Assurance Report to Council on Academic Quality and Standards (covering the 2016/17 academic year) (AS APPROVED BY COUNCIL OCTOBER 2017)

Part 1: Overview and Contextual Update:

In 2016-17, the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) introduced the Annual Provider Review, which is the revised method for monitoring the effectiveness of the processes that Higher Education Institutions have in place to assure and enhance the quality of their programmes. Under this revised method, City's Council must, as our governing body, provide an annual assurance statement to HEFCE each year on City's academic quality and standards.

a) Sector developments and compliance:

The academic year 2016/17 saw a period of unprecedented change in the external regulatory landscape. The Higher Education and Research Act (2017) became law in April 2017 including change initiatives designed to further encourage the enhancement of quality in teaching, learning and research across the sector. A new regulator and funding council entitled the Office for Students (OfS) will be set up in 2018 with statutory responsibility for quality and standards. The OfS will be empowered to make arrangements for assessing the quality of teaching in the sector through continued development of the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF).

The Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) was introduced in 2016 designed to recognise excellent teaching at undergraduate level above the baseline expectations of national quality requirements for HEIs. In June 2017, City received a Silver Award.

The statement of findings about City referenced the clear evidence of a strategic perspective on all key areas aligned with TEF criteria. The Panel found that City delivers high quality teaching, learning and outcomes for students with evidence of excellent levels of student satisfaction. This means that City consistently exceeds the rigorous national quality requirements for UK higher education. Our strong engagement with students and the Students' Union was commended, as was the highly-valued focus on excellent assessment and feedback. There was also praise for the fostering of a culture of teaching excellence and commitment to investment in physical infrastructure. Non-continuation rates were higher than expected across all programmes when benchmarked to other comparable institutions, and our TEF submission set out our commitment to addressing this weakness.

b) Strategic update:

The Education & Student Strategy 2016-2021 provides the road map via which we will achieve City's Academic Output Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for our students' experience, progression and employability. In 2016/17 to ensure alignment with City's Vision and Strategy 2026, significant work was undertaken to refresh the Strategy and create a Year One implementation plan. The revised Strategy was approved by Senate and Council in July 2017 underpinned by the following themes:
An overview of strategic data including student numbers, number of programmes and degree outcomes can be found in Appendix 6.

c) Senate Academic Regulation and Policy changes

During 2016/17 the following Regulations were updated and approved by Senate:

- Regulation 6 (Academic Governance of Collaborative Provision)
- Regulation 12 (Library and IT Services)
- Regulation 13 (Student Discipline)
- Regulation 19 (Assessment Regulations)

During 2016/17 the following policies were updated and approved by Senate:

- Academic Misconduct
- Extenuating Circumstances
- Assessment and Feedback
- External Examiners
- Annual Programme Evaluation (APE)
- Student Mobility and Placements
- Research Students Who Teach

d) Compliance with external Frameworks:

City’s quality assurance processes which are documented in the Quality Manual, are designed to be compliant with the UK Quality Code for Higher Education and Part 1 of the European Standards and Guidelines for Higher Education (ESG) (Mapping of City’s processes against the ESG and Quality Code can be found in Appendix 3). Information on City’s award-bearing programmes are available on our website and published prospectuses.

This report has been written with reference to the CUC guidance (a mapping against the CUC guidance can be found in Appendix 2).

e) Student Representation and Feedback/Student Voice:

Collaborative Statement from City and the Students’ Union
Central to managing the quality of our educational provision and identifying the need for change is considering, and acting upon, feedback from our students. Feedback is gathered through City working closely in partnership with the Students’ Union (SU).

During 2016-17, student representatives continued to play a key role in informing change, including via Annual Programme Evaluations (APEs) and Periodic Review (see Part 2). Student representatives sat on a range of committees from Student-Staff Liaison Committees (SSLCs) through to Council. The Students’ Union also submitted standing reports to each meeting of the Education and Student Committee and Senate, providing a further dedicated opportunity for students’ views to be heard.

The University and SU are jointly committed to operating an effective system of student representation throughout all levels of University governance via the Code of Practice for Student Representation. This ensures that students have input on quality and enhancement at City.

2016/17

During 2016/17, the SU worked in collaboration with City to strengthen student representation. A total of 701 student representatives were elected in 2016/17, an increase from 654 in 2015/16. 87.4% received formal training for the role. In conjunction with face to face training, online training was developed by the Students’ Union in partnership with Learning Enhancement and Development via Moodle (City’s Virtual Learning Environment). This was developed to increase engagement and to address opportunities for part-time students and distance learners as a priority.

As part of a rebrand of the Students’ Union, the design and content of guidance to student representatives was refreshed. The SU collaborated with Schools to advise on election processes. Briefing events for students and staff were held advising on the role of programme representatives covering training, development and support. A code of conduct was agreed by student representatives, setting out minimum meeting attendance requirements.

In response to City’s TEF submission, the University and Students’ Union were praised for the collaborative approach in compiling the submission.

A survey of all student representatives was carried out by the SU in May 2017 to establish the effectiveness of the system. There was a response rate of just over 20%. Of those surveyed over 80% rated their experience as good or excellent. The SU has presented the detailed outcomes of the review to Education and Student Committee. A full review of student representation will be carried out during 2017/18 and will be informed by the Students’ Union review and the 2016/17 Internal Audit of the Student Voice.

Zain Ismail (SU VP Education 2016/17) and Malek Arab (SU VP Education 2017/18)

Part 2: Academic Quality and Standards (the Quality Framework)

An overview of Actions for 2017/18 can be found in Appendix 1.

a) Admissions

Overview:
City welcomes applications from all candidates with the potential and motivation to succeed in Higher Education. We seek to advise, guide and select applicants with due care and attention to each individual.

**Principles:**

Admissions decisions are made in accordance with Senate Regulation 14 and as outlined in the University's Admissions Policy. Admissions for research degrees are covered by a separate policy.

**Oversight and Operation:**

The Deputy President and Provost chairs the Undergraduate and Postgraduate Recruitment Working Groups, which revised their terms of reference in 2017. The Working Groups monitor the admissions policy and admissions criteria for all taught award-bearing courses.

**Year reflected on:** 2016/17

**Scope of Activity:**

The undergraduate cycle (for 2016/7 academic year entry) received 26,445 applications. This was a -4.6% decrease on 2015 (27,726) and +1.5% increase on 2014 (26,047). An Unconditional Offer scheme operated for specific programmes in SASS, Engineering as well as Radiography which were taken up by 242 applicants. 955 applicants were recruited through Clearing of whom 811 were Home/EU and 144 were Overseas.

The 2016 cycle for postgraduate taught students (PGT) received 22,310 applications. This was a +4.2% increase on 2015 (21,418) and 4,125 new PGTs registered, against a target of 4,213. The 2016 cycle for research students (PGR) received 288 applications which was a -2.2% decrease on 2015 (294.5) and resulted in 125 new PGRs registering against a target of 133.

**Future Enhancements:**

The Undergraduate and Postgraduate Admissions and Recruitment Working Groups will continue their strategic focus. The Admissions Policy will also be reviewed and revised during 2017/18.

b) **Periodic Review**

**Overview:**

Periodic Review is a process whereby every taught and research degree programme is internally reviewed on a 6-yearly cycle.

**Principles:**
Periodic Review is a peer review (involving a panel independent of the programme team) and evidence-based process drawing on a wide range of available management information and through formal meetings with the subject providers, students and alumni, and external subject experts. Programme teams provide a written reflection on the previous 5 years, as well as planning ahead, ensuring that the programmes continue to be relevant, meet the University’s strategic vision, are adequately resourced and enhance the student experience.

Oversight and Operation:

The Deputy President and Provost has delegated authority from the President and oversees this area. He is advised by Education and Student Committee which receives regular reports on activity and an annual overview report. This report is also received by Senate. School Programme Approval and Review Committees (PARC) have responsibility for overseeing actions including receipt of reports on progress with actions, a year after the review.

Year reflected on: 2016/17

Scope of Activity:

Eight reviews were undertaken:
- MSc Trade and Finance Cluster
- Graduate Diploma in Law
- Legal Practice Course and LLM in Legal Practice
- MA Academic Practice and MPhil/PhD Professional Education
- BSc Nursing
- BSc Optometry
- Undergraduate Radiography Cluster
- BSc Mathematics Programmes

Outcomes from the reviews:

The outcomes from all periodic reviews confirmed confidence could be placed in the academic standards of the reviewed provision. Confidence could also be placed in the quality of the learning opportunities available to students. The Reviews demonstrated ongoing commitment to educational development and the student learning experience, in line with the Education and Student Strategy.

Process following Periodic Review:

For each review a report outlining conditions and recommendations is presented to the Programme Team and School PARCs. Programme Teams then build upon their Action Plans. One-year after the review Programme Teams submit “One Year-on Reports” which are reviewed by School PARCs.

