

Periodic Review update

This paper provides the following information on Periodic Review:

- Overview report of themes and matters for consideration (page 2)
- Periodic Review facilitation – feedback review (page 7)
- Schedule for 2015-16 and reviews due in 2016-17 (page 8)
- MSc Finance Cluster Periodic Review Report (page 10)
- Cass UG Programmes Periodic Report (page 22)
- UG/PG Journalism Periodic Review Report (page 31)
- UG/PG Psychology Periodic Review Report (page 40)
- PG Sociology Periodic Review Report (page 53)

Recommended actions:

- To **consider** the overview report 2014-15 and recommendations for the University arising from Periodic Reviews
- To **note** the schedule of Periodic Reviews for 2015-16 and reviews due in 2016-17
- To **receive** the Periodic Review reports for the above programmes/departments Reports included are for those not previously received by Education and Student Committee. Some of the Periodic Reviews covered in the thematic review have been received at previous Committee's.
- ADEs to **confirm** timeframes for Periodic Reviews prior to the next Education and Student Committee.
- To **note** that a report on outstanding reports, responses and 1 year on reports will be made to the next meeting of Education and Student Committee.

OVERVIEW REPORT 2014-15

The Periodic Review Policy gives full details of the aims of the Periodic Review. However, in summary, each department will take part in the process on a 6 year cyclical basis. The Periodic Review forms part of City's framework for the management of the quality and standards of provision. In addition, it aims to gain an understanding of developments, provisions, and changes undergone by a department. It involves the Programme Teams; Current Students and Alumni; and the School Management Team; with the aim of gaining greater understanding of the provisions available, and the direction of the department.

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

The 2014/15 Periodic Review Reports highlighted a number of common key themes which are covered below. The report seeks to give a flavour of the types of activities being undertaken in each area and to draw out what students particularly like, areas of best practice, and innovative or successful development initiatives.

The Report covers the following Departments/Programmes:

- Psychology (School of Arts and Social Sciences)
- Journalism (School of Arts and Social Sciences)
- Postgraduate Sociology (School of Arts and Social Sciences)
- Music (School of Arts and Social Sciences)
- Civil Engineering (School of Mathematics, Computer Science and Engineering)
- BSc/PG Dip in Specialist Community Public Health Nursing and BSc Practice Nursing (School of Health Science)
- Research Programmes (School of Health Science)
- Cass Undergraduate Programmes (Cass Business School)
- PG Finance (Cass Business School)

Educational Offer/Effectiveness of Programmes	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Academic Standards and Student Achievement	3
Student Support and Resources	4
Student Community, Engagement and Feedback	5
Alumni and Graduate Engagement	5

EDUCATIONAL OFFER/EFFECTIVENESS OF PROGRAMMES

PANELS HIGHLIGHTED THE FOLLOWING GOOD PRACTICE

A common theme noted by Panels was the high regard of the majority of programmes in Europe and internationally by employers and students. Specifically noted as good practice were;

- The teaching staff on programmes consisting of both academics and practitioners (Psychology). It was thought that this combination gives students a wider perspective on the discipline and profession allowing them to make more informed choices regarding research focus and future employment.
- The links with professions, the use of high profile guest lecturers and visiting lecturers who offer specific expertise (Journalism).

WHAT STUDENTS LIKE

- The expertise and specialist knowledge offered by Visiting Lecturers (Journalism)
- Challenging but supportive nature of their programme (BSc Psychology)

DEVELOPMENTS SINCE LAST REVIEW

The Higher Education sector has changed greatly since these courses were last reviewed, including an increase in fees for UG students. A common theme amongst the programmes is the emphasis on practical and theoretical knowledge. The majority of programmes were commended on their professional aspect and preparing students for work.

Visiting Lecturers have increasingly become a method of lecture delivery and this was a subject for discussion in a number of Periodic Reviews. In all Periodic Reviews it was noted that the use of Visiting Lecturers had the potential to be extremely beneficial, but it must be carefully monitored by permanent members of the department. Staff felt that the University had gained a better understanding of the use of Visiting Lecturers, and appropriate support mechanisms had been put in place in many departments to support modules run by Visiting Lecturers. Further research related teaching had also been developed amongst several programmes.

PLANS FOR FUTURE

The majority of programmes plan to continue to develop research led activity within the programme for both staff and students.

There was also a common theme of enhancing a coherent vision of various departments to capitalise on the advantages that City has to offer and its unique selling points.

ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

PANELS HIGHLIGHTED THE FOLLOWING GOOD PRACTICE

For all programmes that were reviewed, confidence was placed in the academic standards of the reviewed provisions and in the quality of the learning opportunities available to students. In particular the following were highlighted;

- High NSS scores (Music)

WHAT STUDENTS LIKE

- The quality and commitment of staff delivering all programmes, including much of the administrative support provided.

DEVELOPMENTS SINCE LAST REVIEW

The majority of the programmes reviewed had engaged positively with the Annual Programme Evaluation process to monitor programmes and provide enhancement. Both the APEs and the student feedback demonstrated that there had been some improvement in developing methods and quality of feedback for assessment, further demonstrating a commitment to enhancing both the student experience and the academic standards.

PLANS FOR FUTURE

Visiting Lecturers continues to be a common theme. Although the general feedback on the use of Visiting Lecturers appears to be positive, there were some concerns regarding staffing imbalance between academic and vocational priorities. Some students also reported difficulties in communication where modules are run by Visiting Lecturers. Mechanisms should continue to be put in place to ensure that VLS are supported, integrated into the programme and have an understanding of the wider curriculum.

STUDENT SUPPORT AND RESOURCES

PANELS HIGHLIGHTED THE FOLLOWING GOOD PRACTICE

- For all programmes considered for review, panels noted the high standard of learning resources and facilities for students.
- The quality of staff engagement in preparing student for employment and careers (Journalism)
- Placement programme (UG Cass). This was seen as a great strength with students identifying a placement as being of great benefit during their studies and their employability on completion of their studies

WHAT STUDENTS LIKE

- The quality and commitment of staff delivering all programmes, including much of the administrative support provided.

DEVELOPMENTS SINCE LAST REVIEW

All programmes considered in the report have worked on providing additional support and resources to students with an emphasis on improving the student experience. Programmes have been developed with employability at the forefront to maximise opportunities for students to cultivate industry/professional links.

It was clear from the reviews that students felt that they were able to speak to staff about their concerns on both a formal or informal basis. Students particularly commented on the availability of staff across the programmes reviewed.

Departments have been active in improving student support including via the use of feedback in programme development, availability of resources, and reflection on support needs within, and relevance to, professional environments.

Overall students felt that their feedback was valued and they were able to let staff know what their views were.

PLANS FOR FUTURE

An overall theme was to continue to support students, particularly in relation to enhancing work experience/related opportunities.

STUDENT COMMUNITY, ENGAGEMENT AND FEEDBACK

PANELS HIGHLIGHTED THE FOLLOWING GOOD PRACTICE

Panels found that students interviewed as part of the periodic review process were knowledgeable about their subject areas, reflective and engaged in the interview process. Particular good practice was highlighted as;

- The level of student engagement in the programmes (Journalism)
- Deliberate steps to respond to UG student feedback, with visible improvement in module scores (Journalism)

DEVELOPMENTS SINCE LAST REVIEW

There have been a number of developments towards trying to encourage student feedback and engagement through existing committees and students generally reported that they felt that feedback was valued.

PLANS FOR THE FUTURE

Encouraging the development of the student community continues to be a clear theme across the recommendations within the reviews. Ensuring consistency of student feedback and improving mechanisms by which students are informed of the actions taken in response to their feedback was also a common theme across the programmes that were reviewed.

To ensure that key strategic areas affecting the student experience are being considered through the Periodic Review Process, the guidance will be revised to ensure constructive engagement with the Education and Student Strategy and broader consideration of strategic fit will be included within the Periodic Review Policy and guidance.

ALUMNI AND GRADUATE ENGAGEMENT

PANELS HIGHLIGHTED THE FOLLOWING GOOD PRACTICE

- The level and commitment of ongoing alumni engagement with the programmes (Journalism)

WHAT STUDENTS LIKE

- Engaging with Alumni
- Reputation of graduates progressing to good careers

DEVELOPMENTS SINCE LAST REVIEW

It was clear from the reviews undertaken during this period that continuing to strengthen relationships with Alumni to enhance networking and job opportunities for current students was a priority across the departments.

PLANS FOR FUTURE

The majority of programmes reviewed noted that there was a lack of engagement with alumni. This was noted across all the reviews as an area that should be improved to foster a wider sense of student community, as well as for practical uses such as mentoring.

Several recommendations were made for programmes to strengthen relationships with Alumni to enhance networking and job opportunities for current students.

RECOMMENDATIONS ARISING FROM PERIODIC REVIEW FOR UNIVERSITY CONSIDERATION

The following recommendations arose from Periodic Review Panels for consideration at University level. The majority of recommendations related to guidance and enhancements to the process.

1. Consider the reputational impact of increasing student numbers whilst retaining the same levels of resourcing (MSc Finance-Cass)

The Panel acknowledged that this was an area of concern for the School, with staff reporting that the increased intake of students in recent years had put significant pressure on the resourcing of IT and on effective operations within the premises at Bunhill Row. The University Executive Team are asked to give specific consideration to the impact this has already had upon the School in any future decisions around further increasing student numbers.

2. For the University to consider Periodic Review Guidance for Senior Staff responsible for the management of Periodic Review processes within their School/Department.

In order that Senior School staff be better positioned to support their departmental staff in completing a Periodic Review it was suggested that Periodic Review Guidance aimed at Senior Staff be developed/redrafted.

3. For the University to consider a review of the Periodic Review process to include a presentation.

In order to assist the Panel to fulfil its role, and the requirements of the Reflective Review to be met, Programme Teams from the Psychology department were asked to prepare a short presentation on “market position and strategy”, “students and alumni”, “programme design and analysis” and “staff development”. The Panel reported that this assisted greatly in reaching its outcomes and recommended that the University consider including the requirement of a presentation by programme teams in future periodic reviews.

4. To consider including Staff-Student Liaison Committee minutes in the documentation presented to the panel as a standard item.

The PG Sociology Panel recommended that Periodic Review packs include Staff-Student Liaison Committee for reference.

PERIODIC REVIEW FACILITATION- FEEDBACK REVIEW

The facilitation of the Periodic Review process was reviewed over the summer to identify what worked well during 2014-15 and what can be improved for the future. Feedback was sought from the Quality Forum attended by professional staff in Schools and Student and Academic Services who support Periodic Reviews, and from panel members. A summary of the feedback received is provided below and will be addressed in Periodic Reviews taking place in the coming year:

WHAT WORKED WELL

- Day runs smoothly
- Overall positive experience
- Good participation from panel members
- University academic services support is generally good
- Team members work with commitment and come up with useful and relevant conclusions
- Quality of reports has improved-more critical insight and forward thinking

WAYS TO IMPROVE

- Ensure that the process as outlined in the Quality Manual i.e. initial scoping, development event and pre-meeting between Chair, Secretary and Programme Directors is completed for each Periodic Review as this supports the effectiveness of the process To support this, dates of Reviews, Chairs and Secretaries should be in place by the beginning of the academic year.
- For an outline draft of the Reflective Review to be prepared prior to the development event to provide a focus for discussions at that meeting and support academic staff engagement with the process.
- Provision of basic pro-forma questions for the panel to ask at each meeting that can be adapted by e-mail discussion in advance and refined on the day to ensure that time is used efficiently
- Build in sufficient time for team reflection and discussion on the day of the event s the timetable for the review day is often very packed
- Ensure that students are involved in the process prior to the Review day. Schools will be reminded that in line with the Periodic Review guidance, students should be asked to provide input to the Reflective Review and Action Plan for each review and that they should be briefed prior to attending the student meeting on the Review day.
- For Schools to ensure that documentation is complete and inconsistencies addressed prior to submission to review panels.
- Make use of an electronic database (e.g. SharePoint) to facilitate review of and access to documentation. This should include access for students.
- Panel members to include staff undertaking Periodic Review in the following academic year (where possible/appropriate) to improve their understanding of and engagement with the process for their own Review
- Ensure that student panel members are appropriate for the level of programme undergoing review
- Programme teams should engage with LEaD earlier in the process to maximise the support available when drafting documents.

2015/16 SCHEDULE

School	PR	Last Review	Key contact	Prelim Mtg Date	Dev Event Date	PR Day Date	Chair	Sec	Internal panel member (School)	Internal panel member (other)	Student panel member	External name and email address	LEaD rep	Partnership provision
SASS	UG Sociology Programmes	Last Review 05/06 (carried over from 14/15)	Carmai Pestell	01-Oct-15	01-Nov-15	Wednesday 2 nd March 2016	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	Cordelia Bryan	
SASS	Doctoral Programmes		Carmai Pestell	01-Dec-15	01-Jan-16	Thursday 19 th May 2016	Vicky Joffe (SHS)	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	Cordelia Bryan	
Cass	MSc / PG Dip Actuarial Science & MSc / PG Dip Actuarial Management	Last Review 10/11	Mary Flynn	01-Jan-16	01-Feb-16	June/July	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	Sian Lindsey	
Cass	MSc Real Estate & MSc Real Estate Investment	Last Review 10/11	Mary Flynn	07-Sep-15	01-Nov-16	Feb	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	Sian Lindsey	
SHS	Speech and Language Therapy	Last Review 10/11	Waheeda Dhansey	01-Jan-16	01-Feb-16	Thursday 16th June 2016	Peter Hungerford-Welch (Law)	Helen Fitch/	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	Neal Sumner	Joint award with UCL Institution of Education (MSc Speech, Language and Communication Needs in Schools: Advanced Practice).
SMCSE	Maths Grouping	Last Review 10/11	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	Pam Parker	
SMCSE	UG, PG Electrical Engineering Programmes	Last Review 07/08 (carried over from 14/15)	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	Pam Parker	Franchised Access/Feeder programme with City and Islington College (Foundation Year in Engineering) Articulation (2+2 arrangements) with Nanjing University of Aeronautics, Manipal Education Network, Harbin University of Science and Technology and Jiangsu University of Science and Technogy.

