

## Periodic Review Overview

### Summary

This paper provides the following information on Periodic Review for the year 2017-18:

- Overview report on themes and matters for consideration. (p. 2)
- Interim schedule of Periodic Review Events for 2018-19 (this will be updated once finalised) (p. 12)

This report was considered and approved by Educational Quality Committee at its meeting in September 2018. Periodic Review Reports for the following programmes that this report covers can be found in the Educational Quality Committee paper here

[https://www.city.ac.uk/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0009/434457/Item-17-Periodic-Review-Overview-Report-for-17-18.pdf](https://www.city.ac.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0009/434457/Item-17-Periodic-Review-Overview-Report-for-17-18.pdf):

- Masters in Innovation, Creativity and Leadership (MICL)
- PG Quantitative Cluster (*MSc Financial Mathematics, MSc Mathematical Trade and Finance, MSc Quantitative Finance*)
- LLB/GELLB
- MSc Health Management
- PG. Cert. /MSc Medical Ultrasound
- MSc Maritime Operations Management
- MSc Coastal and Marine Engineering Management
- PG Aviation Cluster (*MSc Aviation Management, MSc Air Safety Management, MSc Aircraft Maintenance Management, MSc Air Transport Management*)

Two actions required.

### Recommended Action

Senate is asked to:

- To **consider** the overview report for 2017-18
- To **consider** the recommendations for City arising from Periodic Reviews.

**Publication: Open**

## Overview Report 2017-18

The Periodic Review Policy gives full details of the aims of the Periodic Review. In summary, each department/discipline will take part in the process on a 5-6 year cyclical basis. The Periodic Review forms part of City, University of London's framework for the management of the quality and standards of provision. In addition, it aims to gain an understanding of developments, provisions, and changes undergone by the programme(s) under review. It involves the Programme Teams, current students and Alumni, and the School Management Team, with the aim of gaining greater understanding of the provision available, and the strategic direction of the Department/discipline.

Additionally, Periodic Review is designed to support the realisation of the University's Vision and Strategy, and Education and Student Strategy, to ensure that Programmes are demonstrating commitment to high quality education, and the continuous enhancement of learning opportunities for students.

The 2017/18 Periodic Review outcomes highlighted a number of key themes, alongside some programme-specific themes, which are covered below. This report seeks to offer a flavour of the types of activities being undertaken in each area, and draw out what students, in particular, like about their programmes. It also addresses areas of good practice and innovative or successful development activities.

The 2017-18 Periodic Review cycle was very busy with 18 programmes across 10 events undergoing Review. This cycle is representative of the increasing Periodic Review activity over the next 5-7 years, reflecting the continuing growth of provision. Three planned Reviews did not take place due to the unavailability of either Senior Staff or External Advisors, and will take place prior to December 2018. The final Review of the 2017-18 cycle is planned for the end of September and will consequently be included in the overview report for 2018-19.

The Periodic Review Reports for 2017-18 indicate a successful year of Reviews, with many of the Panels commenting on the dedication of Programme and Support staff, the commitment to academic excellence and offering a number of examples of good practice.

This report covers the following programmes/programme clusters:

- Masters in Innovation, Creativity and Leadership (MICL)
- PG Quantitative Cluster (*MSc Financial Mathematics, MSc Mathematical Trade and Finance, MSc Quantitative Finance*)
- LLB/GELLB
- MSc Health Management
- PG. Cert. /MSc Medical Ultrasound
- MSc Construction Management
- MSc Civil Engineering Structures
- MSc Maritime Operations Management

- MSc Coastal and Marine Engineering Management
- MSc Project Management, Finance and Risk
- MSc Energy, Environmental Technologies, and Economics
- PG Aviation Cluster (*MSc Aviation Management, MSc Air Safety Management, MSc Aircraft Maintenance Management, MSc Air Transport Management*)

**Note:** the reports for MSc Construction Management, MSc Civil Engineering and MSc Project Management, Finance and Risk, and MSc Energy, Environmental Technologies, and Economics were pending finalisation at the time of writing.