The outcomes from all periodic reviews are reported to Education and Student Committee. An annual overview report reflecting on key themes is presented annually to Education and Student Committee and Senate.

Particular strengths were identified as the:
- commitment, dedication and expertise of the academic staff
- excellent links with the alumni community
- strong relationships with professional bodies, and the commitment to the inclusion of industry expertise, where appropriate
- strong sense of student community, both at Undergraduate and Postgraduate level
- innovative teaching and assessment methods
- quality of the facilities available for students, particularly in a clinical setting
- embedded focus on employability, and the staff support offered in pursuit of this.

Future Enhancements:

The Periodic Review panels identified the following enhancements to be addressed to:

- consider the growing importance of the Competition and Markets Authority (CMA) guidelines and the implications for programme development or significant amendments
- improve the consistency of student-facing documentation, specifically in terms of programme and module specifications
- strengthen the relationship between research and teaching, and to make this more apparent to students
- improve the quality of the Action Plans included in the Reflective Review documentation.

There were also considerations which linked explicitly to developments under the Education and Student Strategy to put in place explicit plans to address progression and to implement plans for attendance monitoring.

Education and Student Committee approved a programme of work to review the Periodic Review Policy and Guidelines during 2017/18. This review is being undertaken following initial consultation with Associate Deans (Education), and will be completed in liaison with academic and quality colleagues and with reference to sector research and best practice.

c) Programme Development and Approval

Overview:

City operates a robust process of programme approval which is designed to ensure that new programmes fit with the strategic direction of the institution, are financially viable with evidenced demand, meet robust academic standards and provide high quality learning opportunities.

Principles:

The principles of Programme Approval at City are to:

- Support the development of high quality, relevant and complementary provision.
- Provide a common framework that is robust, but flexible and responsive to new market opportunities and the development of new/innovative provision.
- Be a peer review process; drawing on the expertise of internal colleagues and external experts.
• Promote constructive and challenging discussion of matters related to academic provision and the quality of the student learning experience.

• Allow for the enhancement of proposals drawing on internal and external innovation and good practice.

Proposals should have significant staff and, where appropriate, employer and student input from the earliest stages of development. These must articulate, as far as possible, with PSRB (Professional and Statutory Regulatory Bodies) accreditations and Research Council requirements.

Significant amendments to existing programmes are also considered through the programme approval process.

Oversight and Operation:

The Deputy President and Provost has delegated authority from Senate. Programme Approval operates as a two-stage process. Stage 1 considers the market and strategic fit of the provision alongside the resource implications. Programme Approval and Review Committees (PARC) within Schools initially consider proposals before referral to the University Programme Approval Committee (UPAC). At Stage 2, the proposed programme content is examined with input from an external expert. School PARCs review and approve the programme documentation before UPAC makes a recommendation to the Deputy President and Provost for a final decision.

Year reflected on: 2016/17

Scope of Activity:

Stage 1:
• 14 proposals (some covering more than one programme) were considered
• 3 submissions were not approved, two have subsequently addressed the requirements of Stage 1

Stage 2:
• 10 proposals were considered, and all were approved

This year we piloted a revised approach to the programme approval process in Cass which has offered some opportunities to streamline the system. This pilot will be reviewed fully in 2017/18.

Particular strengths of new programme proposals were identified as:

• The innovative and responsive approach to programme development.
• The student-focused nature of programme development, including flexible study options, study abroad and sandwich options, and embedded employability, including the promotion of placement opportunities, where appropriate.
• Commitment to strategic development, both in response to the Education and Student Strategy, and external market drivers.

Future Enhancements to Process:
• Schools to work more closely with Learning Enhancement and Development (LEaD) prior to Stage 2 submissions to ensure that programme and module specifications are in line with University and external regulatory frameworks
• To improve the consistency of student-facing documentation
• To give further consideration to the consistency and necessity of assessments, including the information given to students regarding assessments.

Education and Student Committee approved a programme of work to review the Programme Approval Policy and Guidelines during 2017/18. This review is being undertaken following initial consultation with Associate Deans (Education), and will be completed in liaison with academic and quality colleagues and with reference to sector research and best practice. This review will be informed by feedback from the piloted system in Cass.

New Programmes and Significant Amendments to Existing Programmes Approved in 2016-17

Programmes below marked (*) have been approved through the piloted process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cass</td>
<td>Executive Masters in Medical Leadership*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass</td>
<td>Executive PhD programme (considered via circulation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass</td>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate in Anti Money-Laundering*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass</td>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate in Legal Leadership*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass</td>
<td>BSc Business Management (significant amendment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Legal Practice Course (significant amendment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>BPTC (significant amendment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SASS</td>
<td>BA History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SASS</td>
<td>Joint PhD in Psychology and Social Neuroscience (with Sapienza University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHS</td>
<td>MSc Primary Care [Practice Nursing]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHS</td>
<td>Nursing Associate Programme (Pilot Programme)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHS</td>
<td>Speech and Language Therapy (significant amendment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHS</td>
<td>Speech and Language Science (significant amendment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHS</td>
<td>Advanced Practice Health and Social Care [All Pathways] (significant amendment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCSE</td>
<td>MSci Data Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body Accreditations and Reviews

Overview:

Professional and Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs) is a general term used to describe those organisations that work with the University in the approval, monitoring and review of programmes that lead to a professional or vocational qualification and which exist to ensure that national standards within the professions are met. PSRB accreditation may include recognition of membership or exemption from professional exams.

Oversight and Operation:
Due to their diverse nature, and close relationship with individual programmes, PSRB relationships are managed at School level and overseen via Boards of Studies and relevant sub-committees. A register of PSRB accredited programmes is maintained at institutional level and reported to Senate annually.

**Year reflected on:** 2016/17

**Scope of Activity:**

- There are 55 programmes currently accredited by PSRBs.
- There was one new PSRB accreditation - BSc Music, Sound and Technology was awarded provisional accreditation from Joint Audio Media Education Support (JAMES) for the period March 2016 to July 2017 inclusive.
- An Internal Audit of oversight of accreditation and PSRBs took place in May 2017. The outcome of the Audit will be reported to the Audit and Risk Committee.

**Future Enhancements:**

Education and Student Committee has approved a review of the PSRB policy during 2017/18, this will be informed by the recommendations from the Internal Audit which took place in 2017.

e) **Academic Standards and Outcomes: Assessment practice and outcomes (including assessment feedback turnaround).**

**Overview:**

Assessment of learning is integral to City’s commitment to provide high quality education and to underpin the academic standards of awards made to students.

**Principles:**

**Assessment Standards and Outcomes**

The assessment of students on taught programmes is underpinned by Senate Regulation 19 and the Assessment and Feedback Policy. The Policy also applies to partnership provision unless equivalent alternative arrangements have been agreed between City and the partner institution.

**Assessment Feedback**

Assessment and Feedback strategies are agreed and reviewed during programme approval and review. Feedback is provided on all assessed work, including examinations, and on other relevant aspects of a student’s performance and progress in a module. Turnaround times of three weeks for coursework and other in-term assessments, and four weeks for end of module examinations or equivalent are set out in Senate policy and adherence to this is overseen by Senate and ExCo on a regular basis.

**Oversight and Operation:**

**Assessment Standards and Outcomes**
Assessment Boards are sub-committees of Senate and under Senate Regulation are responsible for making formal recommendations on student progression and award based on the marks achieved by students.

Assessment Feedback

Boards of Studies oversee the effective implementation of the timeliness of feedback and associated data on turnaround times.

**Year reflected on:** 2016/17 (Term One of the academic year 2016/17 up to and including the Examination Period of Autumn 2016/17)

**Scope of Activity:**

9 Briefing Sessions were delivered to over 100 staff including Assessment Board Chairs, other academic and professional staff involved with the 2016/17 Boards. 152 Progression and final Assessment Boards were held between December 2016 and October 2017, of which 23 (15%) were observed by Student & Academic Services on behalf of Senate. Overall, the Boards operated according to City’s regulatory framework with robust discussion and External Examiner contribution. Good practice was noted at many Boards and where risks or inconsistencies were noted, recommendations are being made to Senate on how practice can be improved. There is a desire to strengthen the statistical data available to Assessment Boards to enable greater oversight and analysis of student and programme outcomes and this is being taken forward within a forthcoming Modernising Administration for Students project.

The average compliance rate for assessment feedback turnaround was 95%, a significant improvement from 80% on the same period in 2015/6. Reasons for non-compliance were reported to Senate and ExCo. Senate and ExCo both requested 100% compliance.

