

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

Academic Standards Committee – 19 May 2017

Periodic Subject Review: Review of History of Art held on 22 February 2017

Robbie Mulholland, Clerk to the Review Panel

Review Panel:

Professor Tom Guthrie	Academic Standards Committee, Convener
Professor Mark Crinson	Birkbeck, University of London, External Subject Specialist
Dr Duncan Ross	Senior Senate Assessor on Court
Ms Alex Pancheva	Undergraduate Science and Engineering Convenor, Student member
Dr Marina Moskowitz	School of Humanities (History), Cognate member
Dr Michael McEwan	Learning Enhancement & Academic Development Service
Mr Robbie Mulholland	Academic Collaborations Office and Clerk to the Panel
Ms Fiona Dick	Senate Office, Observer

1. Introduction

- 1.1.1 History of Art is located in 7/8 University Gardens and is part of the School of Culture and Creative Arts within the College of Arts. Schools and Colleges were formed in 2010 when a major restructuring exercise reshaped the University from nine Faculties to four Colleges.
- 1.1.2 History of Art is also home to The Centre for Textile Conservation and Technical Art History (CTCTAH) which occupies newly refurbished space on two floors of the Robertson Building. CTCTAH which relocated to the University from the University of Southampton in 2010 brings together expertise in Textile Conservation and Technical Art History in support of the following three postgraduate programmes: MLitt Art History: Dress and Textile Histories; MLitt Art History: Technical Art History: Making and Meaning; and the MPhil Art History: Textile Conservation.
- 1.1.3 The previous internal review of the Subject's (Department's) programmes of teaching, learning and assessment took place in February 2010.

1.1.4 The Self Evaluation Report (SER) had been prepared by Dr Deborah Lewer, Head of History of Art, with substantial assistance from Dr Dominic Paterson and Professor John Richards. Ms Pauline McLachlan, Head of School Administration and several other administrative staff also assisted in collating information for the SER and the Review. The SER draws on the results of discussions, correspondence, meetings and reviews with teaching and support staff, and with students at all levels.

1.1.5 The Review Panel met with Dr Deborah Lewer, Head of Subject, Professor Dimitris Eleftheriotis, Head of School and Dr Wendy Anderson, Deputy Dean (Learning and Teaching), College of Arts. The Panel also met with 21 members of academic and administrative staff - including 3 early career staff, 9 undergraduate students, 7 postgraduate taught students and 4 Graduate Teaching Assistants.

2. Context and Strategy

2.1 Staff

History of Art currently has 21.8 FTE teaching staff.

The staff:student ratio across the Subject's taught programmes is 1:10. The Review Panel noted that the level of the staff:student ratio reflected the specialised nature of the teaching in CTCTAH and the need for greater staff input per student in the programmes supported by CTCTAH.

2.2 Students

Student numbers for 2015-16 are summarised as follows:

Individuals enrolled on one or more courses at each level	class enrolment (headcount)
Level 1 – History of Art 1	160
Level 1 – History of Art 1 (Half-course)	37
Level 2 – History of Art 2	88
Level 2 History of Art 2A	2
Level 2 – History of Art 2B	2
Junior/Senior Honours	113
PGT	95

2.3 Range of provision under Review

2.3.1 Undergraduate degrees

- M.A. Honours degree in History of Art. Single Honours
- M.A. Honours degree in History of Art. Joint Honours (various subjects)

2.3.2 Postgraduate degrees

- M.Litt Art History: Art, Politics, Transgression: Twentieth-Century Avant-Gardes (1 year)

- MLitt Art History: Dress and Textile Histories (1 year)
- MLitt Art History: Technical Art History: Making and Meaning (1 year)
- MLitt Art History: Collecting and Provenance Studies in an International Context (1 year)
- MLitt Art History: The Renaissance in Northern Europe and Italy (1 year)
- MPhil Art History; Textile Conservation (2 years)

History of Art also contributes to the delivery of the following programmes:

- MLitt Curatorial Practice (Contemporary Art), a 1-year collaborative programme delivered jointly with The Glasgow School of Art
- Pg Cert Antiquities Trafficking and Art Crime

History of Art also contributes to the provision of cross-School teaching which includes/has included the UG and PGT courses Festivals, Making Time, Genders and Interwar Cultures.

2.4 Strategic Approach to Enhancing Learning and Teaching

2.4.1 The Review Panel noted that the key strategic changes and developments which had taken place within History of Art since the last internal review aligned with key University and College objectives. The SER notes that 'our vision and strategy for innovative and inspiring research-led teaching to be at the centre of our current and future practice accords in a number of ways with the University Learning and Teaching Strategy for 2015-2020 and the College of Arts Learning and Teaching Plan for 2016-17'.

Vision

2.4.2 The Review Panel recognised that History of Art had undergone considerable changes in the period since the last internal review and this had coincided with a substantially increased student population at both UG and PGT level. A new Head of Subject had been appointed in 2016 and several longstanding senior members of staff had retired or left the University. These changes came at a time when the Subject was re-evaluating its priorities with regard to curriculum design and teaching delivery.

2.4.3 The Review Panel noted that key aspects of the Subject's vision clearly mirrored University and School strategic ambitions. A review of the curriculum at Levels 1 and 2 had taken place over the course of the last 5 years, the outcome of which was a move away from a traditional chronological approach to one based around a thematic interpretation. The curriculum review had sought to embed key graduate attributes within the curriculum such as critical thinking, independent inquiry, employability, and communication skills. The Review Panel was impressed with the way the Subject had sought to make many generic and transferable skills key features of the curriculum whilst managing to retain a character and vision quite distinct from other Scottish art history departments.

- 2.4.4 The Review Panel agreed that one of the key priorities for the newly formed Teaching Forum (see 4.1.8 to 4.1.9) should be to articulate a core vision for the Subject. The Review Panel considered that the SER reflected on the changing cultural narratives which had influenced the discipline in the 1970s/80s but could have highlighted more recent theoretical developments. Furthermore, the SER could have made more reference as to how the Subject's 'core philosophy' was articulated throughout and between courses and programmes - in other words, an understanding of what the central concerns of the subject are, how they are developing, and how they can be conveyed within the curriculum. In this context, the Review Panel suggests the Subject makes more extensive use of the Subject Benchmarking Statement, with its extensive comments on this issue.
- 2.4.5 The Review Panel **commends** History of Art for its comprehensive Self-Evaluation Report (SER) and its strong engagement with the PSR process. There was clear evidence that staff and students were highly committed to the Subject's next phase of development under the new Head of Subject.