Educational Offer/Effectiveness of Programmes .....	3
Academic Standards and Student Achievement .....	5
Student Support and Resources .....	7
Student Community, Alumni and Graduate Engagement and Feedback.....	8
Issues and Challenges.....	10
Recommendations.....	11

### **Educational Offer/Effectiveness of Provision**

#### *PANELS HIGHLIGHTED THE FOLLOWING GOOD PRACTICE*

A common theme, noted by all Review Panels, was the use of innovative teaching and assessment methods. The Panel for MSc Medical Ultrasound commented specifically on the use of innovative delivery methods for teaching ergonomics and safety with regards to scanning equipment.

The Reviews reflected the interdisciplinarity embedded within a large proportion of the programmes under Review, considering this to be a key strength of many of the programmes. The Panel for MSc Energy, Environmental Technologies, and Economics (EETE) commented specifically on how the programme balanced the varied, and sometimes conflicted, aspects of the programme in order to provide a thorough understanding of the subject for the students. Similarly, students from the Masters in Innovation, Creativity and Leadership (MICL) commented that the diverse and interdisciplinary nature of the skills being taught was a key factor in their recruitment to the programme, and they felt it would benefit them moving into employment.

Many of the reports noted the excellent educational relationships with, and value of, the extensive Visiting Lecturer team at City. Commenting on the inclusion of professional experience, academic expertise and exposure to industry, the Panels were unanimous in their appreciation for, and approval of, this model. The Programme Team for the PG Aviation Cluster received a particular mention for their effective management of the ‘well-qualified and diverse visiting lecturers’, commenting particularly on the robust management system and resilience planning which the Programme Team had embedded into practice. Panels noted, though, that substantial Visiting Lecturer involvement did introduce an element of risk, and this will be discussed later in the report.

#### *WHAT STUDENTS LIKE*

All students commented on the variety of learning opportunities available to them, and the developing portfolio of diverse assessment. The opportunity to interact with industry experts also garnered praise from all student and alumni groups, with many agreeing that this enhanced their academic understanding and offered a vital resource in terms of employability.

The students and alumni from MSc Energy, Environmental Technologies, and Economics (EETE) reported that the breadth of programme content and engagement from visiting lecturers and industry experts had exposed them to career opportunities previously unrecognised, and agreed that the programme would provide the necessary skills to pursue these.

Of particular note within the Reviews was:

- MSc Health Management, who, in response to student feedback, have incorporated an element of 'work audit' into their group assignments, requiring students to reflectively self-evaluate their contribution to the project and award themselves a grade.
- MSc Health Management, who evidenced an impressive array of formative and summative assignments, offering students multiple opportunities for feedback. The Student and Alumni group confirmed that the feedback had been an invaluable part of their learning.

#### *DEVELOPMENTS SINCE LAST REVIEW*

The Panels noted where there had been significant amendment to programmes, and noted that cumulative minor changes within programmes had not constituted significant change.

The Review Panel for the LLB/GELLB programmes noted significant changes to the content and structure of the programme, due to changes in the professional regulations which govern the programme. The Panel for this Review was asked to consider the new programme alongside evaluative data, and was able to approve the new programme. The Panel commended the Programme and Senior Teams for the extensive work, coherent approach and quality of thought evident in the documentation and discussion.

The Law School was also commended for its commitment to provide training resources for staff, specifically focused on learning and teaching, to support delivery of the new programme. This strategic decision demonstrated the School's proactive approach to delivering high-quality provision, and significant forethought in planning to accommodate a changing learning environment.

#### *PLANS FOR THE FUTURE*

Many of the Reviews discussed the difficulty of providing students with accurate programme information as early as the students may like it. This was particularly pertinent to programmes where significant change had taken place or was planned for the future.