REVIEWS DUE IN 2016/17

- LLB Grouping (CLS) Last reviewed in 10/11
- Graduate Diploma in Law (CLS) Last reviewed in 11/12
- Legal Practice Course (CLS) Last reviewed in 11/12
- UG Radiography (SHS) Last reviewed 10/11
- UG Optometry (SHS) Last reviewed in 11/12
- MSc Health Management (SHS) Last reviewed in 11/12
- MA Academic Practice (LEaD) Last reviewed in 11/12
- Quantitative Maths Cluster (Cass) Last reviewed in 11/12
- Research Degrees (SMCSE) Last reviewed 11/12

Periodic Review report

Programmes reviewed

Cass Business School Finance Cluster of degrees

MSc Banking and International Finance
MSc Investment Management
MSc International Accounting and Finance
MSc Finance and Investment (Part -Time)
MSc Corporate Finance
MSc Finance

Date of review

Monday 6th July 2015

Review participants

Review Panel members:

Professor Martin Caraher	Chair
Issy Cooke	Student Panel member
Dr Anton Cox	University Internal Panel member
Dr Andreas Tsanakas	Cass Internal Panel Member
Dr Lara Cathcart	External Panel Member
Nerida Booth	Co-Secretary
Mark Smith	Co-Secretary

Meetings held during the day and attendees:

Senior Staff Team

Name	Title/Role
Professor Steve Haberman	Dean of Cass Business School and Chair of Board of Studies
Professor Cliff Oswick	Deputy Dean and Head of Undergraduate Programme
Professor Andrew Clare	Associate Dean, MSc Programme
Dr Lorenzo Trapani	Associate Dean, Teaching and Learning
Dr Simon Parker	Associate Dean, Academic Quality and Standards

Programme Teams

Name	Title/Role
Dr Barbara Casu-Lukac	Course Director, MSc Banking & International Finance
Dr Sonia Falconieri	Course Director, MSc Corporate Finance
Dr Ivana Raonic	Course Director, MSc Accounting & Finance
Dr Nick Motson	Course Director, MSc Finance & Investment
Professor Richard Payne	Course Director, MSc Finance
Dr Sotiris Staikouras	Course Director, MSc Investment Management (Acting)
Mrs Hanna Anders	MSc Admissions Manager
Ms Zoe Owen	MSc Course Operations Manager
Ms Alison Sands	MSc Academic Quality and Standards Manager
Dr Pam Parker	LEaD Academic

Students/Alumni

Name	Programme, Year, Mode of Study
Arun Randhawa	MSc Banking and International Finance Student
Aron Korenblit	MSc Finance Student
Abdelaziz Tazi	MSc International Accounting & Finance Student
Igor Shchepilov	MSc Corporate Finance Student
Lolita Kochieva	MSc Corporate Finance Student
Clem Menasce	MSc Finance & Investment Graduate
Martin Bayfield	MSc Finance & Investment Graduate

School co-ordinator

Mary Flynn	Deputy Registrar (Academic Quality)
------------	-------------------------------------

Preparation for review

Date of development day: 26th March 2015

Reflective review and supporting evidence

Panel members were provided with the Reflective Review document and supporting evidence approximately four weeks ahead of the review. This included the following key documentation covering the preceding three years: annual programme evaluations (including management and survey data); external examiner (taught) reports and responses; Programme Management Committee minutes; Staff-Student Liaison Committee minutes; programme handbooks; Advisory Board minutes. The Report from the 2008 Periodic Programme Review was also made available.

Professional/ regulatory/ statutory body involvement

This was not relevant for this Review.

Conduct of the review

The Reflective Review (which will be submitted to Education & Student Committee with this report) was provided to the Panel with a clear overview of the history and context of the provision, developments since the last periodic review and short and long term action planning. The Panel considered the educational offer, effectiveness of the programmes, academic standards and student achievement, inclusivity of design and equality of opportunity, programme and School management, the student experience, and student support and resources.

During the course of the review day the following topics were given particular consideration:

- **Programme specifications**

Statements regarding credit loads for programmes and modules are inconsistent across the Reflective Document – the School confirmed these are likely typographical errors. The Panel suggested that these had best be corrected as the Reflective Document would be retained as part of the record for this Periodic Review.

- **Current Market and context**

The Panel noted that the Reflective Document mentioned very briefly the current market and competitors, but provided no more detail. Both the Senior Team and the Programme team were able to provide more detail. It was explained that there has been increasing numbers of Universities based outside of London setting up campuses in London. Alongside this increasing competition, increasing student expectations and increasing student numbers are having an impact on the student experience and how the School approaches what it offers.

Increasing UKVI restrictions on student visas and regular changes to these rules make it difficult to provide an attractive offer to international students, which works for both the student and the Programme Team. On-going changes to UKVI regulations mean that the Programme Team is looking to adapt the design of programmes to be able to provide an offer to international students. The Programme Team works with the Tier 4 Audit and Risk Group (co-ordinated by Student & Academic Services comprising members across the University) to monitor UKVI regulation changes and determine how the University and the Schools will respond. Some students understood that taking the dissertation would mean that they could work over the summer (for up to 20 hours a week), however this option was not in the end available. The students affected believed this could have had an impact on their employment and felt that the information was communicated poorly by the School. The School has confirmed that this issue is very prominent in the forward planning within the Programme Team, and hopefully students will not be put in this situation again (however, future UKVI changes cannot be predicted).

The School is adapting its offer to increasing the number of part-time students. As the part-time market appears to be shrinking and weakening, the School is considering the option of moving what would traditionally be a part-time offer to towards the online market. The School is looking at offering more teaching of modules (International Modules) outside the UK – at selected sites – as these are very popular with current students and could be a way of developing and focussing the planned distance learning programmes.

- **Management of resources**

The School as a whole is very aware of the limitations on the physical facilities at Bunhill Row. The building was originally built for approximately 900 students and staff, but is currently catering for 1500 students. This is putting a strain on resources, has been an issue for about five years and is something that the School has taken this up with University management. Students perceived resources (IT facilities, Rooms, etc.) at Bunhill Row to be of good quality, but limited quantity. The School considers student numbers of between 1150-1200 to be more workable – if the School was allowed to reduce student numbers, they could manage their physical resources better. With prospects of a better student experience, the School could be more confident about raising fees. At this point in time, the School feels the current fees are right, but would hesitate to increase fees until they had more control over student numbers. Both the School management and programme teams expressed concern that the University will seek to increase student numbers further in the coming years, and the Senior Team and the Programme team believe this is not sustainable. The Programme Team stated that it is difficult to manage resources (student numbers on one particular course have recently increased from 90 to 150 in one year) with little notice.

The School believes it has a very successful admissions team, which is able to recruit an impressive number of applicants each year, but the School are under increasing pressure each year to recruit more and more students.

The School believed that increasing student demand, increasing requirements and expectations from IT provision concomitant with the reduction in IT support (in real terms) are all potential risks to the reputation of the programmes. The School is very mindful of the potential risks of having nationally and internationally ranked programmes (specifically MSc Finance and MSc Management) with overly large student cohorts. The overstretched resources have a potential impact on student feedback, word-of-mouth recruitment and institutional reputation.

- **Educational Offer**

Students were drawn to the offer within the MSc Finance Cluster for various reasons: the range of programmes and variety of electives on offer, the reputation of the School, the content of modules (which includes more technical content than some competitors), location (especially for those already working in the City), opportunities for networking, reports from friends/colleagues, and the competitive tuition fees.

Student feedback suggested that teaching quality was considered to be very high. There were some reported difficulties with lecturers who had a relatively poor standard of spoken English or strong accents. Students were also concerned that some lecturers were using out-of-date content for lecture presentations and case studies. The School noted that students were not always happy with their lecture experience. How the School manages this is discussed later in this report.

Whilst students appreciated group work and the benefits it brought, there were concerns about the potential risks to a stronger student when working with other weaker students when group work was linked to formal assessments. It was noted, in response to this issue, by the Programme Team that students do not always appreciate the value and continued relevance of theoretical information, regardless of the timeframe to which a specific case study may relate. The Panel noted that this is perhaps an issue that the teaching team need to think about how to communicate to students. On the whole, peer assessment is considered very positive for students, as students will often be more demanding of their fellow students' work.

The Programme Team are looking to introduce more research-focused routes for students, as there was a concern that the content (as it was) was not adequately preparing students for a research orientated work or further study. The intention is to provide students with an opportunity to learn research methods, and try out more research-focused study. Whether this has any adverse impacts on the recruitment for the existing suite of programmes will need to be considered in both the short and longer terms.

The International modules were seen to be very successful. The credit offer for these is small, being only 10 credits, but is particularly popular with part-time students.

Students were very complimentary about the workshop format. These were considered to be very helpful and students are keen for more teaching to be conducted in a workshop format. Currently those modules that feature workshops have approximately 10 lectures with 5 workshops. The Programme Team agreed that there is some evidence for workshops being very beneficial to students, and would support the idea of increasing the number of workshops for some modules. There are, however, practical constraints, such as the availability of appropriate rooms and teaching staff for example. The School are keen to be able to provide block booking teaching sessions of under 3 hours, which will require additional consideration with the University's timetabling team.

The Panel noted that the Student Group raised the issue of how the topics of ethical governance, regulatory frameworks and compliance were addressed within the programmes. The Students who raised this stated that compliance and regulation are a big part of the work experience now, and it would have been helpful for the programme to cover these in more detail. The Programme Team noted that there were at least six examples of these issues being covered, but appreciated that students may still perceive this as being an overlooked topic. It was noted that many students would receive training once in employment and, as information changes so frequently, perhaps this is the best way for students to be gaining this knowledge.

The Programme Team were open to the idea of increasing formative assessment, but made clear that owing to current class sizes, this is very challenging.

- **Dissertation**

The Panel noted an increasing take up of the dissertation option by international students. This is demanding on staff who are called on to supervise regularly in order to comply with UKVI rules.

The increase in students taking up the dissertation option was due in part to unforeseen, sudden changes affecting Tier 4 students which "forced" those affected to take the dissertation (when they really would have preferred to take electives) to ensure they had a visa to cover an entire year. Staff were concerned that this put these students under unnecessary academic pressure, as such students were not ideally suited the dissertation route. The School acknowledged that despite guidance, students will choose what route they consider best for them and their careers.

- **Electives**

The Panel noted that the information in the Programme Specifications was not clear and the Programme Team acknowledged that the information printed here does not necessarily represent the actual offer in all cases. It was made clear that students were informed of the full modules available in February/March via emails and other communications through the year. The Programme Team acknowledged that the process of confirming the modules available might take longer than ideal, but the variety of modules offered is a USP for the Cluster.

In terms of elective options, the School was very clear that students are told in advance what might be available, and then told when they arrive what is available. It was noted that some students seem to want to take electives from outside of their course. The Programme team provide students with recommendations on electives and it was noted that a minimum number of students is needed in order for an elective to run.

- **Introduction of a more research orientated MSc**

The Panel noted that the Reflective document mentions this but does not provide much detail. The Programme Team explained that this was to respond to the fact that the current suite of programmes would not fully prepare a student for further research orientated study. This proposed programme would be to allow students the opportunity to focus more on theory and a technical approach. The Programme will need to consider what impact recruiting to this programme might have on recruitment to the other programmes in the suite.

- **Proposal to offer online Programme**

It was noted that an online course - MSc Global Finance – is still at Stage 1 in the approval process. It is hoped that this programme will launch in May 2016, recruiting 50-100 students in the first year, and then 150-200 in the following years. The introduction of this offer is in response to changes in the current market (as detailed above), students being discouraged by the cost of living in London whilst studying, and partly in response to the increasing pressure to recruit more students, without expanding resources.

A specialist member of staff has been recruited to manage the development, introduction and running of the online programme – this person will oversee the recruitment of the support team and the online tutors. Whilst the School acknowledged the Panel's suggestion that an online delivery has potential risks, it considers expanding the School's offer and student numbers at the current rate and delivery of this via a traditional format constitute an even greater risk.

- **The student experience and support for students**

The Senior Team were clear that the School takes the student experience seriously – suggesting that if the School was to fail to meet student expectations, the School has failed in its objectives. Also, it is known that a significant portion of student recruitment is facilitated via word-of-mouth – a poor student experience can affect future recruitment.

The School is aware that an average in-coming student will have had 5 contact points with the admissions team before they commence their studies. The Admissions team is therefore a very important aspect of the School's delivery of a good experience. Once a student commences, the Course Officers are very much at the front of the School's delivery – and have a very hands-on approach in supporting students. Where appropriate, students are encouraged to make use of the Student Services available at Northampton Square for specific support (financial advice, learning support, or the new Sports facilities).

Feedback about lecturers is taken seriously. Should a module evaluation show that a Visiting Lecturer has scores of about 2.5 or less (noting that this is a very rare occurrence), they won't be asked to return. Where student feedback highlights issues with teaching by faculty staff, then the School would consider the most suitable developmental avenues (including coaching and

mentoring). The School does not stop providing this support when student feedback rises to institutionally acceptable levels of 3.5.

The Student Group noted that those students whose English language skills were not strong may place pressure on others to assist with written work when doing group work. The Programme Team noted that students would not often appreciate group members' various strengths, and part of the purpose of group work was to provide them with experience and opportunity to develop skills in working with a wide range of individuals. To this end, individuals were allocated to the groups to reflect variety, for example of gender, country of origin and language backgrounds). Students are reminded that 75% of their mark is still based on individual work. The Programme Team are aware that students joining these courses will have qualifications of varying content. However, it was stressed that processes were in place to ensure the recruitment of students of a high quality for these programmes. In response to students' concerns that their academic achievement might be affected by group work with weaker students, there is no statistical evidence to support the concern that student achievement is dropping due to changes to entry requirements.

Students were very complimentary about the Cass Careers Services, however those students who were already in work and looking for a career change, felt that the Cass Careers Service was not well-orientated towards their needs.

Students were aware of the availability of student reps but did not find they needed to utilise them, as most issues could be resolved via contacting the appropriate member of staff. Only more serious or formal issues or complaints would be co-ordinated by Course Reps on behalf of a cohort. Course Reps were mostly involved in co-ordinating social events for the cohort, but again, as students used social media it was not necessary to rely on them to arrange events.

It appeared that students would use multiple access points with queries/concerns, as opposed to using their Personal Tutors. The Panel suggested that it could be made clearer to students where they needed to go with particular queries or for information.

