

## UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

**Academic Standards Committee – Thursday 23 April 2009**

### **Departmental Programmes of Teaching, Learning and Assessment: Report of the Review of Archaeology held on 30 January 2009**

**Mrs Marjory Wright, Clerk to the Review Panel**

#### **Review Panel:**

Professor Graham Caie	Clerk of Senate and Vice Principal (Convener)
Professor Ian Ralston	University of Edinburgh (External Subject Specialist)
Ms Jessica Harwood	Students' Representative Council
Professor Thomas Clancy	Department of Celtic (Cognate Member)
Professor Muffy Calder	Senate Assessor on Court
Dr Jane Mackenzie	Learning and Teaching Centre
Mrs Marjory Wright	Senate Office (Clerk)

## **1. Introduction**

### *1.1 Background Information*

- 1.1.1 The Department of Archaeology is based in the Faculty of Arts but also has a presence in the Faculty of Physical Sciences.
- 1.1.2 The Department is located in the Gregory Building. Physical resources include two teaching rooms, one of which is shared with the Department of Geographical and Earth Sciences, one large teaching laboratory with four specialised rooms and a smaller 'dirty' laboratory, and an Information Technology (IT) suite provided and managed by the Arts Faculty IT Support and containing 14 personal computers with digitising tablets and specialist software. The Department also has off-site facilities at Garscube.
- 1.1.3 The previous internal review of the Department's programmes of teaching, learning and assessment took place in May 2003. The Department's Self Evaluation Report (SER) reflected on progress made in the intervening time.
- 1.1.4 The SER had been prepared by the Head of Department and a senior colleague. The preparation process had included consultations with a named contact in the Learning and Teaching Centre and with Departmental Staff, Undergraduate Student Representatives, Taught Postgraduates and Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs). This inclusive approach had resulted in an exemplary document which demonstrated an

honest and reflective approach to review. The Review Panel **commends** the Department on this achievement.

1.1.5 The Review Panel met with the Dean of the Faculty of Arts, the Head of Department, 7 key staff members, 2 Probationary Staff members, 5 GTAs, 15 undergraduate students from Level 1, Level 2 and Honours courses, including an exchange student, and one taught postgraduate student.

1.1.6 The Department currently has a total of 18.96 FTE staff members, 12.15 of whom are academic staff. The academic staff complement comprises 4 Professors, 6 Senior Lecturers and 3 Lecturers. The Panel was disappointed to note that the Chair of Archaeology had been vacant since 2006 (see also **Conclusions**).

1.1.7 The Department has an 'in-house' contract research unit, Glasgow University Archaeological Research Division (GUARD) which employs around 28 archaeologists. The Department also hosts three research centres, the Centre of Battlefield Archaeology (operating out of GUARD), the Leslie and Elizabeth Alcock Centre for Historical Archaeology and the Centre for Aerial Archaeology.

1.1.8 Student numbers for Session 2008-09 are as follows:

<b>Students</b>	<b>Headcount</b>
Level 1	286
Level 2	140
Level 3	4
Honours	225
Undergraduate Total	655
Postgraduate Taught	38
Postgraduate Research*	30

\*(for information only - research is not covered by the Review)

1.1.9 The Review Panel considered the following range of provision offered by the Department. A full list with notes is attached as Appendix 1.

- MA Single Honours in Archaeology
- BSc Single Honours in Archaeology
- BSc Designated Degree in Archaeological Studies
- Level 3 options contributing to MA Designated Degrees in Ancient Studies, European Civilisation, Historical Studies and Scottish Studies
- MLitt/PGDip in Aerial Photography and Geophysical Survey in Archaeology
- MLitt/PGDip in Archaeological Studies
- MLitt/PGDip in Battlefield and Conflict Archaeology
- MLitt/PGDip in Historical Archaeology
- MLitt/PGDip in Material Culture and Artefact Studies
- MLitt/PGDip in Medieval Archaeology

- MLitt/PGDip in Mediterranean Archaeology
- MLitt/PGDip in Professional Archaeology

The Department contributes to the following *joint* degree programmes offered with other departments or other institutions

- MA Joint Honours in Archaeology and another subject
- MA in Social Sciences Joint Honours in Archaeology and another subject
- BSc Joint Honours in Archaeology and another subject (ie Geography or Earth Sciences)

The Department also contributes to the following degree programmes offered by other departments:

- MLitt/PGDip in Classical Archaeology and Ancient History (Lead Department: Classics)
- M.Litt/PGDip in Medieval Scottish Studies (Lead Departments: Scottish History/Celtic)
- MLitt/PGDip in Celtic Studies (Lead Department: Celtic)
- Medieval and Renaissance Studies (Lead Department: Glasgow Centre for Medieval and Renaissance Studies)

A range of the Department's MLitt courses are also available to programmes across the Faculty of Arts.

## **2. Overall aims of the Department's provision and how it supports the University Strategic Plan**

- 2.1 The SER set out the overall aims of the Department's provision. The Review Panel was satisfied that these aims supported the University Strategic Plan, in particular the aim 'to be renowned internationally for enquiry-led learning in a knowledge culture that is shaped by the richness and diversity of our research environment and to be recognised as a leading postgraduate university, renowned for the quality and breadth of our provision'.

## **3. An Evaluation of the Student Learning Experience**

### **3.1 Aims**

- 3.1.1 As stated in the SER, the aims of the Department's undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes are clearly laid out in programme specifications. The aims of all programmes take account of relevant benchmarks and other external reference points and also take cognisance of the discipline and its development in recent years and the professional expertise of the Department's staff as practitioners and researchers in the field.

### 3.2 *Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs)*

3.2.1 As stated in the SER, the ILOs for all programmes and courses are outlined in the respective programme specifications, in Student Handbooks and detailed postgraduate programme handouts, and also made available on the departmental website.

3.2.2 The Review Panel found the quality of ILOs to be variable. Whilst many articulated clearly what students were expected to be able to do by the end of the course, others were less explicit. The Panel explored this with staff and suggests that the Department might find it helpful to review the explicitness of skills-based ILOs in consultation with colleagues in the Learning and Teaching Centre.

