



**Senate**

<b>Paper Title</b>	Periodic Review Report: School of English and Drama 2015
<b>Outcome requested</b>	Senate is asked to <b>note</b> the periodic review report for the review of the School English and Drama.
<b>Points for Senate members to note and further information</b>	<p>The report sets out the formal commendations and recommendations made by the panel for the Periodic Review of the School of English and Drama, and summarises the Panel's discussion.</p> <p>Progress on the recommendations specific to the School will be monitored through an interim action plan and twelve month progress report.</p>
<b>Questions for Senate to consider</b>	<p>Senate is asked <b>to Senate</b> the commendations and recommendations summarised in paragraphs 140 to 151 of the report. The recommendations concern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reviewing the employability provisions within the English programmes, including examining the potential for increasing links with industry and employers.</li> <li>• ensuring appropriate specialist equipment and resources are available to students, where appropriate through collaboration with other Schools within QMUL such as the School of Languages, Linguistics and Film, and the School of Electronic Engineering and Computer Science.</li> <li>• ensuring that postgraduate taught students receive appropriate feedback within term 1, and in any case prior to the submission of other pieces of assessment, providing students with the opportunity to progress and develop their skills throughout the programmes.</li> <li>• further considering and developing an international partnership, in line with the new HSS strategy, to provide strategic development, as well as increased opportunities for the recruitment of overseas students.</li> <li>• reviewing the attractiveness of the curriculum and titles used to market postgraduate taught programmes to students.</li> <li>• The Panel supported the School's desire to increase the number of PhD students, and recommended that the College review the internal mechanisms for bidding for internal scholarships.</li> </ul>
<b>Regulatory/statutory reference points</b>	The Periodic Review of teaching and learning in academic schools and institutes occurs on a six year cycle. It forms part of

	the College's Quality Framework for the assurance of academic standards and quality. Periodic Review provides the opportunity to assess the effectiveness of the quality management processes in place for teaching and learning.
<b>Strategy and risk</b>	Periodic Review supports the College's Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy. The Quality Assurance Agency expects all providers of higher education to conduct some form of Periodic Review, and will look for evidence of this in its Institutional Review processes.
<b>Reporting/ consideration route for the paper</b>	Senate <b>to note</b> .
<b>Author</b>	Ruth Wilkinson, ARCS
<b>Sponsor</b>	Professor Susan Dilly, Vice-Principal (Teaching and Learning)



## SENATE

### REPORT OF THE PERIODIC REVIEW OF THE SCHOOL OF ENGLISH AND DRAMA

5 MARCH 2015

#### SCOPE OF REVIEW

1. The Periodic Review encompassed the undergraduate, postgraduate and research degree provision provided by the School of English and Drama.

#### OBJECTIVES

2. The objective of the Review was to assess the effectiveness of the quality management processes in place within the School of English and Drama (hereafter 'the School').
3. The aims of Periodic Review are set out in the QM Quality Assurance Handbook as follows:
  - to assess the effectiveness of the School's processes for managing academic quality and standards, and that QM's agreed policies and procedures are operating as intended to assure and enhance the standard of provision;
  - to consider how the school is developing and implementing its Learning, Teaching and Assessment strategy, and how QMUL's Statement of Graduate Attributes is reflected in the curriculum;
  - to evaluate the currency of the School's programmes in the context of developments in the discipline, and its success in achieving its aims, and to consider its future plans;
  - to review all partnership, or partner supported delivery;
  - to commend and disseminate good practice;
  - to provide public information on the quality and standards of the School's programmes.

## **THE REVIEW PROCESS**

### **Panel members**

4. The following members of the Review Panel (appointed by the Vice-Principal, Teaching and Learning on behalf of Senate) conducted the review:
  - Professor Susan Dilly, Vice-Principal (Student Experience, Teaching & Learning) (Chair)
  - Dola Osilaja, Students' Union President
  - Professor Omar Garcia, Dean for Taught Programmes (Humanities & Social Sciences)
  - Professor Thomas Prellberg, Director of Taught Programmes (School of Mathematical Sciences)
  - Dr Matthew Williamson, Head of Educational Development, Centre for Academic and Professional Development
  - Professor Bill Spence, Vice-Principal (Research)

The external members of the Panel were:

- Professor Carl Lavery, University of Glasgow
- Professor John Whale, University of Leeds

The Secretaries to the review were:

- Ruth Wilkinson, Academic Standards and Quality Officer
- Rachel Davies, Academic Standards and Quality Officer

### **Review material**

5. The Panel received a copy of the School's Self-Evaluation Document (SED), which had been produced by the School in accordance with the QMUL guidance informed by the Quality Assurance Agency's guidelines. A list of the additional briefing material provided to support the SED is provided in Annexe A to the report. The Panel thanked the School for the thorough and informative SED, which had provided a useful overview of the School's education provision and its management and assurance structures as a basis for the Panel's discussions.

### **Meetings with staff and students**

6. During the review the Panel met with the following members of the School's staff:
  - Professor Markman Ellis, Head of School
  - Professor Julia Boffey, Director of Research
  - Professor Jerry Brotton, Staff Mentor
  - Dr Shane Boyle, Chair of Exam Board
  - Professor David Colclough, Joint Programmes Lead
  - Dr Cornelia Cook, Teaching Fellow
  - Professor Mark Currie, Postgraduate Admissions
  - Dr Rob Ellis, Probationary Administrator

- Dr James Emmott, Library Liaison
  - Dr Bridget Escolme, Head of Drama
  - Ms Jenny Gault, School Director of Administration
  - Professor Paul Hamilton, Head of English
  - Professor Jen Harvie, Director of Graduate Studies
  - Dr Alfred Hiatt, English Postgraduate Convenor
  - Dr Caoimhe McAvinchey, Exam Board Chair
  - Dr Aoife Monks, Senior Tutor
  - Ms Daphne Rayment, Research and Graduate Studies Manager
  - Professor Joad Raymond, Co-admissions Lead (PG)
  - Professor Chris Reid, Director of Taught Programmes
  - Professor Nicholas Ridout, Admissions Lead (UG)
  - Ms Kate Russell, Teaching and Student Support Manager
  - Dr Catherine Silverstone, Joint Programmes Lead
  - Dr James Vigus, Senior Tutor
  - Professor Lois Weaver, Employability Lead
  - Dr Martin Welton, Co-admissions Lead (PG)
  - Dr Tessa Whitehouse, Probationary Lecturer
7. The Panel also met with undergraduate, postgraduate taught and research students in formal sessions, and an informal meeting over lunch.