3. Enhancing the Student Experience

3.1 Admissions, Retention and Success

Recruitment

- 3.1.1 Approximately 5 years ago, History of Art took the decision to expand its Level 1 intake. The Level 1 cohort now operated with an average of 180 students. The demographic profile of students within the Subject had changed markedly over the last 20 years and there had been a significant increase in student numbers right across the Subject's portfolio. The gender balance of students in the Subject, however, remained very uneven at: female (421) and male (73). This was in contrast to the gender ratio within the College of Arts, which was approximately 2:1 female to male. However, the Panel was pleased to note, that History of Art was involved in a collaborative project with Physics and Astronomy, under the auspices of the Emerging Leaders' Programme, to address the issue of gender imbalance in both subject areas.
- 3.1.2 It was evident from the students who met with the Panel that the distinct learning approach which History of Art brought to the subject had been a determining factor in their choice of institution/programme. The range of professional expertise offered by staff, the low staff/student ratio and the emphasis placed on a practical and 'interactive' approach to the subject were clearly valued. Students attending the MPhil Art History: Textile Conservation informed the Panel that this was the only programme of its sort in the EU offering intensive and highly specialist teaching.
- 3.1.3 The PGT students the Panel met with also praised highly the opportunities offered by the dedicated Centre for Textile Conservation and Technical Art History (CTCTAH), which had relocated to the University (the Robertson Building) from the University of Southampton in 2010. Professional development opportunities such as work-based learning, placements and engagement with professional staff at the Kelvin Hall and Hunterian Museum were also significant factors highlighted by students when deciding to apply to the University of Glasgow.

3.1.4 The Review Panel noted that a collaborative agreement existed between Christie's Education, London and the University. Christie's Education was one of the University's validated institutions and did not have degree-awarding powers in its own right. The collaboration involved students enrolled on the MA (Honours) History of Art and Art-world Practice programme at Christie's transferring to the University at the end of their second year of study, to follow the History of Art Junior and Senior Honours programme. Under this collaborative arrangement, students who followed a programme at Christie's received their awards from the University of Glasgow. This collaboration had recently been terminated and a period of 'teach-out' for the last students coming through this route was now in place. The last intake of students into Junior Honours through the Christie's link would be in 2018-19 (these students currently being in their first year at Christie's). No further such collaborative teaching activity with Christie's Education was planned by History of Art at this time.

Progression

3.1.5 Retention rates within the Subject were good and in line with trends observed within the School and College. In 2015-16, 95% of students on the full year Level 1 course had achieved a D grade or better. Additional factors had impacted the remaining 5%. At Level 2, the pass rate was 97.7%, and at the end of session 2015-16, 79 out of 91 students qualified for Honours entry by achieving the required C1 grade. 31 of the 79 progressed to Single Honours History of Art and 21 to Joint Honours.

Honours Courses

3.1.6 The Review Panel noted that student numbers had also continued to rise at Honours level - from 34 Single Honours and 14 Joint Honours students in 2013-14 to 43 and 21 respectively in 2016-17. The key staff who met with the Panel pointed out that the Subject had previously capped class sizes at 25 at Honours level but this was no longer the case. However, courses which required access to specialist materials, tended to be restricted to 20 students. It was noted, also, that demand from visiting students for individual courses fluctuated year on year and this made planning course numbers more difficult.

3.1.7 The Review Panel noted from the SER that several Honours courses had small numbers of students registered and queried to what extent this created an additional workload for staff. However, staff who met with the Panel confirmed that course student figures were higher than those reported. The Head of Subject considered that staff were fully committed to the range of courses at Honours level but acknowledged that at key times of the year, for example around examination times, staff were exposed to additional pressures. While the Subject's current approach to workload modelling was consultative, the Head of School advised the Panel that the College of Arts expected to implement the more detailed University Workload Model in 2017-18 with a view to improving workload planning. The Head of School noted that History of Art had the best staff:student ratio in the College, but it was difficult to assess, from this alone, the extent to which this was an accurate reflection of overall staff workload across the Subject. The specialised nature of the teaching in CTCTAH required greater staff input per student in the programmes CTCTAH supported.

3.1.8 The Honours students the Review Panel met with reported that the availability of Honours courses did vary according to the availability of staff with particular expertise

and the level of student demand. In general, the students reported that they liked the range of courses on offer at Honours level and did not want this reduced. The Review Panel **commends** History of Art on the delivery and content of the Methodology of Art History Junior Honours core course, which was highly praised by the students the Panel met with.

- 3.1.9 Since the last internal review of History of Art in 2010, arrangements around undergraduate dissertation supervision had changed and students were now assigned a dedicated dissertation supervisor. At both UG and PGT level, the Subject operates a policy that students meet with dissertation supervisors normally five times a year. Senior Honours students were permitted to submit sections of their dissertation in draft form to their supervisor for review. The Subject has introduced guidelines regarding supervision and review of drafts and this was intended to set out more consistent practice in relation to supervision.

Postgraduate Taught Provision

- 3.1.10 The Review Panel noted that History of Art had expanded its provision of postgraduate taught programmes significantly in recent years and now offered 6 PGT programmes (and contributed to the teaching of another two). These programmes had very strong links to international professional practice in museums and galleries. Numbers on these programmes did fluctuate and some programmes were regularly over-subscribed while others had small numbers of students.
- 3.1.11 The Head of Subject noted that History of Art was currently considering streamlining its PGT provision with a view to amalgamating some of its programmes. The Head of Subject reported, however, that she was very conscious that changes to the shape and range of History of Art's PGT provision might detract from some of its unique characteristics. She was aware that a balance had to be struck between maintaining the quality and integrity of the student experience currently available to History of Art PGT students with the need to address the University's future financial planning objectives. The Subject's aim, ideally, was to have approximately 15-17 students on each PGT programme. The Review Panel **recommends** that History of Art develop a strategic approach with regard to its PGT portfolio. In doing this, History of Art should reflect on the overall vision for the Subject, the distinctive nature of its existing provision and emerging opportunities such as those linked to the Kelvin Hall and Hunterian Museum developments.
- 3.1.12 The PGT students the Review Panel met were extremely positive about the quality of the learning opportunities available to them. This included inspirational staff, the opportunity to benefit from a wide range of professional expertise and mentoring from guest lecturers, along with the chance to undertake work-based placements, of which there were currently 42 within the Subject. Both PGT students and several of the staff the Panel met with stressed the importance of research to the undergraduate and PGT learning experience. They considered that the knowledge base which undergraduate and PGT History of Art students could draw on was considerably enriched by the quality of research undertaken within the Subject. The Panel noted that within History of Art at Honours level and above, the emphasis was on research-led teaching and many of the PGT specialised programmes were based on on-going research within the Subject.