### 3.3 *Assessment, Feedback and Achievement*

#### Code of Assessment

3.3.1 The Review Panel had noted from the SER that the Department had welcomed the changes introduced with the Code of Assessment, but that it had not found the five-way division of A-grades helpful. Staff explained that they had been sceptical about their ability to distinguish between these different descriptors and had therefore modified practice locally, utilising the A1, A3 and A5 grades for marked work, with the A4 and A2 grades only arising where calculated marks were employed. The SER acknowledged that the Department had been asked to justify this approach to the Clerk of Senate in the previous academic session and that it had been accepted at that time. The Panel explored the matter with the Head of Department and academic staff, highlighting its concerns that deviation from the prescribed operation of the Code of Assessment could potentially cause confusion for students, who will be aware from the document *Understanding our Marking System – Guide for Students* that the Code of Assessment 'is used across the University so that the same rules apply for all students doing taught courses in all faculties at all levels'. Students will have expectations of, and the right to, an equality of experience in this respect. The Head of Department assured the Panel that he doubted whether any student would be disadvantaged by the Department's current practice but appreciated the Panel's concerns about equality issues. The Panel **recommends** that the Department utilises the entire range of bands prescribed in the Code of Assessment with a view to upholding the University's aim of promoting institution-wide equality in the student experience of assessment.

3.3.2 The Review Panel learned from staff that the Moodle assessment function was not fully aligned with the Code of Assessment and that only numerical marks could be given. The Panel **recommends** that the capabilities of the Moodle assessment function be investigated with a view to ascertaining whether it might be modified to allow the Code of Assessment grade descriptors to be applied in marking.

#### Assessment procedures

3.3.3 The Review Panel noted that External Examiners had highlighted the overall range and variety of assessments as one of the strengths of the Department's provision and learned from the SER that the Department employs a broad range of assessment methods, including essays, short seminar papers, oral presentations, practicals, projects, worksheets,

practical portfolios, reflective journals and notebooks, dissertations and research reports, and examinations.

- 3.3.4. Following suggestions from External Examiners, the Department had been looking at further developments to enhance the portfolio in order to reflect students' practical work.
- 3.3.5 The Review Panel had noted that there was interesting course work, such as presentations, which was formatively assessed but did not contribute to the final assessment of courses. In their discussions with the Panel, undergraduate students had said that student engagement in presentations was variable and suggested that students' approach to preparation and engagement with presentations, including time management, might be improved if the process was linked to formal assessment. The Panel appreciated that the need to demonstrate to External Examiners transparency in relation to assessment procedures and the rationale for awarding grades would limit how this might be approached, but suggests that there could be benefit in exploring possibilities for including such activity in the portfolio of assessed work with a view to enhancing graduate attributes through the development of robust transferable skills.
- 3.3.6 Most undergraduate courses were assessed by 50% coursework and 50% examination. The SER acknowledged that the Department had a higher percentage of coursework than was the norm across the Faculty but that staff considered this to be a better reflection of the subject. Postgraduate taught courses were assessed by 100% coursework. The Review Panel had some concerns about the associated workload for staff (see also Paragraph 3.8.4).
- 3.3.7 The Department aims to provide feedback on assessed work within the two weeks specified in course Handbooks and had been surprised to note that the 2008 National Student Survey (NSS) results had shown a level of dissatisfaction with the promptness of feedback on assessment. Students had not hitherto drawn this concern to the attention of the Department but the Department's exploration of the NSS outcomes with current Student Representatives had confirmed that there was variation in practice, which the Head of Department was currently investigating with a view to ensuring that the stated policy was followed. The Review Panel explored with undergraduate students whether there was a reason for not making their concerns known to staff and learned that they were reluctant to risk damaging the excellent relationship that they had with staff (see also Paragraphs 5.1 – 5.7).
- 3.3.8 Postgraduate taught course assessments were double-marked internally but there was no mechanism in place to ensure that an agreed grade was reached before the work was returned to students. The Review Panel learned from the SER and from discussions with a postgraduate taught student that students had raised concerns about having assessed work returned to them when it had only been marked by the first marker, with the second marker's grade and comments being proffered some time later. This practice had, on occasion, led to students receiving conflicting feedback and substantially different grades from the two markers. The student advised the Panel that this could be resolved in discussion with staff but that it was difficult for students to know how to improve if they received conflicting feedback. The Panel explored this issue with staff and learned that this had arisen as a result of contract staff not always

being able to meet the deadlines for the return of work and work being returned by the first marker to avoid delaying the provision of feedback to students. Staff confirmed that the grades awarded were provisional and subject to ratification by the Board of Examiners. The Panel **recommends** that the internal examiners reach an agreement on provisional grades and feedback before returning assessments to students even if the hand back date is slightly delayed to achieve this.

#### Plagiarism

3.3.9 The Review Panel learned from students that the guidance provided in course Handbooks on how to avoid plagiarism was excellent and that examples were also provided. Level 1 students had found this information very useful and said that referencing was also well explained and that they found their tutors very helpful in this respect. Honours students said that they found the refresher course on referencing at the start of their Junior Honours year very helpful.

#### Student achievement

3.3.10 The Review Panel found the number of A grades and First Class Honours awards to be consistent with the norm for the Faculty of Arts.

3.3.11 The SER had observed that it was noticeable that students often perform strongly on coursework, but fall away at the examination, whilst the reverse is rarely the case. The Review Panel suggests that underperformance in examinations may be exacerbated by the relatively light reliance on examinations in the curriculum.

3.3.12 The Department was proud of its students' achievements and the Review Panel learned that one of the Department's 2007-08 graduates had won the Royal Archaeological Institute prize for the best dissertation in the last academic year.

### 3.4 *Curriculum Design, Development and Content*

#### Undergraduate

3.4.1 The Department offers both MA and BSc courses in Archaeology with strong emphasis on the practical aspects of the discipline through fieldwork which might take place in the field, in museums or through working with archives.

3.4.2 The curriculum is also designed to assist students with the development of both subject specific and more generic transferable skills.

3.4.3 Since Archaeology is seldom studied at school, first year students tend to have little or no background knowledge. The SER described the Department's approach to the design and delivery of its courses and emphasised that its courses were related to staff personal research interests, ensuring a clear linkage between research and teaching.

3.4.4 Single Honours students are required to undertake 11 weeks of fieldwork with Joint Honours students undertaking 7 weeks. 50% of this must be undertaken in the field. Students learn and practise excavation and its associated recording methods and are given experience in a range of survey methods. The SER explained how this work fed into the practical components of the Junior Honours portfolio and that students were expected to keep a detailed personal reflective diary of their experiences which formed the basis of their fieldwork report. Three weeks of the

required practical experience for students is undertaken at the Department's Field School between Year 2 and Junior Honours and the remainder is undertaken in the field, in museums or with archived sources in accordance with the student's interests.