## THE SCHOOL CONTEXT

8. The School of English and Drama is part of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, and is located on QMUL's Mile End campus. The School has a strong reputation in the UK and internationally for the quality of its teaching and research, and takes pride in its collegial approach to all aspects of teaching and learning.
9. The Panel **commended** the School's excellent results in both the National Student Survey and the Research Excellence Framework; indicating the international standing of the School, and the School's ability to combine research strengths, innovative programmes, and the student experience.
10. The School had undertaken a major review of its curricula since the last review, focusing in particular upon instilling key skills, managing the transition to university level study, embedding the employability agenda, and widening its portfolio to include a more diverse range of specialisms.
11. The School had also reviewed progression rates and secured £1983 funding to support students undertaking late summer resits. The School intended to assess the effectiveness of this support with a view to implementing it on a permanent basis.

## Staff and students

12. The student body totalled approximately 850 FTE students, comprising approximately 770 undergraduates, 45 at postgraduate taught level, and 43 postgraduate research students. Additionally, the School had 29 postgraduate taught, and 22 postgraduate research students studying part time.

13. The School had 51.6 FTE academic permanent staff members, 11 FTE academic fixed-term staff, 12 professional services staff members, and 4 technical staff members.

### **Taught programmes**

14. A list of the programmes offered by the School in 2014/15 is shown in Annexe B to the report. The School offered two single honours undergraduate programmes, and led or contributed to thirteen joint honours programmes. At postgraduate taught level there were two programmes, the MA English studies offering multiple pathways, and the MA Theatre Studies. The School also offered a doctoral degree programme.

### **Research**

15. The School had a strong research profile in the UK and internationally. The departments of English and Drama had separate research strategies to reflect the different research cultures within the disciplines. In the most recent Research Assessment Exercise the English department was ranked within the top two departments in the country for research. In the latest Research Excellence Framework the Drama department was ranked top for the quality of research. The number of postgraduate research students has declined slightly since 2008/9 but the School maintained a healthy number of applicants.

### **School management and committee structure**

16. The Panel discussed the School committee structure for the oversight of teaching and learning with the Head of School and other staff. The School operated the committees listed below. The School revised its governance structures in 2013/14 so that from the start of 2014/15 the two Department Boards reported to the School Board, which met twice a year. Unless otherwise stated, these reported to the School Board.

- School Management Group (SMG);
- School Board;
- Drama Department Board;
- English Department Board;
- E-Strategy Group;
- Drama Research and Graduate Studies Committee (reports to Department Board);
- Drama Teaching and Student Support Committee (Drama TSC)(reports to Department Board);
- English Research and Graduate Studies Committee (reports to Department Board);
- English Teaching and Student Support Committee (English TSC)(reports to Department Board);
- English MA Programme Committee (reports to TSC);
- English Subject Area Groups (reports to TSC);
- Staff Student Liaison Committees (UG/PG/Drama/English report to TSC);
- Subject Examination Boards (reported to QMUL's Degree Examination Boards).

17. The Head of School was a member of all committees to ensure that relevant matters discussed at SMG were communicated throughout the committee structure. At the Department RGSC and TSC the Head of Department had a standing Agenda item to report any QMUL business relevant to the School.
18. The School Management Committee considered policy matters and provided advice to the Head of School. The membership comprised the Head of School, Heads of Department and the School Administrative Director.
19. The Panel queried how the two distinct departments worked cohesively as a School. It was reported that whilst the School recognised the departments' distinct research and pedagogical interests, it ensured that all administrative processes were identical, thereby providing the same level of services to all students.

### **Internationalisation**

20. The School attracted large numbers of Associate Students, especially from Australia and America. Registration in 2014-15 showed approximately 270 students registered on modules per semester. The School ensured that spaces were provided for associate students across the curriculum.
21. At the time of the Review the School did not have in place any international partnerships. It was reported that the School was examining the postgraduate research market in China and Scandinavia, but had no immediate intentions to form international partnerships.
22. The Panel queried whether the School intended to utilise the number of students attracted to their modules to try and form international partnerships in the future. The School reported that there were no specific plans to further international partnerships, but that it would be happy to engage with Faculty wide collaborative agreements.
23. The Panel **recommended** that the School further consider and develop an international partnership, in line with the new HSS strategy, to provide strategic development, as well as increased opportunities for the recruitment of overseas students.

### **Aims**

24. The School's overall Aims were provided in their Self Evaluation Document as follows:
  - To provide coherent, wide-ranging, and intellectually stimulating programmes in Drama and in English.
  - To produce and disseminate research of the highest quality, both within the relevant academic and research communities and to a wider public.
  - To encourage innovation, collaboration, and interdisciplinary work in research, teaching, and learning.
  - To introduce students to advanced research, and to ensure that the curriculum reflects the most recent developments in Drama and in English.
  - To enable students to develop independent critical thinking and judgment, and to undertake independent research tasks.

- To provide for the progressive acquisition of key analytical and communication skills through the design of an appropriately structured curriculum.
- To support student learning through the delivery of the curriculum, the embedding of teaching technologies, and by providing access to appropriate academic guidance, advising, and mentoring.
- To promote widening participation in higher education, and to attract applicants of the highest potential and calibre by appropriate policies for recruitment and retention.
- To offer students and researchers a supportive intellectual and material environment in which to pursue their work.
- To draw on the wide cultural and intellectual sources of London in the design and delivery of the curriculum.
- To develop academic and cultural links with the local community.
- To incorporate a wide range of transferable skills into the specialist education offered, and to prepare students for the challenges of the contemporary workplace.
- To provide a basis for further study in Drama, or in English, or in related fields
- To encourage and develop an international dimension in our curriculum and student cohort.

25. The School's Teaching, Learning and Assessment Strategy states that the School is committed to supporting and developing excellent, innovative teaching practice, to fostering independent and collaborative student learning and to conducting clear assessments in all its programmes. The School highlights 11 areas that are of strategic importance to achieving these aims. These are expanded upon in the relevant sections later in this report:

- Teaching and Research
- Collaborative Teaching and Assessment
- Independent Student Learning
- Collaborative Student Learning
- Pathways and Progression
- Clear Learning Outcomes and Assessment criteria
- Curriculum Review and Quality Assurance
- Supporting Student Writing
- Educational Technologies
- Communicating Effectively with Students
- Student Attendance

26. The School's research aims are as follows:

English:

- To continue to develop areas where research has been especially distinctive, at the highest level of international excellence.
- To embed English studies research in an interdisciplinary humanities context.
- To promote work across sub-disciplines within English studies, especially collaborations between researchers.
- To remain committed to lesser-studied but distinctive aspects of the discipline.
- To promote and encourage research-led teaching in the curriculum.
- To encourage renewal of the research of the discipline.
- To provide departmental support structures for research.