Students were aware that it was not always possible to meet socially with a whole cohort – especially the larger cohorts – but this was not seen as a particular issue. Students who were part-time, or from outside of the UK, felt welcomed and appropriately supported.

Students reported that they were happy with the library resources, and IT facilities (save for the previously stated limitations of those facilities - students also mentioned that the Cass building is becoming too busy during term time).

Students who had sought advice from the Visa Compliance Team at Northampton Square reported a very positive experience, but on the whole the facilities at Northampton Square were not used widely by postgraduate students based at Bunhill Row. Students expressed concern that they may be missing out on information about what opportunities there were available to them, such as TechCity, CassTalks, etc. - and that perhaps the way in which this information was communicated could be reviewed. Students reported preferring Twitter, for example, over email – but of course, this is a personal preference. It was noted that the School once had dedicated PR team, but the recent restructures meant this was no longer the case. However, students were complimentary about the communications they received about changes affecting their studies (timetabling, etc.)

The Programme Team had recently starting introducing incoming students to Alumni – and this has had a number of benefits: students can learn from Alumni experience during their studies and it facilitates student networking from the very beginning.

- **Use of technology**

Moodle is seen by students as a helpful access point for notes, recordings etc. especially from the point of view of part-time students (who were also working). However, the Programme Team acknowledged that staff often use this solely as a file-sharing platform. There is some scope to look to making more of Moodle, where appropriate. Such developments could also contribute to plans for the distance learning format being developed.

The School does not have a policy on lecture capture at this time, beyond an “opt-in” approach. It is not used as a standard across the programmes. The Programme Team observed that lecture capture often meant a lot of work – staff spent a lot of time editing lectures as many are unwilling to upload the lectures in their entirety. Some programme team members expressed a concern that doing so might lead to a drop in student attendance at lectures. This was countered by those who currently put their lectures on Moodle who reported no drop-off in attendance.

Students observed that many students were already audio-taping lectures and sharing these (at their fellow student’s request). Part-time students in particular considered the availability of lectures online to be helpful. They were aware that other Universities were very good at this, and considered Cass “lacking” on this particular issue. There was an expressed preference for the recording of special lectures by invited speakers (as this would be more beneficial than recording lectures delivered as part of the normal teaching timetable).

The Programme Team identified the need to find a balance between using new technologies and new media to communicate with students and for teaching.

- **Student feedback**

Student Feedback is collected via Course Representatives, SSLCs and fed into programme development via the usual routes, with any outcomes reported back. How the feedback is ultimately dealt with will depend on what the feedback relates to.

- **Relationship with the City of London Financial Sector**

The Panel encouraged the Programme Team to make more of its links with industry. The Programme Team noted that the most beneficial interactions came via lecturers, and not via the Advisory Board. The Team acknowledged that it was always clear what the expectations were from both the School and Advisory Board members.

The Chair thanked the students, Programme Team and the Senior School Team for their engagement with the process and their contribution to the discussions during the day.

Outcome of the review

With the presentations by the Programme Teams, the provision of the Reflective Review and the supporting documentation, the Review Panel confirmed that the development and review processes were robust and evidenced the following:

- A reflective, enhancement focused, peer-review process drawing effectively on internal and external expertise and including constructive and challenging discussion of the academic provision.

- On-going educational development of the provision and the student learning experience including continued alignment with relevant benchmark standards.
- Consolidation of areas of development and action planning in line with the University's Education & Student Strategy.
- Promotion of student engagement within quality and enhancement processes including the use of student feedback and contributions during the development process, receipt of the reflective review by student participants ahead of the review, and contributions on the day both via Panel membership and the student meeting.

The Periodic Review Panel considered that:

- confidence could be placed in the academic standards of the reviewed provision; and
- confidence could be placed in the quality of the learning opportunities available to students.

The Panel **commended** the following particular strengths:

1. Strength of teaching and the Programme Team as a whole

The Panel were impressed with the quality of teaching offered to students. Student satisfaction was very high, and it was clear that provisions were in place to manage instances of where teaching could be improved. The Programme Team worked well together to provide students with quality content and an excellent academic experience.

2. Course Officers

The Course Officers were clearly an important aspect of the School's delivery. Students were aware of the role of their Course Officers, and this was a significant contribution towards student satisfaction.

3. Careers Service

Students were very positive about the service provided via the Cass Careers Service.

4. Wide variety of modules and International modules

Whilst the Panel was keen to see students receiving correct information about the electives on offer as soon as possible, the range of electives was clearly a selling point for the programmes, with students stating this as one reason they chose the programme. The International modules, in particular drew good feedback and students obviously valued what these modules could contribute towards their studies

5. Delivery to part-time students

Part-time students reported that they felt very welcomed, and were able to access support and other resources. The Panel were impressed with the very positive feedback received from part-time students about their experience during their studies.

6. Strong School Reputation

The Panel noted student's feedback about the value attached to the School, the programmes it delivered and its relationship with Industry.

The Panel required the Department meet the following **condition**:

1. Programme Specifications must be compliant with University Regulations – to correspond with the structure of the programme.

The Panel noted that the Programme Specifications did not provide full and accurate information. In the context of the University's obligations to ensure that applicants and students were receiving accurate information, the Panel considered there to be a significant risk if this information was not appropriately corrected. This action should be implemented so as to take effect in Programme Specifications for 2015/16.

All conditions must be responded to initially via a report and action plan to be submitted to the Panel Secretary, who will liaise with the Panel Chair, and other Panel members as necessary. Following this the response will be received at the first School Board of Studies of 2015/16 to approve the schedule of actions in place to meet the conditions. The response must be submitted to the Panel Secretary at least two weeks before the deadline for papers for Board of Studies. It is expected that actions toward meeting the conditions will be completed by the end of the current academic year, where it is not possible to meet the condition in this timeframe; the programme team are expected to provide a clear timeframe for completion.

The Panel made a number of **recommendations** for areas where enhancements could be made to the programmes:

1. Senior Management develop and publish a Policy on lecture capture

Lecture capture is clearly popular with students, who seem to expect that this would be on offer from a provider with Cass Business School's reputation. The School does not yet have a formal policy on lecture capture, and the Panel do not consider the "opt-in" approach sufficiently responds to the student expectation that lecture capture would be available.

2. Review how group work and peer assessment works

The Panel noted that students were concerned about the impact of different levels of academic and English language competency on individual group members' marks. The Panel also acknowledged the Programme Team's view that group work was an important developmental opportunity for students. The Panel recommend that the Programme Team consider how group work is currently functioning, look at the overall process of peer assessment and look at ways in which students could be communicated with and reassured about group work.

3. Use of tutorials – balance of taught vs interactive teaching

The Panel noted that Workshops are popular with students and the Programme Team confirmed that there is some support for the benefits of the use of workshop learning in some modules alongside a link to key lectures. The Panel recommend that the Programme Team consider the potential for expanding the delivery of workshops across modules.

4. Making the most of use of technology in teaching – in particular, Moodle

The Panel observed that the Programme Team are not maximising the use of Moodle as a learning tool. The Panel recommend the Programme Team consider ways in which technology within Moodle could be used to enhance teaching and learning opportunities and the student

experience. On-going development of distance learning provision could inform taught programme uses of Moodle.

5. Develop better rationale for the taught MSc Finance and Economics – and how it sits alongside existing programmes

The Panel noted that little detail about this MSc was provided in the Reflective Document and raised this with the Programme Team on the Review Day. Whilst it is noted that this proposal is in the early stages, the Panel recommend that the Programme Team work towards a more defined rationale for the development and implementation of this new MSc. The Programme Team should specifically consider the positioning of this within the MSc Cluster as a whole.

6. The Senior Team ensure the proposed online MSc is fully assessed for risk and resourcing implications

Having discussed the proposals to offer an online MSc on the Review Day, and note that the full proposals for the introduction of this course are in the early stages, the Panel would recommend that the Senior Team ensure that the proposed online MSc undergoes a robust assessment for risk and resourcing implications. The Panel acknowledged that the School's recruitment of a specialist member of staff will address issues associated with management and implementation. However, the Panel considers that the School needs to ensure that risk and resourcing is assessed and supported at a Senior Management level.

7. The Programme Team ensure that the proposed 'third exit route' is adequately resourced and supported

The Panel noted the rationale for the introduction of a 'third exit route' option. However, the Panel were not persuaded that the Programme Team had a robust plan for resourcing and supporting this option to ensure it does not represent a significant risk to the School and the Cluster.

8. Communications to students about opportunities available across the University (eg. TechCity, City Talks etc.)

The Panel noted that students were concerned they were missing out on opportunities across the University. The Panel appreciate that it can be challenging to find a balance between overloading students with communications and not reaching out sufficiently well to a wide range of students at the right time. The Panel recommend that the School consider how it can best communicate with students about the various events, and opportunities available across the University.

Recommendations for the University arising from the Periodic Review

5. Consider the reputational impact of increasing student numbers whilst retaining the same levels of resourcing

It was clear to the Panel that this was an issue which was of great concern across the School. The increased intake of students in recent years has put significant pressure on the resourcing of IT and on effective operations within the premises at Bunhill Row. There was agreement across all groups and the Panel on the Review Day that this has inevitable associated risks for the student experience and the reputation of the MSc Cluster as a whole. The University Executive Team are asked to give specific consideration to the impact this has already had upon the School in any future decisions around further increasing student numbers.

All recommendations must be responded to initially via a report to the next available meeting of the School Board of Studies accompanying this report and in full via the one year on report. A copy of the report, initial response and one year on report will be submitted to Education & Student Committee following approval by the Board of Studies.

Nerida Booth
Student Experience Officer
Student & Academic Services

Mark Smith
Student Experience Officer
Student & Academic Services

Date of approval of report by Panel: 23rd July 2015



Periodic Review report

Programmes reviewed

BSc Accounting & Finance

BSc Actuarial Science

BSc Banking & International Finance

BSc Business Studies

BSc Investment & Financial Risk Management

BSc Management

Date of review

18th February 2015

Review participants

Review Panel members:

Professor Nigel Duncan	Chair - Programme Director, LLM in Professional Legal Skills, City Law school, City University
Ms Issy Cooke	Student Panel Member - VP Student Union, Education
Ms Claire De Than	Internal Panel Member - LLB Programme Director, City Law School, City University
Professor Paul Palmer	Cass Internal Panel Member - Associate Dean, Ethics, Sustainability and Engagement; Course Director, MSc Charity Degrees, Cass Business School
Dr Trevor Watkins	External Panel Member - Director of Education, The Institute and Faculty of Actuaries
Professor Judy Day	External Panel Member - Former Professor of Accounting, University of Manchester
Nerida Booth and Anika Bloomfield	Secretaries - Student and Academic Services Department

Meetings held during the day and attendees:

Meeting with Senior School Team	
Name	Title/Role
Professor Steve Haberman	Dean of Cass Business School and Chair of Board of Studies
Professor Cliff Oswick	Deputy Dean and Head of Undergraduate Programme
Dr Russell Gerrard	Associate Dean, Undergraduate Programme
Dr Lorenzo Trapani	Associate Dean, Teaching and Learning
Dr Simon Parker	Associate Dean, Academic Quality and Standards

Meeting with Programme Team

Name	Title/Role
Dr Russell Gerrard	Associate Dean
Ms Jackie Dawes	Programme Manager
Mr Michael Davies	Assessment Manager
Dr Maria Carapeto	Course Director, BSc Banking and International Finance
Dr Jaap Spreeuw	Co-Director BSc Actuarial Science
Mr David Smith	Co-Director BSc Actuarial Science
Dr Panos Poulialis	Director, BSc Business Studies
Dr Sotiris Staikouras	Course Director, BSc Real Estate Finance & Investment, BSc Investment & Financial Risk Management
Dr Martin Rich	Course Director, BSc Management
Dr David Edelshain	Course Director, Master of European Business
Dr Danielle Lyssimachou	Course Director, BSc Accounting & Finance
Dr Siân Lindsay	LEaD Academic Liaison for Cass Business School

Meeting with Students and Alumni:	
Name	Programme, Year, Mode of Study
Chirag Pandya	1 st Year BSc Investment & Financial Risk Management
Ralph Payne	3 rd Year BSc Business Studies
Ngaakudzwe Gandure	2 nd Year BSc Banking & International Finance
Carl Folke Primus Dahl	BSc Management (Alumnus)
Aditya Vika Agarwal	2 nd Year BSc Management
Jemalit Salami	3 rd Year BSc Management
Andra Dogaru	3 rd Year BSc Business Studies
Umeeta Umeeta	3 rd Year BSc Actuarial Science
Ioana Isaiu	3 rd Year BSc Business Studies
Rahul Mukherjee	2 nd Year BSc Actuarial Science

School co-ordinator: Mary Flynn, Deputy Registrar (Academic Quality)

Preparation for review

Date of development day: 19th September 2014

Reflective review and supporting evidence

Panel members were provided with the Reflective Review document and supporting evidence four weeks ahead of the review. This included the following key documentation covering the preceding three years: Annual Programme Evaluations (including management and survey data), external examiner reports and responses, and Staff-Student Liaison Committee minutes. The Report from the previous Periodic Review Day in 2008 along with the action plan was also provided.

Supplementary documentation was made available to the Panel via SharePoint, including Programme Management Committee minutes, Student Experience Committee minutes, programme handbooks, Module Specifications, notes of the School Periodic Review Development Day and Board of Studies minutes.

Changes to provision

The documentation included an overview of amendments made to the provision since the last periodic review.

It was noted that on-going changes to provision are monitored and consulted on where re-approval may be warranted. The cumulative effect of amendments since the last periodic review is not considered to require re-approval via the current periodic review process.

Professional body involvement

The Reflective Document includes details regarding the Professional Body accreditations for these programmes. Briefly, currently students on these Undergraduate programmes are eligible for exemptions from the IFS, the CII, the RICS, the IFA, the CIM and (since the commencement of the Accounting & Finance degree) ICAEW, the CIMA and CIPFA. The School is in the process of applying for CFA and ACCA, with the outcome to be confirmed at the time of the Review.

No Professional Bodies were required to be involved in the Review day.

Partnership provision

The Panel were satisfied that the Reflective Document alongside representation adequately covered the Partnership provision on these programmes.