- 3.1.13 Some of the PGT students the Review Panel met with who were based in CTCTAH thought that their location away from other students based at 8 University Gardens sometimes detracted from the sense of a cohesive postgraduate community within History of Art. They recognised, however, that the Subject had made considerable efforts to foster a common sense of identity across both locations and were grateful for this. An example of this was the opportunity to allow all PGT students to meet and present preliminary work on their dissertation at the Subject's annual Postgraduate Symposium. The Review Panel **commends** History of Art on its use of the annual Postgraduate Symposium as a means of fostering common identity and purpose across its PGT community. The Review Panel also **commends** History of Art on the very high levels of satisfaction reported by the PGT students it met with.
- 3.1.14 Several of the PGT students the Review Panel met with reported that they particularly valued the wide range of specialist PGT programmes offered within History of Art and that this allowed them to concentrate specifically on their chosen area of study without having to take courses which they considered to be generic and non subject-specific. However, the Research Methods course was considered by most students to be too generic and could be more meaningful for students with specialist interests. The Review Panel noted from the SER and staff they met with that despite previous attempts to re-model the Research Methods course, it was seen as lacking relevance and was not tailored to students' previous experience. There was also concern that students were unfamiliar with the course ILOs, that there was inconsistency between the aims and delivery of the course and that staff delivering the course did so in different ways and were perceived as having differing levels of commitment to the course. In view of the concerns expressed regarding the Research Methods course, the Review Panel encourages the Subject to consider alternatives to the current delivery of the course, such as dividing the class into three or four groups and allowing students to select their own particular stream within the course. The Review Panel **recommends** that History of Art liaises with the Learning Enhancement and Academic Development Service (LEADS) in a review of the content and delivery of the Research Methods course. This should include an evaluation of other models for similar courses offered in the University, for example in English Literature, and be cognisant of the role of Course Convener (see paragraph 4.4.11).
- 3.1.15 While students who met with the Panel were positive regarding their time at the University, there was some concern that some information made available to international students had presumed familiarity with the UK education system and its practices/terminology. It has also not been clear, prior to arrival, whether work placements were paid and how many courses students could undertake.

3.2 Equality and Diversity

- 3.2.1 The Head of Subject acknowledged that History of Art's physical location on University Gardens presented practical challenges regarding access to the building for students with a mobility impairment. She advised the Panel that, up until now, the Subject had successfully managed to resolve any access difficulties which had arisen, by making suitable alternative arrangements with students on a case by case basis. The Review Panel acknowledged the positive efforts the Subject had made on an ad hoc basis to accommodate the needs of students with access requirements. The Panel also

recognised that, under campus re-development plans, the College of Arts would eventually be co-located in a new building adjacent to the former Western Infirmary site. In the meantime, however, any adjustments that were required to allow students with a mobility impairment access to existing learning spaces would still need to be made. The Review Panel **recommends** that History of Art continues to make reasonable adjustments (in liaison with the School and College of Arts) to ensure that its learning spaces and all learning opportunities, for example, field trips and work placements are accessible to disabled students, in accordance with the University's Equality and Diversity Policy and the Equality Act 2010.

- 3.2.2 The Review Panel noted that, to date, only 64% of History of Art staff had completed Equality and Diversity Training. The Head of Subject advised the Panel that she would continue to encourage staff to comply with the necessary training requirements with a view to achieving 100% completion as soon as possible.
- 3.2.3 The Head of Subject advised the Review Panel that information regarding the Carers' Policy was available to students and that students who had caring responsibilities were given appropriate support around submission deadlines by the Subject. The Panel noted that the Carers' Policy also set out specific responsibilities on certain staff and suggested that this be brought to the attention of relevant staff where appropriate. Further information regarding the Carers' Policy was available from the Equality and Diversity Unit.

3.3 Supporting Students in their Learning

Pastoral Support

- 3.3.1 The Review Panel noted the Subject's strong commitment to pastoral support and the importance it placed on creating a welcoming and inclusive learning environment for all students. Staff members maintained an open-door policy and the students the Panel met with reported positively on the supportive environment provided by all staff members. Induction meetings were provided for Levels 1 and 2 students and for prospective Honours students and a series of welcome events and inductions were in place at Subject and School level for new PGT students and students transferring from Christie's Education.
- 3.3.2 The Review Panel noted that History of Art staff would make students aware of the services provided by Counselling and Psychological Services as appropriate. Depending on the nature of individual cases, staff would encourage students to consult their GP for a referral to the most appropriate service - or in cases of a more routine nature, staff would offer sympathetic and confidential support where they were able to do so.
- 3.3.3 The Head of Subject advised the Panel that the School did not currently operate the Mental Health Peer-Support scheme but was aware that this scheme ran successfully in other Colleges throughout the University and agreed to investigate the possibility of introducing it within the Subject.
- 3.3.4 The Review Panel noted that History of Art used its strong connections with its alumni to help promote events such as career development days. These events included workshop sessions run in conjunction with the Careers Service at which alumni with

established roles gave presentations. These included an auction house valuer, museum curator, and a historic buildings inspector who also discussed career opportunities with students.

Graduate Attributes

- 3.3.5 The Review Panel noted that History of Art placed great emphasis on embedding graduate attributes within the curriculum and the Subject maintained close links with international practitioners in museums and galleries. The Panel considered that Honours and PGT students benefitted greatly from the range of work-based placements on offer within the Subject and the range of professional expertise and professional mentoring available through the guest lecturer programme.
- 3.3.6 Several PGT students the Panel met with reported that interaction with a range of art professionals had helped to develop their confidence in areas such as team-working and presenting to groups. They considered that the enhanced awareness they had gained from this experience would contribute significantly to their future employability. Work placements were available to all students at Honours and PGT level and an established application process was in place for this. The Subject was also considering enhancing the Placement Course documentation by including formal criteria on Moodle. The Review Panel **commends** the Subject on its engagement with the wider community and, in particular, its efforts to bring professional expertise to bear on student learning through work placements, its guest lecturer programme and its partnership working with external art organisations.
- 3.3.7 The Head of Subject advised the Review Panel that the incorporation of graduate attributes such as critical thinking, independent inquiry and communication skills had been key considerations in the re-design of the Levels 1 and 2 curriculum. The Level 1 and 2 students the Panel met with were aware of the importance of graduate attributes within the curriculum but considered that, in general, course ILOs at Levels 1 and 2 were too holistic and did not relate specifically to the subject area. The Honours students the Panel met with, however, considered that ILOs at Honours level were generally satisfactory and students had been given opportunities to reflect on these as part of group-work activities. (See 3.3.9 for recommendation regarding ILOs].