- To engage with users of our research in academia, education, and commercial and media enterprises, based on a distinctive view of English research.

## Drama

- To lead research nationally and internationally in theatre and performance studies across areas of critical investigation, methods and forms of dissemination.
- To continue to develop areas where research has been especially distinctive, at the highest level of international excellence.
- To sustain political and ethical commitments to the interrogation of relationships between performance and social justice.
- To promote the development and renewal of research in the field through active leadership and participation (in, for example, editing, curatorship, programming, early career researcher mentoring and postgraduate student development).
- To nurture the relationships of drama, theatre and performance studies to interdisciplinary research (in, for example, geography, medicine, politics, visual cultures, economics, film, literary studies, languages and history).
- To produce research in a range of forms and media, most effectively to reach diverse and distributed audiences locally, nationally and internationally.
- To produce research with social and cultural impact, particularly for: artists; arts agencies and organizations; policy makers; and communities that are potentially marginalized (for example, by age, class, ethnicity, gender, sexuality and poverty).
- To promote and encourage research-led teaching.
- To pursue and promote research that adheres to rigorous ethical standards, respecting the College's ethical guidelines.
- To provide strong departmental support structures for research.
- To engage and collaborate with users and co-creators of our research in: higher education; other areas of education; arts practice; arts, social, and cultural policy; community organizations; commercial and media enterprises; and elsewhere.

## EVALUATION OF PROGRAMMES

### Learning outcomes

27. In developing learning outcomes for programmes and modules, the School considered QMUL's Teaching, Learning and Assessment Strategy. All learning outcomes were reviewed in line with the QAA benchmark statements (for English, the 2014-15 revision, Drama, 2007 statement), and external examiner reports. Both departments had recently undertaken major reviews of their undergraduate programmes with a view to ensuring that the structure and content of the curriculum was consistent with the School's and QMUL's stated learning outcomes. The Drama department's new curriculum would be implemented from 2015/16.

### Curricula

#### *Undergraduate*

28. The School offered or contributed to fifteen undergraduate programmes, including thirteen joint honours programmes. These are detailed in Annexe B.

29. The Drama department curriculum review had taken approximately a year to complete, and involved consultation with students through the SSLCs, sessions with Level 4 students, and advice from external examiners. The School had reviewed the curriculum to accommodate the increase in undergraduate numbers, and the change in staff members.
30. The School noted that they had in place ongoing curriculum review mechanisms, and every module convenor was required to compile an annual report detailing any issues that had arisen and providing plans for the future. In addition to this detailed analysis of the module evaluations would also be provided to the Heads of Departments and Head of School. The reports were also published on QMPlus to share good practice and provide an archive to aid in module development.
31. The Panel **commended** the culture of reflection present within the School, demonstrated by the sharing of module evaluations and feedback on QMPlus and the clear action taken to address any areas of concern.
32. The new level four Drama curriculum was made up of compulsory modules that offered teaching and learning that resembled that provided at Levels 5 and 6 including longer studio based sessions for practice based work. Additionally, a non-credit bearing module would be compulsory to manage the transition from Secondary to Higher Education, and aid in retention.
33. The new level five Drama curriculum contained three compulsory modules. 'Cultural Politics and Performance' was intended to introduce students to key philosophical and ethical debates about the nature and purpose of the theatre in relation to its cultural contexts; 'Group Practical Project' continued, as in the existing curriculum, to provide the opportunity for collaborative practice and greater independent work than at Level 4; and 'London Archives/Resources' introduced students to archival materials, and the resources that support the study of performance in London.
34. The level six Drama curriculum required students to undertake either the 'Written research Project' or the 'Practice-based research project'. The structure given by the curriculum at Levels 5 and 6 was intended to prepare students for the transition to greater independent research and artistic production. Additionally, a non-credit bearing module would be compulsory to manage the transition from University to careers, livelihoods and employment.
35. The English curriculum had been revised since the previous review so that all students at level four follow a common curriculum, providing a transition from sixth-form to Higher Education. At level five students were required to take elective modules from three areas of literature: Medieval and Early Modern Literature, Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Literature, and Modern and Contemporary Literature. Level six students were required to undertake a dissertation with other modules chosen from a wide range of electives.
36. The School reported that the modules provided were derived from the academic staff's research specialisms. In addition to informing students of the different areas of research, different areas of research skills and methods were embedded within the curriculum.
37. Following the success of the non-credit bearing modules that had previously been funded through a bid to the Faculty, the School had embedded the modules into

curriculum and timetable. Some funding would be provided for the budget for teaching provision. Much of the designated budget would provide funding for visiting speakers to aid employability.

38. The Drama department had introduced numerous innovative teaching methods. These included the use of Skype to facilitate distributed performances, and to give input to teaching fellows from international scholars; the development of artists' webpages and blogs; and following the establishment of the Written Research Project, the adaptation of the Practice-based Research Project.
39. The Panel **commended** the School's strength of curriculum, which was both regularly reviewed and ensured the appropriate integration of appropriate research at all levels of teaching.

### ***Postgraduate***

40. The School offered two postgraduate programmes including the MA in English Studies, which from 2014/15 had five specialist pathways reflecting the research expertise of staff. The MA in English Studies would offer two additional pathways from 2015/16.
41. The School reviewed the provision of postgraduate programmes annually and shared best practice and module evaluations on QMPlus. Since the last review a MA Programmes committee had been established within the English department to manage and provide guidance for the specialist pathways. Postgraduate Taught admissions were being run centrally by one academic administrator within each department.
42. The MA Theatre and Performance required students to undertake a 'Dissertation Preparation module' in the first semester. The School hoped to attract students interested in both academic and artistic careers, and catered for this by providing an optional placement module. The Panel noted that the variety of modules available was comparatively smaller than those offered at Level 6. It was unclear whether the School intended to expand the curriculum, as it would rely on an increase in student numbers, and facilities.
43. Recruitment onto the MA Theatre and Performance had improved since the last review, but still had the potential to increase. It was noted that some facilities were in high demand, and space was at a premium due to the London location, meaning that recruitment was restricted to small numbers.