Conduct of the review

The Reflective Review (which will be submitted to Education & Student Committee with this report) provided the Panel with an overview of the history and context of the provision, developments since the last periodic review and short and long term action planning.

The Panel considered the educational offer, effectiveness of the programme, academic standards and student achievement, design and management of the programmes, student support and resources. During the course of the review day the following topics were given particular consideration:

- Supporting students towards employability, including soft skills, networking
- Industry placements, study abroad
- The relationship Programmes have with Professional bodies
- The portfolio of Programmes offered
- Programme design: the relevance of programmes (notably the professional programmes), the use of streams within the programmes, the options available to students during the programme, how the topic of business ethics is covered
- The operation of these programmes, within the School's plan and strategy moving forward
- Student engagement with feedback mechanisms, and those mechanisms in place to inform students of activity in response to their feedback
- Assessment and quality assurance (marking and moderation)
- Support for students – particularly International students, in the area of academic English and mathematics, and with the final Project
- The role of Personal Tutors
- How the School and Programme Teams work with the Alumni

- How the School and Programme Teams balance the needs of the recruitment process and the demands of ensuring quality and standards in the delivery of the programmes
- How the Programme team manage student expectations, and the information provided to students via Induction and throughout the year
- the School student community and its relationship with the wider University community

During the course of the Review Day, a few topics raised in the Reflective document were clarified for the Panel. These were:

- Cass Consultants – a programme designed to support students in their employability and career-skills. This operates in conjunction with the careers service already in place. This programme allows students to meet with members of the business community, in order to gain a better understanding of what employers would be looking for in a graduate, and to get help with their skill-base.
- Transferability between programmes – students are able to transfer after the first year, usually with little difficulty. This would depend on their academic progress, and following discussion with the Programme Director.
- Carrington Crisp Report – Cass commissioned external consultants to identify where Cass currently stands and where it could be. The report itself focuses on key areas for development as well as possible quick wins for the School. The types of activities identified include stronger branding, commercial activities and strengthening Alumni connections. It was, however, noted that at present the focus of these activities is Postgraduate provision only.

The Chair thanked the students, Programme team and Senior team for their engagement with the process and their contribution to the discussions during the day.

Outcome of the review

The Review Panel confirmed that the development and review processes were robust and enabled and evidenced the following:

- A reflective, enhancement focused, peer- review process drawing effectively on internal and external expertise and including constructive and challenging discussion of the academic provision
- On-going development of the provision and the student learning experience including continued alignment with relevant benchmark standards
- Consolidation of areas of development and action planning in line with the University's Education & Student Strategy
- Promotion of student engagement within quality and enhancement processes including the use of student feedback and contributions during the development process, receipt of the reflective review by student participants ahead of the review, and contributions on the day both via Panel membership and the student meeting

The Periodic Review Panel considered that:

- confidence could be placed in the academic standards of the reviewed provision;

- confidence could be placed in the quality of the learning opportunities available to students.

The Panel **commended** the following particular strengths:

- Strong suite of programmes delivered by the Programme Team

The Panel recognised the strength of Programme Team’s offering, which is perceived by industry and students to be of a high standard. This Review has highlighted that students are attracted to the range of programmes on offer and the high ranking of the programmes. Through the course of their studies and beyond graduation students have come to recognise the benefits of the programme content and delivery, which they considered gave them an advantage in respects to their experience as a student and in their graduate employment.

- Cohesiveness of the School and Programme Teams and the quality of the Cass Brand

The School and Programme Team were seen as working well together in the management of their programmes, and in delivering a good experience for students. The School is rightly proud of its reputation and ranking within the Higher Education sector, and its role within the University. Students identified the Cass brand as having great value, recognised by industry, which would benefit them on completion of their studies.

- The recruitment of high quality students in the context of increasing complex challenges

The Panel noted that despite the increasing complexity of balancing the needs of the recruitment process with the on-going challenges of delivering high standards and ensuring quality, the School continue to recruit high quality applicants.

- Placement programme – this was seen as a great strength within the programme, with students identifying a placement as being of great benefit during their studies and their employability on completion of their studies

The Panel recognised the merits of the placement programme, and noted that those students who have participated in the placement programme have obviously valued its contribution to their studies. Some students were so positive about the contribution of their experience on their placement, that they considered this to be the best feature of the programme. Staff members were very positive about the placement opportunity, and were keen to encourage as many students as possible to take up the opportunity.

The Panel **endorsed** the following which were not covered within the reflective review documentation but were discussed during the development day:

- Support provided for students, both academic and non-academic, and in particular for International students

The Panel was reassured by students’ reports that they felt the level of support provided by the School was appropriate. It was reported that International students felt that they were provided with useful information both prior to commencing and following their arrival ahead of their studies, and the assistance provided in relation to visa acquisition was helpful.

Students reported that they were satisfied with the provision of information made available by the School via the Induction programme and the materials circulated for student information. The student group made one suggestion for enhancing the induction process: the School could consider conveying information in smaller batches throughout the first three weeks, to allow students the opportunity to absorb information more readily and to provide information at a time they would need it – for example, arranging library orientations in the 3rd week of term when students would be starting to prepare for tutorials and commence researching for coursework.

The Panel noted the School's approach in providing support in Academic English and mathematics aimed at all students – not just International Students, or any other particular group - and endorsed this support as potentially helpful to any student.

The Panel made a number of **recommendations** for areas where enhancements could be made to the programmes:

- The School should consider ways in which it could encourage its students to engage more with students from across the institution – this could be through social, sport or other extra-curricular activities

While the Panel recognised the sense of community within the School is clearly strong, the Panel considered that it would be of benefit to Cass UG students to engage with students from other areas of the University during their studies. This would enhance the student's sense of belonging to the University as a wider community, and may also enhance their ability to work cohesively with others from outside the business community.

- The Programme Team and School Team should consider ways to make more of its relationship with Alumni.

It was clear that the School benefitted from very good relationship with its Alumni. The Panel noted that there were efforts by the School to create opportunities for its current students to develop links with members of the business community, and it would seem of potential benefit to students, and the School and its relationship with Alumni to consider ways in which it could facilitate ways in which Alumni could have a closer relationship with students in the context of a mentoring programme, or making connections with members working in the business community.

- The Programme Team could consider ways in which it could encourage innovation and sharing good practice amongst programme staff with regards to Course design and management

The Panel noted that the Programme Team has a tradition of Course Directors taking ownership of their courses, and this allows individual members of staff flexibility in implementing responsive change, taking risks and using more creative decision-making. This might not be possible in a more centrally-managed system. The Panel commended this approach, and encouraged the Programme Team to take steps to incentivise on-going innovation in programme design.

- That the School and Programme Team improve mechanisms by which students are informed of the actions taken in response to their feedback (provided via Student Staff Liaison Committee meetings, Student Experience Committee, Module Evaluation and so on).

The Panel noted that students reported a lack of information coming from the School about what happened with the feedback, suggestions and requests conveyed to the School via formal student feedback mechanisms. The students interviewed by the Panel were keen to know what happened to the feedback they provided, and what actions were taken in response. The Panel acknowledged the School's comment that some actions arising from student requests (about a change in timetabling for example) would be self-evident; however, this would not be the case for all actions. The Panel considered there were examples from other areas of the University where students were provided accessible information with minimal administration, and the School should investigate options and implement an agreed mechanism of reporting back to students.

- Continue to develop the placement programme, maintaining the existing connections with employers involved with the view to increasing the number of employers.

For the very reason that it is such a strong feature of the programme, the Panel recommends that the Programme Team continue to develop the placement programme, in order to reinforce a valued aspect of the programme and to attract more students to participate in the programme.

- The Programme Team should work towards improving the marketing of placements opportunities to students, highlighting the potential benefits to their final year and employability on completion of the programme.

The Panel noted the great enthusiasm expressed by the Students and Alumni they met with for the placement and student abroad programme. Those students who had participated in some sort of placement considered this to be of great benefit to their career skills and graduate employability.

All recommendations must be responded to initially via a report to the School Board of Studies accompanying this report and in full via the one year on report. A copy of the report, initial response and one year on report will be submitted to Education & Student Committee following approval by the Board of Studies.

While confirming its confidence in the current provision, the Panel requires the Programme Team to meet the following **condition**:

That the School review the marking and assessment practices and an effective and consistent system of moderation of coursework be introduced in respect of all assessment components that contribute to a Module mark. This moderation process must meet the requirements of the QAA and City University London Assessment Policy, and specifically:

- ensure a consistency of assessment standards. This should extend to building in assurances that coursework assessments are revised every year, and not reused;
- deliver arrangements for moderation that are set out clearly and referred to in published information accessible to staff and students.

This condition has been set in order to ensure these programmes are demonstrating clearly the academic standards maintained within the programme, in accordance with QAA Guidance. In requiring this action, the Panel is not stipulating any particular form of moderation, only that a method be decided upon and consistently be put in place across the School's Undergraduate programme provision. It is recommended that the marking and moderation process could be outlined in Module Specification.

In requiring the Programme Team meet this condition, The Panel have referred to Guidance in the QAA Quality Code which outlines its expectations regarding assessment (emphasis of the text is the Panel's):

“Staff involved in marking and moderating student work are **guided by clear processes** which address the degree-awarding body's requirements. In particular arrangements for, and the degree-awarding body's definitions of, first and second marking are **clearly set out and applied, and include guidance on how agreement will be reached on the final marks to be awarded.**

Expectations on the use of anonymous marking, including to which forms of assessment it applies or does not apply, are clear. Where anonymity is used, procedures specify the point at which anonymity is lifted (for example, before or after the examination board/assessment panel).

There is clear guidance about how borderline marks or grades are defined and treated, both in individual assessments and in overall results for a module or a programme.

Internal moderation is a process separate from that of marking and **provides assurance that assessment criteria have been applied appropriately, reflecting the shared understanding of the markers, and an approach which enables comparability across academic subjects (in particular recognising that students may be studying more than one subject).**

Moderation focuses on the marks awarded to the **full set of assessed work for a task, module or programme**, in the context of the academic standards for the award. It is therefore separate from the question of how differences in marks between two or more markers are resolved, and is not about making changes to an individual student's marks. **Staff are clear how moderation will be conducted, for example, through sampling assessed work, reviewing all the marks awarded, and providing opportunities for discussion between moderators to develop shared understandings. They are also clear about what action might be taken where significant differences in marks awarded are identified.**

Clear guidance sets out the degree-awarding body's requirements in relation to moderating assessment that does not involve the production of physical evidence. Assessments of this kind include various types of performance or presentation (for example, in the creative and performing arts).

In particular, Quality Code B6, Indicator 13 states:

‘Processes for marking assessments and moderating marks are **clearly articulated and consistently operated** by those involved in the assessment process.’ Consistency is explained as a key value of fair marking processes, and moderation is explained as referring to ‘the arrangements that institutions put in place to ensure consistency of marking, including the proper application of the assessment criteria. This can include rescaling marks based on the consideration of quantitative data, as outlined below, as well as the sampling of scripts by internal and external examiners.’

In addition to this, The Panel, have noted that the CUL Assessment Policy states the following:

Marking and moderation

Marking may take various forms, including the use of anonymous marking and double or second marking. Double marking usually means that markers do not see each other's comments or marks whilst for second marking these may be made available to the second marker.

Moderation is used to ensure that an assessment outcome is fair and reliable. Moderation can also take various forms including sampling, additional marking of borderline cases or statistical review of marks.

Marking guidelines should be provided to all markers, moderators and external examiners and used to mark and grade assessments. This supports consistency and transparency.

Marking guidelines consist of the intended learning outcomes the assessment is designed to assess; the assessment information; the assessment criteria; the grade-related criteria; and, if relevant, additional guidance that provides information on what should have been included in specific answers.

The University requires that:

1. In addition to external examining requirements, **more than one member of staff is normally involved in marking and moderation processes**. This should ensure that **no module mark is finalised on the basis on only one internal assessor's decision**.
2. Marking of examination scripts is anonymous. This is considered to be an appropriate means of avoiding claims of bias and demonstrating a commitment to equal opportunities and equality and diversity policies.
3. Second marking or moderation of all dissertations or equivalent assessment tasks takes place.
4. Boards of Studies are required to determine appropriate marking and moderating mechanisms and the criteria for the identification of samples to be considered through the moderation process.

The University also considers that the use of anonymous marking for forms of assessment other than examinations should be encouraged where this is appropriate to the assessment type. The use of a statistical analysis of the distributions of marks both within and between modules, including their centre and their spread, is also to be encouraged. Where possible, Boards of Studies should review the efficacy of their marking and moderation processes with the aim of considering the use of moderation at component level and should also review the weighting of individual assessment components.

This condition must be responded to initially via a report and action plan submitted to the Panel Secretary, who will liaise with the Panel Chair, and other Panel members as necessary. This response must be submitted to the Panel Secretary at least two weeks before the deadline for papers for the relevant Board of Studies. The School's response (including the schedule of actions in place to meet the condition) will be received at the Board of Studies in the normal way for approval. It is expected that actions toward meeting this condition will be completed by the end of the current academic year, where it is not possible to meet the condition in this timeframe; the programme team are expected to provide a clear timeframe for completion.