A comprehensive review of undergraduate assessment strategies is being undertaken to ensure they best support student learning and progression.

f) **Academic Standards and Outcomes: External Examining**

**Overview:**

External examining is a principal means for maintaining UK academic standards. Higher Education institutions appoint external examiners who are suitably qualified and experienced in their subject. They offer advice on good practice and opportunities to enhance the quality of those programmes/modules and also offer a view of how standards compare with the same/similar awards in the sector. External examiners provide written reports providing independent feedback where programmes and modules can then respond to recommendations.

**Principles:**

An External Examiner is appointed to each programme. Boards of Studies may appoint additional External Examiners to cover specialised academic areas within a programme. Examiners are normally appointed for four years.
Oversight and Operation:

The External Examining process applies to all award-bearing programmes. Arrangements for research degrees are tailored to the nature of the provision.

The Board of Studies responsible for the programme considers nominations and at institutional level these are considered by an appointed Academic Lead on behalf of the Deputy President and Provost. An overview of themes from External Examiner reports is presented to Senate each year.

Year reflected on: 2016/17

Scope of Activity:

The External Examiner policy was revised in 2016/17. The External Examiners handbook was also refreshed.

Two University-level inductions were held for newly-appointed Examiners.

294 External Examiner were appointed as well as a further 22 for validated provision at partner institutions leading to a City award.

Particular strengths identified by Examiners included:

i. The openness and responsiveness of programme teams to dialogue with External Examiners.
ii. The innovation in the content, range and variety of assessment on several programmes
iii. Best practice by teaching and professional staff in relation to teaching, assessment and administration. In particular, the link between curriculum content and employability.
iv. Confidence in the academic standards, performance and attainment of City’s students.

Future Enhancements include:

External Examiners identified that use of appropriate statistics and data analysis of student outcomes at Assessment Boards could be more systematically applied across the institution. Student and Academic Services in liaison with Assessment Board Chairs and professional staff will review the information provided at Assessment Boards in 2017/18.

g) Extenuating Circumstances, Student Complaints, Academic Appeals and Academic Misconduct

Overview:

Procedures are in place for managing student complaints (about specific aspects of their experience), academic misconduct, academic appeals (against marks or decisions awarded by Assessment Boards), and for considering students presenting with extenuating circumstances which may have adversely affected performance in assessment.
**Principles:**
Student cases are managed in accordance with the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education’s (OIA) Good Practice Framework. The OIA framework is non-regulatory, and serves as operational guidance.

Our processes are designed to focus on providing support to students and staff to enable resolution whilst ensuring fairness and consistency in treatment of the student body as a whole, as well as for particular individuals.

**Oversight and Operation:**
The Deputy President and Provost has delegated authority from Senate. He is advised by Education and Student Committee which receives regular reports on activity and annual overview reports. These reports are also received by Senate.

**Extenuating Circumstances**
Claims for Extenuating Circumstances are managed and considered in accordance with Senate Regulation 19: Assessment.

**Student Complaints**
Student complaints are managed and considered in accordance with Senate Regulation 26: Student Complaints. The procedure operates as a three stage process. Stage 1 (Early Resolution), Stage 2 (Local-Level Resolution) and Stage 3 (Institutional Level Review).

**Academic Appeals**
Academic Appeals are managed and considered under Senate Regulations 20-22: Assessment.

**Academic Misconduct**
Academic Misconduct is covered in Senate Regulation 19: Assessment.

The Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA)
A student may take a complaint to the OIA on receiving confirmation that all internal procedures for considering their complaint or appeal have been exhausted at their institution. The OIA refers to any case submitted by a student as a “complaint” regardless of the nature of the original issue. The OIA expects an institution to adopt its recommendations within prescribed timescales.
The time limit to take an appeal to the OIA is 12 months.

**Year reflected on: 1 January-31 December 2016 (This is due to the reporting requirements of the OIA)**

**Scope of Activity:**

**Extenuating Circumstances**
Schools processed 5,309 extenuating circumstances claims across undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes. Of these, 3,384 related to examinations and 2,530 coursework assessments. 3,981 (64%) were accepted and arrangements put in place to support students in completing the outstanding assessment. This was the first year that

---

1 The OIA is an independent body set up to review student complaints. Free to students, the OIA deals with individual complaints against Higher Education Providers in England and Wales.
data was collated across the university. It is planned from 2017/18 that reporting will be
developed and additional analysis presented to Senate.

**Academic Appeals**
Schools processed 530 Stage 1 level Academic Appeals across all undergraduate and
postgraduate programmes, a decrease from 545 in 2015. Student and Academic Services
received 52 Stage 2 requests from students for review, a significant decrease from 80
requests received in 2015. Of the 52 subject to final stage review, 6 were upheld and
referred back to the relevant School for action.

**Student Complaints**
27 student complaints were processed by Schools, a significant decrease from 42 in 2015.
Seven of these complaints progressed to the final review stage, of which two were upheld.

**Academic Misconduct**
Schools initially investigated 173 instances of alleged academic misconduct. Of these, 134
cases were upheld and a sanction applied. 7 cases were referred to the second stage. 9
cases were referred to the City Disciplinary Panel under stage 2. Of these, 8 cases were
substantiated and penalties were applied. 1 case was on hold awaiting further
investigation.

**OIA Activity**
All institutions that subscribe to the OIA are required to issue a completion of procedures
letter to confirm a student’s case has exhausted the internal procedures and may be
eligible for review by the OIA. City issued 60 Completion of Procedures Letters in 2016,
compared with 84 in 2015.

In May 2017, the OIA published Annual Statements for all providers subscribing to the OIA
in 2016. This covered complaint investigations by the OIA completed within the calendar
year ending December 2016. Data provided in this Annual Statement revealed that in
2016, the OIA reviewed 16 cases against City. Of these, 3 were considered ‘partly
justified’, none were found to be ‘justified’ and 9 were ‘not justified’. The remaining 3 cases
were classified as Settled, Not Eligible and Withdrawn.

**Particular strengths (within City) were identified as:**
- A noticeable decline in the number of student cases and referral to the OIA.
- Staff engagement with the sector through various networks (e.g. Academic
  Registrar’s Council)
- Through the Modernising Administration for Students initiative, processing of
  extenuating circumstances and appeals has moved on-line. This is improving the
  student experience by increasing accessibility, transparency as well as improving
  efficiency of administrative processes.
- The OIA Annual Statement published externally by the OIA commends City’s
  ‘positive engagement’, with staff attending a number of training events. City also
  hosted a delegation from the OIA to share best practice.

**Future Enhancements:**
City received 2 OIA complaint outcomes where the recommendation required review of
internal processes. In one case, the recommendation was to change City’s regulations to
improve procedural fairness and to encourage closer alignment with duties under the Equalities Act 2010. The change to regulations was approved by Senate with immediate effect.

An increasing trend in the OIA’s consideration of complaints is a focus on procedural fairness, and whether procedures allow sufficient flexibility to permit special consideration of cases for good reasons. Work will continue throughout 2017/18 to review regulations ensuring sufficient flex to consider individual student cases in existing policies and procedures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>h) Research Degree Provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overview:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Research Degrees Framework applies to all full and part-time research students, including those registered on a research degree programme validated at a partner institution, academic staff with a responsibility for the supervision and examination of research students, administrative staff who have a role in supporting academic staff and external stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principles:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Framework contains core principles of City's commitment to academic support and development of Research Students, alongside continuous development of our services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oversight and Operation:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research degree policy and provision is overseen by Senate and supported through the Graduate School Committee, which is advisory to the Dean of the Graduate School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Schools, Boards of Studies are responsible for the approval of the admission, monitoring and progress review, examination and award of individual research students, and for monitoring the delivery and evaluation of research degree programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year reflected on:</strong> 2016/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scope of Activity:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 510 students including 151 in writing up status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 90 awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhancement activities undertaken during 2016/17:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work was undertaken to address the results of a survey of research students by the Students’ Union in 2016 which indicated that the Senate Policy on Research Students Who Teach was not being implemented consistently. Revisions to the policy were approved by Senate, and a guidance note and templates will be in place for 2017/18 to enable Boards of Studies and Senate to monitor implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A review of the implementation of the Policy on the Approval of Doctoral Degree Supervisors was undertaken. This demonstrated a good level of compliance with the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
policy. The review also confirmed that the current arrangements for exceptions for the appointment of supervisors who do not meet the Annual Research Quality Monitoring score requirements as ‘first’ supervisors, was appropriate. No amendments to the policy were recommended as a result of the review.

Work continued to ensure doctoral projects and doctoral student profiles are published on the website. This activity contributes to City’s research profile and community, and supports the recruitment of high quality students.

Future Enhancements:

Revisions will be made the template for annual programme evaluation for research degrees to align it more closely with the objectives of the Graduate School, and streamline action planning and reporting, particularly relating to completion rates.

The policy on suspensions and extensions of research degree candidature will be reviewed to support more timely completion rates, to align with sector norms and to address external compliance requirements.