### **Joint Honours Programmes**

44. The School led or contributed to thirteen Joint Honours programmes. In English all students taking English as part of a joint honours programmes had to take two compulsory modules at level four. In Drama all joint honours Drama students were required to take the same three compulsory modules as single honours Drama students.
45. It was noted that the curricula of some joint programmes were more integrated than others. In English and Drama, and English and History students took modules from

the two subject areas that were paired in methodological, thematic or historical terms. The pattern was not uniform across all joint programmes.

46. Student on Joint Honours English programmes were required to take varying compulsory modules. Those within Drama and English would take in English the Modules, Reading, Theory and Interpretation English Reading and Theory; and Shakespeare at level four. The History and Drama student curriculum was agreed with the School of History to provide thematic schemes of study.
47. The School noted that provision for joint honours programmes is an area that requires ongoing development. The School had a representative on the Joint Honours Programmes Coordinators group, and intended to integrate joint honours more closely into the business of the departmental teaching committees.
48. The English department had introduced additional pathways for the MA English Studies to allow greater specialisms and reflect staff research interests.
49. The Panel noted that the School may benefit from forming strategic partnerships to increase postgraduate taught numbers, and provide greater employability skills to graduates.
50. The Panel **recommended** that the School review the attractiveness of the curriculum and titles used to market postgraduate taught programmes to students.

### **Assessment and feedback**

51. In each department the relevant TSC discussed and reviewed assessment as required. TSC, in turn reported to the relevant department board, and where it was felt necessary, the School Board. Assessment was designed to measure the achievement of learning outcomes for each module. The appropriateness of the assessment was evaluated annually within the Module Reports, and amendments made where necessary.
52. The School had included a wide variety of both formative and summative assessments in the curriculum, including essays, presentations, examinations, and drama practical work. Much of the formative assessments were delivered through the use of QMPlus as it allowed the School to provide feedback quickly. Formative assessment at the earlier stages of a module was intended to offer both constructive feedback, and encourage student skill development for use in summative assessments.
53. Students were provided with generic grade-band criteria applicable to all modules on their programme. Additionally, they received a set of grade-band criteria specific to each of the academic levels. At module level criteria were provided for each of the assessment tasks. All criteria are provided to students online at the beginning of the academic year. The departments ensure that they discuss the different criteria used so that the School is consistent in its approach across the disciplines.
54. Postgraduate taught programmes are assessed by coursework including research based essays for each module. The essay provided preparation for the writing of the dissertation. Additionally, competence was developed through small group teaching

and individual sessions to discuss essay planning, or provide feedback on written work.

55. The use of a wide range of assessments in the undergraduate programmes was intended to allow students the opportunity to work in number of ways, developing their academic skills, whilst also preparing for the dissertation element at level 6. All modules (including the final year dissertation/project) included two assessments that included at least two different exercises, allowing for formative as well as summative feedback on the students' performance and for all relevant skills and knowledge to be assessed, whilst also contributing to the development of Graduate Attributes.
56. There was a clear sense of progression between developmental years, and the expectations of the students. Additionally, the use of assessments, and support throughout the curriculum prepared students for the large dissertation project. Feedback from students had been very positive, though the new curriculum had been introduced too recently for there to be a measurable effect on assessment results at the time of the review.

### ***Feedback on assessment***

57. The School's policy was to provide feedback within 17 working days. It was unclear whether all students were aware of this policy, and it was noted that students were provided with both soft copy feedback and hard copy written feedback, but staff reported that hard copy written feedback was often not collected, which suggested that students had limited interest in such feedback once the initial grade and soft copy feedback had been received.
58. Students explained that some module leaders gave students a specific date by which feedback would be returned; students had welcomed this approach.
59. The Panel noted that there was inconsistency between the student survey data relating to feedback and the comments provided by external examiners. The School reported that the feedback was usually very substantial, but was not always promptly delivered. The students that met with the Panel reported that the feedback they had received had been excellent, but they had not always been happy with the time it took to be receive it following submission of the assessment.
60. The School reported that it was unsure whether students were always aware when they were being provided with feedback. It was therefore a priority to ensure that students had the correct expectations relating to what kind of feedback they would receive, and what form this feedback would take.
61. Some postgraduate taught students reported that although the content of the feedback provided was beneficial the delay in returning it prevented development in advance of the next assessment.
62. The Panel **recommended** that the School ensure that postgraduate taught students receive appropriate feedback within term 1, and in any case prior to the submission of other pieces of assessment, providing students with the opportunity to progress and develop their skills throughout the programmes.

## **QUALITY OF LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES**

### ***Contact hours and delivery***

63. Teaching methods used in the School included lectures; seminars; writing-intensive workshops; fieldwork; practical workshops led by staff and visiting artists; group practical projects; collaborative and creative writing projects; performance, exhibition, and gallery visits; presentations by visiting writers and practitioners; induction in the use of appropriate technologies; small-group tutorials; and individual guidance and feedback on assessed work.
64. Lectures were rarely used in the Drama department as a core aspect of the teaching, except for some level 4 modules. The majority of level 5 and 6 Drama teaching was undertaken in practical workshops and/or seminars. Practical modules at level 5 and 6 were usually capped at 15 students.
65. Since the last review there had been a move within the School to reduce the size of seminar groups (in both English and Drama). The seminar groups had been reduced from 25 to 21 students per class.
66. The English department used lectures on all level 4 modules, and the majority of level 5 modules. Lecture based modules were often team taught, particularly where the module spanned a large period of time in history. Co-lecturing was also used, where lectures were written and delivered by two members of staff, thereby creating a dialogue within the lecture. Students noted that they found the dialogue interesting, and allowed them to better understand the different theories surrounding the subject.
67. Within seminars student participation played a large role in the delivery of learning. Students engaged in group discussions moderated by staff, and often had preparatory tasks. Group exercises often also played a role in the seminars. In the English department many Level 6 modules were taught solely by seminar, in Drama by seminar and practical workshop. A large number of modules used logbooks, learning journals, and portfolios to allow students to reflect on their learning. QMPlus allowed additional student participation via discussion and the setting of tasks prior to seminars.
68. To allow for the differing teaching methods, the School allocated funding through a Module Expenses procedure. Module convenors applied to the Head of the Department for funds to provide module related activities. These included payment of visitors, materials for performances, and subsidising outings. Convenors could receive up to £200 for a 15 credit module and up to £400 for a 30 credit module.