- 3.4.5 Students were unstinting in their praise of the Field School and told the Review Panel of the wide ranging experience that they gained from participating in it and of the excellent opportunities that it provided for discussions with staff and with their peers (see also Paragraph 3.7.3).
- 3.4.6 The Review Panel had a perception that Field Schools were labour intensive for staff but was reassured to learn that the Field School was embedded in a Departmental research project and therefore closely linked to staff's research interests. Staff explained that they perceived their participation in the Field School as contributing to their research but said that it also offered students the ideal environment in which to learn key field skills and to receive essential training in health and safety issues.
- 3.4.7 The Department holds an annual Teaching Review meeting at the end of June which discusses points raised by External Examiners as well as more general provision and feedback, and informs curriculum review.
- 3.4.8 The Review Panel learned from the SER that the number of Level 2 courses had been reduced in 2004-05 allowing an increase in both the practical component and the theoretical component. This had now bedded in and the Department had noted a marked improvement in Junior Honours student confidence and performance in terms of taught courses and practical fieldwork.
- 3.4.9 The Review Panel noted that the Department was currently reviewing its Level 1 provision with a view to reducing the number of options offered from three to two. The original reason for offering three options had been to give more choice to students but the Department hoped that reducing the number of options to two would make the course more attractive and exciting and that it would also improve retention. The revised courses would focus on Archaeology in Scotland and Archaeology in Contemporary Society with the key information that students needed to know insinuated into these courses by means of case studies to explain methodologies.
- 3.4.10 The Department anticipated that the revision of the Level 1 curriculum would address issues, such as the repetition of material and unchallenging worksheets, which Level 1 students had raised with the Review Panel. The Panel was satisfied that student concerns were being addressed.
- 3.4.11 The Level 1 curriculum review was staff-driven but also involved the Department's GTAs who had been provided with an outline of the proposed courses and ILOs to comment on. The GTAs who met with the Review Panel were enthusiastic about their involvement and said that they had attended two meetings to discuss the Level 1 curriculum and that a third meeting was planned to lay down the basis for tutorials. They said that they planned to hold their own unofficial pre-meeting prior to the formal meeting. The Panel **commends** the Department for involving its GTAs in the Level 1 curriculum review.
- 3.4.12 The Review Panel explored whether student feedback had informed the review of Level 1 provision. Staff explained that students did not tend to

identify with the Department until the end of Level 2 and that very little feedback was currently received from Level 1 students. The rationale for the review had been e-mailed to all Level 1 students and they would become involved in the consultation process when a plan was available to put to Staff-Student Liaison Committees (SSLCs). The need for more formal student feedback processes is discussed in Paragraphs 5.1 – 5.7.

3.4.13 The Review Panel learned from the SER that the Department had started to implement formal Personal Development Planning (PDP) procedures in the last two years. There was a strong reflective emphasis to the Junior Honours practical work portfolio and PDP had been an important component of the MLitt degrees in Professional Archaeology and Material Culture and Artefact Studies since 2007, with other MLitt students also being encouraged to participate. The Panel also learned from the SER that, as an experiment this year, a Level 2 class was being encouraged to use PDP for reflection on learning and revision techniques. Exploration of PDP indicated that it was used only sporadically elsewhere in the curriculum and the Panel encourages the Department to continue to explore innovative ways of introducing PDP into the curriculum.

3.4.14 The SER had identified that the programme of Honours optional courses was due for review to ensure that provision remains appropriate and suitably balanced in the light of recent appointments and the changing preferences of staff linked to research developments, and to take account of the significant increase in the teaching loads of staff involved in the delivery of the new postgraduate taught programmes.

#### Postgraduate Taught

3.4.15 The Department offers a broad portfolio of postgraduate taught provision which comprises 8 programmes.

3.4.16 Since student numbers on each programme were generally small and viability questionable in some cases, the Review Panel explored with the Dean, the Head of Department and staff whether there was potential for the joint delivery of some of the MLitt and Honours teaching with the learning outcomes and assessment appropriately tailored to the different levels of study, both to enhance the student experience and to ease the staff workload. However, it was understood by both the Dean and the Head of Department that the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) discouraged such practice. The Panel was aware of such practice occurring elsewhere and suggests that the Faculty's understanding of the QAA position would merit further investigation.

### 3.5 *Student Recruitment*

#### Recruitment strategy

3.5.1 The Review Panel explored the Department's recruitment strategy with the Head of Department and with staff and learned that the Department had no tradition of working with the Recruitment and Participation Service (RAPS) although it had been working with the International and Postgraduate Service (IPS) to increase its international profile and to aid international recruitment. Despite the fact that Archaeology is rarely offered as a school subject, the Panel **recommends** that the Department engages with RAPS since it is of the view that the Service could provide assistance with recruitment by ensuring that the potential for studying



Archaeology at the University of Glasgow as part of both an MA and BSc degree is drawn to the attention of schools.

- 3.5.2 The Review Panel learned from the SER that the 2009 prospectus for the Faculties of Science degree programmes had not made reference to Archaeology and also learned from staff that there was a perception that Advisers of Studies were not particularly promoting Archaeology to their advisees. It was believed that the latter omission could, in part, result from confusion regarding the progression opportunities available from the three Level 1 courses currently being offered. The Review Panel believes that the planned changes to the Level 1 Archaeology curriculum provide an excellent opportunity to draw these courses to the attention of Advisers of Studies in the Faculties of Arts and Science and suggests that the Department might consider hosting an information and social event for Advisers of Studies to introduce them to the curriculum opportunities afforded by the restructured Level 1 courses.
- 3.5.3 The Review Panel shared the view that the Department would benefit from being more proactive in using the University's recruitment materials, the Department's course Handbooks and the web to advertise its flexibility in relation to meeting the particular fieldwork needs of students with a disability and students with family and other commitments.
- 3.5.4 The declining number of students undertaking the BSc in Archaeology was also a matter of concern which the Review Panel explored with staff. Staff believed that the incompleteness of the University's publicity materials and the differences in the structure of the BSc and MA degrees could be contributory factors. One staff member on the Science side is also on long-term secondment outwith the University. Staff also believed that competition from other science subjects with a higher unit of resource, better teaching spaces and perceived career options could also limit the opportunities for increasing BSc numbers. This was not dissimilar to the situation in other institutions where Archaeology was increasingly viewed as an Arts subject.
- 3.5.5 Since Archaeology is seldom offered as a subject in schools, it was not a natural first choice subject for students applying for entry to the University of Glasgow. Nevertheless, the Review Panel found entry to Level 1 Archaeology disappointingly low. A number of the students who met with the Review Panel said that they had not originally intended to pursue Archaeology to Honours level but had transferred when they discovered how much they enjoyed the subject. The Panel suggests that the obvious enthusiasm of current Honours students might also be harnessed in recruitment materials to encourage potential applicants to consider the subject.
- 3.5.6 The Review Panel learned from the SER that 29% of the Department's postgraduate taught students were from beyond the UK, largely from North America, and that the Department also had special relationships with particular universities, including the University of Athens, which had sent seven students to the MLitt in Mediterranean Archaeology in the last seven years. The Panel also learned from the SER that incoming Erasmus and Junior Year Abroad exchange students were important to the Department as they not uncommonly decide to finish their degree at Glasgow or subsequently return to Glasgow for postgraduate study. In discussions with staff, the Panel learned that the Department's undergraduate students seldom took advantage of the opportunities

available to them under the University's Study Abroad Programme to include an international experience as part of their Glasgow degree. Since both personal and intellectual benefits can be derived from an international experience, the Panel encourages the Department to promote the Study Abroad Programme to its students.