All Programme Teams were encouraged to make every effort, often in light of the Competition and Market Authority guidelines, to ensure that published information is as accurate as it can be, prior to publication.

The Senior Team for the MICL Review expressed conflicting views on how this programme may develop, moving forwards. Some expressed the view that aligning the programme more closely with Cass and more effectively integrating the programme into the catalogue should be the priority, whilst others believed that remaining on the current trajectory and expanding the elective choice

would increase recruitment. The Panel was agreed that the Programme Team needed to do further work to evaluate these options, noting that, in either case, the distinctive nature of the programme should be retained.

## **Academic Standards and Student Achievements**

### *PANELS HIGHLIGHTED THE FOLLOWING AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE*

All Panels noted the commitment, dedication and demonstrable expertise of the academic staff within each department. The Review Panel for MSc Maritime Operations Management & MSc Coastal and Marine Engineering Management was particularly impressed with the composition and management of the Industry Advisory Board for these programmes, recognising that the blend of industry experts, and members from accrediting and professional bodies, alongside the Honourable Group of Master Mariners was both supportive and prestigious. The group worked to ensure that the curriculum was relevant to industry needs and, therefore, supported student employability, as well as reaffirming the programmes' relevance to practice.

The Review Panel for the MSc Quantitative cluster specifically commended the academic content and rigour of the programme, noting that the programmes struck a careful balance between practical training and theoretical knowledge. The students felt that this rigour gave them a competitive advantage in the workplace, and praised the supportive classroom environment for offering them various opportunities to improve their understanding of complex subjects.

Many of the reports commented on the strong industry focus of the programme, and the need to balance this strength of teaching alongside pertinent research. The Review of EETE noted that the permanent programme staff were highly research active, and had developed a culture of research-led teaching. The Review Panel was agreed that the programme maximised this research, with the input of relevant external speakers to produce well-informed, highly employable graduates.

### *WHAT STUDENTS LIKE*

Of particular note, were:

- All Panels noted the valuable contributions of Visiting and Guest lecturers made to provision at City. The students spoke highly of their ability to cross educational and industry boundaries, and offer a connection to the relevant professions, as well as appreciating the variety and interest they added to programmes. Panels noted, though, that over-reliance on such provision introduced risk and this will be discussed later in this report.
- The students from Law commented specifically on the Microplacements module, and the School efforts to introduce more employability and skills-focussed modules. These new modules were seen as very valuable in offering students the opportunity to strengthen both their academic and professional capabilities.
- The Review Panel for MSc Maritime Operations Management & MSc Coastal and Marine Engineering Management commended the range of visits on offer on the programme, with the students confirming that these visits provided an invaluable connection between theory and practice. Specifically, the students discussed the visit to the International Maritime

Organisation, agreeing that this strengthened their understanding of the taught material and supported their preparation for employment.

- The students from EETE spoke very highly of the industry involvement in the programme, with one student who met with the Review Panel explaining that they were pursuing a dissertation with an external company, using an external advisor to support the project. The Panel was agreed that industry involvement in this programme offered vital exposure for students.

#### *DEVELOPMENTS SINCE LAST REVIEW*

All programmes reported developments since their last Review, and the Panels noted the following:

- The Review Panel for the LLB/GELLB noted that there were plans to integrate the professional expertise of the PG team into Programme Stage 3 of the LLB, to offer students greater industry exposure and to create 'feed-through' from UG to PG within the School.
- The students from MSc Maritime Operations Management & MSc Coastal and Marine Engineering Management observed that the order of module delivery had changed, and confirmed that this was a very welcome development on the programme. The Panel commended the Programme Team for their responsiveness to this feedback.
- The Review Panel for the MSc Quantitative cluster commended the strategic development of a common first term which recognised the cyclical nature of recruitment, and served to protect provision across all of the programmes by building in synergies and efficiencies across the wider Cass portfolio. The Panel was agreed that the new structure provided a strong and flexible basis for delivery and would allow additional agility moving forwards.