### ***Skills training and employability***

69. The Drama department had actively embedded employability within the curriculum. Placements in socially engaged and other theatre practice were introduced in certain optional modules. BA and MA modules were provided to introduce students to the creative and administrative work of the creative industries and provide contact with art producers and curators via visiting speakers and placements. The students engaged with theatre practice, the public domain and local groups in the London Boroughs of Hackney, Tower Hamlets and Newham.
70. In addition to the placement modules available, other modules offered by the Drama department offered students the opportunity to take part in practical workshops, talks from artists, and attend performances and presentations at external venues.

71. The School reported that it would like to further increase the work that students undertake with partners in the creative industries. A dedicated QMPlus page had been provided to publish opportunities such as apprenticeships, employment and internships. This area was available for both Drama and English students.
72. The Drama department had actively engaged with and developed opportunities to enhance employability and training. These include the AiR Supply scheme, to provide students contact with Artists in Residence opportunities and to support emerging artists graduating from Drama's programmes. Additionally, the Livelihood lunches where artists were invited to discuss their industry.
73. The Panel **commended** the School's efforts in embedding employability skills within the Drama programmes through:
- Links with Creative Industries.
  - Elective workshops.
  - Elements of the curriculum.
  - Artists in Residence project (AiR)
74. The English department reported that it was trying to learn from the Drama department and embed employability further in the curriculum. The department reported that it was aware of the transferable skills that students gained, but could provide greater formal skills development. The Careers Service had provided support when requested by the School.
75. The English students with whom the Panel met reported that they did not feel strongly supported with their potential careers and employability. These students felt that they were encouraged to progress into postgraduate study, but were not provided with the same level of support for developing their careers.
76. The Panel **recommended** that the School review the employability provisions within the English programmes, including examining the potential for increasing links with industry and employers.

### ***E-learning***

77. Since the last review the School had received a project grant from the Westfield Fund for Enhancing the Student Experience (2012) and used this to fund a School of English and Drama Practice and Style Homepage. The page provided advice and guidance on essay writing, academic referencing, and a step-by-step online citation tutorial, as well as advice about essay writing practice.
78. The School had encouraged the use of QMPlus across all modules and programmes and it had become embedded into the delivery of teaching across all programmes, and provided a consistent structure across the School.
79. The Panel noted that the School did not make extensive use Talis Aspire to provide reading lists, but that there appeared to be engagement with all other forms of e-learning. The majority of lectures were recorded on QReview, enabling students to expand their notes. The School reported that QReview had not impacted attendance at lectures.

## Staff Support and Development for Pedagogy

### *Induction and training*

80. All new members of academic staff underwent induction upon joining the School. This included an introduction to the culture of the School, led by the Head of School. Each member of staff was provided with a mentor to provide advice about the School, teaching and research, and also a Probation Advisor to advise about matters relating to probation.
81. The School also inducted all new members of staff into its administrative processes through a training session, led by the Director of Administration. Staff were also provided with training in QMplus and in module design.
82. Early Career Researchers were required to undertake QMUL's Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice (PGCAP), though exemptions were available for those with prior equivalent qualifications or experience. The School was working towards ensuring that all teaching staff had or were apply for a recognised qualified teaching status by 2019.
83. The School had welcomed QMUL's move to a points based training system as it allowed the departments to develop their own training, whilst still using that offered by the CAPD. Additionally, Teaching Assistants received formal training twice per semester in addition to the induction training.
84. The School had a Workload Allocation Model that was regularly updated and accessible by all staff. The Workload Allocation Model had been devised by the Head of School in consultation with the Heads of department, and was circulated to all staff, in addition to being posted on QMPlus.
85. The School had introduced a distributed appraisal scheme. All staff had the opportunity to appraise another staff member, regardless of seniority. The appraisal was written up by the relevant allocated member of staff, and any recommendations were provided to the Head of School. The School intended to allow staff of all levels to take part in the process as both appraiser and appraisee.
86. The School actively engaged in peer review. All teaching staff were subject to formal peer observation on an annual basis. Additionally, team teaching formed an established part of the culture of the School ensuring informal peer review throughout the academic year.
87. The Panel **commended** the School's collegial and transparent approach. The Panel noted the following examples:
  - The distributed appraisal scheme, and peer observation.
  - The development and implementation of the workload allocation model.
  - The intelligent use of team teaching, dual teaching, and individual teaching across all levels.
  - The commitment to staff development around learning and teaching at all stages of staff's careers.

### *Teaching Assistants*



88. The School employed a number of Teaching Assistants, both current PhD students, and post-doctoral. In the English department, separate School induction sessions were undertaken, one for new staff and one for Teaching Assistants, to complement the QMUL staff induction; in the Drama department a two-day induction was provided for new staff and Teaching Assistants, known as Teaching Associates, with parts of the induction reserved for those who were new to teaching. In addition to this a range of staff development activities and training opportunities were also run through the Centre for Academic and Professional Development at QMUL.
89. Both Departments offered Teaching Assistant workshops in both semesters that were integrated into the postgraduate research training programme, as well as English's day-long and Drama's two-day induction prior to the first semester of teaching and a Teaching Assistant Information Session in the Exam Term for prospective (English) Teaching Assistants. The topics addressed in the workshops included moderating, coping with different seminar dynamics, and giving effective feedback, teaching through theatre practice and curriculum development.
90. Teaching Assistants were used to provide teaching on undergraduate level 4 and 5 modules. Students informed the Panel that the teaching they had received by Teaching Assistants had been excellent and enjoyable. They also noted that it was often beneficial to receive teaching at level 4 from those who were closer to their age, as it allowed them to feel more comfortable in an unfamiliar environment. Where Teaching Assistants were used to mark work, the work would be second marked by a permanent member of academic staff.
91. Two training sessions for staff within the School (including Teaching Assistants) had been offered to provide guidance on how to respond to students in distress. The sessions had focused on mental health issues and their manifestation in teaching and pastoral contexts, these sessions were jointly run by the Disability and Dyslexia Service and Advice and Counselling, and tailored to address the students with mental health support needs within the School.
92. Teaching Assistants and visiting lecturers had use of a shared Faculty room on the ground floor of the Arts One building. This space includes two small meeting rooms where they could hold office hours, and access to computers and printing.