The system used to record and monitor research degree progress will be reviewed and replaced. This is intended to enhance engagement and provide better information to support improved completion rates.

i) Education with Others and Flexible Delivery – Partnerships and Validation

Overview:

Partnerships
City’s Partnerships Policy sets out the approach to quality and standards for provision delivered by one of City’s Schools in partnership with another organisation, which leads to a City award or that leads to guaranteed admission to one of the City’s programmes. Partnership provision includes joint programmes, access/feeder arrangements, franchised provision and off-site delivery of City’s programmes.

Validation
Validation is the process by which the University recognises as equivalent to its own the quality and standards of programmes designed, delivered and managed by another institution. Successful students receive an award from City in accordance with the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications. Through validation, the University takes ultimate responsibility for the quality and standards of the validated programmes. The University needs to satisfy itself that the approach being applied is no less rigorous than that applied to programmes offered internally so as to meet national and international Higher Education requirements. City’s validation arrangements are covered by the Policy on Validation.

Principles:
• The University is responsible for the academic standards of all awards granted in its name. The academic standards of awards developed and delivered through partnership arrangements are equivalent to those delivered solely by the University.
• The University is ultimately responsible for ensuring that the quality of learning opportunities offered through a partnership or validation are at an appropriate level to enable the student to achieve the academic standards required for the award.

Oversight and Operation:

School Boards of Studies are responsible for overseeing quality and standards matters relating to partnership provision. For validated provision, a Course Board oversees quality and standards for each validation partnership and comprises representatives from City, the validation partner and an external advisor appointed by City. Institutional oversight arrangements were revised during 2016/17 and a single Collaborative Provision Committee will now oversee the development and implementation of City’s quality and standards framework for validation and partnerships.

Year reflected on: 2016/17

Scope of Activity:

• Partnership provision: 1794 students on 28 partnership arrangements
• Validated provision: 653 students on 8 programmes at 5 institutions. The one programme due for revalidation in 2016/17, successfully completed the revalidation process.
• An Internal Audit of oversight of Partnerships was undertaken. The outcome of the Audit was reported to the Audit and Risk Committee.

Enhancement work undertaken in 2016/17:

Senate approved changes to the academic governance arrangements for partnership provision and validation to strengthen institutional oversight. The Senate Validation and Institutional Partnerships Committee and a separate advisory Partnerships Sub-Committee have been replaced by a single Collaborative Provision Committee, which reports to Senate. This addresses a recommendation in City’s last institutional review by the Quality Assurance Agency.

New policies and associated guidance and templates were approved by Senate for student mobility opportunities (e.g. exchange arrangements) and placement activities for implementation in 2017/18.

Future Enhancements:

Work will be undertaken to develop a consistent process for the transfer of academic credit to a City award for student mobility opportunities to conclude work initiated through the development of the revised Student Mobility policy.

Boards of Studies oversight and compliance with Senate policy for partnership provision will be reviewed to identify further enhancements to guidance and support required.

Part 3: Educational Quality Support and Enhancement

a) Annual Programme Evaluation

Overview:
The Annual Programme Evaluation (APE) is a process for assuring the quality and continual enhancement of programmes. It draws on evidence including student feedback, reflects upon the impact of previous actions, and is designed to support the dissemination of good practice and enabling oversight of the way in which strategic priorities are implemented at programme level.

**Principles:**

All taught and research degree programmes are expected to complete an Annual Programme Evaluation (APE) in collaboration with students, and an action plan is developed ensuring continuous reflection and development.

**Oversight and Operation:**

APEs are completed for all programmes. Tailored approaches exist for collaborative provision and research degrees. When compiling APEs, programme teams review programme-related management information and External Examiner reports. They also reflect on various sources of student feedback considered throughout the year. This includes:

- Discussions at Staff-Student Liaison Committees and Student Experience Committees.
- Module evaluation outcomes.
- Results from the institution-wide internal survey, *Your Voice*.
- Results from the National Student Survey (NSS), Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES) or Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES).

APEs for internal and partnership provision are approved by Boards of Studies on behalf of Senate. Institutional consideration of key themes arising is facilitated through reports to Education and Student Committee.

**Year reflected on:** 2015/16 (APEs compiled in 2016/17 reflected on the previous academic year)

**Scope of Activity:**

- 78 Undergraduate APEs submitted
- 139 Postgraduate Taught APEs submitted
- 34 Postgraduate Research APEs submitted

Changes to the APE form and guidance were made to support engagement with statistical data, City’s KPIs and sharing of good practice.

Programme Directors were consulted on the timing of APE workshops and were held at an earlier date to support timely submission of APEs.

**Particular strengths** identified included:

i. Overall APEs gave an effective overview of the health of the programme
ii. Many programmes provided an extensive analysis of strengths and concerns and provided details of the future direction of the programme
iii. Changes were made to programmes as a direct result of student feedback
iv. Various sources of student feedback were considered, including SSLCs and survey results
v. Comprehensive action plans with clear links to management information were provided

**Enhancements**

A SharePoint site for KPI data was launched in October 2017 to support Programme Directors completing APEs.

---

**b) Student Surveys and Action Plans (Includes NSS, Your Voice, PTES and PRES)**

**Student Surveys**

**Overview:**

City conducts an annual suite of surveys to gain feedback on student satisfaction, the institution’s performance and to identify issues that need to be addressed.

The surveys comprise:

- Your Voice 1 (Undergraduate (UG) Year 1 internal survey)
- Your Voice 2 (UG Year 2 internal survey)
- National Student Survey (NSS) (UG Year 3, national survey)
- Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES) (PGT students, national survey)
- Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES) (research students, national survey) takes place every two years.

**Principles:**

City invites students to participate in one programme-related survey per year. Students participate in the surveys anonymously. All surveys take place in a single ‘survey window’ in the spring term. This principle enables the University to work in conjunction with the Students’ Union to undertake focused promotional work with the aim of eliciting high rates of participation.

**Oversight and Operation:**

Question sets for Your Voice Surveys are designed to mirror the NSS. Question sets for the NSS, Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey and Postgraduate Research Experience Survey are set nationally. Summary reports for Your Voice 1 and 2, NSS, PTES and PRES are reported to Education and Student Committee, with further reports going to Senate and Council for the NSS results.

The Deputy President and Provost meets with Programme Directors to discuss programme NSS results. Action plans around NSS results are developed as part of the Annual Programme Evaluation (APE) process.

**Year reflected on:** 2016/17

Voice 1 and Voice 2
In both surveys 75% of students surveyed were overall satisfied with their experience.
No sections in either Your Voice surveys saw decreased scores when compared to 2016.
Learning Resources was the best performing section in both surveys
For both surveys the Students’ Union section recorded the lowest results, however the score increased compared to 2016.
Assessment and Feedback was the second lowest performing section in both Your Voice surveys, however they saw increased results from 2016 by ~10%.

**NSS**

Overall satisfaction was 82% (compared to 85% in 2016, and a national average of 84%).
Institutionally there were declines in all areas except learning resources.
The Students’ Union question recorded the lowest results.
Assessment and Feedback was the second lowest performing section.

**PTES**

Overall satisfaction was recorded as 78% (compared to 82% in 2016).
The highest score was for Resources and Services.
The lowest results were recorded for Assessment and Feedback and Organisation and Management.

**PRES**

Overall satisfaction score of 71%.
The institutions best performance came in the ‘Supervision’ category, with an overall score of 89%.
The lowest performing section was ‘About your programme’ which was made up of one question (the extent to which students received appropriate support).

**Future Enhancements:**

Development work to focus on needs of postgraduate students particularly around dissertation support in light of the PTES and PRES survey results.

NSS action planning meetings have commenced earlier for 2016-17. There has also been work to track trends between the Your Voice and NSS surveys.

The Students’ Union is working with Schools to introduce new academic societies supporting the learning community.

c) **Module Evaluation**

**Overview:**

Module evaluation assesses student satisfaction at that level of delivery. The University operates a common question set for module evaluation to ensure consistency of approach and measurement across all provision. Programmes also engage with students through
informal discussions during the modules, and through the Staff Student Liaison Committees (SSLCs).

**Oversight and Operation:**

Collated evaluations are reviewed within Schools through academic and executive structures. At institutional level, aggregate results are presented to ExCo and Senate. A systematic process is in place to produce and monitor action plans for modules scoring below 3.5 (on a scale of 0-5).