### 3.6 *Student Progression, Retention and Support*

#### Encouraging progression

- 3.6.1 The SER explained that the institution of a Level 1-2 Progress Committee in 2007-08 had helped the Department to identify progress issues between one semester and the next and between courses with different conveners and had allowed the Department to be more proactive in identifying and supporting students with progress issues.
- 3.6.2 The principal objective of the long-standing Honours Progress Committee, whose function was clearly described in the SER, was to identify progress issues at an early stage and allow contact to be made with the students in order to agree a way of containing these issues. There was evidence from discussion with undergraduate students that they found this support beneficial.
- 3.6.3 The SER revealed that the Department had also implemented a system of mitigation categories which provided valuable shorthand for indicating the nature and severity of a problem, whilst at the same time maintaining confidentiality. Reports from External Examiners' confirmed that the Department's internal Mitigation Panel made considerable effort to ensure that mitigation was applied fairly. The Panel **commends** the Department on this practice.
- 3.6.4 The SER indicated that postgraduate taught student progression, retention and support were managed by individual course conveners under the oversight of the Taught Postgraduate Convener. The postgraduate taught student who met with the Review Panel confirmed that the Department provided quality support to postgraduate taught students.

#### Retention issues

- 3.6.5 The Department had concerns about student retention but, since students were admitted to a Faculty and Archaeology was not the primary subject for the majority of those undertaking a Level 1 Archaeology course, it would always be difficult to predict how many students were likely to progress to the next level of study. The Review Panel learned from the SER that one of the objectives of the current reshaping of Level 1 provision was that the new courses could attract more students to continue Archaeology to Level 2 and beyond.
- 3.6.6 The Review Panel explored with staff whether the practical emphasis of the Department's courses might make Archaeology less attractive to students wishing to pursue a general humanities degree, and whether the Department was adequately supporting the employability of those who chose not to pursue a vocational route. The Head of Department agreed that the Department focused predominantly on archaeological employability and that this was reflected in the ILOs and in the careers talks arranged for Honours students. He considered that it might be

possible to include more ILOs to support the development of a greater range of non vocational transferable skills to enhance the general employability of students who did not wish to pursue a vocational qualification and that the focus and content of the careers sessions provided for students might also be reviewed. The Panel encourages this approach.

#### Support

- 3.6.7 The students who met with the Review Panel spoke warmly of the Department and gave examples of particular instances where staff had supported them through difficult circumstances.
- 3.6.8 Honours students particularly valued the week-long induction session at the start of the Junior Honours year. They said that the induction built on the sense of community that had developed amongst students in the course of the three weeks spent at the Department's Field School between the end of Level 2 and the start of the Junior Honours year. Honours students had also found that the Field School provided an excellent opportunity to get to know staff and GTAs and told the Panel that the staff were very approachable and helpful at all times and that the Department's 'open door' policy meant that staff were readily accessible.
- 3.6.9 Students praised staff for their active involvement in assisting them to source fieldwork and funding opportunities which helped to minimise the financial pressures of undertaking fieldwork. Travelling expenses to and from fieldwork locations were provided by the Department and the students who met with the Review Panel had, in the main, been successful in sourcing suitable fieldwork opportunities, including library and museum experience. The costs incurred varied and some students spoke of a need to juggle part-time employment and family commitments to fit in the field work requirements. One of the undergraduate students who met with the Review Panel spoke of the Department's flexibility and responsiveness towards students with family and other commitments and of the willingness to allow the fieldwork requirement to be undertaken in accordance with their particular needs.
- 3.6.10 The Departmental Disability Co-ordinator had a key role in student progression, retention and support and was responsible for encouraging and reminding staff of their responsibilities towards students with disabilities. The Review Panel learned from the SER and from staff that the Department did its utmost to support students with a disability and made special arrangements to accommodate their requirements. This was not always easy to achieve and sometimes had cost implications for the Department. Staff explained that there were limitations to the specialist advice and help that the Student Disability Service could provide and to the timeliness with which they were able to respond.
- 3.6.11 Whilst the Department reacted positively to the needs of mature students and those with a disability, the Review Panel formed the impression that Department could be more proactive in demonstrating to potential students that it was a 'can do' Department in terms of supporting student needs. The Review Panel therefore **recommends** that the Department makes its willingness and ability to accommodate students' needs transparent to both potential applicants and students in the early years of the undergraduate curriculum, to reduce the likelihood of those with financial difficulties or other needs perceiving the fieldwork commitments as being too difficult to achieve.

3.6.12 The Review Panel considered whether the volume and composition of fieldwork might dissuade Humanities students from considering Archaeology as an Honours pathway and suggests that there may be merit in considering whether it would be possible to accommodate less 'hands on' fieldwork for students who do not wish to pursue a vocational employment route. The Panel **recommends** that the Department liaises with the Alumni Office to ascertain the employment destinations of Archaeology alumni with a view to exploring whether any of them might be able to assist with the provision of suitable fieldwork placement opportunities for undergraduate students.

### 3.7 *The Quality of Learning Opportunities*

3.7.1 The students who met with the Review Panel demonstrated satisfaction with the quality of their learning opportunities and their experience as students in the Department. The Panel was satisfied that this was the case.

3.7.2 The Review Panel learned from students that every topic in the Archaeology undergraduate programme was taught by the relevant expert in the field. Students liked the continuity within the programme and an international exchange student who met the Panel described the Glasgow experience as being 'better for students' than what that individual had experienced elsewhere.