Arts Advising Service

- 3.3.8 The Review Panel noted, that as a Subject Area within the College of Arts, History of Art's undergraduate advising arrangements had changed in 2015. Undergraduate students now had access to the College of Arts Advising Service at 6 University Gardens. PGT students had a dedicated Advisor based in Archaeology. The students the Panel met with expressed overall satisfaction with the quality of advising and supervision they received.

Student Handbooks

- 3.3.9 The Review Panel considered that course information presented in *PGT* student handbooks and on Moodle was consistent and appropriately detailed. However, the Panel noted several inconsistencies and inaccuracies in *undergraduate* handbooks. The undergraduate students the Panel met with reported that several handbooks did not contain ILOs and, where they did, students considered them to be often vague and unclear. Several students advised the Panel that, on occasion, they had received

advice from staff which was not consistent with information contained in student handbooks. These students were concerned that this might potentially put students at a disadvantage, particularly where guidance around issues of assessment criteria and weighting of assessments was concerned. The Head of Subject acknowledged that handbooks did require more regular review and update, but noted that steps had already been taken to review handbooks at Junior Honours level, and the Subject was looking at models of handbooks available at other institutions. The Review Panel **recommends** that History of Art (in liaison with students and the College of Arts) undertake an annual review of all its course handbooks with the aim of:

- Ensuring all information in handbooks, and in particular that relating to ILOs, Programme Specifications and guidance regarding assessment criteria and weighting of units of assessment is clear, up-to-date and consistent with all other sources of information available to students; and
- Ensuring students have a clearer understanding of relevant policies and regulations relating to the University's Code of Assessment. (see also 4.2.5)

3.4 Student Engagement

Staff Student Liaison

- 3.4.1 The Head of Subject advised the Review Panel that staff student liaison and communication took place via a range of channels. Staff Student Liaison Committee (SSLC) meetings with student representatives drawn from each year group, took place once a semester and the Subject gathered student feedback via course evaluations (using Evasys) and the National Student Survey (NSS)/Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES). Subject meetings and Annual Monitoring Reports (AMRs) also reflected on matters highlighted by students and feedback, and where necessary, were communicated to students in person and through e-mail. The Subject also had a policy where students were welcome to approach staff directly, by appointment, within normal, non-teaching hours.
- 3.4.2 The students the Review Panel met with valued the efforts that Subject staff made to address issues raised and to keep them informed regarding student-related matters, for example in relation to the re-modelling of the Levels 1 and 2 curriculum, where they had been kept informed of developments at SSLC meetings. However, these students noted that outcomes were not always communicated to them consistently or promptly. In addition, minutes of SSLC meetings were not published on Moodle or Student Voice.
- 3.4.3 Some of the key staff the Review Panel met with observed that feedback from students, particularly that derived from on-line sources such as surveys was often too specific. Staff took the view that electronic feedback, in particular, was not always a good barometer of student opinion and made it difficult to gauge general perceptions from limited data. The Review Panel recognised that discussion surrounding electronic student feedback alone wasn't particularly valid and that better engagement with all forms of feedback should be encouraged.
- 3.4.4 The Review Panel noted from the SER that History of Art had acknowledged that it could improve further its approach to the process of consultation and liaison with

students. The Review Panel **recommends** that History of Art undertakes a review of student feedback mechanisms within the Subject, to ensure that actions/outcomes arising from student feedback are clearly identified and reported back to students promptly, and also that SSLC minutes are made available to students via Moodle and/or Student Voice.

National Student Survey

3.4.5 The Review Panel noted that in the National Student Survey (NSS), students in their final year were reported under the History JACS Level 3 code. The small number of students involved meant it was not possible to separate the History of Art responses from the larger History cohort. Overall Satisfaction and Ranking scores therefore represented the responses of the whole History group. Although the Overall Satisfaction score at 95% in 2016 was one percent up on the previous year, several low scores, in particular that relating to the clarity of criteria used for marking and the promptness of feedback (59%) were of particular concern. The Review Panel noted that although the SER had acknowledged the need for prompt return of feedback, the NSS results also suggested that the nature and quality of feedback also needed review. (See also 4.2.4) ¹

3.4.6 The Head of Subject advised the Review Panel that in cases where courses were team-taught, there were particular challenges around feedback, especially when large quantities of coursework were being assessed. She noted that NSS results were being considered in detail at School level and had also been the subject of discussion at a recent School away day. The Review Panel welcomed the news that some of these matters, along with a review of the role of Course Convener, were to be addressed through the Subject's newly formed Teaching Forum and also the School Learning and Teaching Committee (see also 4.1.8 to 4.1.9).

4. Enhancement in Learning and Teaching

4.1 Learning and Teaching

Curriculum Design

4.1.1 As noted in 2.4.3, History of Art had undertaken a review of the curriculum in Levels 1 and 2. The revised Level 1 curriculum had been introduced this session (2016-17) with Level 2 implementation to follow in 2017-18. The main rationale behind this was to establish a clear sense of progression from Level 1 to Level 2. Student feedback regarding the new level 1 curriculum had been very positive to date.

4.1.2 The Head of Subject advised the Review Panel that the key change to the Level 1 and 2 curriculum was that courses now reflected a thematic, rather than chronological, approach to the study of History of Art. She noted that the revised curriculum was also aimed at exposing students to new ways of seeing and interpreting art across broad historical fields. The re-modelled curriculum took advantage of new staff expertise

¹ The College of Arts has confirmed in post-report feedback that paragraph 3.4.5 refers to the NSS JACS3 results, in which History of Art is grouped with History, but not to NSS plan-level results, which enable Single Honours History of Art to be considered separately. The College notes that the plan-level results raise significant concerns, especially about feedback and assessment (see section 4.2). These results, and others in the School, are the focus of action by the School Learning and Teaching Committee.

within the Subject and a pedagogical ethos which drew more on applied research skills, research-led teaching and advanced methodological approaches within the discipline. The Review Panel noted that some new Honours courses were under development and encouraged the Subject to have similar regard to progression within Honours as it had shown for progression at pre-Honours level.

- 4.1.3 The Head of Subject advised the Review Panel that curriculum changes at Levels 1 and 2 also provided students with valuable practical skills and knowledge that incorporated many graduate attributes, such as enhanced communication skills and capacity for critical thought. The Subject considered that the opportunities offered to History of Art students through work-placements and engagement with external practitioners helped develop a strong sense of professionalism and responsibility amongst its students (see 3.3.5 to 3.3.6).
- 4.1.4 Several undergraduate students the Review Panel met with reported that there had been isolated concerns expressed by students regarding the learning resources available to support the new Level 1 curriculum. However, overall, the students were extremely positive about the new learning opportunities offered by the new curriculum. Students now in later years of the programme advised the Panel that they had been kept informed through SSLC meetings at the time, when proposed revisions to the Level 1 curriculum were being discussed. Students also considered that their input to this process had been valued by staff.

