduate Studies, to consider future cross-discipline postgraduate provision, which responds to student needs and builds on the strengths of the Subject [Section 3.9].

For Action: Head of School

For information: Deans of Graduate Studies

Recommendation 4

The Review Panel recommends the Subjects continue with their review of curricula, and in particular the MLitts in Film and Television Studies and Playwriting and Dramaturgy to ensure programme aims meet student needs and expectations [Section 5.1.5].

For Action: Head of School

For Information: Professor Raymond Boyle, Dr Ian Garwood and Dr Anselm Heinrich

Recommendation 5

The Review Panel recommends that the Subjects engage with the Learning and Teaching Centre (L&TC) and utilises their online support to ensure a consistent approach in the communication of assessable Intended Learning Outcomes to students [Section 5.1.2].

For Action: Head of School

For Information: Professor Raymond Boyle, Dr Ian Garwood and Dr Anselm Heinrich

For information: ADU, Learning and Teaching Centre

Recommendation 6

The Review Panel recommends that the School continue discussion with the College of Arts to reach final agreement on the continuation, or otherwise, of the 30 credit model. Depending on the outcome of these discussions, the School should develop an appropriate implementation plan for any agreed changes and communicate this clearly to staff and students [Section 5.2.5].

For Action: Head of School

For information: Head of College

For Information: Professor Raymond Boyle, Dr Ian Garwood and Dr Anselm Heinrich

Recommendation 7

The Review Panel recommends that the School communicate with teaching staff and students to ensure that advice and provision of feedback on examinations is consistent and in accordance with University policy on Feedback Following Summative Examinations

(See:

<http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/senateoffice/policies/assessment/feedbackfollowingsummativeexaminations/>) [Section 5.2.8].

For Action: Head of School

For information: Professor Raymond Boyle, Dr Ian Garwood and Dr Anselm Heinrich

Recommendation 8

The Review Panel recommends that the School consult with Human Resources so that where appropriate, University Teachers are conferred with early career status and benefit from relevant training [Section 5.3.5].

For Action: Head of School

For information: Director of Human Resources

Recommendation 9

Review Panel recommends the School works with the College to review how teaching space and equipment requirements could be supported in the future, taking a creative approach, including examples of best practice, to ensure the Subjects' accommodation needs are reflected in the College of Arts and University estate plans [Section 5.4.4].

For Action: Head of School

For information: Head of College

For Information: Professor Raymond Boyle, Dr Ian Garwood and Dr Anselm Heinrich

Recommendation 10

The Review Panel recommends, as a matter of urgency⁷, the Senate Office liaise with Ms Dorothy Welch, Deputy Secretary, to reassess the viability of installing of a swipe-card controlled system in Gilmorehill Halls, to provide evening and weekend access for staff and students.[Section 5.4.6].

For Action: Senate Office

For information: Deputy Director, Court Office

For information: Head of School

For information: Professor Raymond Boyle, Dr Ian Garwood and Dr Anselm Heinrich

Recommendation 11

The Review Panel recommends the School undertake a review of the operation of the Subject's Staff Student Liaison Committees, to ensure that actions are clearly identified and progressed, and outcomes reported back to students [Section 4.5.7]

For Action: Head of School

For Information: Professor Raymond Boyle

Dr Ian Garwood and Dr Anselm Heinrich

Recommendation 12

The Review Panel recommends that the Subjects liaise with the Recruitment and International Office to ensure that prospective postgraduate students are provided with accurate information regarding the availability of course options [Section 3.11].

For Action: Head of School

For information: Director of RIO

⁷ Clerk's note: A review of the standard access system (apparently now defunct) through E&B is likely to delay progress.