3.7.3. The Department's Field School is integrated with a major Departmental research project – Strathearn Environs and Royal Forteviot (SERF) – which is supported by the British Academy and Historic Scotland. Students clearly valued the learning opportunities provided by the Field School and the fact that they had a unique opportunity to participate in an ongoing research project and learn from experts in the field. The Review Panel also learned from the SER and from staff that there were now opportunities for students entering Senior Honours to apply for 6 funded trainee supervisor positions at the Field School, and that the students appointed to these positions took responsibility for managing areas of the excavations, taking oversight of the small-finds recording, on-site planning activities, and topographic survey, and in the process supervised other students. This was reported to have been an immensely valuable experience for the students concerned and would stand them in good stead when seeking employment.

3.7.4 The Review Panel noted that the undergraduate programmes focused predominantly on Scotland and North-west European and Mediterranean subject matter and asked staff how issues of equality and non-Western perspectives were addressed. The Panel was reassured to hear that theory was a central strand of the Department's teaching and that it was taught at every level. This included the history of early non-Western type societies. Visits to museums to gain an understanding of these early societies also helped. The SER noted that the Historical Archaeology course, which looks at the Caribbean and the Empire, had made the biggest strides in this respect.

### 3.8 *Resources for Learning and Teaching*

#### Learning resources

3.8.1 The Review Panel noted from Annual Monitoring Reports that better and more versatile teaching space was needed. In the course of a guided tour of the Department to illustrate the physical resources available for teaching the Panel was shown the architect's drawings for a potential conversion of the main teaching laboratory to more effective laboratory facilities. Other facilities included a drawing office which could also be used for small group teaching and a faculty-resourced computing laboratory which was well-used by students, since its computers contained the specialised software that they required. The Department also shared Library space with the Department of Geology which was used for small group teaching and staff meetings and was available to students as a study room for out-of-hours use. Staff told the Panel that the Department of Archaeology tended to make greater use of this space but that the books stored in it belonged to Geology. Staff explained that the layout of this room was not ideal for teaching and said that the Department had discussed its refurbishment and reorientation with the Department of Geology.

3.8.2 The SER had drawn attention to the low unit of resource for Archaeology teaching in Scotland which remains equivalent to History rather than that of other field subjects such as Geography, whilst Archaeology departments in England receive a significantly higher unit of resource. This anomaly had left the Department dependent on continued Faculty collegial support and, although the Department had received considerable support in this regard, staff believed that much more could be done to enhance the curriculum if the anomaly in the unit of resource could be rectified. The Review Panel explored this anomaly with the Dean and the Head of Department and learned that the University had recognised the situation several years ago, but that providing additional resources to Archaeology would have meant taking resources away from somewhere else and there had also been more pressing matters to take forward with the Scottish Higher Education Funding Council at that time. The Review Panel **recommends** that the University considers whether there would be merit in exploring potential solutions to address the significant disparity between the unit of resource for Archaeology teaching in Scotland and England with the Scottish Funding Council, in conjunction with other Scottish Higher Education Institutions if appropriate, with a view to strengthening the Department's ability to compete with institutions south of the border in attracting entrants to its undergraduate programmes.

3.8.3 The significant costs of the Field School meant that continued funding remained challenging. The Review Panel explored the sustainability of the Field School and learned that a recent agreement with the Department of Archaeology at the University of Aberdeen to collaborate on the Field School should help to provide additional financial security. This collaboration would also allow funding to be sought through the Carnegie Trust.

#### Staff workloads

3.8.4 The Review Panel was conscious that the Faculty of Arts had not yet introduced an approved template for a faculty-wide workload model.

Although the Department had provided relevant information at the Panel's request, in the absence of a departmental workload model, the Panel had found it difficult to ascertain the full extent of staff workloads but had gained the impression that all members of staff were very busy and that, following the introduction of the specialist MLitt programmes, the workloads of some individual staff members appeared to be particularly high at certain periods of the year. The Panel was concerned that staff might have difficulty in sustaining such high workloads over a prolonged period of time and explored with the Head of Department whether any adjustments might be made to teaching and assessment to reduce staff workloads. This might include consideration of adopting less labour intensive assessment methods, such as multiple choice questions (MCQs), in some areas. The Panel acknowledged that it would take time and staff expertise to build an MCQ resource but felt that this could be justified by the longer term gain. The Panel encourages the Department to explore whether there might be opportunities to substitute some of its current assessment with less resource intensive methods of assessment.

- 3.8.5 The Review Panel learned from the Dean that the Faculty of Arts had piloted a workload model and that this would be rolled out imminently. The Head of the Department of Archaeology was very conscious of the current pressures on staff and was considering the possibility of introducing the pilot Faculty workload model into the annual Performance and Development Review process which was due to take place in June 2009. The Panel encourages the Head of Department in this initiative.

#### Probationary Staff

- 3.8.6 Half of the Review Panel met with the Department's two probationary staff which comprised a research student, who was covering a temporary post and who provided interesting insights into the challenges of the role, and a recently appointed member of staff who was now in the second year of probation. Experience of the New Lecturer Programme was reported to be positive and both had found colleagues to be approachable and helpful. The latter staff member had initially been allocated a half load of teaching but now carried a full teaching load, which had been particularly heavy in the autumn. The Panel explored the nature of this staff member's role in the Department and learned that the workload included some cover for a member of staff who was on leave. The Panel had some concerns about the impact of a high workload on opportunities to enhance teaching practice and establish independent research and **recommends** that the Department be proactive in ensuring that probationary staff have well directed mentoring and are allocated an appropriately balanced workload that includes protected research time.

#### GTAs

- 3.8.7 The second half of the Review Panel met concurrently with the Department's GTAs and was impressed by their attitude. The Panel had also noted the overwhelming praise for GTAs in the most recent set of student questionnaires.
- 3.8.8 The GTAs who met with the Review Panel had all volunteered to teach and most did 1 – 2 hours a week. They were enthusiastic about their involvement in undergraduate teaching and had seen it as privilege to be able to do it and very much a part of their PhD training. They had found assisting at the Field School 'a wonderful experience' and believed that it was important for them to experience teaching outside the classroom.

Participation in the Field School had also helped them get to know the undergraduate students. All had attended the statutory training provided by the Learning and Teaching Centre and had found it useful. They had also attended additional training courses on the Code of Assessment and Marking and Assessment. They had found these helpful but felt that they had been offered a little late in the semester to be of maximum use. GTAs had involvement in marking first year work and, to a lesser extent, second year work. Their marking was always moderated and they were told to go and see someone if they encountered a problem essay. GTAs felt well supported by the staff of the Department and said that they also had opportunities to sit in on someone else's teaching to learn the ropes. In addition to this they had developed an informal structure for supporting each other which was helped by the fact that they shared a room. The Panel **commends** the Department on the standard and commitment of its GTAs.