Study Abroad

- 4.1.5 The students the Review Panel met with reported that they did not feel well informed about study abroad opportunities, other than in a very general sense. They expressed the view that they had received little, if any, information or advice either through History of Art or through the College of Arts regarding study abroad opportunities. Furthermore, most of the students the Panel met with did not know where to access such information.
- 4.1.6 Some of the students advised the Panel that they would have reservations about going abroad for a number of reasons. These included: concerns over financial support; ability to prosper academically in a non-English speaking environment (if competence in a foreign language was essential); the potential lack of subject-specific staff expertise at the overseas institution and concern that an unsuccessful experience abroad might put their progression and/or final classification at risk. The Panel suggested the Subject investigate study abroad opportunities at overseas institutions where English-medium instruction is available, and also consider other formats of international experience that might avoid some of the concerns expressed by students.
- 4.1.7 Some of the staff the Review Panel met with reported that they normally referred enquiries regarding study abroad opportunities to the Year Abroad Unit staff in the College, whom they considered had greater expertise in this area. Some staff advised the Panel that they tried to be flexible regarding curriculum requirements for students hoping to go abroad, but they did not always feel best placed to make a judgment on matters such as curriculum compatibility between the University and an overseas institution. The Review Panel **recommends** that History of Art takes steps to more actively promote study abroad opportunities within the Subject, with a view to meeting the University's strategic objectives.

Innovation

- 4.1.8 The Review Panel explored with staff what areas of the Subject's activity they considered to be innovative. Most of the staff the Panel met with considered that the introduction of a dedicated Teaching Forum was an innovative development. The Teaching Forum provided an arena within which any issues related to Learning and Teaching could be addressed and it would help the Subject to incorporate School, University and external best practice on a range of matters.
- 4.1.9 The Head of Subject advised the Panel that the Teaching Forum would be convened by the Level 1 Convenor and would provide a valuable opportunity to discuss Learning and Teaching matters beyond the normal confines of Subject meetings. Some staff also considered the introduction of a Teaching Forum would help reinforce the status of teaching within the teaching/research mix. The business considered by the Forum would also be informed by matters raised by students at SSLCs. The Forum, which had only met twice so far, did not currently include student representation but this was under consideration. The Review Panel **commends** History of Art's introduction of a Teaching Forum as an excellent example of innovative practice in Learning and Teaching. The Panel encourages History of Art to use the Teaching Forum to further articulate the strategic direction of undergraduate level provision, particularly around the availability of Honours courses. The Panel also noted that the Subject had just one External Examiner at undergraduate level. Given the breadth of History of Art's curriculum, the Panel encourages the Teaching Forum to review this level of provision (see 5.1.3).

Technology Enhanced Learning and Teaching

- 4.1.10 The Review Panel noted from the SER that History of Art used Technology-Enhanced Learning at all levels in line with the College of Arts E-learning Strategy. Moodle was used by staff to communicate with students and to make available resources such as Power Point presentations, course reading materials and lecture notes.

4.2 Assessment and Feedback

- 4.2.1 The Review Panel was satisfied that a range of formative and summative assessment methods were employed across the Subject Area, but noted that greater care should be taken when planning the timing and combination of assessments to ensure suitable student and staff workloads.

4.2.2 Feedback on Assessment

The Review Panel was told that the Subject and School were undertaking an Assessment Blueprinting Exercise, which involved staff mapping their assessment commitments against a timeline and considering each assessment against overall ILOs. Several students the Review Panel met with raised concerns about the quality and timeliness of the feedback on assessments they received. They reported that feedback was often received some time after the benchmark 15 working day period stipulated by the University and sometimes feedback for a later assignment was received before feedback for an earlier one. This meant that students were not always able to draw on feedback from the first assignment to help inform the next one. Several of the students the Panel met with noted that in the event that feedback was

going to be delayed, the normal practice was that staff would contact students by e-mail to confirm when they could expect it, however, on occasion, when there had been delays, e-mail notification had not been sent. Some students reported that, on occasion, they had received notification of their grades for assignments but had not received the piece of work back, or any feedback, until later. Several students also pointed to instances where the actual grade received for a piece of work did not seem consistent with the comments on the quality of the work contained in the feedback sheet and they considered that the assessment terminology used was sometimes unclear. The students understood that the Subject had recently introduced a new policy on feedback, which included the provision of feedback to students on undergraduate exams summarising the performance of all students on the course. Several students noted, that up until now, there had been no feedback for end of year exams and visual tests.

4.2.3 The Head of Subject advised the Review Panel that the matter of feedback on assessments had been highlighted in the recent NSS results across the School of Culture and Creative Arts and the Subject had been working hard to address the issue. At Honours and PGT level, literature reviews, dissertation proposals and some essays were discussed in one-on-one tutorials. She reported that any assessed work could also be discussed in tutorials and with staff within office hours. She noted that a new policy regarding feedback had recently been introduced which attempted to address the concerns raised by students. Also, the Subject set assessment deadlines and weightings which would support students' learning development and not place overly burdensome demands on them.

4.2.4 Several of the staff the Review Panel met with acknowledged that there were 'pinch-points' throughout the session, particularly in exam marking periods when staff were exposed to additional workloads and stresses. The Head of Subject was working with staff to address this issue and acknowledged that it was important to build marking time into staff timetables. She advised the Panel that the introduction of the University Workload Model by the College of Arts in session 2017-18 would help to manage staff workloads and the priorities assigned to activities such as marking.² The Review Panel **recommends** that History of Art, undertake a review of its procedures in relation to feedback on assessment, this review to have particular regard to the following matters:

- the quality, consistency and timeliness of feedback to students;
- the adoption of the University Workload Model to help staff plan workloads ensuring that time for marking is recognised and built into staff timetables at appropriate points;
- the setting of deadlines for student assignments which ensure that, where possible, 'bunching' of assignment deadlines is avoided; and

² The College of Arts has confirmed in post-report feedback that History of Art is already participating during the current session in the College implementation of the University Workload Model and this is focusing on teaching this year. The College advises that the primary tasks in the current session have been to ensure that staff details for all timetabled events are included to enable the checking of figures and a review of the methodology. The intention is to use this data at School and Subject level to inform planning for next session.

- the implementation of a strategy to consolidate the use of Assessment Blueprinting within the Subject – this exercise to be conducted with the support of LEADS.