## **Student progression**

### ***Undergraduate***

93. Entry requirements for the programmes offered by the School were consistently high, whilst still offering flexibility for those applying from non-standard routes. The School assessed the majority of candidates for undergraduate places by interview, after pre-selection by a team of academic staff. Interview days were held between December and March each academic year.
94. Students were required to meet with their personal adviser formally twice a year; at the beginning and towards the end of the academic year. This allowed advisers to track students' progress through the module levels, and aimed to identify areas of weakness or concern prior to further action being required.

95. The School had been considering methods to address progression since the last review. The non-credit bearing modules offered at level 4 had been introduced to support student transition to higher education. Prior to this, the School had secured funding to set up the 'Step-up' programme. The programme was introduced to ensure students were aware of the support available, as well as encourage engagement with the School by providing weekly meetings.
96. The School had investigated the reasons for non-progression but had found it difficult to obtain the data. A working group had been established to investigate the reasons that students did not progress. The new level 4 module was designed to ensure that students learnt essential skills, whilst undertaking tasks relevant to the rest of the curriculum.
97. Additionally, the School was introducing late-summer resits in 2014/15, and hoped to offer support to those students who had failed at level 4, as well as identify the reasons for the failure.
98. The School reported in the past students from minority ethnic backgrounds had recorded results above the average, that recently this had not been the case. The School was therefore establishing a working group to identify the reasons, and address the issue.
99. The Panel queried whether there was a follow up for students that did not progress. The School reported that although it was hoped that students would discuss with their academic advisor prior to ending their studies they did not always do so. It was reported that students on Drama programmes were often unaware that the programme would be different to A level Theatre Studies.
100. In 2013-14 the 20.7% of single honours students achieved a 1<sup>st</sup> class degree, and 35.1% of joint honours students achieved a 1<sup>st</sup> class degree. The School therefore noted that although progression rates had been lower than hoped, the awards achieved by completing students were positive.

### ***Postgraduate taught***

101. The School had maintained postgraduate taught completion levels of approximately 85% between 2010/11 and 2012/13. There had been a slight rise in the number of enrolments across all PGT programmes, but the numbers remained small.
102. Students on PGT programmes within the School undertook a compulsory non-credit bearing module to prepare them for the dissertation. This was intended to provide them with the relevant research skills they would require for both the dissertation and further academic study.
103. The students with whom the Panel met indicated that although they felt supported and enjoyed studying at QMUL and within the School, they were aware of a gap between the PGT and PGR students in regards to research opportunities available. The PGT students praised the programme, and the staff support they had received, including prior to their enrolment, when staff had been happy to answer queries, and provide advice.

## **MAINTENANCE AND ENHANCEMENT OF STANDARDS AND QUALITY**

104. The School followed all standard QMUL procedures for the maintenance and enhancement of standards and quality. These included Annual Programme Review, scrutiny of assessment processes and external examiner comments through the Subject Examination Boards, and the consideration of policy matters through the School committee structure. The School also operated Student-Staff Liaison Committees, and engaged with a number of national and local surveys to canvas student opinion.
105. Module and programme proposals, were completed using the standard QMUL template, and discussed at the department TSC. When appropriate the Taught Programmes Board viewed programme amendments or proposals for new programmes, and these were reviewed by ARCS prior to submission. Proposals for new programmes required the advice of external colleagues. Module proposals, amendments, and withdrawals that did not form part of a new or revised programme were approved by the TSC, and subsequently ratified by the department boards.
106. External examiners formed an essential element of the maintenance and enhancement of academic standards within the School. Within the School external examiners were invited to contribute to the development of the curriculum. During the recent curriculum review in the Drama department, the undergraduate external examiner had been consulted on the proposed changes and provided feedback. Both undergraduate and postgraduate external examiners for the Drama department were invited to see assessed performance, and, where this was not possible, to view filmed documentation of work that had formed part of a module assessment.

#### **Acting on staff feedback**

107. Staff were given the opportunity to feedback on modules and programmes at departmental boards, TSCs, and meetings of the MA Committee (English). The annual module reports written by module convenors, required feedback from all staff who had provided teaching on the module. Module reports were posted on QMPlus, where staff were able to provide feedback.
108. Staff provided informal feedback whilst undertaking team teaching. Teams of teachers and teaching assistants that had collaborated on modules discussed teaching and provided feedback. In the past two years both departments had undertaken major curriculum review meetings, where all staff were encouraged to contribute.

#### **Student feedback**

109. The Panel discussed with staff the mechanisms for gathering student feedback on teaching and the learning environment. These included:
  - Staff-Student Liaison Committees (SSLCs) at UG and PGT level;
  - PGR representation on the Graduate Studies Committee;
  - the student course representative system;
  - module evaluation questionnaires;

- analysis of the National Student Survey (NSS), Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES), Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES), and other student surveys;
  - informal contact between students and programme and module leads.
110. Each module convenor was required to produce a short report each year reflecting on each set of module evaluations and the success and difficulties of delivering the module during that academic year. These reports as well as the full details of the module evaluation results were shared on QMPlus to be used by staff to help develop the curriculum. Issues raised by the report were discussed at TSCs and were further considered by the department boards and School Management Group.
111. Students had access to module evaluation results for the School via the ARCS webpages. A digest of the evaluations together with an account of the proposed actions was a standing agenda item for November meetings of the SSLCs.
112. The students with whom the Panel met reported that the course representative system worked very well, and that a social media site was used to gather feedback from the cohort of students. However, it was also noted that an open forum for all students would be beneficial to provide greater student feedback.
113. The results of the National Student Survey for both English and Drama had been consistently high, with both departments scoring above both 90% in the last 5 years. The 'Teaching on my Course' area of the survey increased from 98% to 100% for Drama programmes in 2014. In 2014 the averages overall placed Drama 14 points above the sector average, and English 1 point above the sector average.
114. The results of the Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey showed 90% overall satisfaction from students, but only 50% of students feeling feedback was prompt and only 52.2% feeling library resources were up to expectations. The School did receive the highest response rate across QMUL, with 40%.

## **POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH**

115. Responsibility for Postgraduate research (PGR) students was shared by a team within the School led by the School Director of Graduate Studies, and including a Director of Graduate Studies for the Department of Drama, and within the Department of English, a Director of Graduate Studies for current students, a Director of Graduate Studies for admissions, and a Director of Graduate Studies for training. The School Director of Graduate Studies reports to the Associate Dean for Research, and sits on the Dean for Research's Advisory Group. Administrative support was provided by the Research and Graduate Studies Manager.
116. The School has a strong record for PhD submission and completion rates. And this had been supported by the development of central monitoring; Doctoral College supervisor training; and expanding research training to PGR students.