- 3.8.9 The GTAs told the Review Panel that they would like to have had more opportunities for interaction with the staff of GUARD as they believed that such a relationship could be beneficial. One of their number had been a student during the period where the Department's relationship with GUARD had been more closely integrated and had benefited from the collegiality that this arrangement had brought. The Panel understood that there had been strategic reasons for disaggregating GUARD from the Department.

#### Handbooks

- 3.8.10 The Review Panel was impressed with the perspective and coverage of the Department's handbooks although they were perhaps rather pointed in places, eg reminding students of the busyness of staff. Students confirmed that they found them to be an excellent resource, particularly the clear and instructive sections on plagiarism and referencing. External Examiners had also commented on the helpfulness of being able to access these handbooks online.

#### Library resources

- 3.8.11 Students perceived library resources to be excellent and said that they routinely made use of online journals and that they were also able to borrow books from staff.

#### Engagement with Moodle

- 3.8.12 The Department continued to develop its Moodle resources and undergraduate students told the Review Panel that they used the Moodle sites regularly. GTAs also uploaded forms to Moodle to allow the discussion from their tutorials to continue.
- 3.8.13 The SER noted that following the receipt of funding from the Faculty to facilitate the podcasting of lectures via Moodle, the Department had experimented with podcasting in Session 2007-08. Students had found lectures more enjoyable and attendance at lectures did not appear to have been diminished by the availability of this resource. In addition to their being able to participate in lectures without the need to take notes, students told the Panel that it been helpful to access the podcasts for revision and to catch up on lectures missed through absence. GTAs told the Panel that they had also found it helpful to be able to access the podcasts in their own time and had used them as a resource to support their teaching preparation.

#### **4. Maintaining the Standards of Awards**

Benchmark Statement and other relevant external reference points

- 4.1 The Review Panel learned from the SER that the Honours programme specifications were prepared with reference to the QAA Benchmark Statement for Archaeology and that postgraduate programme specifications, for which no equivalent benchmark statement existed, were prepared with reference to the SCQF Level 11 descriptors and other relevant external reference points, eg the National Occupational Standards relating to professional functions and standards in archaeological practice.

External Examiners

- 4.2 As stated in the SER, the Department relies on its External Examiners, in conjunction with the experience of departmental staff who act as External Examiners at other institutions, to ensure the overall comparability of its standards with other Archaeology departments.
- 4.3 External Examiners' reports had expressed satisfaction with the standard of the Department's programmes and had confirmed that comments were taken on board and responded to. External Examiners had also reported that the Glasgow programmes gave students a robust, broad grounding and had perceived the overall range and variety of assessment methods, which allowed students the potential to excel in a variety of different ways, as being a strength of the Department's programmes.
- 4.4 External Examiners had affirmed the appropriateness of the Department's programmes and the Department had also benefited from one of its External Examiners having sat on the committee that had established the original benchmark for Archaeology.

Consultation with employers

- 4.5 The Department's taught postgraduate specialisms had benefited from the advice of relevant professional bodies and the specifications for the vocational taught postgraduate programmes, which included significant work placements, were drawn up in consultation with employers.
- 4.6 The SER asserted that the significant amount of fieldwork that undergraduate students had to complete - one of the higher requirements across the UK - was justified by the feedback from employers and observation of student destination and recruitment feedback. The Department was therefore confident that Glasgow students are better prepared than most for vocational employment. Whilst satisfied that this is the case and acknowledging the high quality of the student experience, the Review Panel continues to have concerns about the amount of work involved for staff in maintaining this level of fieldwork.

#### **5. Assuring and Enhancing the Quality of the Students' Learning Experience**

Student engagement with feedback processes.

- 5.1 Undergraduate students assured the Review Panel that they were satisfied that they had sufficient opportunities to provide feedback to staff and said that staff were responsive to the issues that they raised.



However, the Panel had observed that students' use of formal feedback mechanisms was less well established than staff would wish.

- 5.2 The SER had highlighted the difficulties in engaging students in formal feedback processes, including student representation, and the Review Panel had also noted this phenomenon when reviewing the quality assurance materials provided for the Review. The Panel explored the reasons for this with students.
- 5.3 In short, the Department's Honours students had developed a strong sense of community with staff and with each other in the three weeks that they had spent together at the Field School. This had resulted in their feeling able to approach staff on an individual basis whenever necessary and having less need to raise issues through formal feedback or at Staff-Student Committees. The students knew each other well and tended to communicate regularly over coffee and to share information. There were few Student Representatives but the students who met with the Review Panel knew who their representatives were and those who participated in Staff-Student Committees told the Panel that they received instantaneous feedback from staff and said that the minutes of meetings were made public promptly and that the assigned actions were clear and followed up at the next meeting under 'Matters arising'.
- 5.4 The undergraduate students who met with the Review Panel were motivated and confident and clearly enjoyed their learning experience but the Panel had concerns that the absence of strong formal feedback mechanisms could make it difficult for Level 1 and 2 students and less confident senior students to raise issues.
- 5.5 The strong relationship between undergraduate students and staff also had disadvantages in that students appeared reluctant to raise certain issues with staff in case it damaged that relationship. This had resulted in some students suppressing their dissatisfaction with aspects of their learning experience but using the National Student Survey as a vehicle to express this anonymously in their final year of study, thereby missing the opportunity to engage with the Department in addressing their concerns.
- 5.6 The Review Panel discussed these matters with students and **recommends** that the Department explores ways of strengthening engagement with the more formal aspects of obtaining and responding to feedback from students with a view to enhancing the quality and effectiveness of interactions between students and staff and encouraging students to participate in opportunities for the collective exchange of views on matters related to learning, teaching and assessment.
- 5.7 The Panel found the student feedback questionnaires currently in use to be a little outdated and suggests that the Department might find a new student feedback questionnaire that was currently being piloted in the University to be helpful. It also suggests that the Department might consider supplementing traditional feedback mechanisms with, for example, focus groups. A range of suggestions for enhancing the feedback process are also available from '*Obtaining and Responding to Feedback from Students: A University Code of Practice*' ([http://senate.gla.ac.uk/ga/CoP\\_Obtaining\\_student\\_feedback\\_Oct08.pdf](http://senate.gla.ac.uk/ga/CoP_Obtaining_student_feedback_Oct08.pdf)). The Panel was aware that the Head of Department had already been reflecting on this matter.