**Year reflected on:** 2016/17

**Scope of Activity:**

**Term 1:** 1160 surveys were conducted  
**Term 2:** 939 surveys were conducted

- 30.5% of modules achieved a response rate of 80% or above (compared to 27.8% in 2015/16)  
- 28.4% of modules received scores of 4.5 or above (compared to 27% in 2015/16)  
- 7% of modules received a score of 3.5 or less for overall satisfaction (compared to 6.6% in 2015/16)

**Future Enhancements:**

The current module evaluation process has been in place since 2011 and has expanded to encompass all taught undergraduate and postgraduate modules. A review of the process has been undertaken and Senate will receive a report during the Autumn term 2017.

d) **Peer-Supported Review of Education**

**Overview:**

Peer-supported review of education is a collaborative developmental activity which focuses on improving/developing/sharing aspects of academic practice through non-judgmental peer input or advice. The review focuses on practice (i.e. what is observed) rather than on the individual; and each partner to the reviewed event reflects on the review to draw conclusions for improvement of his/her own practice. In addition staff may use evidence from their review when applying for promotion and for internal and external teaching awards.

The peer review process was reviewed and revised in 2015-16. A new policy was implemented in 2016-17.

**Principles:**

All those who are involved in any teaching activity i.e. including Visiting Lecturers and PhD students should engage in this process at least once per year.

**Oversight and Operation:**
The policy is monitored through the appraisal process in Schools to monitor engagement. Anonymous reflections from the peer supported review of education are collected to elicit data at School level and good practice that can be shared.

**Year reflected on:** 2016/17

**Outcomes:**

Previously, there was no reporting at institutional level on the outcomes of the process, so good practice and development needs were only available within Schools. Learning Enhancement and Development (LeaD) will analyse the data from the reflections on the first year of implementation of the revised policy and present a report on the number of reflections submitted, the development needs identified and good practice so this can be shared within Schools and across the institution. The development needs will be used to identify any staff development activity that may be required.

**Part 4: Governance Framework**

a) **Report on the operation of Senate in relation to academic quality and standards**

Senate met on six occasions in 2016/17, including one extraordinary meeting of Senate convened to discuss the proposed Research and Enterprise Strategy. The composition of Senate, set out in Ordinance C1, is at Appendix 4. The Appendix also gives details of attendance at Senate in 2016/17 and contains a table showing the attendance at meetings of Senate of lay members of Council. Key topics covered in Senate meetings included the following:

**Major Strategic Discussions:** Teaching Excellence Framework Submission, Research & Enterprise Strategy, Student Progression Priorities, Education and Student Strategy Refresh.

**Major Approvals:** Re-designation of the institutional partnership with City & Islington College to a School-managed partnership, Academic Calendar, Recommendations included in the overview of Assessment Boards 2015/16.

**Senate Regulation Approvals/Revisions:** Regulation 6 Governance of Collaborative Provision, Regulation 13 Student Disciplinary Regulation, Regulation 19 Assessment Regulations, Regulation 12 Library & IT Services Regulation.

**Senate Policy Approvals/Revisions:** Academic Misconduct Policy, Assessment & Feedback Policy, Extenuating Circumstances Policy, External Examiners Policy, Policy on Animal Research, Research Students Who Teach Policy, Doctoral Degree Supervisor Policy, Student Mobility and Placement Policies, Annual Programme Evaluation Policy.

**Monitoring Reports & other discussion items:** Assessment Feedback Turnaround Times, Outcomes from Module Evaluations, Annual Research Quality Monitoring (ARQM) Report, Degree Classifications, Student Complaints, Academic Appeals and Academic Misconduct, Periodic Reviews, Improving the Effectiveness of Senate, External Examiner Reports, Student Experience Committee Reports, Annual Programme Evaluation Reports, Governance of Educational Quality, Student Survey Activity, Senate elections.
b) **Reports on the operation of sub-committees of Senate including Boards of Studies**

Senate necessarily delegates many activities critical to quality and standards to its Sub-committees, notably its Boards of Studies and its Assessment Boards. Details of Senate delegations are at Appendix 4. Senate at each meeting receives verbal updates as well as minutes of all its Sub-committees and also of two Executive Advisory Committees which are concerned with academic quality and standards, the Education & Student Committee and the Research & Enterprise Committee.

Key areas of work carried out by sub-committees of Senate during 2016/17 included the following:

**AGC:** Scrutiny of Senate Regulations 6, 12, 13, 19, Scrutiny of Senate Assurance Report to Council, consideration of Internal Audit Reports into External Examiners and Student Records, Sabbatical Leave Monitoring Report, Committee Responsibility to Equality Duty, Improving Senate’s effectiveness.

**Education & Student Committee:** Education and Student Strategy, Periodic Review, Assessment Strategies Project, TEF, Progression Improvement, Student Experience, Student Satisfaction, Key Performance Indicators, Student engagement.


**Boards of Studies:** Annual Programme Evaluations and actions plans, Module Evaluation, Student Experience, External Examiner appointments, reports and responses, Special Schemes of Study, Assessment Feedback Turnaround Times, Programme Approval, Assessment Board reports, Monitoring Reports.

c) **Overview of management actions taken by the Executive in relation to academic quality and standards.**

The Executive Committee:

**Discussed:** NSS results and Student Satisfaction, Student Recruitment, TEF submission, Modernising Administration for Students (MAfS) project, the Vision and Strategy 2026.

**Approved:** Individual action plans for modules scoring <3.5 in module evaluations, MAfS Project Proposal and Priorities, the TEF submission.

**Part 5: Key findings of independent reports on quality and standards (i.e. that sit outside the quality and standards framework)**

a) **Internal Audit Reports on quality and standards**

Internal Audit carried out four audits relating to City’s quality assurance processes:
- Annual Programme Evaluations and Periodic Review
- Partnerships
- PSRBs
- The Student Voice
The Internal Audit process identified that “substantial” level of assurance could be placed on the processes reviewed. The outcome of the internal audits, along with their recommendations will be reported to the Audit and Risk Committee as well as Senate. Actions relating to quality and standards will be embedded in work overseen by relevant Senate sub-committees and Executive advisory committees.

b) Other independent reports
Council received the Minerva report for the Council Effectiveness Review.

City commissioned a review and report on our mechanisms for improving the student experience from Professor Gill Nicholls, previously Deputy Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, at the University of Surrey. ExCo approved terms of reference for the review in summer 2016, and received her report.

Sources of further information
For further information shortened links to relevant information are below:
City, University of London Quality Manual: https://goo.gl/5gwsuF
City, University of London – Academic Committees (Agendas, Papers and Minutes): https://goo.gl/hU7N8S
European Standards and Guidelines: https://goo.gl/yzfZwu
Chair of University Councils Annual Reporting Guidelines: https://goo.gl/qX5kaT
HEFCE Annual Provider Review: https://goo.gl/W79xmE
OIA guidance: https://goo.gl/HwEjnY