Engagement with the Code of Assessment

4.2.5 Several of the students that the Review Panel met with noted that they were not fully conversant with aspects of the University's Code of Assessment 22 point scale and the Marking Scheme. They reported that they had, on occasion, received marks, which did not comply with the alpha-numeric banding of the Marking Scheme, and had also received what they considered to be conflicting advice around assessment criteria and the weighting of units of assessment. The Review Panel suggested that the Subject could, instead of using the generic grade descriptors in the Code of Assessment, develop a more subject-specific gloss on these. The Review Panel noted that a previous recommendation (3.3.9) regarding student handbooks had also identified a need to ensure students had a clearer understanding of relevant policies and regulations relating to the University's Code of Assessment.

4.3 Resources for Learning and Teaching

Staff

4.3.1 The Review Panel met with several early career staff on the Early Career Development Programme (ECDP) who reported that the qualification they were taking, for example, PgCAP, was not accounted for and time-protected in terms of their workload. Several early career staff also advised the Panel that their contracts of employment contained no reference to protected time. Consequently, these staff had to sometimes make informal arrangements with colleagues to ensure they had time set aside in their timetable for ECDP commitments. The Review Panel **recommends** that History of Art fully implements the University Workload Model and reviews timetabling arrangements for early career staff, such that adequate protected time is made available to them to undertake commitments related to ECDP and PgCAP.³

Learning and Teaching Space

4.3.2 The Review Panel noted that most learning and teaching within the Subject took place in 8 University Gardens and CTCTAH. The Review Panel noted that History of Art also had its own Resource Centre at 7 University Gardens at which all students were encouraged to enrol. The Centre houses over 4,500 subject-specific books and subscribes to several periodicals. The Centre serves undergraduate needs, principally at Levels 1 and 2 but also has a separate room which is exclusively for postgraduate use. The Review Panel noted that the Resource Centre was open only three days a week to coincide with the Manager's availability. The Review Panel invited the Subject to consider ways by which it might extend the Centre's opening hours, without incurring any additional costs, such as arranging a pool of students to support it on a rotational basis.

4.3.3 The Review Panel noted that the expansion of the Level 1 intake several years ago had prompted History of Art to change its venue for the Level 1 class from the

³ See footnote 2

Hunterian Art Gallery (capacity c. 135) to the Graham Kerr Lecture Theatre (capacity c.200) in Zoology and other venues. In general, staff and students the Review Panel met with were content with the learning and teaching resources available to them. Several students the Panel met, however, pointed out that a continuing source of frustration for them was the misplacement of books within the University Library. Staff and students the Review Panel met with noted that the visual nature of subject materials meant that accommodation usually had to have 'black-out' facilities and adequate audio-visual equipment and, in general, these facilities were in place and adequate for the Subject's needs.

4.3.4 The Head of Subject advised the Review Panel that the Hunterian Museum and Art Gallery and the re-developed Kelvin Hall offered many opportunities for partnership working involving History of Art. The Hunterian Collections Study Centre within the Kelvin Hall was a purpose-built facility and offered, amongst other things, a state-of-the-art central collections depot, object study rooms and conservation and digitisation studios. History of Art used the accommodation and facilities within the Kelvin Hall for teaching purposes and also for delivering student-led projects such as that undertaken by students on the MLitt Curatorial Practice (Contemporary Art) programme run jointly with the Glasgow School of Art. The Head of Subject also advised the Panel that several strategic staffing appointments involving History of Art staff had been made within the Hunterian Art Gallery. These appointments would further strengthen collaborative opportunities between the Subject and the Hunterian.

4.4 Engaging and Supporting Staff

4.4.1 The Review Panel noted the reference within the SER which confirmed that History of Art was currently developing a strategy for improving staff engagement and support. This exercise drew on the principles set out in the School Strategic Plan, which highlighted the importance of 'encouraging staff engagement and empowerment'. The Head of Subject was taking part in the Emerging Leaders' Programme which included training in leadership practice and how best to support cultural change and reform in the Subject area. The Head of Subject noted that the need for such change was a standing item on Subject Meeting agendas. The Subject's overarching aim was to engage with meaningful change, which both respected and promoted shared aspirations and values within the Subject. The Head of Subject advised the Panel that a key element of cultural change should be the recognition that staff and student satisfaction levels were intertwined. She therefore considered that a collegiate and mutually supportive approach between staff and students was essential to achieve successful cultural change within the Subject. She also advised the Panel that academic staff taught at all levels of the curriculum and this was considered to be an important factor in supporting pedagogical cohesion and professional staff development.

4.4.2 Several staff the Review Panel met with considered that recent/forthcoming initiatives such as the roll-out of the Workload Model across the College of Arts, the Work-Life Balance group within the School, and the Teaching Forum at Subject Level, would provide valuable opportunities for staff to engage with a range of issues. The Head of Subject advised the Panel that work/life balance was an important consideration for staff at a time when additional matters such as REF, Performance and Development

Review and promotion criteria contributed to levels of staff stress. The Review Panel noted that it had already recommended that History of Art adopt the University Workload Model (see 4.2.4 and 4.3.1) as a means of improving workload planning.⁴

4.4.3 The Review Panel praised the excellent level of staff engagement across the Subject's portfolio of activity and their continuing support for the recently appointed Head of Subject. The Panel recognised that the Subject had undergone a period of substantial change in recent years which had included a considerable increase in student numbers and an expansion of provision at PGT level.

Early Career Staff

4.4.4 The early career staff the Review Panel met with were participants in the Early Career Development Programme and, as part of this, undertook the PgCAP qualification supported by LEADS. They reported that they felt well integrated within the Subject community.

4.4.5 The Review Panel noted from the SER that new staff received mentoring, however, the early career staff the Panel met with reported that they would welcome more systematic mentoring and, in particular, more opportunities to observe teaching, over and above that which they experienced through the ECDP. They also reported that internal Subject communication with early career staff on certain matters (such as research-related events) was on occasion inconsistent. The staff advised the Panel that they would welcome the introduction of a staff-room and/or a notice-board within the building which could help facilitate internal communication. Some of the early career staff the Panel met with also acted as Course Convenors. They reported that they would value more support and direction from the Subject in terms of the responsibilities attached to this role. (See 4.4.11)

Graduate Teaching Assistants

4.4.6 The Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) the Panel met with reported that they taught on Level 1 and this took the form of a 9-session seminar sequence. These seminars shadowed lectures and provided students with an opportunity to follow-up on academic and study-support matters.