Annual monitoring process

- 5.8 The Review Panel noted that there was variation in staff engagement with the Annual Monitoring process. Some reports were highly detailed and reflective and showed good consideration of the specific areas for enhancement in a particular year, whilst others demonstrated a less rigorous approach to the process. The Panel **recommends** that the Department explores ways of promoting greater individual and collective engagement in the Annual Monitoring process, with a view to encouraging a team approach to identifying areas that might benefit from enhancement and good practice that might usefully be shared within and beyond the Department.

#### Social space for students

- 5.9 The Review Panel learned that, until recently, postgraduate taught students had shared study space with research students which had promoted collegiality between the two groups of students and had stimulated postgraduate taught students' interest in progressing to postgraduate research. The recent increase in taught postgraduate numbers had meant that it was no longer possible for the Department to provide study space for postgraduate taught students within the Gregory Building and staff had concerns that this would impact on PhD recruitment.
- 5.10 The Review Panel had been able to meet with only one postgraduate taught student and was therefore unable to explore the matter more widely with this group of students. However, discussions with the student had indicated that the loss of shared postgraduate space appears to have created a notional divide between the two groups of postgraduate students and that the opportunity for interaction with research students was now limited to the departmental research seminars, which were well attended and compulsory for postgraduate taught students. The matter had also been drawn to the Panel's attention by the Department's probationary staff who had experienced the collegiality of the shared space and regretted that it could no longer be part of the postgraduate taught student experience. The Panel **recommends** that the Faculty explores with the Faculty of Physical Sciences whether it might be possible to secure the use of an additional room in the Gregory Building for postgraduate students, with a view to increasing the opportunities for engagement between postgraduate taught students and postgraduate research students.

#### Faculty Research Skills course

- 5.11 The postgraduate taught student who met with the Review Panel drew attention to apparent student dissatisfaction with the 20 credit Faculty Research Skills course which the Department's postgraduate taught students were required to undertake. It appeared to be perceived as a 'box-ticking exercise' which contributed few opportunities to enhance postgraduate students' learning, focusing as it did on topics such as 'how to access your e-mail account', 'how to access Moodle', 'how to write an essay' and 'how to use the University Library', the latter coming far too late in the semester to be useful. A view was expressed that the course did not merit 20 credits at Level M in its present format and would have greater relevance to postgraduate taught students if it included topics such as statistics training and high-end IT skills. The Panel was conscious that it would increase the burden on the Department's staff if this course were to be removed and replaced with a course led by the

Department. The Panel drew postgraduate taught students' perceived dissatisfaction with the 20-credit Faculty Research Skills course to the attention of the Head of Department and the Dean and **recommends** that the Faculty reviews the content of this course with a view to improving its relevance and value to postgraduate taught students.

## 6. Summary of Perceived Strengths and Areas for Improvement in Learning and Teaching

### *Key strengths*

- An honest and reflective approach to review as demonstrated in the inclusive approach taken to the preparation of an exemplary Self Evaluation Report
- Approachable and helpful staff
- The quality of staff support provided to both undergraduate and postgraduate taught students and to Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs)
- The overall range and variety of assessment methods which allowed students the potential to excel in a variety of different ways
- The perspective and coverage of the Departments course handbooks which included, for example:
  - excellent guidance on how to avoid plagiarism, including examples
  - well explained referencing
- The refresher course on referencing at the start of the Junior Honours Year
- The week-long induction session at the start of the Junior Honours year
- The quality of the Field School experience both academically and as a training exercise
- The active involvement of staff in assisting students to source fieldwork and funding opportunities
- The annual Teaching Review meeting
- The involvement of GTAs in Level 1 curriculum review
- The effectiveness of the Department's Progress Committees
- The introduction of a system of mitigation categories which provide valuable shorthand for indicating the nature and severity of a problem to the Examination Board whilst at the same time maintaining confidentiality
- Courses related to staff research interests thus ensuring a clear linkage between research and teaching
- Opportunities for Senior Honours students to compete for funded trainee supervisor positions at the Field School
- The high standard and commitment of GTAs
- The success of podcasting in enhancing student participation in lectures, as a revision and 'catch up' resource and as a resource to support the teaching preparation of GTAs

### ***Areas to be improved or enhanced***

- Engagement with recruitment mechanisms
- Recruitment materials
- Student retention
- Promotion of study abroad opportunities to undergraduate students
- PDP opportunities
- Clarity about the support mechanisms available to students with particular needs
- Skills-based intended learning outcomes
- The range of transferable skills for students who may not wish to pursue a vocational career
- Feedback on assessment to postgraduate taught students
- Student engagement with formal feedback mechanisms
- The approach to engagement with the Annual Monitoring process
- Staff workloads

### ***Conclusions and recommendations***

#### **Conclusions**

The Review Panel was impressed with the leadership of the Head of Department of Archaeology, the collegiality of the Department's staff, the quality of support to students and the opportunities that were provided to enhance the personal development of the Department's GTAs. However, the Panel was disappointed to note that the Chair of Archaeology had been vacant since 2006 and hopes that it will be filled soon with a view to maintaining and enhancing the Department's standing both nationally and internationally.

The Department had adopted a frank and inclusive approach to internal review which had resulted in an exemplary document that was both reflective and forward looking and an excellent resource to support the Panel's review of the Department's learning, teaching and assessment. The students who met with the Panel were articulate and enthusiastic about their learning and spoke highly of the Department.

The Department demonstrated that it had made significant progress since the previous internal review in May 2003 and also demonstrated an impressive array of strengths and an awareness of the areas where it needed to improve. The most substantive of these are reflected in the recommendations that follow whilst development in other areas are encouraged through suggestions from the Panel.

#### **Recommendations**

The recommendations interspersed in the preceding report are summarised below. It is important to note that the majority of these recommendations refer to tasks or issues identified by the Department for action either prior to the Review or in the SER.

The recommendations have been cross-referenced to the paragraphs in the text of the report to which they refer and are not ranked in any particular order.