Authors
Dr Alexander Rhys (Development Co-ordinator (TEF/Quality))
Emily Thornton (Policy Analyst (TEF/Quality))
Appendix 1: Action plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Summary of work to be undertaken</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Expected end date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education and Student Strategy</strong></td>
<td>The Education and Student Strategy approved in 2014/15 will be revised to support the Vision 2026, new KPIs in satisfaction, progression and employability and readiness for the TEF.</td>
<td>Deputy President and Provost</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transformation Programme (now known as Modernising Administration for Students)</strong></td>
<td>A number of projects are being undertaken within the Transformation Programme to improve underpinning systems and processes that support the student journey. This is a large-scale institution-wide programme of work which is planned to take place over the next 3 years. A One-Year on report was made to SIPCO by the Director of Student &amp; Academic Services in September. MAFS is supporting City in KPIs in student satisfaction and progression as well as operational effectiveness</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Summary of work to be undertaken</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Expected end date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSS 2016 action planning</td>
<td>Meetings will take place with programme teams and the Deputy President and Provost regarding the outcomes of the NSS 2016 to support action planning.</td>
<td>Deputy President and Provost</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ Union Strategy</td>
<td>Work will be undertaken in close collaboration with the Students’ Union on how outputs from the new SU Strategy and new City Vision and Strategy can collectively maximise impact for students and meet KPIs.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS &amp; SU</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression data analysis</td>
<td>An analysis of recruitment and progression data will be undertaken to improve understanding of which students are failing to progress and why. The work will also identify gaps in current data that hinder our understanding of progression issues, so that these gaps can be filled. Improved data and understanding of it will inform a Progression Improvement Programme and planned future decision-making in this area. A Progression Improvement Working Group of ExCo has been established and a plan of work has been presented to Council.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Summary of work to be undertaken</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Expected end date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| UG Assessment Strategy Review      | This review will examine and revise assessments strategies across City’s undergraduate programmes to ensure that:  
  - Assessments for each programme are clearly mapped against learning outcomes  
  - The volume and spread of assessment across each programme are appropriate  
  - Assessments are authentic and inclusive  
  - Each programme team has a clear plan for the on-going evaluation of impact against on student satisfaction, retention, progression and employability. | LEdA    | March 2018        |
<p>| Student Representation Review      | The Students’ Union and City will seek to ensure our students are able to effectively engage in decision-making about their academic and broader experience at different levels of decision-making through a review of student representation undertaken during 2017/18. This will examine the effectiveness of existing feedback mechanisms in capturing the student voice particularly in relation to programme enhancements and overall student experience. | S&amp;AS &amp; SU | December 2018     |
| Personal Support for Students Review | Personal Support for Students will be reviewed as an enabling project of the Education and Student Strategy. The project will examine the personal support offer at City in the context of student feedback, best sector practice and current work to improve Personal Tutoring. | S&amp;AS    | July 2019         |
| Peer Mentoring                     | The CityBuddies scheme is currently an opt-in peer mentoring scheme which matches current City students with new undergraduates on the same course to provide support during their first months. During 2018/19, the scheme will be expanded and become an opt-out programme so that all first year students will be paired with a mentor before they start on their programme. | S&amp;AS    | July 2019         |
| Student Engagement and Attendance Monitoring | Effective attendance monitoring will allow us to better engage with our students and therefore improve student progression and the student experience as a whole. This project aims to provide technological enablement | S&amp;AS    | July 2020         |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Summary of work to be undertaken</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Expected end date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to support the monitoring of student attendance of all students, supporting the Attendance and Participation Policy to better engage with all our students, to improve progression/retention and to improve the student experience, in general.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Surveys</td>
<td>During 2017/18, strategic adjustment to new NSS question set and implications for City within sector</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Surveys</td>
<td>During 2017/18, strategic adjustment to operation of new DLHE and implications for City within sector</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distinctive Offer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot of an Employability Award</td>
<td>An Employability Award will be piloted to support students in planning and reflecting on opportunities and achievements desired by employers beyond the curriculum. Following a pilot, students across all programmes will have the opportunity to take part in the award in 17/18.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careers Registration project</td>
<td>All new and returning students will be required to complete a questionnaire which will provide new insight into students’ views about their employment readiness. The scheme has received positive feedback from Schools and is supporting the Careers Service in targeting support for students.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic review of Widening Participation Outreach framework</td>
<td>A comprehensive review of our Widening Participation Outreach framework will be undertaken. Findings will inform our understanding of the preferences and needs of WP students making the transition into university life.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>Review will be presented to ExCo in Autumn 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctive Offer Benchmarking Framework</td>
<td>This project will consider what is unique or distinctive about the curriculum offered at the University. It will draw in existing initiatives looking at aspects of the curriculum including research and practice inspired teaching, employability, entrepreneurship and internationalisation.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS and LEaD</td>
<td>July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Summary of work to be undertaken</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Expected end date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of work to be undertaken</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scoping activity will take place in early 2017/18 to develop project aims and identify outputs, alongside developing a project timeline.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employability in the Curriculum</strong></td>
<td>This project to integrate employability development into the curriculum is focused on the delivery of specific employability modules and broader work with programme teams to look holistically at the curriculum and how employability development can be integrated within teaching and learning pedagogy.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scoping activity will take place in early 2017/18 to develop project aims and identify outputs, alongside developing a project timeline.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational and professional practice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPD for Educational Practice</strong></td>
<td>There is currently a range of CPD for staff to improve their learning and teaching practice, and this initiative will look at how this is targeted for staff who occupy different roles and at different points in their careers. It will also consider the range of CPD on offer and how to improve engagement with staff across the University.</td>
<td>LEaD</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scoping activity will take place in early 2017/18 to develop project aims and identify outputs, alongside developing a project timeline.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluating and Sharing Local Initiatives (best practice)</strong></td>
<td>During 2017/18, an evaluative framework will be used to evaluate best practice across City with reference to initiatives designed to improve progression.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Designing Active Learning Initiative (DALI) Project</strong></td>
<td>This is a rolling project to redesign of the technology within learning spaces at City. During 2016/17, the first second year of the initiative, learning spaces will be updated with new teaching equipment. Planning will also take place for the programme of works for 2017/18.</td>
<td>LEaD</td>
<td>On track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality Framework</strong></td>
<td>Development and implementation of revised Placements Policy and guidance concluding work initiated in 2015/16.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Summary of work to be undertaken</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Expected end date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning policy and guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Student mobility policy and guidance</td>
<td>Development and implementation of revised student mobility policy and guidance for management of outgoing study abroad opportunities concluding work initiated in 2015/16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Senate policy on the appointment of research supervisors</td>
<td>A revised policy on the appointment of research supervisors was implemented in 2015/16 as part of the action plan to improve completion rates. When approving the policy, Senate agreed that a review should be undertaken of how it had been implemented by Boards of Studies during 2015/16.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate regulatory framework and new modes of programme delivery</td>
<td>Work will be undertaken to develop the Senate regulatory framework to respond to new flexible modes of delivery emerging from School strategic plans.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEFCE revised operating model for quality assessment including Part 1 of the European Standards Guidelines</td>
<td>Consideration will be given to whether any adjustments are required to the quality and standards framework in response to HEFCE’s QA requirements beyond potential changes to Periodic Review processes and academic governance arrangements outlined under 2 and 3 below. Further work to the framework will be dependent on pilot activity and further research being undertaken by HEFCE either directly or under contract during 2016/17. It is currently envisaged that changes may be required external examining and the way in which degree classifications are calculated.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>As part of the revised quality assessment model implemented by HEFCE for 2016/17, Council is receiving this report to outline the quality assurance processes at City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy on extensions for submission of assessed work</td>
<td>Arrangements for extensions to deadlines for the submission of assessed work are currently set and managed at School level. The need to establish an institutional-level policy in this area was identified as a priority by Schools through the review of the Senate Assessment Regulations undertaken in 2015/16.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>December 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Research and Progress system for research students</td>
<td>Research and Progress (RaP) is the system used to record and monitor the progress of City’s research students. The system licence is due for renewal in</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Summary of work to be undertaken</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Expected end date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017. A review will be undertaken to consider future requirements and ongoing fitness for purpose.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic governance arrangements for award-bearing collaborative provision</td>
<td>The current academic governance arrangements will be reviewed to reflect the changing shape of the collaborative provision portfolio and to ensure fitness for purpose in relation to national requirements.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Senate and sub-committees and reporting arrangements</td>
<td>Work will be undertaken to consider any adjustments required to the operation of Senate and its sub-committees including reporting to support Council in providing assurance to HEFCE within the new operating model for quality assessment. During 2016/17 Education and Student Committee, AGC and Senate have discussed proposals for the establishment of a new sub-committee of Senate which would report directly to Senate on matters of educational quality and standards. It is anticipated that the committee will commence work during 2017/18 following formal approval through Senate.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module evaluation</td>
<td>The current module evaluation process has been in place since 2011 and has expanded to encompass all taught undergraduate and postgraduate modules. A review of the operational processes has been undertaken and Senate will receive a report on current practice and opportunities for enhancement during the Autumn term. This will ensure that module evaluation remains fit for purpose and continues to align with City’s current priorities and other internal and external developments.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body Accreditations and Reviews</td>
<td>Education and Student Committee has approved a review of the PSRB policy during 2017/18, this will be informed by the recommendations from the Internal Audit which took place in 2017.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Approval Policy Review</td>
<td>Education and Student Committee has approved a review of the Programme Approval Policy during 2017/18. This review will develop the Programme Approval Policy to align to City’s Vision and Strategy, the Education and Student Strategy, as well as the Teaching Excellence Framework, tighter</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>March 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Summary of work to be undertaken</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Expected end date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>regulations from the CMA and changes in the national regulatory framework. This will be further informed by the piloted Programme Approval process piloted in Cass during 2016/17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodic Review Policy Review</td>
<td>Education and Student Committee has approved a review of the Periodic Review Policy during 2017/18. This review will develop the Periodic Review Policy to align to City’s Vision and Strategy, the Education and Student Strategy, as well as the Teaching Excellence Framework, tighter regulations from the CMA and changes in the national regulatory framework. This will be further informed by the recommendations from the Internal Audit which took place in 2017.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>March 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Amendment Policy Review</td>
<td>Education and Student Committee has approved a review of the Programme Amendment Policy during 2017/18. This review will develop the Programme Amendment Policy to align to City’s Vision and Strategy, the Education and Student Strategy, as well as the Teaching Excellence Framework, tighter regulations from the CMA and changes in the national regulatory framework.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>March 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Suspension/Withdrawal Policy Review</td>
<td>Education and Student Committee has approved a review of the Programme Suspension/Withdrawal Policy during 2017/18. This review will develop the Programme Suspension/Withdrawal Policy to align to City’s Vision and Strategy, the Education and Student Strategy, as well as the Teaching Excellence Framework, tighter regulations from the CMA and changes in the national regulatory framework.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>March 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment feedback turnaround</td>
<td>On-going work to ensure compliance with the turnaround times for providing students with feedback on assessed work. Non-compliance reports and action plans to ensure compliance will continue to be required from Schools on a termly basis.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS and Schools</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Degree Completion Rates</td>
<td>On-going work to implement the action plan developed during 2015/16 to improve research degree completion rates.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS and Schools</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 2: Coverage of CUC guidance on a possible reporting approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUC Suggestions on Possible Approach</th>
<th>Location in City’s Proposed Report Template</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| i. Details about membership and meetings during the year, including the topics covered in pre-/post-meeting seminars/workshops or away days; | Part 4: Governance Framework  
A) Report on the operation of Senate  
B) Reports on the operation of Boards of Studies and sub-committees |
| ii. Summary of outcomes of internal periodic programme reviews carried out during the reporting year, and any action taken as a result; | Part 2: Academic Quality and Standards (the Quality Framework)  
B) Periodic Review |
| iii. Details of key reports considered during the year and any action arising from their consideration, such as: | |
| a. Summary of themes from programme approval/review activities; | Part 2: Academic Quality and Standards (the Quality Framework)  
B) Periodic Review  
C) Programme Development and Approval |
| b. Summary of themes from external examiners’ reports; | Part 2: Academic Quality and Standards (the Quality Framework)  
F) Academic Standards and Outcomes: External examining |
| c. Summary of reviews carried out by Professional Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs) | Part 2: Academic Quality and Standards (the Quality Framework)  
D) Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body Accreditations and Reviews |
| d. Annual reports on student complaints, academic appeals, mitigating circumstances, examinations; | Part 2: Academic Quality and Standards (the Quality Framework)  
E) Academic Standards and Outcomes: Assessment practice and outcomes (including assessment feedback turnaround)  
G) Student Complaints, Appeals and Mitigating Circumstances |
| e. Faculty annual reviews; | Part 3: Educational Quality Support and Enhancement  
A) Annual Programme Evaluation |
| f. National Student Survey results and action plans; | Part 3: Educational Quality Support and Enhancement  
B) Student Surveys and Action Plans (Includes NSS, Your Voice, PTES and PRES) |
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| g. Research Degrees Committee annual report; | Part 2: Academic Quality and Standards (the Quality Framework)  
H) Research Degree Provision |
| iv. details of other key areas of work carried out by the Senate/Academic Board’s sub-committees; | Part 4: Governance Framework  
A) Report on the operation of Senate  
B) Reports on the operation of Boards of Studies and sub-committees |
| v. details of student engagement in academic governance; | Part 1: Student Representation and Feedback/Student Voice section |
| vi. any action arising out of relevant internal audit work that relates to academic quality and standards; | Part 5: Independent reports on quality and standards (i.e. that sit outside the quality and standards framework)  
A) Internal Audit Reports on quality and standards |
<p>| vii. opinion – as in respect to paragraph 2 [assurance statement] (and reasons for any exceptions); | Part 1: Contextual update section |
| viii. action plan, or outline of priority areas, for the following year (this is expected to be a requirement of the new quality assurance framework). | Overview and contextual update section, supplemented by specific actions in each section of the report |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESG Standard</th>
<th>Relevant chapter/section of the UK Quality Code and other regulatory requirements</th>
<th>Report Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Policy for Quality Assurance** | Institutions should have a policy for quality assurance that is made public and forms part of their strategic management. Internal stakeholders should develop and implement this policy through appropriate structures and processes, while involving external stakeholders. | **Quality Code:** Chapter A2: Degree-Awarding Bodies’ Reference Points for Academic Standards Chapter B10: Managing Higher Education Provision with Others | **Part 1: Overview and Contextual Update**  
D) Compliance with external framework |
| **Design and approval of programmes** | Institutions should have processes for the design and approval of their programmes. The programmes should be designed so that they meet the objectives set for them, including the intended learning outcomes. The qualification resulting from a programme should be clearly specified and communicated, and refer to the correct level of the national qualifications framework for higher education and, consequently, to the Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher education Area. | **Quality Code:** Chapter A1: UK and European Reference Points for Academic Standards Chapter A3: Securing Academic Standards and an Outcomes-Based Approach to Academic Awards Chapter B1: Programme Design, Development and Approval | **Part 2: Academic Quality and Standards (the Quality Framework)**  
C) Programme Development and Approval |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESG Standard</th>
<th>Relevant chapter/section of the UK Quality Code and other regulatory requirements</th>
<th>Report Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment | **Quality Code:** Chapter A3: Securing Academic Standards and an Outcomes-Based Approach to Academic Awards  
Chapter B3: Learning and Teaching  
Chapter B4: Enabling Student Development and Achievement  
Chapter B5: Student Engagement  
Chapter B6: Assessment of Students and the Recognition of Prior Learning  
Chapter B7: External Examining  
Chapter B9: Academic Appeals and Student Complaints  
OIA Good Practice Framework for handling complaints and academic appeals | **Part 2: Academic Quality and Standards (the Quality Framework)**  
E) Academic Standards and Outcomes: Assessment practice and outcomes (including assessment feedback turnaround)  
F) Academic Standards and Outcomes: External Examining  
G) Extenuating Circumstances, Student Complaints, Academic Appeals and Academic Misconduct  
H) Research Degree Provision  
I) Education with Others and Flexible Delivery – Partnerships and Validation  
**Part 3: Educational Quality Support and Enhancement**  
A) Annual Programme Evaluation  
B) Student Surveys and Actions Plans (includes NSS, Your Voice, PTES and PRES)  
C) Module Evaluation  
D) Peer-Supported Review of Education  
E) Personal Tutoring |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESG Standard</th>
<th>Relevant chapter/section of the UK Quality Code and other regulatory requirements</th>
<th>Report Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Staff</strong></td>
<td><strong>Quality Code:</strong> Chapter B3: Learning and Teaching</td>
<td><strong>Part 3: Educational Quality Support and Enhancement</strong> D) Peer-Supported Review of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions should assure themselves of the competence of their teachers.</td>
<td>They should apply fair and transparent processes for the recruitment and development of the staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning resources and student support</strong></td>
<td><strong>Quality Code:</strong> Chapter B3: Learning and Teaching Chapter B4: Enabling Student Development and Achievement</td>
<td><strong>Part 1: Overview and Contextual Update</strong> A) Strategic Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions should have appropriate funding for learning and teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Part 3: Educational Quality Support and Enhancement</strong> D) Peer-Supported Review of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities and ensure that adequate and readily accessible learning resources and student support are provided.</td>
<td></td>
<td>E) Personal Tutoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 3: European Standards and Guidelines (Part 1) Compliance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESG Standard</th>
<th>Relevant chapter/section of the UK Quality Code and other regulatory requirements</th>
<th>Report Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutions should ensure that they collect, analyse and use relevant information for the effective management of their programmes and other activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions should publish information about their activities, including programmes, which is clear, accurate, objective, up-to date and readily accessible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions should monitor and periodically review their programmes to ensure that they achieve the objectives set for them and respond to the needs of students and society. These reviews should lead to the continuous improvement of the programme. Any action planned should be communicated to all those concerned.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Senate Composition - Ordinance C1.3