#### *PLANS FOR THE FUTURE*

A common theme in the Reports was the need to improve the consistency and timeliness of communications with students, particularly around programme and module information, and assessments.

The Reports demonstrate, though, that plans for development were very programme-specific, rather than in response to University-wide considerations. This suggests a high degree of compliance with University Policy in the programmes reviewed in 2017-18.

Particularly mentioned, were:

- The Review Panel for MSc Medical Ultrasound advised the Programme Team to seek an exception to the Senate Regulations to allow an extension to the maximum period of registration (currently 5 years). The Panel felt that this could particularly disadvantage female students who may have one or more pregnancies during this time.
- The MSc Quantitative cluster discussed plans to alter the function and structure of the Advisory Board for the programme. It was felt that the current structure facilitated too great a focus on individual programme interests, rather than being accountable for strategic guidance and developments which could be enacted at School-level. The Panel agreed that the decision to move to a broader, School-level Advisory Board would allow for a greater diversity of experience and opinion and would support the overall direction of the programmes and enhance the student experience.

## **Student Support and Resources**

### *PANELS HIGHLIGHTED THE FOLLOWING AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE*

All Panels commended the Programme and Senior Teams, alongside the professional and administrative services, for their commitment to providing excellent support to students. Of particular note were the Course Officers for the MSc Quantitative Cluster, MSc Aviation Cluster, MSc Maritime Operations Management & MSc Coastal and Marine Engineering Management and EETE.

Many of the reports comment on the interdisciplinary nature of the programmes, but the report for the MICL notes the diversity and complexity of the cohort as a unique and beneficial feature. Ably supported by the academic staff, the students commented that this diversity fostered creativity and excellence.

Responding directly to student feedback, the Law School recognised that students were becoming disengaged with the year-long, 30-credit modules, agreeing that the time between learning and assessment was too great and did not offer students the opportunity to accurately reflect their learning. As such, these modules have been removed and redesigned as part of the wider suite of changes.

Whilst a number of the Reports confirm that personal tutoring arrangements are clear and consistent, several comment on the need for a greater degree of consistency in this area and have conditions and/or recommendations to support this development. To ensure further enhancement in this area it will be included in the recommendations arising from this report.

### *WHAT STUDENTS LIKE*

Of particular note, were:

- The wealth of experience demonstrated by the Programme Team for MSc Maritime Operations Management & MSc Coastal and Marine Engineering Management, and the obvious pride they have in their students' achievements. The international students on these programmes commented very positively about the support on offer for them, focusing on the responsiveness of the team and the quality of the pastoral support available.
- The student and alumni group from the MSc Aviation cluster spoke very highly of the student induction workshop. A large proportion of the cohort had not previously engaged in higher education and felt that the workshop served to familiarise students with the processes which would govern their learning, and to introduce the academic expectations in a supportive environment. They also said that the format of the induction created a very strong sense of programme identity and fostered practices of community, sharing ideas and networking.
- Students from the MSc Health Management programme were encouraged to enter the CitySparks business competition and a couple of teams from the programme had taken up the opportunity. The students involved explained that it had provided an opportunity to build and enrich their skills and experience.

### *DEVELOPMENTS SINCE LAST REVIEW*

All of the reports noted the importance of School responsiveness to student feedback. Of particular note were the Programme Team for the MSc Project Management, Finance and Risk (PMFR), in

response to student feedback, created a new module - *Introductory Mathematics* – to support those students from a non-qualitative background.

The changes proposed as part of the LLB/GELLB Review saw significant changes around assessment, particularly around improving student workload management and an increased variety of assessment types. In an example of best practice, student feedback, gathered prior to the Review, cited this as an example of the ongoing support for their academic achievement and commitment to their experience, which characterised the programme.