## **Code of Assessment**

### *Recommendation 1*

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department utilises the entire range of bands prescribed in the Code of Assessment with a view to upholding the University's aim of promoting institution-wide equality in the student experience of assessment. (*Paragraph 3.3.1*)

For the attention of: **The Head of Department**

### *Recommendation 2*

The Review Panel **recommends** that the capabilities of the Moodle assessment function be investigated with a view to ascertaining whether it might be modified to allow the Code of Assessment grade descriptors to be applied in marking. (*Paragraph 3.3.2*)

For the attention of: **The Director of the Learning and Teaching Centre**

## **Assessment procedures**

### *Recommendation 3*

The Review Panel **recommends** that the internal examiners reach an agreement on provisional grades and feedback before returning assessments to students even if the hand back date is slightly delayed to achieve this. (*Paragraph 3.3.8*)

For the attention of: **The Head of Department**

## **Student Recruitment**

### *Recommendation 4*

Despite the fact that Archaeology is rarely offered as a school subject, the Review Panel **recommends** that the Department engages with the Recruitment and Participation Service since it is of the view that the Service could provide assistance with recruitment by ensuring that the potential for studying Archaeology at the University of Glasgow as part of both an MA and BSc degree is drawn to the attention of schools. (*Paragraph 3.5.1*)

For the attention of: **The Head of Department**

## **Student Progression, Retention and Support**

### *Recommendation 5*

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department makes its willingness and ability to accommodate students' needs transparent to both potential applicants and students in the early years of the undergraduate curriculum, to reduce the likelihood of those with financial difficulties or other needs perceiving the fieldwork commitments as being too difficult to achieve. (*Paragraph 3.6.11*)

For the attention of: **The Head of Department**

*Recommendation 6*

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department liaises with the Alumni Office to ascertain the employment destinations of Archaeology alumni with a view to exploring whether any of them might be able to assist with the provision of suitable fieldwork placement opportunities for undergraduate students. (*Paragraph 3.6.12*)

For the attention of: **The Head of Department**

**Learning Resources**

*Recommendation 7*

The Review Panel **recommends** that the University considers whether there would be merit in exploring potential solutions to address the significant disparity between the unit of resource for Archaeology teaching in Scotland and England with the Scottish Funding Council, in conjunction with other Scottish Higher Education Institutions if appropriate, with a view to strengthening the Department's ability to compete with institutions south of the border in attracting entrants to its undergraduate programmes. (*Paragraph 3.8.2*)

For the attention of: **The Vice Principal (Strategy and Resources)**

*Recommendation 8*

The Review Panel had some concerns about the impact of a high workload on opportunities to enhance teaching practice and establish independent research and **recommends** that the Department be proactive in ensuring that probationary staff have well directed mentoring and are allocated an appropriately balanced workload that includes protected research time. (*Paragraph 3.8.6*)

For the attention of: **The Head of Department**

**Assuring and Enhancing the Quality of the Student Learning Experience**

*Recommendation 9*

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department explores ways of strengthening engagement with the more formal aspects of obtaining and responding to feedback from students with a view to enhancing the quality and effectiveness of interactions between students and staff and encouraging students to participate in opportunities for the collective exchange of views on matters related to learning, teaching and assessment. (*Paragraph 5.6*)

For the attention of: **The Head of Department**

*Recommendation 10*

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Department explores ways of promoting greater individual and collective engagement in the Annual Monitoring process, with a view to encouraging a team approach to identifying areas that might benefit from enhancement and good practice that might usefully be shared within and beyond the Department. (*Paragraph 5.8*)

For the attention of: **The Head of Department**

*Recommendation 11*

The Review Panel **recommends** that the Faculty explores with the Faculty of Physical Sciences whether it might be possible to secure the use of an additional room in the Gregory Building for postgraduate students, with a view to increasing the opportunities for engagement between postgraduate taught students and postgraduate research students. (*Paragraph 5.10*)

For the attention of: **The Dean of the Faculty of Arts**

*Recommendation 12*

The Review Panel drew postgraduate taught students' perceived dissatisfaction with the 20-credit Faculty Research Skills course to the attention of the Head of Department and the Dean and **recommends** that the Faculty reviews the content of this course with a view to improving its relevance and value to postgraduate taught students. (*Paragraph 5.11*)

For the attention of: **The Dean of the Faculty of Arts**

## Appendix 1

### Full List of Programmes and additional notes

#### *Undergraduate Programmes*

- MA Single Honours in Archaeology
- BSc Single Honours in Archaeology
- BSc Designated Degree in Archaeological Studies in the Faculty of Physical Sciences
- Level 3 options contributing to MA Designated Degrees in Ancient Studies, European Civilisation, Historical Studies and Scottish Studies

#### *Joint Degree Programmes (Undergraduate)*

The Department contributes to the following *joint* degree programmes offered with other departments or other institutions

- MA Joint Honours in Archaeology and another subject  
In the last three years these subjects have included:  
Applied Mathematics (2)  
Celtic Civilisation (5)  
English Literature (1)  
German (1)  
History (11)  
History of Art (1)  
Music (1)  
Philosophy (1)  
Spanish (1)  
Theatre Studies (2)
- MA in Social Sciences Joint Honours in Archaeology and another subject  
In the last three years this has included:  
Anthropology (4)
- BSc Joint Honours in Archaeology and another subject  
In the last three years these subjects have included:  
Earth Science (1)  
Geography (1)



Note:

Students undertaking undergraduate programmes follow a broad curriculum in their first two years, with Archaeology contributing 33% to their Level 1 curriculum and 50% of their Level 2 curriculum.

*Postgraduate Taught Programmes*

- MLitt/PGDip in Aerial Photography and Geophysical Survey in Archaeology
- MLitt/PGDip in Archaeological Studies
- MLitt/PGDip in Battlefield and Conflict Archaeology (through the Centre for Battlefield Archaeology)
- MLitt/PGDip in Historical Archaeology
- MLitt/PGDip in Material Culture and Artefact Studies
- MLitt/PGDip in Medieval Archaeology
- MLitt/PGDip in Mediterranean Archaeology
- MLitt/PGDip in Professional Archaeology

Notes:

Professional Archaeology, Material Culture and Artefact Studies, Historical Archaeology, and Battlefield and Conflict Archaeology were introduced in 2006, as was a redesigned Archaeological Studies.

Aerial Photography and Geophysical Survey in Archaeology is currently under review and will be relaunched in 2009 as Aerial Archaeology. Medieval Archaeology will be retitled Celtic and Viking Archaeology to reflect more closely its content and differentiate it from competitive offerings elsewhere.

*Contributions to Degree Programmes offered by other departments*

The Department also contributes to the following degree programmes offered by other departments:

- MLitt/PGDip in Classical Archaeology and Ancient History (Lead Department: Classics)
- M.Litt/PGDip in Medieval Scottish Studies (Lead Departments: Scottish History/Celtic)
- MLitt/PGDip in Celtic Studies (Lead Department: Celtic)
- Medieval and Renaissance Studies (Lead Department: Glasgow Centre for Medieval and Renaissance Studies)

*Courses available to programmes across the Faculty of Arts*

A range of the Department's MLitt courses are also available to programmes across the Faculty of Arts.