i. The following Ex-Officio members:
   a) President (Chair)
   b) Deputy President & Provost
   c) Vice-Presidents
   d) Chairs of the following Standing Committees of Senate:
      - Boards of Studies
      - Academic Governance Committee
      - Research Ethics Committee
      - Validation and Institutional Partnerships Committee
   e) Dean of City Graduate School
   f) Director of Student and Academic Services

   The Deputy Chair of a Board of Studies may attend in place of the Chair of the Board on occasions when the Chair is unable to attend.

ii. Non Ex-Officio members

   Elected members of Category A staff to equal the number of ex-officio staff posts and to include at least two from each of the academic discipline Board of Studies areas (i.e. excluding the Board of Studies in Learning Development). All are elected for a period of three years, renewable. Category A staff comprise the entire electorate for this election.

   One additional elected member from Category B Staff (with an alternate) where the Category B staff comprise the entire electorate for that election.

   Note:

   Category A staff = Staff on full time and fractional academic staff contracts but excluding research assistants and research fellows.

   Category B staff = Staff on Visiting Hourly Paid Lecturer Contracts

iii. Student members

   A maximum of five students including the three sabbaticals and up to two other students nominated by the Trustee Board, ensuring that the student members include at least one undergraduate, one postgraduate taught and one postgraduate research student.