#### *PLANS FOR FUTURE*

There were frequent recommendations across the Reviews to improve the quality of the student-facing documentation, including the Student Handbooks, programme and module specifications. Whilst there were examples of good practice, recommendations to continue collaborative working with LEaD, and a greater attention to detail in published material (both hard-copy and web-based), were present.

There were also several instances of needing to increase resilience in the staffing structures for programmes to provide a greater degree of consistency and experience for the students. This was predominantly focused on better forward-planning and minimising reliance on Visiting Lecturers, where possible and appropriate.

A number of programmes had undergone significant staff changes since the last Review, particularly in the role of Programme Director. In particular, EETE had seen two changes of Programme Director since 2008. The Reports recommend unreserved support for the Programme Directors, and encourage the Senior Teams and wider School teams to offer this where possible.

### **Student Community, Alumni and Graduate Engagement, and Feedback**

#### *PANELS HIGHLIGHTED THE FOLLOWING GOOD PRACTICE*

The Reviews were agreed that, where relationships with Professional Bodies were existent, these were strong and well-maintained. It was also noted that the inclusion of industry expertise, and exposure to the industry, outside of academia, was of benefit to students.

All of the Reports also note the commitment, maturity and enthusiasm of the students involved in the student group meetings. Many of the Reports also demonstrate the significant, localised efforts to develop and strengthen alumni relations, with many reports citing specific instances of alumni involvement as examples of best practice.

Of particular note in this area was the MSc Quantitative cluster who discussed the offer to the alumni network for 'lifelong learning', a scheme within Cass Business School which allows graduates to return to audit modules, should they wish. The Review Panel was agreed that this would create personal and lasting relationships with alumni and encourage their input into future programme developments.

The Panels for MICL and PMFR both noted particular strengths in the synergy between the programme and the cohort – each supporting and developing the other. The students and alumni from the MICL programme demonstrated loyalty and energy towards the programme and their experience, which reportedly came from the creative and supportive nature of the programme. The

PMFR students argued strongly that the interdisciplinary approach to the programme facilitated success for students from a wide range of backgrounds.

#### *WHAT STUDENTS LIKE*

Of particular note, were:

- Placements and the importance of industry input were common themes. Students from the MSc Health Management articulated the importance of targeted, specific placements as a key driver for recruitment and highlighted the value of these supportive activities.
- The Panel drew on written submissions from Alumni and current students on the MSc Aviation cluster programmes, and commended the boundless energy, enthusiasm and commitment to excellence demonstrated by the Programme Team.
- The student and alumni group for EETE commented on the efforts of the Course Officer team to retain engagement between teaching blocks, and the quality of support on offer for the duration of their studies. The students also noted their appreciation of the involvement of programme alumni, often as guest speakers and Visiting Lecturers. The Review Panel commended the team in this regard.
- The students from MSc Health Management were very positive about the international outlook of the programme, and how the students were encouraged to research sector practice from around the world. As a substantial percentage of the cohort were not UK-based, the international focus of the programme fostered intellectual curiosity and could be incorporated well into group work and discussion.

#### *DEVELOPMENTS SINCE LAST REVIEW*

All Reviews noted ongoing work around student engagement and alumni relations development and none of the reports note any areas of significant concern.

The Review Panel for MSc Maritime Operations Management & MSc Coastal and Marine Engineering Management noted a particularly innovative development in the programmes' efforts to support student engagement. Commending their newsletter, *Making Waves*, the Review Panel were impressed by the promotion of gender equality both in the newsletter and marketing activities, profiling female students in the 2017 Piraeus cohort, in an effort to create female visibility in a stereotypically male field.

Student feedback was extremely positive and the Review Panel was impressed with the newsletter's engaging style and content. As well as serving as a platform to discuss issues, the newsletter fostered a sense of community between the students and alumni, and allowed all participants to keep abreast of the programme and to celebrate any achievements.