Anika Bloomfield

Nerida Booth

Date of approval of report by Panel: 20th March 2015



Periodic Review report

Programmes reviewed

BA	Journalism
MA	Journalism (Broadcast)
MA	Journalism (Financial)
MA	Journalism (Interactive)
MA	Journalism (Investigative)
MA	Journalism (Magazine)
MA	Journalism (Newspaper)
MA	Journalism (Science)
MA	Journalism (Television)
MA	Journalism (International)
MA	Erasmus Mundus (Journalism, Media and Globalisation)

Date of review

11th and 12th March

Review participants

Review Panel members:

Professor Susan Blake	ADE, (Chair)
Issy Cooke	Vice President Education (Student Panel Member)
Dr Miguel Mera	Reader in Music and Deputy Head of Department, Department of Music, School of Arts and Social Sciences (Internal Panel Member)
Professor Chris Hull	Professor of Optics of Vision, Divisional Lead for Optometry, School of Health Sciences (Internal Panel Member)
Professor Stuart Allan	Deputy Head of School – Academic Professor of Journalism and Communication, Cardiff University (External Panel Member)
Emerita Professor Máire Messenger Davies	Director of the Centre for Media Research, University of Ulster (External Panel Member)
Shereen Sally	Deputy Head of Student Experience, Student and Academic Services (Co-Secretary)
Dr Naomi Hammond	Head of Graduate School Office, Student and Academic Services (Co- Secretary)

Meetings held during the day and attendees:

Senior Staff Team

Professor Andrew Jones	Dean
Damian Williams	Chief Operating Officer
Carmai Pestell	School Head of Academic Services
Professor Laurence Solkin	Deputy Dean (Education)
Professor Michael Bromley	Head of Department

Programme Teams (UG)

Professor Michael Bromley	Head of Department
Professor Suzanne Franks	UG Programme Director
Dr Sarah Lonsdale	Lecturer
Dr James Rodgers	Year 1 lead
Glenda Cooper	Lecturer
Patrick Baughan	LEAD Liaison link
Barbara Schofield	Year 3 lead
Dr Melanie Bunce	Year 2 lead
Richard Evans	Lecturer
Natasha Cornwell	Course Officer
Neil Hodgkins	Course Operations Manager
Richard Evans	Lecturer

Programme Teams (PG)

Professor Michael Bromley	Head of Department
Dr Tom Felle	MA Journalism (Interactive/ Newspaper) Acting Programme Director
Jonathan Hewett	MA Journalism (Interactive/ Newspaper) Programme Director
Professor Lis Howell	MA Journalism (TV/ Broadcast) Programme Director
Brendan Martin	MA International Journalism Programme Director
Barbara Rowlands	MA Journalism (Magazine) Programme Director
Professor Steve Schifferes	MA Journalism (Finance) Programme Director
Connie St Louis	MA Journalism (Science) Programme Director
Dr Neil Thurman	Erasmus Mundus Programme Director
Dr Rosie Waterhouse	MA Journalism (Investigative) Programme Director
Patrick Baughan	LEAD Liaison link
Neil Hodgkins	Course Operations Manager
Josie Barnes	Course Officer
Martin Chivers	Course Officer
Rachel West	Course Officer

Students/Alumni

Safraz Ali	BA Journalism, part 1
Julia Martincic	BA Journalism, part 1
Fraser Moore	BA Journalism, part 1
Jack Fenwick	BA Journalism, part 2
Emma Younger	BA Journalism, part 2
Joanna Trainor	BA Journalism, part 2
Yannic Rack	BA Journalism, part 3
Emma Volney	BA Journalism, part 3
Bada Kim	BA Journalism, part 3
Chris Wharfe	BA Journalism Alumnus

Marianna Aragão	Erasmus Mundus
Sofia Cerqueira	Erasmus Mundus Alumna
Guilherme Kfour	Erasmus Mundus Alumnus
João Grando	Erasmus Mundus
Eilidh Wagstaff	MA Financial Journalism
Laura Lambert	MA Newspaper Journalism
Tom Witherow	MA Newspaper Journalism
Ben Jackson	MA Interactive Journalism
Emily Shackleton	MA Interactive Journalism
Greg Jones	MA Science Journalism Alumnus
Niall Sargent	MA Investigative Journalism
Jordan Milne	MA Investigative Journalism
Gordon Watson	MA Broadcast Journalism
Joceline Sharman	MA Broadcast Journalism
Ashna Hurynag	MA Broadcast Journalism
Alex Morgan	MA Television Journalism
George Negas	MA Television Journalism
Gian Volpicelli	MA International Journalism Alumnus

School co-ordinator:

Carmai Pestell	School Head of Academic Services
----------------	----------------------------------

Preparation for review

Date of development day: 13th February 2015

Reflective review and supporting evidence

Panel members were provided with the Reflective Review document and supporting evidence approximately one week ahead of the review. This included the following key documentation covering the a Strategic Plan, Journalism Periodic Programme Review 2008, Annual Programme Evaluations, Module Evaluation Results, UG and PG Module Specifications, Destination Data, National Student Survey results, Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey results and Student Staff Liaison Committees minutes.

Professional/ regulatory/ statutory body involvement

The Reflective Review noted that the MA Journalism Magazine pathway was accredited by the Professional Publishers Association and that the Broadcast/TV pathways possessed accreditation from the Broadcast Journalism Training Council. The professional bodies were not required to be involved in the Periodic Review.

Partnership provision

At the time of the Review, the Department offered a two-year Erasmus Mundus joint Masters programme in Journalism, Media and Globalisation with the University of Aarhus. The programme was managed by a Programme Management Committee (PMC), which met three times a year. Students on the joint City-Aarhus degree also shared modules with students on other partnership programmes in the wider Erasmus Mundus Journalism consortium. An Erasmus Mundus Journalism Board of Studies (BoS), which met twice a year, considered the shared elements of the various programmes in the consortium. The Panel was satisfied

that the partnership provision was adequately covered in the Reflective Review and through representation from colleagues at the various meetings on the day of the Periodic Review.

Conduct of the review

The Reflective Review (which will be submitted to the University Education & Student Committee with this report) provided the Panel with a clear overview of the history and context of the provision, developments since the last periodic review and short and long term action planning.

The Panel considered the educational offer, effectiveness of the programmes, academic standards and student achievement, inclusivity of design and equality of opportunity, and student support and resources. During the course of the review day the following topics were given particular consideration:

- Low student satisfaction scores in UG provision and low PTES response rates in PGT provision
- Staffing imbalance with a high number of visiting lecturers
- The imbalance between the academic and vocational priorities of the programmes
- The separation of UG and PG teaching provision and access to shared resources
- Credit for placement activity/work-based learning
- The scheduling of assessments and the distribution of student workloads
- The provision of specialist training, such as in video recording, and skills progression
- The consistency of feedback to students

The Chair thanked the students, Programme teams and the Senior School Team for their engagement with the process and their contribution to the discussions during the day.

Outcome of the review

With the responses in meetings from the programme teams and the students, , the provision of the Reflective Review and the supporting documentation, the Review Panel confirmed that the development and review processes were robust and enabled and evidenced the following:

- A reflective, enhancement focused, peer- review process drawing effectively on internal and external expertise and including constructive and challenging discussion of the academic provision
- On-going development of the provision and the student learning experience including continued alignment with relevant benchmark standards
- Consolidation of areas of development and action planning in line with the University's Education & Student Strategy
- Promotion of student engagement within quality and enhancement processes including the use of student feedback and contributions during the development process, receipt of the reflective review by student participants ahead of the review, and contributions on the day both via Panel membership and the student meeting

The Periodic Review Panel considered that:

- confidence could be placed in the academic standards of the reviewed provision;
- confidence could be placed in the quality of the learning opportunities available to students.

The Panel **commended** the following strengths during the Periodic Review:

- The breadth of the action plan, in identifying a range of key actions needed
- The strategic ambition to reposition the department with a focus on producing a clearer identity for the “City” profile of its students, including developing research-informed teaching, and the commitment of many staff to taking this forward
- The taking of deliberate steps to respond to UG student feedback, with visible improvement in module scores
- The quality of staff commitment to students, including informal availability, and staff expertise, which is well appreciated by students
- The quality of staff engagement in preparing student for employment and careers
- The level of student engagement with and commitment to the programmes
- The level and commitment of ongoing alumni engagement with the programmes
- The extent to which all Journalism programmes contribute to high levels of employability and career development for students, including input from staff, students and alumni
- The important contribution made by links with the profession, high profile guest lecturers and VLs who offer specific expertise
- The development of an enhanced admissions process, including interviews, written tests and acknowledgement of diverse qualifications, which is having a positive effect on the quality of students and retention (noting the importance of using this process to widen participation and diversify access to the profession)
- The commendable development of research-related teaching, linked to the good performance of research staff in the REF

The Panel made a number of **recommendations** for areas where enhancements could be made, proposing that the programme team should do the following :

6. In developing the departmental strategic plan, improve the depth of detail in what is currently a relatively aspirational action plan so as to ensure sufficient focus is placed on the 3-5 years’ timeframe.

The Departmental Strategic Plan was very aspirational with targets such as being ‘The best in the world (in practice and research) by 2016.’ The team should take a more detailed approach in specifying more precise action points to show how targets would be achieved with timeframes.

9. In setting out a coherent vision across all parts of the department, specify how professional practice and research-informed teaching will be embedded. The team noted the importance of the concept of a “City” journalist, with clear identities for the UG and PG programmes.

The Panel recommends that the provision be more balanced between theory and practice. Whilst providing students with the relevant training to enable them to practice as journalists is important, the courses need clear and sound academic underpinning. A high quality university course should balance the academic with the vocational. For example, discussions during the Development Day revealed an expectation that students should be 'ethically' aware and 'critical thinkers' so that they would be equipped with broader understanding and values, in addition to possessing skills in the use of specialist professional equipment and practical techniques.

3. In developing all programmes to ensure currency, particularly in relation to preparing students with regard to relevant digital technologies and competencies, clarifying what steps will be taken to ensure this.

The Panel noted that students came from a range of backgrounds and felt they were not always fully equipped to use the different current technologies and techniques required to practice as a journalist, The Programme Teams should look at ways to ensure students are reassured that their studies provide currency.

4. Review the provision of, use of and access to studios, ICT with specialist software, etc., so as to maximise availability of these resources for teaching and assessment activities, and independent learning.

There was a strong sense from both students and staff during the day of the Review that there were limits on resources available across the Department. The meeting with the UG students suggested that there was a noticeable difference with PG students getting more access to resources. The Reflective Review outlined some ways in which the Department planned to improve access to resources but the Panel recommends that the Department further review resource access options and processes in order to ensure that access to both UG and PG students is fair and consistent.

5. Whether or not as part of the formal curriculum, consider providing a fuller introduction for students in relation to practical skills relevant to a 21st century journalist, such as video production, editing, how to use a DSLR, and use of software such as Photoshop, and Final Cut Pro, even if through self-directed online learning.

Following on from recommendation 3, PG students, particularly those who had not completed a Journalism undergraduate degree or worked in industry did not feel they were not always fully equipped with understanding of modern technologies relevant for their studies, and potentially relevant for their working lives. The team should consider how to introduce students to potentially relevant technologies, even this can only be done through online or self-directed learning rather than as a full part of the curriculum.

6. Consider ways of developing some more shared use of lecturers across the MA and UG provision (in particular year 3) so as to provide further access to specialist areas/skills for UG students.

The UG students commented on their perception that the content of some courses seemed repetitive rather than developing further knowledge and skills. In particular, they stated that they welcomed the opportunity to build skills year on year and benefit in year 3 from some of the courses available to PG students. The quality of teaching on

the PG provision was praised and ways should be found to share some teaching across both provisions to benefit the UG students..

7. Consider exploring opportunities for sharing expertise across programmes; for example as regards data journalism, and financial and legal-focused journalism.

During meetings with the Panel, students stated that they wanted to be able to take modules that were available on other programmes in the Department, seeing the current structure as restrictive. It seemed to the Panel that more flexibility across the Department could be an efficient use of resources, and be attractive to students in widening what they could offer potential employers.

8. Reconsider the rationale of the MA International Journalism to ensure it focuses on international aspects of journalism rather than being seen as effectively restricted to international students.

In meetings with the Panel students said that international students were often directed towards the MA International Journalism course. There was a general view that this was a disadvantage as the programme would better focus on the use of journalism in an international context.

9. Review the UG curriculum to ensure that students see clear progression in skills and knowledge between the 3 years.

Following on from recommendation number 6, in addition to exploring shared teaching between UG and PG provision, the Panel recommends that the Department review its UG curriculum, working with students to ensure that there is clear progression and development between the three years of the programme..

10. In reviewing assessment, reconsider the weighting of assessment elements (including the balance of formative and summative) to better reflect the time and effort students are expected to commit to an assessment task, and to ensure that all students get clear, early and consistent guidance on weightings, and on what is required for an assessment. In doing this, avoiding congestion of assessment due dates is important.

UG and PG students commented on the inconsistency of time and effort required in relation to the award of credits for particular assessment elements. The Panel noted, for example, that students were of the view that if an assessment was designed to take substantially more time than another assessment it should also attract more credit. Some students raised concerns that they were not always very clear what they were expected to do for an assessment. Some UG students also commented on the high number of assessments that might be scheduled over a short period, and other students said there could be competition for access to specialist software etc needed for an assessment. Although the Department explained to the Panel that this could reflect the working conditions of a journalist practitioner, the Panel felt that the range of concerns was such that it could impact negatively on assessment, and these points should be taken into account in reviewing assessment.

11. Consider introducing forms of assessment that build directly on relevant work experience.

Students are encouraged to undertake work experience, and many were very positive

about work experience they had undertaken, but there was concern that work experience was not formally assessed in any way by the Department. The Panel heard that a high level of time and effort was invested in securing placement opportunities for and by students (and in carrying out the placement activity) and was of the view that options should be considered as to how this activity might count towards the award of the final degree in some circumstances. The Panel recognised that there are some barriers in crediting work experience but encourages the Department to look at ways in which this could work, for example through the use of reflective journals or projects. There are examples of such approaches working well in similar courses across the University, and in other universities.

12. Seek to ensure more consistency in feedback to students (including a professional tone in all comments), and a clear focus on improving the range and quality of assessment tasks, so as to further enhance the student experience.

During the meeting with the Panel, some PG students stated that they had received some comments in feedback on assessments that were not very constructive or helpful. The Panel noted that while the courses are partly preparing students for the workplace, the University should be a place in which students should be supported to learn in a nurturing environment. There were also comments from students about clear variations in the amount and type of feedback, and the Department might do more to ensure a sufficient level of consistency and quality of feedback across the courses.

13. Establish a more coherent approach in communicating information about placements, to help to ensure reasonable fairness and consistency in supporting students (within the understanding that some placements are appropriate for particular types of students), bearing in mind QAA guidance on best practice in relation to placements.

A range of UG and PG students said they benefitted from the contacts of their personal tutors and mailing lists when it came to work placements, but some others said they did not receive support or notifications of this kind. There is a risk of unfairness here, and steps should be taken to ensure that reasonable and appropriate consistency is in place across the Department to help benefit all students.

14. Consider introducing more formalised processes for VL selection, deployment induction, development and management alongside regular communication about teaching responsibilities throughout the term.

The Panel noted that there was a high number of visiting lecturers within the Department. Comments from both students and staff showed the benefits of obtaining industry expertise in this way, but there were also comments about the potential to cause inconsistency over support, staff/student contact time and feedback. Better guidance and processes for involving VLs should help to address this.