### ***Admissions***

117. The School reported that PGR applications to the departments were healthy. The English department received 77 applications for Principal's Studentships in 2013-14;

the Drama department received 27 applications. Both departments encourage interested applicants to complete an initial enquiry form before proceeding to full application. This allowed the Director of Graduate Studies to consult with potential supervisors and to offer feedback if appropriate. All applications were circulated by the Director of Graduate Studies to appropriate staff, in the case of attractive proposals contact was established between the potential supervisor, and applications were usually turned around within two weeks.

118. The School attracted a variable number of Principal's Studentships by competition within the Faculty. Individual students were selected by the School and submitted to a Faculty committee; successful applicants were then selected by comparison with other applications across HSS.
119. The Panel queried whether the School was capable of supervising greater numbers of PhD students. It was reported that although the School had the capacity to supervise more students the available funding did not allow for this. The School also expressed concern that the outcomes of successful studentships were often delivered too late to keep those students who had been accepted or offered funding at competing institutions.
120. The Panel supported the School's desire to increase the number of PhD students, and **recommended** that QMUL should review the internal mechanisms for bidding for internal scholarships.

### ***Induction and Mentoring***

121. New PGR students were given a supervisory team including a supervisor, usually established during the application period, and a second supervisor, appointed during the first semester. All primary supervisors were required to have seen a PhD student through to completion, either at QMUL or another institution. A junior member of staff could qualify by seeing a PhD student through to completion as a second supervisor. All new QMUL supervisors were required to attend a supervisor-training course run by the Doctoral College, and/or a refresher course every five years.
122. Since the last review the majority of staff had established recorded supervisions. The minimum number of meetings between student and supervisor was ten. The PGR students were asked to write a meeting record after each meeting. The online supervision recording system on MySIS had been used since its introduction. Students used the system to log each meeting with the supervisor, and the record was then approved by the supervisor. The use of the system was mandatory, and ensured that all supervisions with all supervisors were recorded and easily accessible by all members of the supervisory team.

### ***Training***

123. Research training in the School was overseen by the Departmental Director of Graduate Studies, and delivered by different members of staff, and occasionally additional skill-specific tutors. All students were required to accrue 210 credits of training over their three years, in four categories: Knowledge and intellectual abilities; Personal effectiveness; Research Organisation; and Engagement and impact. Students could also gain credits for additional activities taken outside QMUL, for example speaking at a conference.

124. Students recorded their training (and thus their credits) on the Skills Points Database on QMplus. Additional training was provided by both the Faculty and the Centre for Academic and Professional Development, and students were given access to all training sessions through the events calendar on the Doctoral College website. Training was overseen and discussed at student annual review, when the supervisor ensured that training needs were being met. Additional training sessions were sometimes introduced as a consequence of the annual reviews.
125. The Students with whom the Panel met praised the opportunities available to them for both training and additional research interests. It was also noted that the students felt part of a research community within both the School and at QMUL

### ***Progression***

126. The School followed the standard QMUL progression policy, with a progression review or transfer eight or nine months after registration. PGR students submitted a portfolio of work that included a detailed research and writing schedule, and a chapter-length writing sample. The work was then assessed by an independent assessor and the supervisor. The team's report on the submission was assessed and approved by the Director for Graduate Studies.
127. Since the last review PGR students in their second or third year had received an annual review in July or August. The students had submitted an assessment of their progress, including a record of their training and a piece of written work. The supervisor also completed an evaluation of the progress. The second supervisor would then examine the submissions and provide an independent assessment of the student's progress. The second supervisor then met with the student and produced a report. The student was also invited to submit an optional report on supervision to help identify any problems in supervision or areas requiring development or support.
128. From the academic year 2015-16 the School was intending to replace the annual review with the second and third year progression. This exercise would be similar to the first year progression review. In order to ensure the independence of the review the executive authority would lie with the Director for Graduate Studies.

## **LEARNING RESOURCES**

### **Library provision**

129. The School's annual book purchasing budget has increased to the Russell Group average for the disciplines, and was now £34000. Both departments had a library representative who worked with the Subject Librarian, and in English a library representative from each of the Subject Area Groups has recently been appointed. Both a member of staff and a student from the School serve on the Library Users' Committee. Students at all levels were encouraged to explore and make use of the collections at Senate House Library.
130. Student feedback through the NSS placed satisfaction with library resources behind other areas of satisfaction. The PTES also placed library satisfaction at only 52%. The students with whom the Panel met indicated dissatisfaction with core texts not being available at the Mile End Campus. Although students were able to find books at Senate House and other London libraries, they felt that they should be able to

access relevant core reading within the central library.

131. The School indicated that students were expected to develop their research and investigative skills by identifying texts in other libraries. Assessments had been put in place on certain modules to ensure students had to look outside of the QMUL library.

### **Specialist Equipment**

132. The students with whom the Panel met indicated that they had difficulty when specialist equipment was required for their work. The University did not have a wide range of creative arts and design departments, and students indicated that they felt there was reduced capacity as a result for using specialist equipment. Additionally, it was noted that specialist computer equipment including MACs were difficult to access. It was noted that although the School of Languages, Linguistics and Film owned a Film Suite, and Electronic Engineering and Computer Science possessed equipment, it was only accessible to students from within these Schools.
133. The Panel **recommended** that the School ensure appropriate specialist equipment and resources are available to students, where appropriate through collaboration with other Schools within QMUL such as the School of Languages, Linguistics and Film, and the School of Electronic Engineering and Computer Science.

### **Space Requirements**

134. The School reported that the Drama department required space in order to offer practical modules, to carry out practice-based research and to continue to develop links with artists and cultural organisations. The department had identified an issue with increasing recruitment considering the space constraints.
135. As student numbers had increased the Drama programmes had developed to include more specific and focused teaching and learning in the fields of scenography, technical theatre, multi-media and digital performance, installation and immersive performance, space had become a key issue in ensuring that Drama at QMUL offered teaching and learning experiences comparable to competitor institutions. Since the last Review, Drama had acquired a new 'blackbox' rehearsal studio, Rehearsal Room Three, and 50% usage of the new Film and Drama Studio in the new Arts Two building, a studio with high-specification sound and lighting facilities.
136. Although the department had gained some space for practical teaching it had also lost use of the People's Palace Drama Studio, the Teaching Associate's Room and Design Suite, People's Palace basement storage and the postgraduate space.
137. In the Planning and Accountability Review 2014-15, the School had requested funds for the booking of external professional performance space for the teaching and assessment of third year students and for the refurbishment of the rehearsal rooms, to include modern audio-visual and Wi-Fi equipment. The School was in discussion with QMUL to address the space concerns.