4.4.7 Several of the GTAs reported that they would benefit from more advance notice of material/images to be covered in lectures so they could more effectively plan the content of their seminars. The GTAs advised the Panel that they were issued with a bibliography at the start of the course but were not guided by the Course Convenor on which individual texts might be most suitable in support of individual lectures. As a consequence, the texts and material covered in seminars by different GTAs could vary. The GTAs also noted that they were responsible for assessing a section of the Visual Test but had received mixed advice about how the Marking Scheme should be applied.

4.4.8 The GTAs the Panel met with confirmed that they received formal briefing and debriefing meetings at the start and end of each semester and could seek informal advice from relevant staff in between times. They had also received some initial

⁴ See footnote 2

training from LEADS but thought they would benefit from additional subject-specific training, teaching observation and organised feedback from staff/students.

- 4.4.9 The GTAs the Panel met with advised that they were paid for one hour's preparation time for seminars. They considered that this did not adequately reflect the amount of preparation time actually involved. They also confirmed that the budget they had access to for photo-copying/printing was not adequate.
- 4.4.10 The GTAs the Panel met with considered that there was a lack of clarity around their exact role and responsibilities. They reported that they were frequently the first point of contact for students with academic and/or pastoral concerns and welcomed more guidance on the extent of their responsibilities in such matters.
- 4.4.11 The Review Panel noted that Course Conveners had a key role in providing direction to GTAs, and also more broadly, in supporting the management of courses and course teaching staff within the Subject (see also 3.1.14). The Review Panel **recommends** that History of Art:

- clarifies, and gives greater recognition to, the role of Course Convener such that GTAs are provided with more structured and systematic support; and
- more clearly defines the Course Convener's role in supporting the management of courses and course teaching staff within the Subject.

The Panel noted that increased recognition of the role of Course Convener might also benefit staff wishing to participate in the University's Recognising Excellence in Teaching (RET) framework.

The Review Panel also **recommends** that History of Art reviews the following:

- the role and responsibilities of GTAs, such that these are more clearly defined, particularly with regard to the content and delivery of seminars for which GTAs are responsible; and also the extent to which GTAs may engage with students on pastoral matters; and
- the existing level of provision for GTAs in the following areas with a view to this being increased; subject-specific training; guidance on the University Code of Assessment and Marking Scheme; opportunities for staff/student feedback; recognition/payment for seminar preparation time; peer observation and office space.

The Review Panel **commends** the reflective and knowledgeable approach to student support taken by History of Art's GTAs.

Administrative Support

- 4.4.12 The Review Panel noted from the SER that a move to re-locate and centralise all School administration at a new site in Gilmorehill was underway. This would mean that, for the first time, there would be no administrative support for students or staff in History of Art's main building (8 University Gardens). Several key staff the Panel met with expressed concern that the decision to re-locate and centralise all School administrative staff at the new site would have a detrimental effect on student satisfaction levels. They considered that this would negatively affect the nature of interactions between students and teaching staff at the University Gardens site and the

level of information and advice provided to students. The Review Panel invited the Subject to provide it with a report on the progress of this move in a year's time, ie end of May 2018.

5. Academic Standards

- 5.1.1 The Review Panel noted from the discussions it had undertaken with staff and students during the day and its consideration of the SER and related documents that History of Art had a range of effective policies and procedures in place to support continued quality assurance and enhancement.
- 5.1.2 The Review Panel concludes that the arrangements which History of Art has in place for the setting, maintaining and reviewing of academic standards are satisfactory.
- 5.1.3 The Review Panel notes that History of Art has just one External Examiner at undergraduate level. Given the breadth of its curriculum, the Panel encourages the Subject to review this level of provision.

Currency and Validity of Programmes

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

6. Collaborative Provision

- 6.1.1 History of Art is currently 'teaching-out' a collaboration with Christie's Education (see paragraph 3.1.4 for details) and has no plans to develop other partnerships in the near future.

7. Conclusion

The Review Panel concluded that History of Art demonstrates a clear commitment to excellence in learning and teaching. Despite significant challenges relating to increased student numbers and staffing changes, the Subject has continued to place the quality of the student experience at the heart of its concern. It has embraced the challenges of re-modelling its Level 1 and 2 curriculum, continues to enhance its PGT provision, many aspects of which are unique within Europe, and places great value on research-led teaching. Against this background, History of Art has sought to engage with new pedagogical strategies and innovative practices which continue to set the Subject apart from other Scottish Art History departments. The Review Panel was particularly impressed by the quality and dedication of staff and their commitment to providing a highly enriching learning experience for students. The Review Panel makes a small number of recommendations where it sees opportunities for the Subject to further enhance its provision, but these are made against the Panel's overall view that History of Art continues to be a highly successful academic unit.

7.1 Commendations, Key Strengths and Good Practice

The Review Panel commends History of Art on the following, which are listed **in order of appearance** in this report:

Commendation 1

The Panel **commends** History of Art for its comprehensive Self-Evaluation Report (SER) and its strong engagement with the PSR process. There was clear evidence that staff and students were highly committed to the Subject's next phase of development under the new Head of Subject. [paragraph 2.4.5];

Commendation 2

The Review Panel **commends** History of Art on the delivery and content of the Methodology of Art Junior Honours core course, which was highly praised by the students the Panel met with. [paragraph 3.1.8];

Commendation 3

The Review Panel **commends** History of Art on its use of the annual Postgraduate Symposium as a means of fostering common identity and purpose across its PGT community. [paragraph 3.1.13];

Commendation 4

The Review Panel **commends** History of Art on the very high levels of satisfaction reported by the PGT students it met with. [paragraph 3.1.13];

Commendation 5

The Review Panel **commends** the Subject on its engagement with the wider community and, in particular, its efforts to bring professional expertise to bear on student learning through work placements, its guest lecturer programme and its partnership working with external art organisations. [paragraph 3.3.6];

Commendation 6

The Review Panel **commends** History of Art's introduction of a Teaching Forum as an excellent example of innovative practice in Learning and Teaching. [paragraph 4.1.9];

Commendation 7

The Review Panel **commends** the reflective and knowledgeable approach to student support taken by History of Art's GTAs. [paragraph 4.4.11];

The Review Panel identified the following key strengths and areas of good practice. These are listed **in order of appearance** in this report:

Good Practice 1

The emphasis on the value of generic and transferable skills across its curriculum. [paragraph 2.4.3]

Good Practice 2

The range of professional expertise provided by staff. [paragraph 3.1.2]

Good Practice 3

The opportunities provided by the Centre for Textile Conservation and Technical Art History (CTCTAH). [paragraph 3.1.3]

Good Practice 4

The introduction of guidelines regarding the supervision and review of drafts of dissertations. [paragraph 3.1.9]