15. Consider developing a department wide advisory board of industry specialist advisors.

The Reflective Review noted that the Erasmus Mundus joint Master's degree had an industrial Advisory Board. In discussion with the staff it emerged that while there are good links with industry there is not a clear mechanism for getting input from industry in relation to programmes. The Panel recommends that the Department consider establishing an Advisory Board comprising specialist industry advisors to help benefit the

other courses offered.

16. Consider developing a part time version of the MA, once the new model is established.

In order to tie in students who are already in industry or wish to work alongside their studies, it would be beneficial to have a part time course version of the PG provision. This may help to attract students from widening participation backgrounds and people with children and other caring responsibilities. It could also attract those working in journalism roles seeking to get a qualification.

17. Continue to strengthen research input into teaching and encourage students to recognise the importance of good research skills, both in professional journalistic practice and academically.

Research has grown within the Department over the last few years and this is reflected in the 2014 REF ranking. Students the Panel met showed limited understanding of the importance of research, or how research informed teaching and strengthened what they were learning. The Panel recommends that students should be made aware of the benefits of research and how this incorporated in their curriculum to further help to bridge the gap between theoretical and practical work, underpinning the quality of the programmes.

All recommendations must be responded to initially via a report to the next available meeting of the School Board of Studies accompanying this report and in full via the one year on report. A copy of the report, initial response and one year on report will be submitted to Education & Student Committee where appropriate following approval by the Board of Studies.

Secretaries: Shereen Sally and Naomi Hammond Student and Academic Services

Date of approval of report by Panel: June 2015

Periodic Review report

Programmes reviewed

Psychology	BSc (all routes)
Counselling Psychology	Graduate Certificate
Health Psychology	MSc
Organisational Psychology	MSc
Counselling Psychology	DPsych
Psychology	PhD
	DPsych Top-up

Date of review

15th and 16th October 2014

Review participants

Review Panel members:

Roberta Williams	ADE, School of Health Sciences (Chair)
Ahmed Rasool	MEng Aeronautical Engineering (Taught Student Panel Member)
Emily Patterson	PhD Optometry, School of Health Sciences (Research Student Panel Member)
Professor Martin Caraher	Senior Tutor for Research, Department of Sociology, School of Arts and Social Sciences (Internal Panel Member focusing on research provision)
Professor Suzanne Franks	Undergraduate Programme Director, Department of Journalism, School of Arts and Social Sciences (Internal Panel Member focusing on taught Provision)
Maria Dingle	Senior Lecturer, School of Health Sciences (Internal Panel Member)
Professor Catriona Morrison	Head of Psychology, Heriot Watt University (External Panel Member focusing on taught provision)
Professor David Shanks	Head, Division of Psychology and Language Sciences, UCL (External Panel Member focusing on research provision)
Dr Naomi Hammond	Head of Graduate School Office, Student and Academic Services (Co-Secretary)
Abi Moran	Validation and Partnerships Manager, Student and Academic Services (Co-Secretary)

Meetings held during the day and attendees:

Senior Staff Team

Professor Andrew Jones	Dean/Chair of Board of Studies
Damian Williams	Head of Academic Services
Professor Laurence Solkin	Deputy Dean
Professor Eugene McLaughlin	Associate Dean (Research Students)

Programme Teams

Professor Martin Conway	Head of Department
Dr Stian Reimers	Deputy Head of Department
Sam Kearsley	School Registrar (Psychology and International Politics)
Patrick Baughan	LEAD Liaison link
Carmai Pestell	Assistant Registrar (SASS)
Undergraduate	
Dr Tina Forster	UG Programme Director, BSc Psychology
Dr Lauren Knott	Deputy UG Programme Director, BSc Psychology
Dr Richard Cook	Senior Lecturer, BSc Psychology
Dr Marie Poirier	Reader, BSc Psychology
Dr Lydia Tan	Lecturer, BSc Psychology
Dr Brenda Todd	Senior Lecturer, BSc Psychology
Dr Kielan Yarrow	Senior Lecturer, BSc Psychology
Professor James Hampton	Professor, BSc Psychology
Jonathan Burton	Programme Administrator, BSc Psychology
Postgraduate	
Dr Paul Flaxman	MSc Organisational Psychology Programme Director
Dr Ruth Sealy	Lecturer, MSc Organisational Psychology
Antonio Pangallo	Lecturer, MSc Organisational Psychology
Dr Almuth McDowall	Senior Lecturer, MSc Organisational Psychology
Dr Paula Corcoran	MSc Health Psychology Programme Director
Dr Susan Strauss	Graduate Certificate in Counselling Psychology PD
Erin Miller	Lecturer Grad Cert Counselling Psychology
Amber Bowring	Programme Administrator, Postgraduate Psychology
Research	
Dr Jessica Jones Nielsen	DPsych Counselling Psychology Programme Director
Dr Aylish O'Driscoll	Visiting Lecturer DPsych Counselling Psychology
Dr Kate Scruby	Visiting Lecturer DPsych Counselling Psychology
Professor Carla Willig	DPsych top-up Programme Director
Dr Sebastian Gaigg	Senior Tutor for Research
Richard Thornbury	Programme Administrator, DPsych Counselling Psychology (research components)
Alison Peach	Programme Administrator, DPsych Counselling Psychology (taught components)

Students/Alumni

Natasha Penfold	BSc Psychology, Year 2
Sara Pisani	BSc Psychology, Year 2
Tatiane Da Silva	BSc Psychology, Year 2
Datin Shah	BSc Psychology, Year 2
Aysha Sajid	BSc Psychology, Year 3
Jennifer Murphy	BSc Psychology, Year 3
Mark Mordak	BSc Psychology, Year 3
Tess Bergognoux	Graduate Certificate Counselling Psychology
Kerry Manera	Graduate Certificate Counselling Psychology

Lisa Cox	MSc Organisational Psychology, full time
Lucy Gallagher	MSc Organisational Psychology, full time
Elaine Mullarkey	MSc Organisational Psychology, full time
Isabelle Yeow	MSc Organisational Psychology, full time
Kate Maclean	MSc Organisational Psychology, full time
Durate Pereira	MSc Organisational Psychology, full time
Athena Foran	DPsych Counselling Psychology, Year 3
Lucy Longhurst	DPsych Counselling Psychology, writing up
Brian Murray	DPsych Counselling Psychology, Year 4
Alison McGourty	DPsych Counselling Psychology, alumna
Ali Mair	PhD Psychology, Year 3 full time
Chris Fassnidge	PhD Psychology, Year 3, full time
Ade Afilaka	DPsych Top-up, Year 3, part time
Antje Muller	DPsych Top-up/ transferred to PhD, year 4, part time
Lisa Harrison	DPsych Top-up, Year 4, full time

School co-ordinator:

Carmai Pestell	Assistant Registrar
----------------	---------------------

Preparation for review

Date of development day: 9th July 2014

The minutes of the Development Day are appended to this report with the Reflective Review.

Reflective review and supporting evidence

Panel members were provided with the Reflective Review document and supporting evidence approximately four weeks ahead of the review. This included the following key documentation covering the preceding three years: annual programme evaluations (including management and survey data); external examiner (taught) reports and responses; Programme Management Committee minutes; Staff-Student Liaison Committee minutes; programme handbooks; Advisory Board minutes. The action plan from the previous periodic review and relevant QAA subject benchmark statements were also provided. The following additional documentation was also provided: 2013 PRES summary; data on postgraduate destinations; the Department of Psychology Business Plan; summary of recent staff and student achievements; data on applications, enrolments and awards; 2013 PRES summary; and Postgraduate destinations data.

Professional/ regulatory/ statutory body involvement

Some of the programmes under review had recently undergone accreditation by the British Psychological Society. The BPS report on the visit in March 2015 was provided with the supporting documentation. The Panel asked the Programme Teams to provide the response to the outcome of the BPS accreditation visit as a condition of the Periodic Review.

Conduct of the review

The Reflective Review (which will be submitted to Education & Student Committee and the Graduate School Committee, as appropriate, with this report) provided the Panel with a clear overview of the history and context of the provision, developments since the last periodic review and short and long term action planning. The Panel considered the educational offer, effectiveness of the programmes, academic standards and student achievement, inclusivity of design and equality of

opportunity, and student support and resources. Following consideration of the Reflective Review and supporting documentation by the Chair and with advice from colleagues in Student and Academic Services, Programme Teams were asked in advance of the meetings to prepare a short presentation on the following areas in order to meet the requirements of the Reflective Review:¹

- **Market position and strategy**
To include information on market position and competitor comparison; alignment of future plans to University, School and Department strategy
- **Students and alumni**
Information and analysis of student feedback and input to programmes (and reflective review if possible); student support, community development and alumni relations
- **Programme design and analysis**
Information on the changes to the programmes of study in the last five years and reflection on the impact; reference to APE action plans and outcomes; analysis of the effectiveness of assessments; analysis and update on professional accreditation reports and associated recommendations arising from reaccreditation visits; Research Degrees completion rates (in the case of Doctoral programmes)
- **Staff development**
Information and analysis of staff development and LEaD input

During the course of the review day the following topics were given particular consideration:

- The opportunity for staff to reflect critically on the educational and doctoral degree provision within the Department through the development of the Reflective Review and the Periodic Review itself.
- The fit of the programmes with the strategic direction of the School.
- The reputation of the programmes in comparison to European and International providers and the distinctiveness of the offer at City, and/or the programme(s) within the Department, including the value of the opportunity of a placement year.
- The termination of the MSc in Research Methods and Psychology and the value of an integrated Masters programme
- The diversity of assessment methods, consistency of marking across modules and the receipt of timely and constructive feedback
- The provision of supervision of doctoral students, particularly by external colleagues
- The rationale for the proposed actions for each of the programmes and the plans for implementation
- The consistency of the student experience across the doctoral programmes, such as the integration of, and opportunities for, teaching by doctoral students registered on the PhD programme or one of the professional doctorates
- Student voice and feedback mechanisms, particularly in raising issues and resolving complaints

¹ See pp. 6-7 on "Drafting the Reflective Review and Action Plan" of Guidance for Periodic Review at http://www.city.ac.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0005/192470/pr_guidance.pdf

- Career destinations and the availability of careers' advice to students on all of the programmes, including advice on the range of careers available
- The employment of visiting lecturers, staff recruitment and staff development needs
- The value of BPS accreditation of some of the programmes to the students and to the Department

The Chair thanked the students, Programme teams and the Senior School Team for their engagement with the process and their contribution to the discussions during the day.

Outcome of the review

With the presentations by the Programme Teams, the provision of the Reflective Review and the supporting documentation, the Review Panel confirmed that the development and review processes were robust and enabled and evidenced the following:

- A reflective, enhancement focused, peer- review process drawing effectively on internal and external expertise and including constructive and challenging discussion of the academic provision
- On-going educational development of the provision and the student learning experience including continued alignment with relevant benchmark standards
- Promotion of student engagement with quality and enhancement processes including the use of student feedback and contributions on the day both via Panel membership and the student meeting

The Periodic Review Panel considered that:

- confidence could be placed in the academic standards of the reviewed provision;
- confidence could be placed in the quality of the learning opportunities available to students.

The Panel commended the following particular strengths:

7. The students interviewed as part of the periodic review process were knowledgeable about their subject areas, reflective and engaged in the interview process

The students with whom the Panel met were well informed of the benefits of the programmes. They reported being attracted to the University, Department and/or courses for a variety of reasons. The location, links with business and the professions, the distinctiveness of the offer and the quality of the teaching (witnessed by returning students previously registered on the BSc in Psychology) were all cited by the students as reasons for choosing to study within the Department of Psychology at City. Students were also attracted to the research expertise of the staff; accreditation by the British Psychological Society (BPS); the diversity of modules; and, this year, the opportunity to specialise through the pathways. The students with whom the Panel met were also of the view that the degrees were well respected by employers in the field. Knowledge about particular subject areas was further supported at Undergraduate level by the Psychology at City module; students noted that this module had given them a real insight into the function of the department and the areas of research being undertaken, this expanded their knowledge of their subject areas and encouraged some students to continue to study at post graduate level with City.

8. The quality and commitment of staff delivering all programmes, including much of the administrative support provided, was highly appreciated by all students interviewed.

All students interviewed were very appreciative of both the quality and commitment of staff delivering programmes and, in the most part, the administrative support provided to them. The Undergraduate students interviewed particularly mentioned the support provided by the Programme Administrator and the library staff. For postgraduate students there was particular mention of a staff's enthusiasm on interview day being one of the main drivers behind a student's desire to study at City and excellent support on the MSc programmes for students exploring employment opportunities. This displays a commitment from the staff team to support the students from before the start of their journey through to employment.

The Panel noted the following strengths during the Periodic Review:

- The high regard of the programmes, in Europe and internationally, by employers and by students
- The diversity of the teaching and assessment methods in all programmes, i.e. group work, live web chats, journal club
- The teaching staff on all programmes consist of both academics and practitioners. This gives students a wider perspective on the discipline and profession allowing them to make more informed choices regarding research focus and future employment.
- Engagement of students in broader opportunities and research informed teaching, by eminent researchers
- The students reported that the BSc Psychology was a challenging but supportive programme
- Learning resources e.g. library, databases, journals, online reading lists and, laboratory facilities for particular research areas, such as autism.
- Responsiveness to student voice on the BSc Psychology programme e.g. change in the selection of supervisors and identification of final year projects
- Personal tutor support, e.g. frequency of meetings and availability and accessibility of personal tutors, especially in the first year BSc (i.e. approx 30 students for each personal tutor, over the 3 years)
- Responsiveness to feedback from external examiners for postgraduate programmes, such as the change to journal type projects in order to be more prepared for publications

The Panel required the Department meet the following conditions:

2. A full review of doctoral programmes in the School of Arts and Social Sciences was scheduled for 2015/16. The one year on reports arising from this review would be considered as part of the overall review of doctoral programmes in 2015/16.

The Chair noted that the DPsych Health had been excluded from the review due to mitigating circumstances and that the programme would be reviewed in full alongside the rest of the doctoral programmes in the School in 2015/16. To better monitor the outcome of the periodic review of the doctoral programmes in Psychology, and to consider the consistency of doctoral provision across the

School, the Panel asked that the one year on reports be considered during the full review of the doctoral programmes in the School in the next academic year.