   Note: the University Librarian will be invited to attend.
## Senate Attendance 2016/17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Meeting 12-10-16</th>
<th>Meeting 07-12-16</th>
<th>Meeting 08-03-17</th>
<th>Meeting 15-05-17</th>
<th>Meeting 17-06-17</th>
<th>Meeting 12-07-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President (Chair)</td>
<td>Professor Sir Paul Curran</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy President &amp; Provost</td>
<td>Professor David Bolton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Presidents</td>
<td>Professor Richard Verrall (Deputy Chair)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Andrew Jones</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Stanton Newman (p/t)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Student &amp; Academic Services</td>
<td>Ms Susannah Marsden</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairs of the Standing Committees of Senate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BoS in Arts &amp; Soc Sciences</td>
<td>Professor Theo Farrell</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BoS in Business Studies</td>
<td>Professor Marianne Lewis</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BoS in Eng &amp; Math Sci &amp; Inf</td>
<td>Professor Roger Crouch</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BoS in Health Sciences</td>
<td>Prof S Newman / Prof D Salmon (1 July)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BoS in Law</td>
<td>Professor Carl Stychin</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BoS in Learning Development</td>
<td>Professor Susannah Quinsee</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Governance Cttee</td>
<td>Professor Richard Verrall</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Ethics Committee</td>
<td>Professor Ron Douglas</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Provision Committee</td>
<td>Professor Laurence Solkin</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>N/M</td>
<td>N/M</td>
<td>N/M</td>
<td>N/M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation &amp; Inst Partners Cttee</td>
<td>Professor Steve Grattan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>N/M</td>
<td>N/M</td>
<td>N/M</td>
<td>N/M</td>
<td>N/M</td>
<td>N/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of City Graduate School</td>
<td>Professor Ken Grattan</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected members of academic staff to equal the number of ex-officio staff posts and to include at least two from each of the Board of Studies areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Soc Sciences (to Jul 18)</td>
<td>Professor Giulia Iori</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Soc Sciences (to Jul 18)</td>
<td>Professor Laurence Solkin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Soc Sciences (to Jul 19)</td>
<td>Professor Mireia Jofre-Bonet</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Soc Sciences (to Jul 17)</td>
<td>Dr Rachel Cohen (Senior Elected Senator)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business (to Jul 18)</td>
<td>Professor Charles Baden-Fuller</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business (to Jul 19)</td>
<td>Professor Anthony Neuberger</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business (to Jul 17)</td>
<td>Dr Amanda Goodall</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences (to Jul 17)</td>
<td>Ms Julie Attenborough</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences (to Jul 17)</td>
<td>Dr Chris Flood</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences (to Jul 17)</td>
<td>Professor Chris Hull</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths, Comp Sci &amp; Eng (to Jul 19)</td>
<td>Dr Arif Agrawal</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths, Comp Sci &amp; Eng (to Jul 19)</td>
<td>Dr Anton Cox</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths, Comp Sci &amp; Eng (to Jul 18)</td>
<td>Professor Abdulnasser Sayma</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law (to Jul 18)</td>
<td>Professor Susan Blake</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law (to Jul 18)</td>
<td>Mr Keith Simpson</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law (to Jul 18)</td>
<td>Mr Sarwan Singh</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One additional elected member from the Visiting Staff (with an alternate)</td>
<td>Mr Peter Woodward (to Jul 18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A maximum of five students nominated by the Trustee Board one of whom should be the President of the Students Union. At least one from each of the following categories – undergraduate, postgraduate and research.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Yusuf Ahmad, President</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Zain Ismail, VP Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Sheikh Hassan, VP Activities &amp; Research</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Laura Thompson</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Andy Ridley</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Lay Members of Council – Senate Attendance 2016/17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date of Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Rob Woodward, Chair of Council</td>
<td>12th October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Andy Friend, Council Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Andrian Haxby, Council Member</td>
<td>7th December 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Roger Bright, Council Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council members unavailable</td>
<td>8th March 2017: Extraordinary Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr John Low, Council Member</td>
<td>15th March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council members unavailable</td>
<td>17th May 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Hunada Nouss, member of Council</td>
<td>12th July 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Janet Legrand, member of Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Governance and Senate Delegation Structure

![GOVERNANCE AND EXECUTIVE DELEGATION STRUCTURE](image)
Quality and Standards Short Guide

Introduction
City, University of London aims to deliver excellent programmes in an environment that supports students to be successful at University and in their future careers. To manage this, City has a framework of policies and procedures that underpin our educational provision to provide assurance of academic standards and the continuing quality of programmes. The Quality and Standards Short Guide (QSSG) provides a brief summary of City’s approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic standards</th>
<th>Academic quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The threshold level of achievement required for a student to successfully achieve their academic award.</td>
<td>How well the learning opportunities provided support students to achieve their academic award and prepare for their future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality assurance</th>
<th>Enhancement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A range of policies and procedures designed to safeguard academic standards and the quality of learning opportunities.</td>
<td>Taking deliberate action to ensure continual improvement of the student learning experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The University’s Governance structure includes a framework of responsibilities delegated from the Council. Senate has responsibility for all academic policies and regulations and takes oversight of the development of the City’s educational provision. School Boards of Studies are sub-committees of Senate and have delegated authority for the maintenance of academic standards and quality within their academic subject areas. The Deputy President & Provost is responsible for overseeing academic quality, quality standards and enhancement matters. The Education and Student Committee is a board that provides advice and guidance, and makes recommendations to the DP/Provost and to Senate.

Reporting to the Deputy President & Provost:
- Student and Academic Services supports Schools, the Executive Team and partner institutions in the strategic development and assurance of the quality of education awarded by City. It also works in close liaison with the Students’ Union and with other Professional Services on the student learning experience.
- Learning Enhancement and Development (LEaD) supports staff and students to develop and create new, innovative and responsive learning opportunities with the aim of enhancing academic practice, educational development and technology enhanced learning.

The Quality Assurance Framework
The Quality Assurance Framework articulates the core principles that inform City’s approach to quality, quality standards and enhancement. It comprises a range of policies and procedures that are articulated in detail through the Quality Manual and the Validated and Institutional Partnerships Handbook.

The information below highlights the broad elements covered by the Quality Assurance Framework.

City recognises the importance of establishing policies and procedures for recruitment, selection and admission that are fair, clear and accurate, and in accordance with our Equal Opportunities Strategy and Single Equality Scheme.

The programme approval and amendment processes are designed to ensure the development of programmes that demonstrate:
- Strategic fit and viability
- High quality learning opportunities and robust academic standards
- Research-informed curricula
- Alignment with external factors like professional body requirements and the UK Quality Code
Annual Programme Evaluation (APE) and Periodic Review (PR) provide regular mechanisms to review the success of programmes, to monitor academic standards and to identify areas for enhancement.

High quality programmes require appropriate student support and information.

The student voice is central to the City’s approach. City works in partnership with students and the Students’ Union to ensure that student views are fully represented in the governance structures and inform the local and strategic development of education. Formal mechanisms – student surveys and student representation - are complimented by other less formal opportunities for engagement.

City sets out expected values and behaviours of students and staff in City and You.

The Student Disciplinary Policy and Regulations sets out the context in which a disciplinary process may be invoked.

City aims to provide a high quality experience for each student but it is recognised that on occasion a student may be dissatisfied with or concerned about an aspect of his/her experience. Policies are in place for the management of complaints.

The assessment of learning is integral to the City's commitment to provide high quality education and to underpin the academic standards of awards made to students. City’s Assessment and Feedback Policy provides the context in which assessment operates and outlines the activities to be undertaken by staff to support student learning and maintenance of standards. Clear policies are in place to support the management of appeals.

External Examiners are appointed for all taught provision that leads to a City, University of London award or award of credit. External Examiners play a critical role in supporting the maintenance of academic standards and overseeing the assessment process. They produce annual reports that inform review processes.

City offers a diverse range of research degree programmes both internally and through our validated institutions. The research degrees’ framework sets out the key principles of City in its management of research degree provision.

Validation is a process whereby City recognises the academic quality and standards of programmes designed and delivered by a partner institution as equivalent to its own. Institutional Partnerships may contain a mixture of provision designed and delivered by an approved/validation partner and/or one or more Schools at City. Quality and standards are managed and governed centrally through the leadership of the Dean of Validation, advised by the Validation and Institutional Partnerships (VIP) Committee, and a framework set out in the VIP Handbook.

For School-managed partnerships City makes an award or award of credit for provision that operates at programme level, normally in one School. This activity is managed and governed at local level in accordance with the framework for quality and standards.

Contact Student and Academic Services: http://www.city.ac.uk/about/education/academic-services

Further Information

- Quality Assurance Agency:
  - UK Quality Code
    http://www.qaa.ac.uk/AssuringStandardsAndQuality/quality-code/Pages/default.aspx
  - Framework for Higher Education Qualifications
    http://www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Pages/quality-code-A1.aspx
  - Subject Benchmark Statements
    http://www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Pages/quality-code-A2.aspx
- Higher Education Academy:
  http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/
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### Student Numbers - Rounded Full Time Equivalents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>4625</td>
<td>4845</td>
<td>4850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>8175</td>
<td>8390</td>
<td>8960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>7690</td>
<td>8045</td>
<td>8330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other European Union</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>1615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-European Union</td>
<td>3505</td>
<td>3650</td>
<td>3860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Number of Programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Class of Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:1</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:2</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>