#### *PLANS FOR FUTURE*

Many of the Reports noted ongoing actions within each Review around continuing development of student experience enhancement activity and targeted alumni career activity. There was also generalised encouragement of teams to engage in ongoing review and consideration of already-underway initiatives.

The reports also encourage all programmes to continue to consider effective communication with students as a priority, both to strengthen engagement and to ensure continuing compliance with CMA guidelines and University policies.

### **Issues and Challenges**

There were a number of recurring themes in relation to potential or realised issues with programmes.

In no particular order, these were:

- *Student Communication* – a number of the student and alumni groups reported localised issues with communication. These were commonly related to inconsistencies in the information provided across student-facing platforms (programme and module specifications, programme handbooks and Moodle). All Teams are encouraged to undertake regular reviews of these to ensure consistent information delivery. There were also reported issues around the timing of information, particularly around assessment and possible changes to the assessment of a module. All Teams are reminded that changes should no longer be taking place in-year, and any change which affects current students should be clearly explained at the earliest possible opportunity. It is noted, though, that the introduction of earlier deadlines for programme amendments arising from the MAfS Personalised Timetable project will go some way towards minimising the risks, particularly around last-minute changes to programmes and modules.
- *Consistency around Personal Tutoring* – there were differing experiences of Personal Tutoring reported, with some student and alumni groups demonstrating little awareness of the Personal Tutoring policy or how this would affect them. As the new Personal Tutoring policy embeds into practice, all staff are encouraged to increase awareness and visibility of this vital support resource.
- *Staff Engagement in Periodic Review Events* – whilst the University is mindful of the responsibilities of, and demands on, staff time, engagement with Periodic Review is essential to both the ethos and process of Periodic Review. There were anecdotal reports of non-attendance at the Events, particularly on the part of Senior Team members, which made full discussion of any arising themes problematic.
- *Visiting Lecturers* – whilst many areas of good practice were identified, and the value to students is undeniable, there were many discussions of the risks involved with managing programmes with a high percentage of Visiting Lecturer delivery. Particular concerns raised were around Quality Assurance compliance and risk, assessment practice, staff availability and consistency of experience. In more than one instance, Panels requested a risk management plan as part of the conditions or recommendations of the Review.

### **Recommendations Arising from Periodic Review for University Consideration**

The Periodic Review Panels identified three areas of risk requiring institutional consideration. These were:

1. Student Communication
2. Staff engagement in the Periodic Review Events
3. Visiting Lecturers

Educational Quality Committee approved the following recommendations at its meeting in September 2018 for recommendation to Senate:

1. To consider developing and embedding a cycle of regular, cross-platform checks, into the Quality Assurance cycle within programme administration to ensure consistency between student-facing platforms. Best practice would suggest allocating a single source of information as the 'master', and using this to replicate across the platforms. This should minimise work duplication and reduce the risk of errors. Consultation between the relevant teams would support this.
2. To facilitate, as far as possible, full staff availability for the events, Review dates should be agreed well in advance and subject to change only in exceptional circumstances. It is also recommended that the University expectations for staff should be reiterated and cascaded down through the Senior Management structures.
3. To consider developing a University guidance/best-practice document for programmes where a high percentage of delivery is via Visiting Lecturers, and to develop a framework for consistently inducting, training and monitoring Visiting Lecturer provision, using the examples of best practice evident in those Programmes reviewed here.

There were also considerations across the Reviews which linked explicitly to developments with the Education and Student Strategy:

- i. To continue to effectively embed the Personal Tutoring policy and to ensure all staff work to make this as visible as possible to students.

The recommendations above are representative of both the key thematic concerns, and issues most frequently expressed, in the collated conditions of the 2017-18 Periodic Review Reports.

**Dr Lucy Dawkins**

Academic Development and Quality Officer  
Student and Academic Services

## Interim Schedule of Periodic Review Events for 2018-19

The Reviews in table 1 represent those already scheduled for 2018-19, and those carried forward from 2017-18.