Good Practice 5

The emphasis placed by the Subject on research-led teaching. [paragraph 3.1.12]

Good Practice 6

The clear sense of progression which existed between the Level 1 and 2 curriculum. [paragraph 4.1.1]

7.2 Areas for enhancement

The Review Panel highlighted the following areas as opportunities for further work. These and the recommendations that follow are intended to support History of Art in its reflection and to enhance provision in relation to teaching, learning and assessment:

- The use of Subject Benchmarking Statements;
- Further clarification around specific staff responsibilities associated with the Carers' Policy;
- Consideration regarding the introduction of the Mental Health Peer-Support Scheme;
- Review of issues surrounding Honours progression in a manner similar to that undertaken at pre-Honours level;
- Review of the terminology used in student materials for international students to ensure language is clear and unambiguous;
- Review the appropriateness of having only one External Examiner at undergraduate level;
- Investigate the possibility of the History of Art's Resource Centre's opening hours being extended through the use of student support;
- Investigate study abroad opportunities at overseas institutions where English-medium instruction is available.⁵ Also, consider other formats of international experience that might avoid some of the concerns expressed by students regarding studying abroad;

⁵ History of Art has confirmed in post-report feedback that it undertook a review of study abroad opportunities 1-2 years ago and found that there was no Honours-level provision of a suitably equivalent level and breadth in any University in a non-English-speaking country.

- Investigate the possibility of the Subject putting its own subject-specific gloss on generic grade descriptors.

7.3 Recommendations

Specific recommendations addressing the areas for work are listed below.

The recommendations have been cross-referenced to the paragraphs in the text of the report to which they refer and are **ranked in order of priority**.

Feedback on Assessment

Recommendation 1

The Review Panel **recommends** that History of Art, undertake a review of its procedures in relation to feedback on assessment, this review to have particular regard to the following matters:

- the quality, consistency and timeliness of feedback to students;
- the adoption of the University Workload Model to help staff plan workloads ensuring that time for marking is recognised and built into staff timetables at appropriate points;
- the setting of deadlines for student assignments which ensure that, where possible, ‘bunching’ of assignment deadlines is avoided; and
- the implementation of a strategy to consolidate the use of Assessment Blueprinting within the Subject – this exercise to be conducted with the support of LEADS. [paragraph 4.2.4]

For the attention of: The Head of Subject

For information: Senior Academic and Digital Development Adviser, Learning Enhancement and Academic Development Service

Staff Student Liaison

Recommendation 2

The Review Panel **recommends** that History of Art undertakes a review of student feedback mechanisms within the Subject, to ensure that actions/outcomes arising from student feedback are clearly identified and reported back to students promptly, and also that SSLC minutes are made available to students via Moodle and/or Student Voice. [paragraph 3.4.4]

For the attention of: The Head of Subject

Staff

Recommendation 3

The Review Panel **recommends** that History of Art fully implements the University Workload Model and reviews timetabling arrangements for early career staff, such that

adequate protected time is made available to them to undertake commitments related to ECDP and PgCAP. [paragraph 4.3.1]

**For the attention of: The Head of Subject
The Head of the School of Culture and Creative Arts**

Role of Course Convener

Recommendation 4

The Review Panel **recommends** that History of Art:

- clarifies, and gives greater recognition to, the role of Course Convener such that GTAs are provided with more structured and systematic support; and
- more clearly defines the Course Convener's role in supporting the management of courses and course teaching staff within the Subject.

The Panel noted that increased recognition of the role of Course Convener might also benefit staff wishing to participate in the University's Recognising Excellence in Teaching (RET) framework. [paragraph 4.4.11]

For the attention of: The Head of Subject

Graduate Teaching Assistants

Recommendation 5

The Review Panel **recommends** that History of Art reviews the following:

- the role and responsibilities of GTAs, such that these are more clearly defined, particularly with regard to the content and delivery of seminars for which GTAs are responsible; and also the extent to which GTAs may engage with students on pastoral matters;
- The existing level of provision for GTAs in the following areas with a view to this being increased; subject-specific training; guidance on the University Code of Assessment and Marking Scheme; opportunities for staff/student feedback; recognition/payment for seminar preparation time; peer observation and office space. [paragraph 4.4.11]

For the attention of: The Head of Subject

Student Handbooks

Recommendation 6

The Review Panel **recommends** that History of Art (in liaison with students and the College of Arts) undertake an annual review of all its course handbooks with the aim of:

- Ensuring all information in handbooks, and in particular that relating to ILOs, Programme Specifications and guidance regarding assessment criteria and weighting of units of assessment is clear, up-to-date and consistent with all other sources of information available to students; and
- Ensuring students have a clearer understanding of relevant policies and regulations relating to the University's Code of Assessment. [paragraph 3.3.9]

**For the attention of: The Head of Subject
The College of Arts Quality Officer**

For information: The Head of the College of Arts

Postgraduate Taught Provision

Recommendation 7

The Review Panel **recommends** that History of Art develop a strategic approach with regard to its PGT portfolio. In doing this, History of Art should reflect on the overall vision for the Subject, the distinctive nature of its existing provision and emerging opportunities such as those linked to the Kelvin Hall and Hunterian Museum developments. [paragraph 3.1.11]

For the attention of: The Head of Subject

Recommendation 8

The Review Panel **recommends** that History of Art liaises with the Learning Enhancement and Academic Development Service (LEADS) in a review of the content and delivery of the Research Methods course. This should include an evaluation of other models for similar courses offered in the University, for example in English Literature, and be cognisant of the role of Course Convener (see paragraph 4.4.11). [paragraph 3.1.14]

For the attention of: The Head of Subject

For information: Senior Academic and Digital Development Adviser, Learning Enhancement and Academic Development Service

Equality and Diversity

Recommendation 9

The Review Panel **recommends** that History of Art continues to make reasonable adjustments (in liaison with the School and College of Arts) to ensure that its learning spaces and all learning opportunities, for example, field trips and work placements are accessible to disabled students, in accordance with the University's Equality and Diversity Policy and the Equality Act 2010. [paragraph 3.2.1]

For the attention of: The Head of Subject

Study Abroad

Recommendation 10

The Review Panel **recommends** that History of Art takes steps to more actively promote study abroad opportunities within the Subject, with a view to meeting the University's strategic objectives. [paragraph 4.1.7]

For the attention of: The Head of Subject

For note:

The Review Panel invites the Subject to provide a report on progress regarding the relocation and centralisation of the School administration at a new site in Gilmorehill, by the end of May 2018. [paragraph 4.4.12]

For the attention of: The Head of Subject