3. Establish oversight of all programmes at Senior Management Level in the Department to facilitate a common understanding of issues, joined up thinking in relation to future planning and anticipation of risk; through, for example, portfolio review, identify programmes' positions in the strategic vision of the University and provide a mechanism, for example, for coherent change and development

The Panel questioned the Senior School Team on the fit of the programmes under review with the strategic direction of the School. The Panel, for example, was surprised that the Department had not undertaken a SWOT analysis during the drafting of the Reflective Review and/or considered how any potential opportunities or risks to the provision, given the rapid changes to the HE sector, might be managed and/or mitigated. The Senior School Team explained that they had recently established a School executive group, which met at least twice a year, to oversee the planning and review of the School's portfolio of programmes. The group, for example, reviewed the modules provided across the School and considered proposals for new programmes (developed following feedback from students and based on the interest and expertise of the staff) alongside the principles of the University's strategic vision. The Senior School Team stated that the BPS had also approved the new pathways in Psychology recently and that the pathways had also been considered through the executive group before they were offered to new students for the first time in September 2014.

The Senior School Team was clearly proud of the suite of programmes provided by the Department. In particular, the Team stated that all academic staff who taught on the undergraduate degree were submitted to the 2014 REF; that all academic staff with doctorates were encouraged, and supported, to supervise research students; and that academic staff also possessed the relevant qualifications required by the BPS. The Team, however, also said that they were aiming to reduce the buy-in of expertise through the appointment of visiting lecturers which had, historically, been the case in the Department. The Team also said that they were reviewing the accuracy of the fees using relevant management information given the labour intensity of some of the programmes provided within the School. The Panel acknowledged the measures taken through the School executive group but asked that similar issues were considered by senior management within the Department to support future planning.

4. The governance of Doctoral programmes needs improvement and to be cognisant of University procedures focusing on the following areas:
 - i. Provide information to ensure that all staff and students are familiar with University regulations governing Doctoral programmes or are aware of how to access this information; this includes improving the clarity of information available to students on processes such as application for funding and ensuring that both staff and students are using Research and Progress (RaP).
 - ii. Provide evidence that teaching obligations for all doctoral students (including those who are not in receipt of a University Studentship) are within University requirements. Unless a clear rationale can be provided, students are expected to attend the Learning, Teaching and Assessment module of the MA Academic Practice. Once teaching commences they are required to undergo peer review.
 - iii. Provide a clear process and evidence that the monitoring and oversight of appointment and approval of categorisation of research degree supervisors, including

appointment of external supervisors follows University guidelines; in some instances DPsych students appear to only have one supervisor when they should have two. Additionally, clarify the respective roles of the internal and external supervisors for DPsych students to ensure there is a clear shared understanding. This should include the provision of guidance to external supervisors on their academic supervision role.

- iv. Provide a clear process for students to transfer from DPsych to PhD.
- v. Ensure the DPsych students understand the role of the Senior Tutor for Research.

The following issues were noted during the meeting with the postgraduate research students:

- i. Students with whom the Panel met indicated that they were not always sure of how to access relevant information on key research degree policy and processes. This had led to uncertainty with regard to certain processes, such as transfer from DPsych to PhD.
- ii. It was not clear through the meetings with the staff and the students whether the students were suitably prepared to undertake teaching duties, the number of hours they were expected to teach, or that they were receiving feedback on their teaching practice through the peer review process.
- iii. Doctoral students are currently required to have at least two supervisors, one of whom should be Category A. It was unclear from the meeting with the doctoral students who had overall responsibility for the supervision of students on the DPsych programmes. There was also evidence of inconsistencies in the appointment of external supervisors between DPsych students and it was unclear from the meetings with staff and students whether DPsych students were allocated an internal Category A supervisor.
- iv. There was some uncertainty within the Department about the mechanisms for transferring research students from DPsych to PhD. The Panel recognised that while there may not be any consequences for some students, especially if students were already chartered psychologists, they acknowledged that for other students this may be problematic. The students said that clear information on the key implications in transferring from professional doctorate to PhD (by major thesis, prior publication or by structured components), would better assist students, and staff, in deciding whether a transfer was either appropriate or desirable. The Panel asked that the appropriate Programme Teams clarify the mechanisms for students transferring between DPsych and PhD; in particular, they were asked to identify and make explicit the equivalent progression points in the DPsych programmes as there were for the MPhil/PhD programme.
- v. The uncertainty as to what to do if a student registered on a DPsych programme wished, or was recommended, to transfer to PhD, demonstrated that some research students were unfamiliar with the role of the Senior Tutor for Research. While some research students were aware that they could arrange to speak to the Head of Department if necessary, the Panel asked that the PGR Programme Teams ensure that research students registered on the various DPsych programmes were familiar with

the role of the Senior Tutor for Research. In particular, the Panel asked that all research students be made aware that the Senior Tutor for Research was the first point of contact for all research students in the event of any issue arising that the supervisory team could not resolve directly themselves.

4. Provide full induction of Visiting Lecturers in the roles and responsibilities of teaching and research supervision (ensuring RAP is used by all those undertaking a supervisory role).

It was clear from discussions with the programme team that there was significant reliance on visiting lecturers to deliver the programmes within the department, particularly the postgraduate programmes. An identified risk, related to the use of visiting lecturers, was that they were not always required to use the Research and Progress (RAP) software to log and monitor research supervision etc. which could lead to one student receiving a different level of support to another student. The programme team were therefore asked to ensure each visiting lecturer was provided with an induction to the roles and responsibilities of teaching and research supervision and the use of RAP to record progress.

5. Provide clear marking and moderation procedures for BSc students, including information on the role of internal markers (both doctoral students and tutors) and external examiners

Undergraduate students were satisfied with the range of assessments on their programme, which they described as challenging but supportive. Students were however unclear on the procedures for marking and moderation of their work, and were not aware of the function of the external examiner having oversight of the quality of assessments and marking.

6. Provide Student and Academic Services with the Departmental response to the 2014 BPS re-accreditation undertaken in March 2014.

Some of the programmes under review had undergone accreditation by the British Psychological Society recently. The BPS report on the visit in March 2015 was provided with the supporting documentation. The Panel asked the Programme Teams to provide the response to the outcome of the BPS accreditation visit as a condition of the Periodic Review for information.

7. Provide a clear description of the mechanisms for appointment, and oversight of appointment, of doctoral students employed in BSc teaching and assessment ensuring they change from one year to the next to allow BSc students to experience more than one assessor.

As stated in #5 above, students were unclear on the marking and moderation procedures for their assessments. They also expressed some concern that they were assigned to particular doctoral student 'marking groups' for lab reports and that there wasn't a natural rotation of group membership over the three year programme that would allow all students to experience a range of different markers. The main concern stemmed from the perception that some markers were stricter than others and that this could lead to some students being disadvantaged.

8. Ensure Peer Review of Teaching is undertaken annually and reported by all teaching staff at appraisal (including research students who teach) in accordance with University policy.

There was some evidence that some tutors and some research students, who also undertake teaching duties, were not always considered during the annual departmental peer review of teaching.

9. Update all programme and module specifications, particularly reading lists (e.g. key reading texts dated 1995)

The Panel noted that the information in some of the programme and module specifications were out of date, particularly some of the recommended reading lists. As student facing documents, the Panel requested that they be reviewed and updated as appropriate.

All conditions must be responded to initially via a report and action plan to be submitted to the Panel Secretary, who will liaise with the Panel Chair, and other Panel members as necessary. Following this the response will be received at the Spring Term School Board of Studies to approve the schedule of actions in place to meet the conditions. The response must be submitted to the Panel Secretary at least two weeks before the deadline for papers for Board of Studies. It is expected that actions toward meeting the conditions will be completed by the end of the current academic year, where it is not possible to meet the condition in this timeframe; the programme team are expected to provide a clear timeframe for completion.

The Panel made a number of **recommendations** for areas where enhancements could be made to the programmes:

7. Consider establishing an annual departmental forum/committee to discuss strategic programme development. Over the next academic year this forum should inform the scheduled School Portfolio review of programmes.

The Senior School team described the way in which new subject areas were identified as a 'systematic discussion process' which linked to the annual planning cycle for the School, however it was unclear how successfully this linked with the department planning process. Suggestions for new programmes or modules came in the main part from staff expertise and not from a desire to align the programmes with University strategy. It was therefore proposed that the department consider establishing an annual forum or committee that would discuss programme development from both a strategic University perspective and individual staff expertise and knowledge. This forum or committee should also be positioned in order to inform the School-wide review of programmes scheduled for the 2015/16 academic year.

10. Investigate how Visiting Lecturers with significant roles may be appointed as full (fractional) members of staff as a means of strengthening the coherence of the programme delivery, (without impacting on the REF profile of the department).

The PGR students with whom the Panel met noted that there had been a high turnover of staff which had made it difficult for them to know who to contact at times while the PGT students with whom the Panel met noted that access to visiting lecturers had been patchy which had only been resolved through the intervention of the student representative.

It was suggested that the coherence of programme delivery could be strengthened by appointing those visiting lecturers with significant roles as full members of staff, however staff were concerned that this could impact negatively on the REF profile of the department. It was therefore suggested that this should

be investigated further within both the School and University.

5. For the School/Dept to consider changes to the design and delivery of their assessments in order to maintain a rich experience for students while numbers continue to rise

It was evident from the Reflective Review and the supporting documents that the BSc Psychology programme benefitted from a variety of assessment methods. The programme team were encouraged by the Panel to consider how the design and delivery of the assessments could be changed in order to meet the demands of an expanding cohort while still maintaining the variety and range which allowed for learning outcomes to be assessed in different ways.

6. Introduce a refresher module on statistics for those students on the MSc programmes who have no background in Psychology or who have not studied for some time

The Panel heard that a small percentage of students registered on some of the PGT programmes, notably the MSc in Organisational Psychology, who did not have a background in Psychology, and who did not have a relevant maths qualification, experienced difficulties in working with statistics occasionally. While students from different backgrounds, such as in Human Resources, were stronger in other modules, the Panel recommended that the Programme Teams consider introducing a refresher module on statistics.

7. Introduce an optional session on pursuing doctoral/further study and other types of careers for PGT and DPpsych students (such as in research, marketing and insight and not just consultancy)

It was evident from the meetings with the postgraduate students during the day that they valued the careers' support that they received through their programmes of study. Students reported the provision of regular talks by employers from different companies; frequent notification of job vacancies by staff; and, in some instances, the opportunity to win paid internships as part of project assignments. Some PGR students also commented that the Department organised one-off events, such as seminars at the beginning of the year, which provided careers guidance. While all of the students with whom the Panel met appreciated the emphasis on employability, some students commented, however, that they would also have appreciated more advice on opportunities for further study. Additionally, other students commented that they would have welcomed more advice on the diversity of career paths that may be open to them. Students registered on the Graduate Certificate in Counselling, for example, noted that while they received helpful support from staff in securing placements, particularly through staff networks with the NHS and charities, they also reported receiving useful advice on further study, particularly in progressing to a DPpsych.

6. Strengthen communication between staff and students on access to facilities, research methods and transferable skills training.

The Panel heard that some research students received training in SPSS but that some PhD students were only made aware of additional training opportunities incidentally by other research students. The Panel also heard that some PhD students did not receive formal technical or methodological training, unlike students on the DPpsych programmes, who had received research methods training such as in Grounded Theory through their course of study. Additionally, doctoral students did not appear to be aware of City Graduate School activities (targeted at developing transferable skills such as communication and networking

skills) although students registered on the DPsych programmes and the PhD were encouraged to attend conferences and present their research externally. The Panel acknowledged that access to facilities, and research methods and skills training, would depend on the type of research that a student was undertaking but recommended that the Programme Teams consider ways in which to ensure that both students, and staff, were aware of the facilities and opportunities that were available within the Department, the School and across the University.

7. Consider whether Lecture Capture might be used consistently across the Department (and School) and whether it should be compulsory with an 'opt out' option if there are concerns e.g. regarding exposure of clinical practice/confidentiality issues.

The Panel heard that the majority of Undergraduate students would appreciate more regular and consistent use of Lecture Capture, with some suggesting that the use of this software should be compulsory across the department. The programme teams were concerned that this could lead to a risk of exposure of clinical practice or other confidentiality issues. It was therefore proposed that the department develop a strategy for the use of the software and suggested that its use should be compulsory unless there were a valid reason for it not to be used.

8. Strengthen links between Masters, DPsych and PhD students; develop a research community within the Department and possibly the School.

The Panel heard that while some students progressed from some of the postgraduate taught programmes to the doctoral programmes (in particular, from the Graduate Certificate in Counselling Psychology to the DPsych programmes), there was very little interaction between students registered on the various postgraduate programmes in the Department. The DPsych students with whom the Panel met explained that they were only in University one day a week and were also required to complete taught modules, which significantly reduced the amount of time available to them to interact with other students. However, in light of some of the comments made by students during the day (such as issues around the provision of research skills training; guidance on further study; and the availability of teaching opportunities) and the strategic aim of the School/Department to create a City Psychology community/identity in the London area, the Panel recommended that the Department consider ways in which to strengthen the community between the postgraduate taught students and the students on the various doctoral programmes.

9. Liaise with the marketing department to investigate how a more comprehensive competitor analysis can be undertaken in order to underpin decisions about programme development /termination based on strategic awareness

Competitor analysis within the reflective review and to support new programme design was not considered comprehensive by the panel. The programme team were encouraged to liaise with the marketing department to investigate how this could be improved. The improved competitor analysis should be considered during the School-wide portfolio review to better inform decisions on programme development and amendment.

10. Consider ways in which to integrate a careers support/employability dimension in the UG programme, including entrepreneurship schemes, such as CitySpark

Students on BSc Psychology described how the programme had dramatically broadened their understanding of future career paths and how this had been further supported by the introduction of the pathways through the programme. The panel recognised the value of current practices, but felt that this could be further supported by a more defined integration of careers support and employability throughout the programme. The programme team were also encouraged to consider how students could be encouraged to engage in entrepreneurship schemes, such as CitySpark.

Recommendations for the University arising from the Periodic Review

- For the University to consider Periodic Review Guidance for Senior Staff responsible for the management of Periodic Review processes within their School/Department.