*Please note that these dates are still under discussion and are subject to change.*

**Table 1**

School	Programme/Cluster	Last Review	Preliminary Event Date (where agreed)	Development Day Event Date (where agreed)	PR Event Date (where agreed)
SMCSE	MSc Advanced Mechanical Engineering	Unknown			
SMCSE	MPhil/PhD Research Degrees Computer Science	11/12		06-Sep-18	11 <sup>th</sup> February 2019
SMCSE	MPhil/PhD Research Degrees Engineering	Unknown		03-Sep-18	13 <sup>th</sup> February 2019
SMCSE	MSc Information Science and MSc/MA Library Science	07/08		29-Oct-18	25 <sup>th</sup> February 2019
SHS	MSc Clinical Optometry	12/13			22 <sup>nd</sup> May 2019
SHS	MRes Clinical Research	First Review			26 <sup>th</sup> March 2019
SHS	MSc Advanced Practice Programmes - MSc Advanced Practice in Health and Social Care - MSc Nursing (APHSC) - MSc Midwifery (APHSC) - MSc Adult Mental Health (APHSC)	12/13			3 <sup>rd</sup> June 2019

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- MSc Child and Adolescent Mental Health (APHSC)</li> <li>- MSc Ophthalmic Nurse Practitioner (APHSC)</li> <li>- MSc Advanced Nurse Practitioner (Child/ Adult) (APHSC)</li> <li>- MSc Speech Language and Communication (APHSC)</li> <li>- MSc Clinical Optometry (APHSC) – terminated</li> <li>- MSc Ophthalmic Nurse Practitioner (APHSC) – terminated</li> <li>- MSc Neonatal (APHSC) – terminated</li> </ul>				
SHS	Masters in Public Health	First Review			8 <sup>th</sup> April 2019
SHS	MSc Radiography MRI/ MSc Radiography (CT)	12/13			14 <sup>th</sup> February 2019
SHS	MSc Health Policy	First Review			28 <sup>th</sup> February 2019
SASS	UG/PG Economics Programmes and PhD Economics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- BSc Economics with Accounting</li> <li>- BSc Financial Economics</li> <li>- MSc Business Economics</li> <li>- MSc Development Economics</li> <li>- MSc Economic Evaluation in Healthcare</li> </ul>	12/13		7 <sup>th</sup> June 2018	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- MSc Economics</li> <li>- MSc Behavioural Economics</li> <li>- MSc Financial Economics</li> <li>- MSc Health Economics</li> <li>- MSc International Business Economics</li> </ul> PhD Economics				
SASS	UG/ PG Politics and International Programmes and PhD International Politics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- BSc International Politics</li> <li>- BSc Politics</li> <li>- BSc International Political Economy</li> <li>- BSc International Politics and Sociology</li> <li>- MA Global Political Economy</li> <li>- MA Diplomacy and Foreign Policy</li> <li>- MA International Politics</li> <li>- MA International Politics and Human Rights</li> </ul> PhD International Politics	12/13	7 <sup>th</sup> February 2018		
SASS	PhD /DJourn Journalism	Unknown	5 <sup>th</sup> December 2017	24 <sup>th</sup> May 2018	10 <sup>th</sup> October 2017
SASS	PhD Sociology	10/11	5 <sup>th</sup> December 2017	1 <sup>st</sup> March 2018	
SASS	PhD/DMA Music	Unknown	5 <sup>th</sup> December 2017	21 <sup>st</sup> February 2018	
Law	Research Programmes	12/13			

Cass	MSc Charity Programmes	13/14		26 <sup>th</sup> June 2018	<i>February 2019</i>
Cass	PhD Programmes	13/14			
Cass	MSc Global Supply Chain Management	First Review			
Cass	MSc Marketing Strategy	First Review			
Cass	MSc Management	12/13			