### **Electronic learning resources**

138. The School had embraced the College's online environment, and had been one of the leaders within the Faculty in rolling out QMPlus. It had been integrated into every

level of teaching across Levels 4-7, and staff were expected to provide weekly resources and updates.

139. The School noted that it had not been possible to provide all resources electronically due to copyright laws. In addition to this the School reported that students had reported that they preferred receiving hard copy materials. The School had provided students with study packs on an annual basis, to ensure they had access to key texts.



## COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

140. The Panel's commendations and recommendations are summarised below.

### Commendations

#### Achievement

141. The Panel commended the School's excellent results in both the National Student Survey and the Research Excellence Framework; indicating the international standing of the School, and the School's ability to combine research strengths, innovative programmes, and the student experience. (para 9.)

#### Curriculum Development

142. The Panel commended the School's strength of curriculum, which was both regularly reviewed and ensured the appropriate integration of appropriate research at all levels of teaching. (para. 39.)

#### Employability

143. The Panel commended the School's efforts in embedding employability skills within the Drama programmes through:

- Links with Creative Industries.
- Elective workshops.
- Elements of the curriculum.
- Artists in Residence project (AiR) (para.73.)

#### Staff

144. The Panel commended the School's collegial and transparent approach. The Panel noted the following examples:

- The distributed appraisal scheme, and peer observation.
- The development and implementation of the workload allocation model.
- The intelligent use of team teaching, dual teaching, and individual teaching across all levels.
- The commitment to staff development around learning and teaching at all stages of staff's careers. (para.87.)

145. The Panel commended the culture of reflection present within the School, demonstrated by the sharing of module evaluations and feedback on QMPlus and the clear action taken to address any areas of concern. (para.31.)

## **Recommendations**

### Employability

146. The Panel recommended that the School review the employability provisions within the English programmes, including examining the potential for increasing links with industry and employers. (para.76.)

### Resources

147. The Panel recommended that the School ensured appropriate specialist equipment and resources are available to students, where appropriate through collaboration with other Schools within QMUL such as the School of Languages, Linguistics and Film, and the School of Electronic Engineering and Computer Science. (para.133.)

### Assessment and Feedback

148. The Panel recommended that the School ensure that postgraduate taught students receive appropriate feedback within term 1, and in any case prior to the submission of other pieces of assessment, providing students with the opportunity to progress and develop their skills throughout the programmes. (para.62.)

### Internationalisation

149. The Panel recommended that the School further consider and develop an international partnership, in line with the new HSS strategy, to provide strategic development, as well as increased opportunities for the recruitment of overseas students. (para.23.)

### Postgraduate Taught

150. The Panel recommended that the School review the attractiveness of the curriculum and titles used to market postgraduate taught programmes to students. (para.50.)

## **Recommendations to QMUL**

### Internal Scholarships

151. The Panel supported the School's desire to increase the number of PhD students, and recommended that the College review the internal mechanisms for bidding for internal scholarships. (para.120.)

Ruth Wilkinson

Academic Standards and Quality Officer

ARCS

**Briefing Materials provided for the review of the School of English and Drama**

The Review Panel received a copy of the School's Self-Evaluation Document (SED) produced in accordance with QMUL guidance informed by the Quality Assurance Agency's Guidelines. The briefing material to support the SED comprised the following information:

1. UG & PGT programme specifications
  - a. BA Drama
  - b. BA English and Drama
  - c. BA English and Film Studies
  - d. BA English and History
  - e. BA English Literature and Linguistics
  - f. BA English
  - g. BA Film Studies and Drama
  - h. MA English Studies
  - i. MA Theatre and Performance
2. Strategy documents
  - a. HSS Strategic Plan 2010-15
  - b. QMUL Strategic Plan 2010-15
  - c. HSS Draft Strategy 2015-19
  - d. QMUL Strategy 2014-19
  - e. School of English and Drama Teaching and Learning Strategy 2014
3. Curriculum Review 2015
4. Assessment and Feedback
  - a. Assessment and Feedback Guide
  - b. CAPD Assessment and Feedback Guide
  - c. Drama Feedback Summary
  - d. English Feedback Summary
  - e. QMUL Code of Practice on Assessment and Feedback
5. Annual Programme Review Report
6. Committee Minutes
  - a. Drama Department Board 2012/13, 2013/14, 2014/15
  - b. Drama Research and Graduate Studies Committee 2012/13, 2013/14, 2014/15
  - c. Drama Student Staff Liaison Committee 2012/13, 2013/14, 2014/15
  - d. Drama Teaching and Student Support Committee 2012/13, 2013/14, 2014/15
  - e. English Department Board 2012/13, 2013/14, 2014/15
  - f. English Research and Graduate Studies Committee 2012/13, 2013/14, 2014/15
  - g. English Student Staff Liaison Committee 2012/13, 2013/14, 2014/15
  - h. English Teaching and Student Support Committee 2012/13, 2013/14, 2014/15
  - i. School E-Strategy Group
7. External Examiner Reports 2012/13, 2013/14, 2014/15
8. NSS and PTES 2010-2014 results

**Programmes of Study offered by the School of English and Drama in 2014/15**

**Taught undergraduate programmes**

- BA Drama
- BA English

**Taught undergraduate joint programmes**

- BA Film Studies and Drama
- BA French and Drama
- BA German and Drama
- BA Hispanic Studies and Drama
- BA Russian and Drama
- BA English and History
- BA English and Drama
- BA English Literature and Linguistics
- BA English and Film Studies
- BA English and French
- BA English and German
- BA English and Hispanic Studies
- BA English and Russian

**Taught postgraduate programmes**

- MA Theatre and Performance
- MA English Studies: English Literature
- MA English Studies: Writing in the Modern Age
- MA English Studies: Contemporary Writing
- MA English Studies: Early Modern Studies, 1300-1700
- MA English Studies: Eighteenth-Century Literature and Romanticism
- MA English Studies: Victorian Literature