In order that Senior School staff be better positioned to support their departmental staff in completing a Periodic Review it was suggested that Periodic Review Guidance aimed at Senior Staff be developed/redrafted.

- For the University to consider a review of the Periodic Review process to include a presentation.

In order to assist the Panel to fulfil its role, and the requirements of the Reflective Review to be met, Programme Teams were asked to prepare a short presentation on “market position and strategy”, “students and alumni”, “programme design and analysis” and “staff development”. The presentations assisted the Panel greatly in reaching its outcomes and recommended that the University consider including the requirement of a presentation by programme teams in future periodic reviews.

All recommendations must be responded to initially via a report to the next available meeting of the School Board of Studies accompanying this report and in full via the one year on report. A copy of the report, initial response and one year on report will be submitted to Education & Student Committee and Graduate School Committee where appropriate following approval by the Board of Studies.

Secretaries:

Abi Moran, Validation and Partnerships Manager

Naomi Hammond, Head of Graduate School Office

Date of approval of report by Panel: 03 December 2014



Periodic Review Report

Programmes reviewed

MA Media and Communications
MA International Communication and Development
MSc Criminology and Criminal Justice
MSc Food Policy

Date of review

19th March 2015

Review participants

Review Panel members:

Name	Role
Dr Anton Cox	Head of Mathematics, School of Mathematics, Computer Science & Engineering (Chair)
Issy Cooke	VP Education (Student Panel Member)
Dr Peter Grant	Lecturer in Voluntary Sector Management, Cass Business School (Internal Panel Member)
Professor Andy Pratt	Professor of Cultural Economy, Department of Culture and Creative Industries, School of Arts and Social Sciences (Internal Panel Member)
Professor Jason Hughes	Professor of Sociology, University of Leicester (External Panel Member)
Helen Fitch	Assistant Registrar (Quality), Student and Academic Services (Co-Secretary)
Abdullah Rahman	Quality and Standards Officer, Student and Academic Services (Co-Secretary)

Meetings held during the day and attendees:

Meeting with Senior School Team	
Name	Title/Role
Professor Andrew Jones	Dean
Professor Laurence Solkin	Deputy Dean (Education)

Professor Chris Greer	Head of Sociology Department
Damian Williams	Chief Operating Officer
Carmai Pestell	School Head of Academic Services

Meeting with Programme Team	
Name	Title/Role
Professor Chris Greer	Head of Department
Professor Chris Rojek	PG Programme Director
Dr Dan Mercea	Media Programme Coordinator
Professor Eugene McLaughlin	Criminology Programme Coordinator
Professor Tim Lang	Food Policy Programme Coordinator
Patrick Baughan	LEAD Liaison
Tiril Garda	Course Operations Manager
Tatiana Dias	Course Officer
Karen Hunt	Course Officer

Meeting with Students and Alumni:	
Name	Programme
Efe Aydin	MA Media and Communications
Athina Caraba	MSc Criminology and Criminal Justice
Cameo Lee	MSc Criminology and Criminal Justice
Juliana Nogueira	MA Political Communication
Georgia Prasinou	MA International Communication and Development
Suzan Reumers	MSc Food Policy
Hillary Richonne	MA International Communication and Development
Ziyang Wang	MA Transnational Media and Globalisation

School co-ordinator: Carmai Pestell

Preparation for review

Date of development day: No development day event had been held for this periodic review.

Reflective review and supporting evidence

Panel members were provided with the Reflective Review document and supporting evidence four weeks ahead of the review. This included a range of key documentation covering the preceding three years including Annual Programme Evaluations, External Examiner Reports and Responses and previous Periodic Review Reports. The documentation was initially incomplete and, following enquiry, further items were made available to the Panel prior to the event; these included relevant management and survey data and additional Annual Programme Evaluations, Programme Management Committee minutes, Programme Approval and Review Committee Minutes and Distance Learning Student Feedback.

Changes to provision

The Programme Team confirmed that actions arising from previous periodic reviews had been implemented although the limited diversity of assessment methods continues to be an issue on some programmes. The periodic review documentation for the current event included an overview of amendments made to the provision since the last periodic review. It was noted that on-going changes to provision should be monitored and consulted on where re-approval may be warranted.

A number of proposed amendments had been outlined in the documentation for the Panel's information. The intention is for these to be put forward for approval and implementation with effect from the 2015-16 academic year. It was agreed that these amendments would require further work before being submitted to the School Programme Approval Committee (PARC) for approval outside of the Periodic Review process. Further details are provided within this report.

Professional body involvement

The programmes under review are not subject to Professional Body accreditation and no Professional Bodies were required to be involved in the Review day.

Partnership provision

Not applicable for the programmes under review.

Conduct of the review

The Reflective Review (which will be submitted to Education & Student Committee with this report) provided the Panel with an overview of the history and context of the provision, developments since the last periodic review and short and long-term action planning.

The Panel considered the educational offer, effectiveness of the programme, academic standards and student achievement, design and management of the programmes, student support and resources. During the course of the review day the following topics were given particular consideration:

- the market for the programmes and their future direction
- the positive feedback from students on the programmes, many of whom were attracted to City due to the University's London location and connections
- current student and future student numbers (full-time, part-time and distance learners including home and overseas students) and marketing strategies
- the balance of staffing and resources for the postgraduate suite of programmes in relation to the undergraduate programmes, and the possible fragility in terms of staffing and resources for the small postgraduate programme teams
- the extent of changes made to the programmes to date, and those proposed for the future
- how and when the decisions to suspend programmes were communicated to current and prospective students
- how programme changes are managed, resourced, approved and communicated to students
- the rationalisation of the programmes, shared delivery and the impact of the recalibration of the module credits on the academic content
- the equality of opportunity extended to distance learners in comparison to full-time students (including access to staff and resources)
- the limited diversity of assessment methods and the bunching of assessment deadlines
- the rationale for the approach to how research workshops are offered within the programmes
- the low response rates for the PTES and strategies for increasing participation and responding to student feedback

- the mapping of the programmes, in particular the MSc Criminology and Criminal Justice, to the QAA subject benchmark statements

Discussion during the review event provided clarification on the following points:

(i) Future direction of the programmes

The suite of programmes had been reviewed and revised to meet market requirements, improve recruitment, capitalise on staff expertise and departmental interdisciplinary strengths, and contribute to the University's research objectives. As a result the programmes now have clearer focus and are more distinct from those offered by City's two main competitors, London School of Economics and Goldsmiths, University of London.

(ii) Programme content

The programmes focus on both theory and practice which distinguishes the provision from the theory-based approach of competitors' programmes. A series of research workshops are offered as part of the curriculum for some programmes but are predominantly lecture-based and student feedback has been mixed; the Programme Team are in the process of improving the format to increase participation and the balance of practice-based workshop activity.

(iii) Staffing resources

The Panel enquired about the sustainability of staffing levels for the postgraduate programmes, and for the MSc Food Policy in particular. The Programme Team view that the current staffing levels are sufficient for the target of 15 students per cohort, and advised that guest speakers are engaged for some aspects of curriculum delivery. There are concerns however regarding future succession and adequate staffing levels being maintained (with posts at the same level) due to impending staff retirements and in the light of future plans for the programmes. It was recommended that the School address these risks as soon as possible.

(iv) Student employability

Alumni feedback has indicated that employability prospects for graduates are strong (for the MSc Food Policy in particular), and the Programme Team is now making use of its alumni networks to further enhance current students' prospects. A conscious decision had been made not to offer internship provision due to the administration and risks involved, but the Teams are working to improve students' understanding of transferable skills and strategies to find employment to complement the provision provided by the University's Careers Team. Further work is being carried out to strengthen links with key employers which will benefit both the curriculum and student networking opportunities.

(v) Programme changes and module credit recalibration

The programmes have been rationalised and the credit values of a number of modules have been revised. The aims were to remove duplication, retain sufficient diversity for choice and to allow for sharing electives with other programmes (however there are no plans to create elective modules to serve specific programmes). It was noted however that there were a number of inconsistencies within the programme and module specifications and further work was required to complete this exercise to ensure that learning outcomes, content and reading lists are up-to-date, complete, accurate and meet University regulations and requirements. It was agreed that this must be completed and submitted to the PARC as a condition of the review.

(vi) MSc Food Policy distance-learning students

The MSc Food Policy is also offered as a distance-learning programme and the Programme Team adopts a philosophical position in terms of student equitability, endeavouring to offer students the same learning experience whether they are taught at the University or online. This programme does not have elective modules but there is an element of choice within the focus of the module assessment which enables students to tailor the focus of the programme to meet their area of professional interest. Tutorials are offered via Skype.

(vii) Diversity of assessment

Whilst there are a range of assessment methods within the MSc Food Policy, the Panel and students had noted the lack of diversity in assessment methods across the other MSc programmes. These programmes centre around lectures, seminars and a final written assignment which can cause sequencing issues for the end of term assessments. There have been some initial moves to include other forms of assessments such as group work and workshop-based assignments but it is acknowledged that further improvements can be made. The Programme Teams agreed to continue to explore ways to increase the diversity of assessment methods which would improve students' and lecturers' workloads at key times whilst maintaining academic standards.

(viii) Communication with Students

The student group had noted that provision of assessment information had been inconsistent and there had been a lack of clarity on programme changes and closures. The Programme Team acknowledged that there had been some issues in the past and every effort is being made to improve communications between the Team and students.

Course information, assessment deadlines and all other key student information are usually available through Moodle and from the programme handbook, and it was agreed that particular attention needs to be given to dissemination of pre-arrival information (such as term dates and module reading lists) and induction (to ensure that sessions include appropriate course and study support information at the beginning and throughout the programmes). The Team will endeavour to ensure the students are made aware of key information both before and during their time at City, including timely information on any changes as appropriate.

(ix) Action Planning

It was acknowledged that the Action Plan within the Periodic Review document should be updated to include the topics articulated during the review meeting and assign more focussed responsibilities for staff members. This will include the inclusion of a statement on the Team's strategy for building professional alliances to strengthen the programme and underpin student employability and engagement with work and society.

The Chair thanked the students, programme team and senior team for their engagement with the process and their contribution to the discussions during the day.

Outcome of the review

The Review Panel confirmed that the development and review processes were robust and enabled and evidenced the following:

- A reflective, enhancement focused, peer-review process drawing effectively on internal and external expertise and including constructive and challenging discussion of the academic provision.
- On-going development of the provision and the student learning experience including the continued alignment with relevant benchmark standards, and recalibration of module credits to align with University's modular framework.
- Promotion of student engagement within quality and enhancement processes including the use of student feedback and contributions during the development process, receipt of comments by distance learning student participants ahead of the review event, and contributions on the day both via Panel membership and the student meeting.

The Periodic Review Panel considered that:

- **confidence** could be placed in the academic standards of the reviewed provision;
- **confidence** could be placed in the quality of the learning opportunities available to students.

1. Commendations

The Panel **commended** the following particular strengths:

- 1.1. The highly engaged students who are appreciative of the programmes and their sense of community.
- 1.2. The development of distinctive provision which meet student expectations.
- 1.3. The highly approachable and supportive staff members who are responsive to student feedback.
- 1.4. The distinctiveness of the MSc Food Policy programme and its position in the global market.
- 1.5. The Team's consideration of the positioning of the updated offer in the current market and its commitment to transforming the Department.

2. Recommendations

Recommendations for the Programme Team

The Panel made a number of **recommendations** for areas where enhancements could be made to the programmes. It was recommended that the Programme Team:

- 2.1. Continues its consideration of policy within future programme development.
- 2.2. Continues to develop and articulate the key links between theory and practice within the curriculum.
- 2.3. Continues to explore the merits of including a greater variety of formative and summative assessment methods in the programmes and reviews the sequencing of assessment deadlines.
- 2.4. Updates, develops and clarifies their Action Plan to articulate the topics discussed during the Periodic Review and include more focussed responsibilities for staff members.
- 2.5. Ensures effective and timely communication of any changes to programmes or assessment deadlines to all students.
- 2.6. Ensures that pre-sessional information such as term dates and module reading lists are published for new students prior to their arrival, and to review the approach to induction to ensure that sessions include appropriate course and study support information at the beginning and throughout the programmes.
- 2.7. Ensures that annual programme evaluations and other relevant documentation for future Periodic Reviews are accurate and complete.
- 2.8. Includes in their Action Plan a statement on the Team's strategy for building professional alliances which will strengthen the programmes, and underpin student employability and engagement with work and society.

Recommendations for the School

The Panel made the following **recommendations** for consideration by the School. It is recommended that the School:

- 2.9. Reviews and increase the staffing levels for the MSc Food Policy programme as soon as possible, and replaces existing posts at the same level.
- 2.10. Ensures that adequate administrative support is in place whilst the programme and the department are undergoing significant change.

Recommendations for the University

The Panel made the following **recommendation** for consideration by the University. It is recommended that the University:

2.11. Requests that periodic review packs include Staff-Student Liaison Committee minutes in the documentation presented to the panel as a standard item.

All recommendations must be responded to initially via a report to the School Board of Studies accompanying this report and in full via the one year on report. A copy of the report, initial response and one year on report will be submitted to Education & Student Committee following approval by the Board of Studies.

3. Conditions

While confirming its confidence in the current provision, the Panel requires that the Programme Team meets the following **condition** before Friday 5 June 2015 and ensures that the revisions are presented to the June PARC meeting:

3.1 The School must review and update all programme specifications and module specifications to ensure that their content is current, complete, accurate and meets University requirements.

This condition has been set in order to ensure that these programmes clearly demonstrate the maintenance of academic standards in accordance with QAA and University guidance.

This condition must be responded to initially via a report and action plan submitted to the Panel Secretary, who will liaise with the Panel Chair, and other Panel members as necessary. This response should be submitted to the Panel Secretary by Friday 5 June 2015. The School's response (including the schedule of actions in place to meet the condition) will be received at the Board of Studies in the normal way for approval. It is expected that actions toward meeting this condition will be completed by the end of the current academic year, where it is not possible to meet the condition in this timeframe; the programme team are expected to provide a clear timeframe for completion.

Secretaries to the Review

Helen Fitch (Assistant Registrar, Quality)

Abdullah Rahman (Quality and Standards Officer)

Date of approval of report by Panel: