Periodic Review Update

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

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

Periodic Review Reports:

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

Recommended Actions:

Educational Quality Committee is asked to

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

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

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

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

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

There was an exceptional level of support for these events from Student and Academic Services colleagues, School Quality Teams and Programme Administration teams, and this report offers unmitigated thanks for that.

Planning for next year is well underway and there are currently 19 Review Events ongoing. To support this, new Policy and Guidance documents were approved by Senate in May 2018 and Teams undergoing Review in 2018-19 are encouraged to consult these.

The Reports for 2017-18 speak to a successful year of Reviews, with many of the Panels commenting on the dedication of Programme and Support staff, the commitment to academic excellence and offering examples of best practice in every area.

This report covers the following programmes/programme clusters:

- Masters in Innovation, Creativity and Leadership (MICL)
- PG Quantitative Cluster (MSc Financial Mathematics, MSc Mathematical Trade and Finance, MSc Quantitative Finance)
- LLB/GELLB
Note: the reports for MSc Construction Management, MSc Civil Engineering and MSc Project Management, Finance and Risk, and MSc Energy, Environmental Technologies, and Economics were pending finalisation at the time of writing.
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Educational Offer/Effectiveness of Provision

PANELS HIGHLIGHTED THE FOLLOWING GOOD PRACTICE

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

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

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

**WHAT STUDENTS LIKE**

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

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

Of particular note within the Reviews was:

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

**DEVELOPMENTS SINCE LAST REVIEW**

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

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

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

**PLANS FOR THE FUTURE**

Many of the Reviews discussed the difficulty of providing students with accurate programme information as early as the students may like it. This was particularly pertinent to programmes where significant change had taken place or was planned for the future.
All Programme Teams were encouraged to make every effort, often in light of the Competition and Market Authority guidelines, to ensure that published information is as accurate as it can be, prior to publication.

The Senior Team for the MICL Review expressed conflicting views on how this programme may develop, moving forwards. Some expressed the view that aligning the programme more closely with Cass and more effectively integrating the programme into the catalogue should be the priority, whilst others believed that remaining on the current trajectory and expanding the elective choice would increase recruitment. The Panel was agreed that the Programme Team needed to do further work to evaluate these options, noting that, in either case, the distinctive nature of the programme should be retained.

### Academic Standards and Student Achievements

*PANELS HIGHLIGHTED THE FOLLOWING AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE*

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

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

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

### What Students Like

Of particular note, were:

- All Panels noted the valuable contributions of Visiting and Guest lecturers made to provision at City. The students spoke highly of their ability to cross educational and industry boundaries, and offer a connection to the relevant professions, as well as appreciating the variety and interest they added to programmes. Panels noted, though, that over-reliance on such provision introduced risk and this will be discussed later in this report.
• The students from Law commented specifically on the Microplacements module, and the School efforts to introduce more employability and skills-focussed modules. These new modules were seen as very valuable in offering students the opportunity to strengthen both their academic and professional capabilities.

• The Review Panel for MSc Maritime Operations Management & MSc Coastal and Marine Engineering Management commended the range of visits on offer on the programme, with the students confirming that these visits provided an invaluable connection between theory and practice. Specifically, the students discussed the visit to the International Maritime Organisation, agreeing that this strengthened their understanding of the taught material and supported their preparation for employment.

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

DEVELOPMENTS SINCE LAST REVIEW

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

• The Review Panel for the LLB/GELLB noted that there were plans to integrate the professional expertise of the PG team into Programme Stage 3 of the LLB, to offer students greater industry exposure and to create ‘feed-through’ from UG to PG within the School.

• The students from MSc Maritime Operations Management & MSc Coastal and Marine Engineering Management observed that the order of module delivery had changed, and confirmed that this was a very welcome development on the programme. The Panel commended the Programme Team for their responsiveness to this feedback.

• The Review Panel for the MSc Quantitative cluster commended the strategic development of a common first term which recognised the cyclical nature of recruitment, and served to protect provision across all of the programmes by building in synergies and efficiencies across the wider Cass portfolio. The Panel was agreed that the new structure provided a strong and flexible basis for delivery and would allow additional agility moving forwards.

PLANS FOR THE FUTURE

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

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

Particularly mentioned, were:

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

**Student Support and Resources**

*PANELS HIGHLIGHTED THE FOLLOWING AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE*

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

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

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

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

**WHAT STUDENTS LIKE**

Of particular note, were:

- The wealth of experience demonstrated by the Programme Team for MSc Maritime Operations Management & MSc Coastal and Marine Engineering Management, and the obvious pride they have in their students’ achievements. The international students on these programmes commented very positively about the support on offer for them, focusing on the responsiveness of the team and the quality of the pastoral support available.

- The student and alumni group from the MSc Aviation cluster spoke very highly of the student induction workshop. A large proportion of the cohort had not previously engaged in higher education and felt that the workshop served to familiarise students with the processes which would govern their learning, and to introduce the academic expectations in a supportive environment. They also said that the format of the induction created a very strong sense of programme identity and fostered practices of community, sharing ideas and networking.
• Students from the MSc Health Management programme were encouraged to enter the CitySparks business competition and a couple of teams from the programme had taken up the opportunity. The students involved explained that it had provided an opportunity to build and enrich their skills and experience.

DEVELOPMENTS SINCE LAST REVIEW

All of the reports noted the importance of School responsiveness to student feedback. Of particular note were the Programme Team for the MSc Project Management, Finance and Risk (PMFR), in response to student feedback, created a new module - *Introductory Mathematics* – to support those students from a non-qualitative background.

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

PLANS FOR FUTURE

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

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

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

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

PANELS HIGHLIGHTED THE FOLLOWING GOOD PRACTICE

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

All of the Reports also note the commitment, maturity and enthusiasm of the students involved in the student group meetings. Many of the Reports also demonstrate the significant, localised efforts to develop and strengthen alumni relations, with many reports citing specific instances of alumni involvement as examples of best practice.
Of particular note in this area was the MSc Quantitative cluster who discussed the offer to the alumni network for ‘lifelong learning’, a scheme within Cass Business School which allows graduates to return to audit modules, should they wish. The Review Panel was agreed that this would create personal and lasting relationships with alumni and encourage their input into future programme developments.

The Panels for MICL and PMFR both noted particular strengths in the synergy between the programme and the cohort – each supporting and developing the other. The students and alumni from the MICL programme demonstrated loyalty and energy towards the programme and their experience, which reportedly came from the creative and supportive nature of the programme. The PMFR students argued strongly that the interdisciplinary approach to the programme facilitated success for students from a wide range of backgrounds.

**WHAT STUDENTS LIKE**

Of particular note, were:

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

**DEVELOPMENTS SINCE LAST REVIEW**

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

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

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

**PLANS FOR FUTURE**

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

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

**Issues and Challenges**

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

In no particular order, these were:

- **Student Communication** – a number of the student and alumni groups reported localised issues with communication. These were commonly related to inconsistencies in the information provided across student-facing platforms (programme and module specifications, programme handbooks and Moodle). All Teams are encouraged to undertake regular reviews of these to ensure consistent information delivery. There were also reported issues around the timing of information, particularly around assessment and possible changes to the assessment of a module. All Teams are reminded that changes should no longer be taking place in-year, and any change which affects current students should be clearly explained at the earliest possible opportunity. It is noted, though, that the introduction of the MASt Personalised Timetable project will go some way towards minimising the risks, particularly around last-minute changes to programmes and modules.

- **Consistency around Personal Tutoring** – there were differing experiences of Personal Tutoring reported, with some student and alumni groups demonstrating little awareness of the Personal Tutoring policy or how this would affect them. As the new Personal Tutoring policy embeds into practice, all staff are encouraged to increase awareness and visibility of this vital support resource.

- **Staff Engagement in Periodic Review Events** – whilst the University is mindful of the responsibilities of, and demands on, staff time, engagement with Periodic Review is essential to both the ethos and process of Periodic Review. There were anecdotal reports of non-attendance at the Events, particularly on the part of Senior Team members, which made full discussion of any arising themes problematic.

- **Visiting Lecturers** – whilst many areas of very best practice were identified, and the value to students is undeniable, there were many discussions of the risks involved with managing programmes with a high percentage of Visiting Lecturer delivery. Particular concerns raised were around Quality Assurance compliance and risk, assessment practice, staff availability and consistency of experience. In more than one instance, Panels requested a risk management plan as part of the conditions or recommendations of the Review.
Recommendations Arising from Periodic Review for University Consideration

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

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

This report asks the Committee to note the following recommendations:

1. To consider developing and embedding a cycle of regular, cross-platform checks, into the Quality Assurance cycle within programme administration to ensure consistency between student-facing platforms. Best practice would suggest allocating a single source of information as the ‘master’, and using this to replicate across the platforms. This should minimise work duplication and reduce the risk of errors. Consultation between the relevant teams would support this.

2. To facilitate, as far as possible, full staff availability for the events, Review dates should be agreed well in advance and subject to change only in exceptional circumstances. It is also recommended that the University expectations for staff should be reitered and cascaded down through the Senior Management structures.

3. To consider developing a University guidance/best-practice document for programmes where a high percentage of delivery is via Visiting Lecturers, and to develop a framework for consistently inducting, training and monitoring Visiting Lecturer provision, using the examples of best practice evident in those Programmes reviewed here.

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

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

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

Dr Lucy Dawkins
Academic Development and Quality Officer
Student and Academic Services
Interim Schedule of Periodic Review Events for 2018-19

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

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

Table 1

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHS</th>
<th>Masters in Public Health</th>
<th>First Review</th>
<th>8th April 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHS</td>
<td>MSc Radiography MRI/ MSc Radiography (CT)</td>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>14th February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHS</td>
<td>MSc Health Policy</td>
<td>First Review</td>
<td>28th February 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| SASS | UG/PG Economics Programmes and PhD Economics  
  - BSc Economics with Accounting  
  - BSc Financial Economics  
  - MSc Business Economics | 12/13 | 7th June 2018 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Program Details</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Application Deadline</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SASS</td>
<td>MSc Development Economics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSc Economic Evaluation in Healthcare</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSc Economics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSc Behavioural Economics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSc Financial Economics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSc Health Economics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSc International Business Economics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PhD Economics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SASS</td>
<td>UG/ PG Politics and International Programmes and PhD International Politics</td>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>7\textsuperscript{th} February 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- BSc International Politics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- BSc Politics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- BSc International Political Economy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- BSc International Politics and Sociology</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- MA Global Political Economy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- MA Diplomacy and Foreign Policy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- MA International Politics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- MA International Politics and Human Rights</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PhD International Politics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SASS</td>
<td>PhD /DJourn Journalism</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>5\textsuperscript{th} December 2017</td>
<td>24\textsuperscript{th} May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Unknown</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SASS</td>
<td>PhD Sociology</td>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>5\textsuperscript{th} December 2017</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} March 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>End Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SASS</td>
<td>PhD/DMA Music</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>5th December 2017</td>
<td>21st February 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Research Programmes</td>
<td>12/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass</td>
<td>MSc Charity Programmes</td>
<td>13/14</td>
<td>26th June 2018</td>
<td>February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass</td>
<td>PhD Programmes</td>
<td>13/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass</td>
<td>MSc Global Supply Chain Management</td>
<td>First Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass</td>
<td>MSc Marketing Strategy</td>
<td>First Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass</td>
<td>MSc Management</td>
<td>12/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Periodic Review report

Programmes reviewed
Masters in Innovation, Creativity and Leadership

Date of review
10th May 2018

Review participants

Review Panel members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Oliver Kerr</td>
<td>School of Mathematics, Computer Science &amp; Engineering (Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Rich Payne</td>
<td>Cass Business School (Internal panel member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay Wilder</td>
<td>City Law School (Internal panel member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Jamie Brassett</td>
<td>Reader in Philosophy, Design &amp; Innovation Central St Martins, University of the Arts London (External panel member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatema Dhanani</td>
<td>City Law School (Student panel member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Alderman</td>
<td>Assistant Registrar (Research) (Secretary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malgo Chrzan</td>
<td>Quality and Standards Officer (Co-secretary)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meetings held during the day and attendees:

Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa Ethier</td>
<td>Current Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Haynes</td>
<td>Current Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Stanway</td>
<td>Current Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Grundel</td>
<td>Current Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandima Dutton</td>
<td>Current Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Royce</td>
<td>Current Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwayne Dawson</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Hughes</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Sangale</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andreas Alexiou</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Programme Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Sara Jones</td>
<td>Programme Director, Masters in Innovation, Creativity and Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Neil Maiden</td>
<td>Module Leader: Leading Creative Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Lisa O'Donnell</td>
<td>Visiting Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Wilkins</td>
<td>Honorary Senior Visiting Fellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Clive Holtham</td>
<td>Module Leader: Delivering Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Maire Kerrin</td>
<td>Cass Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visiting Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil O’Shea</td>
<td>Visiting Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Module Leader: The Psychology of Creativity and Innovation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preparation for review

Date of development day: 11th October 2017

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, Programme Management Committee minutes (covering 2011-2014), Staff-Student Liaison Committee minutes, programme handbooks, and programme and module specifications. Module evaluation data, as well as PTES and exit survey results were also provided.

The panel requested additional documentation covering recent Programme Management Committee minutes, and Advisory Board minutes for the Centre for Creativity. These were provided and reviewed during the event.

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

The Panel noted that ongoing changes to provision are monitored and consulted on where re-approval or earlier periodic review may be warranted. It was confirmed that the cumulative effect of amendments since the last periodic review did not require re-approval via the current periodic review process.

Conduct of the review
The Reflective Review (which will be submitted to 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 programme, 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:

- Approaches to teamwork/group work
- Proposed revisions to the dissertation structure
- Alternative formats for delivering course content
- Student support, induction and career development opportunities
- Preservation of the distinctiveness and interdisciplinarity of the programme
- Relevance of the curriculum
- Current staffing provision
- Scalability of the programme and future planning

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

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

1. *The interdisciplinary and diverse nature of the programme, and the manner in which students draw upon the diversity of the intake in underpinning their learning.*

   One of the most positive aspects of the course highlighted unanimously by the students, Programme team and Senior Staff team was the interdisciplinary character of the programme. Students and alumni stated that the programme title, which comprised both creativity and innovation, had been an important factor in their decision to study at City and felt strongly that having the word ‘creativity’ in their degree title was particularly appealing.

   Students and alumni stressed that the course had equipped them with a wide range of useful tools, such as the ability to synthesise ideas from many disciplines and to be creative in a non-creative environment. The diversity in the cohort’s academic background had exposed students to alternative ways of acquiring knowledge and encouraged them to look across disciplinary boundaries to consider other viewpoints.

   The Programme Team, both in the documentation supplied and in meeting the panel, emphasised that this authentically multidisciplinary course provided students with a strong
foundation and enabled them to thrive in a complex and rapidly changing world. This unique offering constituted a response to the world that was becoming increasingly Volatile, Uncertain, Complex and Ambiguous (VUCA) and ensured that the current needs of business were met.

The Senior Staff Team expressed their desire to develop more interdisciplinary programmes and hinted that the Masters in Innovation, Creativity and Leadership (‘the MICL’), being such a good connector programme, could serve as the blueprint for building new synergies at School level. They stressed that the distinct nature of the programme introduced more diversity in the Cass portfolio but also fitted well with the University’s vision and the educational aspect of Cass’s vision.

2. The value of the ethos of the programme to the wider School.

The Panel recognised that the standing of the programme, thanks to its broader innovative aspects, had been cemented when the School had decided to develop its programme offer in entrepreneurship. The Senior School Team and the Programme Team agreed that the MICL, in conjunction with the Centre for Creativity, constituted an ecosystem that encouraged experimentation and enterprise to a greater degree than more traditional programmes. Its innovative approach could be utilised as a prime driver of change and innovation at School level.

3. The united, enthusiastic and dedicated programme team

The Panel were particularly impressed with the dedication and enthusiasm displayed by the Programme Team, which was evidenced by their high levels of engagement with the event. Discussions with the students highlighted that the relationships they had built with staff members and the support that they received from the Programme Team and dedicated Course Officers were central to their positive student experience.

4. The loyalty and energy demonstrated by students and alumni to the programme and their experience.

The students and alumni that the Panel met spoke very highly of the programme and considered it a transformational experience, which had instigated change in their approach to work and to life. They felt that the reflective learning experience had allowed them to challenge their traditional paradigms and to be more confident and constructive outside of their comfort zones.

The Panel required the Department meet the following conditions:

1. To evaluate whether, as further integration of the programme into the wider Cass portfolio is pursued, the distinctiveness of the programme and content has not been diminished.

The Panel assessed the impact of the transfer of the MICL from the School of Mathematics, Computer Science and Engineering to Cass Business School on the programme content and determined whether embedding the programme in the finance environment would diminish its distinctiveness.

Students and Alumni recognised the benefits of holding a Cass degree, however they also noted that the multidisciplinary nature of the course was reinforced by the diversity of student backgrounds. Should the intake become increasingly skewed towards more business-orientated applicants as consolidation with the School progressed, they cautioned that the programme could lose its multidisciplinary character.

The Panel noted that members of the Senior Staff team had different visions for the future development of the MICL. While some expressed their preference for consolidating the business side of the programme and bringing it in line with the rest of the Cass offering, others would like to see the course stay on the current trajectory and expand through opening up their elective modules to the broader student body rather than increasing the intake on the course.

The Panel concluded, therefore, that the Programme Team needed to evaluate whether, as future integration of the programme into the wider Cass portfolio was pursued, the distinctiveness of the programme content would not be diminished.
2. To review the value, position and content of the INM409 The Law, Creativity and Innovation to ensure content and delivery reflects the needs of the student cohort.

As one of the main advantages of the MICL, students and alumni listed the fact that it allowed them to study Creative Design and Creative Writing alongside modules like Law and Psychology. However, they pointed out that the current content of the INM409 was only tangentially relevant to their studies and recommended that the module be rewritten or offered as an elective.

The Programme Team stressed that the INM409 module was indispensable for students who planned to work in the creative industries in the future, especially in relation to the topics on copyrights, trademarks and patent law. The Programme Team indicated that they were in the process of looking for a new module leader with a view of refocusing the content to make it more suitable for non-lawyers.

The Panel were therefore of the view that the Programme Team should review the value, position and content of the INM409 to ensure that it was fit for purpose.

3. For consideration to be given to how this programme is promoted and marketed for its distinctiveness in relation to other Cass Programmes.

The Panel heard that the School had moved to a more integrated marketing approach encompassing a wide range of marketing objectives and initiatives. Students evidenced that this approach disadvantaged small programmes whose distinctive character was lost under the shared umbrella.

The Panel recommended that consideration be given to how the MICL was promoted and marketed for its distinctiveness.

All conditions must be met by 31st May 2019 and a response submitted to the Panel Secretary; the Panel Chair will determine whether the response sufficiently addresses the Panel’s concerns and will consult with other Panel members if required.

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

1. To allow the value of the ethos of the programme to be capitalised, additional resources for the full exploitation of this will need to be addressed.

   The Panel felt that the realisation of the ethos of the programme, which was summarised as ‘to inspire and enable students to drive the future, change things for the better and to develop the knowledge and skills in leadership, creativity and innovation’, was dependent on adequate resourcing.

   The Panel was impressed with the bold ideas the Programme Team proposed for the future of the programme, including the development of e-learning, expansion of the elective offering, opening up the electives to other Cass students, overhaul of the dissertation structure, and introduction of bespoke career events for mature students. Students and alumni were in agreement that these developments would make the programme more dynamic and put it ahead of the competition.

   The Panel was therefore of the view that in order to capitalise on the value of the ethos of the programme, additional resources would need to be allocated.

2. To consider how peer review assessment is incorporated in to the group work and feedback given on assessment
Student feedback indicated that whilst students valued the skills developed through group work, they found collaboration with their colleagues challenging due to diversity of intentions. The students recommended that greater accountability be brought to group work by the implementation of peer assessment. They asserted that peer-reflection was commonly applied in workplace and had a potential to eliminate unfairness.

The Panel were of the view that the current approach to peer review assessment be evaluated and asked the Programme Team to explore the possibility of utilising contentious situations arising during group work to teach leadership, performance management and followership skills integral to the programme objectives.

3. To consider alternatives to the Dissertation to reflect the creative nature of the course

The Panel heard that whilst students frequently used the Dissertation as a springboard for their future careers, the current purely academic structure of the Dissertation left little room for creativity and was incongruent with the innovative character of the programme. The Panel recommended that the Programme Team explore the possibility of introducing the option of taking a ‘Dissertation as creative project’, either written or in other durable formats, accompanied by a critical analysis or reflection on the project and its outcomes.

4. To evaluate how resilience is built into the staffing structure.

The Panel raised concerns over the fragility of the current staffing structure which comprised three members of staff and a network of visiting lecturers. Whilst the visiting lecturers had been engaged with the programme for a number of years and had proven themselves reliable, the overdependence of the programme on the Programme Director was identified as a single point of failure. The Panel was therefore of the view that contingency planning should be carried out to ensure the continuity of the programme in case of staff changes.

5. To consider how additional support and academic preparation can be provided as part of the induction.

The diversity of student backgrounds and the fact that the MICL attracted mature students, frequently unacclimatised with academic study at the point of entry, were identified as primary reasons for the divergence in student learning at the beginning of the course. The Panel recommended that the induction was expanded to include academic writing and reflective journaling in order to provide better foundations for students from mixed academic backgrounds and to ensure more coherent student learning.

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.

Endorsement of Action Plan

The Panel endorsed the Action Plan in the Reflective Review.

Secretary: Richard Alderman
Co-secretary: Malgo Chrzan

Date of approval of report by Panel: 19th July 2018
Date of deadline set for School Response: 30th October 2018
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Programmes reviewed
MSc Quantitative Finance, MSc Financial Mathematics, MSc Mathematical Trading and Finance

Date of review
28th June 2018

Review participants

Review Panel members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Margaret Carran</td>
<td>City Law School (Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Ivana Raonic</td>
<td>Cass Business School (Internal Panel Member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor Deborah Dickinson</td>
<td>School of Arts and Social Sciences (Internal University Panel Member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Nial O'Sullivan</td>
<td>Head of Department of Economics, University College, Cork (External Panel Member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie Hughan</td>
<td>Student Representative (BSc Radiography)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Lucy Dawkins</td>
<td>Secretary to the Review Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malgo Chrzan</td>
<td>Quality and Standards Officer (Co-secretary)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George Shepperd</td>
<td>Graduate - MSc Quantitative Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarun Verghese</td>
<td>Graduate – MSc Quantitative Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayesh Malde</td>
<td>Graduate – MSc Mathematical, Trading and Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semen Sechenov</td>
<td>MSc Financial Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Wong</td>
<td>MSc Quantitative Finance Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mingze Xu</td>
<td>MSc Financial Mathematics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Programme Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Dirk Nitzsche</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer in Finance, Associate Dean for Internationalisation, and Course Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Giovanni Urga</td>
<td>Professor of Finance &amp; Econometrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Ales Cerny</td>
<td>Professor of Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Keith Cuthbertson</td>
<td>Professor of Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoe Owen</td>
<td>Programme Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Fairclough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Sands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Young</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline McNabb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Ruth Windsheffel</td>
<td>LEaD representative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Senior Staff Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
School co-ordinator: Mary Flynn

Preparation for review

Date of development day: 7 February 2018

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, Programme Management Committee minutes, Staff-Student Liaison Committee minutes, programme handbooks. The action plan from the previous periodic review was also provided.

Additional information included: module and programme specifications, module evaluation data, PTES survey results and employment data.

Partnership provision

Since 2012 City, University of London and Singapore Management University have offered the Cass MSc Quantitative Finance as a joint degree option with SMU. Additionally, Cass Business School has one directional dual degree arrangement in place with KAIST in Seoul, which allows KAIST students to obtain a second postgraduate degree at Cass.

Conduct of the review

The Reflective Review (which will be submitted to 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 programme, 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:

- The strategic fit of the Programmes within the School
- Educational offer and curriculum design
- Alumni relations
- Fluctuation in student numbers and marketing strategies
- Reliance on Visiting Lecturers
- Induction, student support and career development opportunities
- Extent to which External Examiners are engaged with the programmes
- Management of collaborative provisions
- Composition of Advisory Boards
- Closing the feedback loop
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 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;
- confidence could be placed in the quality of the learning opportunities available to students.

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

1. *The Programmes Office, and Helen Young in particular, for their effective management of the administrative processes and positive and supportive attitude.*

The Panel noted that the students spoke very highly about the professionalism demonstrated by the Programmes Office staff, and Helen Young in particular. The staff were praised for their efficiency and supportive attitude which contributed to a high level of student satisfaction.

2. *The Programme Team, for recognising the cyclical nature of the MSc Finance market and enhancing the resilience of the Quants cluster by bringing commonality to the first term. The Senior School Team, for introducing flexibility and agility at a School level by building in synergies and efficiencies across the wider Cass portfolio to enable their programmes to respond efficiently to external changes.*

The Panel were satisfied with the rationale provided for the introduction of the common first term for all three Quants degrees. The Programme Team explained that while the demand for Masters in Finance courses remained strong, the availability of a wide range of specialisations created periodic spikes in enrolment numbers in some courses and slumps in others. The integration of the three Quants programmes was described as a hedging strategy against this fluctuating market.

The Senior School Team concurred that the consolidation of the Quants programmes allowed for timely adjustments to the cyclical environment in which the programmes operated and provided a strong basis for building new synergies and efficiencies across the School which aimed at generating agility and flexibility in the course structures.

3. *The Programme Team, for building strong links with the Alumni community and for their innovative strategy to maintain and deepen these links, including the development of a social media alumni network. The Senior School Team, for their ambitious plans to launch a School level Advisory Board to provide high-quality, unanimous advice to the top echelons of the School management.*

The Panel were impressed with the successful alumni community created by the Programme Team and the effort made to maintain it. It was noted that the Programmes Team, in collaboration with the Programmes Office, offered the alumni network the possibility to take modules under the ‘Lifelong Learning’ scheme, involved their alumni in discussions on significant programme developments, held
regular alumni events and successfully engaged with the community through social media. The Panel indicated that these examples of good practice could be adopted in other Schools and/or programmes which struggled with cultivating meaningful ties with their students once they left the university.

The Senior School Team explained that the proliferation of Advisory Boards over the past few years had created an opportunity for individual programmes to advance their own self-interests rather than provide strategic advice which could be acted upon at a School level. To rectify this dysfunction, a decision had been taken to establish a single Advisory Board for the entire School to provide representation for all undergraduate and postgraduate programmes. The Panel agreed that a School level Advisory Board would allow for the diversity of opinion and experience on one hand and on the other it would force the members to step back and take a look at the overall direction of their programmes, how they fitted with the university’s vision and strategy, their long-term goals and how to achieve them.

4. The Programme Team, for the rigour of the content of their programmes.

The Student and Alumni group agreed that the Quants programmes struck balance between practical training and theoretical knowledge what gave them a competitive advantage in terms of finding employment and ensured that they prospered upon entering the workforce. The students praised the programmes for academic rigour and noted that the supportive classroom environment and well-designed coursework provided them with various opportunities to improve their degree of achievement in such areas as maths and programming.

The Panel did not set out any conditions for the Department.

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

1. To review the selection of elective modules on offer with a view to including more quantitative content.

The Panel noted that while the core modules covered a wide array of quantitative content, there was scope for expanding the elective offering to provide mathematically inclined students with further opportunities to develop their mathematical proficiency.

The Panel therefore recommended that the Programme Team reviewed the selection of elective modules to accommodate students with strong interest in mathematics.

2. To incorporate contemporary topics in quantitative finance such as cryptocurrency, blockchain, high frequency trading and Fintech into the curriculum.

The Panel believed that in order to keep up with the fast paced world of the financial services, it was imperative that the Quants cluster incorporated such contemporary issues as cryptocurrency, blockchain, high frequency trading and Fintech into the curriculum. The Panel recommended that these topics be explored in a module on ‘Topical Issues’ to allow for rapid changes to the content guided by the developments in the finance industry.

3. To keep student experience under review as the new structure embeds, to expand the use of pre-sessional teaching to ensure better coherence of student learning and to provide better foundations for students from mixed academic backgrounds to work together as part of the group work assessments.

The Panel heard that some students struggled with the demands of their programmes at the beginning of their studies. As students came from diverse backgrounds, some lacked programming experience while others found mathematics and statistics challenging. This created disengagement issues in group work.

The Panel therefore recommended expanding induction to include pre-sessional teaching on programming, mathematics and statistics to enable students to meet the requirements of academic rigour and to facilitate full participation in group work.
4. To keep the implementation of the Advisory Board under review to better manage reputational risk.

The Panel felt that the implementation of the Advisory Board should be closely monitored to ensure that it was run effectively and fulfilled the School’s business needs. In particular, careful consideration should be given to the composition of the Board to create a platform for superlative knowledge base, relevant experience and candid and competent advice.

5. To provide more explicit opportunities for students to offer informal feedback, such as Student Common Room on Moodle, and to be more proactive in closing the feedback loop so that students are aware of what actions have or haven’t been taken in response to their feedback.

The Panel heard that although on average response to raised issues were timely, relevant and useful, at times students did not discern when this took place. The Panel recommended that the Programme Team devised and implemented methods to explicitly engage students in the process by providing consistent and clear information on what actions have or haven’t been taken in response to students’ feedback, and when and how students would be informed of the School’s decisions. This could be achieved by setting up a Student Common Room on Moodle for recording the progress of ongoing actions and archiving closed initiatives to enable current and future students to identify to what extent student opinion shaped their programmes.

6. To encourage more synergies between Cass Alumni and Cass Careers Services to facilitate events more specifically tailored to the needs of the Quants students.

The Student and Alumni group were keen to see more bespoke careers events with alumni participation organised by Cass Careers Services. The Panel noted that the highly specialised nature of the Quants cluster meant that networking and peer-to peer advice were particularly valuable in identifying suitable job opportunities and preparing graduates for the recruitment process.

The Panel concluded that the expansion of industry-specific career events would encourage student engagement and enhance student employability. This could be achieved by a closer cooperation between Cass Careers Services and Cass Alumni Office.

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.

Endorsement of Action Plan

Please delete as appropriate

The Panel endorsed the Action Plan in the Reflective Review.

Secretary: Lucy Dawkins

Co-secretary: Malgo Chrzan

Date of approval of report by Panel: 30/08/2018

Date of deadline set for School Response: 31/08/2019
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Programmes reviewed

LLB and GE LLB
Date of review
21st March 2018

Review participants

Review Panel members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor Rachael-Anne Knight</td>
<td>Associate Dean Education Excellence and Innovation, Technology, &amp; Innovation, The School of Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Carol Tan</td>
<td>School of Law, SOAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul McKeown</td>
<td>Lecturer, The City Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Victoria Serra-Sastra</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer, Department of Economics, School of Arts &amp; Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Fargher</td>
<td>MSc Food Policy, School of Arts &amp; Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Lucy Dawkins</td>
<td>Academic Development and Quality Officer, Student and Academic Services (Secretary for the Periodic Review)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meetings held during the day and attendees:

Senior Staff Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor Chris Ryan</td>
<td>Interim Dean/ Chair of Board of Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Jones</td>
<td>Chief Operating Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelia Murphy</td>
<td>School Head of Academic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Susan Blake</td>
<td>Associate Dean (Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Margaret Carran</td>
<td>Deputy Associate Dean (Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Jason Chuah</td>
<td>Head of Academic Programmes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students/Alumni:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Programme, Year, Mode of Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angelica Hoyos</td>
<td>GELLB 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Robinson</td>
<td>GELLB, Alumnus, (2012 to 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saoirse Lynam</td>
<td>GELLB 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecilia Foderaro</td>
<td>GELLB 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minni Agyeben</td>
<td>LLB 2, School Representation Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shabana Elshazly</td>
<td>LLB 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophia Demetriou-Jones</td>
<td>LLB 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuna Kunt</td>
<td>LLB 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Ward</td>
<td>LLB 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zain Ismail</td>
<td>LLB, Alumnus, (Students’ Union, VP Education 2016/17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Programme Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor Jason Chuah</td>
<td>Head of Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr David Seymour</td>
<td>LLB Programme Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Luke McDonagh</td>
<td>GELLB Programme Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Margaret Carran</td>
<td>Deputy Associate Dean (Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelia Murphy</td>
<td>School Head of Academic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Houghton</td>
<td>Course Operations Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazzmine Pharr</td>
<td>Senior Course Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Burton</td>
<td>Academic Registrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Nora Honkala</td>
<td>Assessments Officer (GDL and LLM Programmes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Steven Truxal</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer (LLM International Business Law Programme Director)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor Katherine Reece-Thomas</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer (LLM Master of Laws Programme Director)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Andrew Choo</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer in Law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preparation for review

Date of development day: 17th January 2018

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, Staff-Student Liaison Committee minutes, programme handbooks, the School Vision and Strategy, programme and module specifications, and previous Periodic Review reports. The relevant QAA subject benchmark statements were also provided.

Changes to provision
The documentation included an overview of amendments made to the provision since the last Periodic Review.

As part of the Periodic Review major changes were submitted for consideration. A spreadsheet outlining the new structure was submitted, and the changes discussed at length with the Senior and Programme Team. The Panel was agreed that the changes, motivated by a change in the professional standards, were aligned with the School Vision and Strategy, and represented a positive development for the School and students.

Professional Body Involvement
The Panel noted that the scope of the Review provided an opportunity to take account of upcoming changes to the requirements set by the Solicitor’s Regulatory Authority (SRA); namely, the removal of the requirement of having a Qualifying Law Degree (QLD) for the solicitor pathways, and the move towards a Solicitor’s Qualifying Exam (SQE). The Panel also noted the Bar Council stipulation that they will retain the requirement for a QLD, and that students will still be expected to study a programme reflective of the seven foundations of legal knowledge.

Conduct of the review
The Reflective Review (which will be submitted to 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 programme, 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:

- The strategic fit of the programme with both the School and University Vision and Strategy documents.
• Changes to the Professional Body requirements and their impact. This was discussed in each meeting.
• Resources and how the changes to the programme may impact on resources.
• Potential plans for professional and academic collaborations.
• The relocation of the Law School and the plans around this.
• Feedback and personal tutoring arrangements and effectiveness.
• Teaching delivery and assessment diversification.
• Communication with students.

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 educational development of the provision and the student learning experience including continued alignment with relevant benchmark standards

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:

1. The dedication and enthusiasm of all staff involved in the Review.

The Panel was impressed by the detailed understanding of both the Review and the proposed changes that all staff involved demonstrated. The Panel was reassured that the School were very clear in their commitment to the programme, and to its continuing improvement.

The student and alumni group commented on the committed and supportive attitude of all of the School staff.

The Panel also noted that the Review event was very well attended by staff from across the programme.

2. The Senior team and the management of resourcing issues.

The Panel noted that the development work had resulted in an increased need for both Academic and Professional Services colleagues within the School. The Senior team informed the Panel that work to recruit to these positions was underway, with seven new academic staff due to commence in September 2018. Further increases to the professional services team were also planned, incorporating a restructure of the Course Officer roles, an increase in Quality Assurance staff, and the creation of a new role to support student experience.
The Senior team also confirmed that a new workload allocation model was in the early stages of
testing, and that plans to harmonise both sides of the School were under consideration.

The Panel considered this to be a proactive approach to the possible challenges of implementing
the new programme, and a positive step towards integrating the specialist offering within the
School.

3. The clear preparation and thoroughness of the development work.

The Panel noted that the changes proposed as part of the Review were in response to significant
PSRB changes and were advised that there was still some uncertainty as to the final requirements.
The Senior team informed the Panel that there was a realisation that the current LLB programme
did not support the University, or School, Vision and Strategy, and confirmed that the proposed
changes responded to the PSRB requirements and the aligned the programmes with the current
strategic aims.

The Panel noted the informal consultation with students around these changes, and the dedication
to prioritising the employability of students, whilst supporting more flexible, expedient change within
the programme. There was also consideration of the need to foster internationalisation and
partnerships within the new model, and the Panel was impressed by the complexity of thought
which underpinned these changes.

Additionally, the Senior team explained to the Panel that the development for the Review took
place alongside complex planning work for the new Law School site (Sebastian Street).
Consideration of the changes to the available teaching spaces, developments in facilities, and the
relationship between the UG and PG programmes was also part of the Review documentation, and
the Senior team reported that staff engagement around these plans was fantastic.

4. The responsiveness to feedback in the development of the programme (both
 External and student feedback).

The Reflective Report demonstrated the wide range of elective modules on offer to students, and
the Panel noted a greater range of assessments, which introduced greater skills training, were
planned. In response to feedback, the School were developing new programmes in Law and
Criminology, and Law and Politics, too. The School acknowledged that these developments would
require significant collaboration and were positive about the level of buy-in from the Associate
Deans.

In terms of the proposed changes, the Student group reported a very positive response to the
developments around assessment, particularly commenting on the improved workload
management measures and the increased variety of assessment, which was felt to offer greater
opportunities to demonstrate overall learning.

The School reported that student satisfaction data demonstrated that students were increasingly
disengaged with the 30 credit, year-long modules. The Programme team reported that students felt
the time between learning and assessment was too great, and that the long modules did not
accurately reflect the learning involved. The Programme team explained that the new model would
minimise the gap between teaching and assessment, and offer students a greater range of
opportunities to demonstrate their skills.

5. The flexibility of the new programme.

The Senior team explained to the Panel that the PSRB changes were yet to be finalised, but that
further changes were anticipated. The new programme was designed to mirror the experience of
the Solicitors exams, giving students valuable professional practice. Taking the possibility of future
changes into account, the Senior team explained that the new programme was, in many ways, preemptive, and was aiming to ‘build in’ the flexibility required to address a shifting legal educational landscape.

The Panel were advised that the School were also investigating the possibility of introducing a Law and Business collaboration and, in response to the University KPI on internationalisation, were exploring the possibility of international partnerships, specifically with Japan. The new programme structure should allow sufficient flexibility to introduce an international exchange for students in Programme Stage 2.

### 6. The range of electives on offer, and the commitment to the development of a skills-specific module.

The Panel noted the wide range of electives on offer to students and commended the School for the choice and flexibility available to students.

The Panel also noted the introduction of skills-specific modules. The Programme team reported that the School had participated in the Microplacements modules, offered by the Careers Service, and that the students had responded positively to this. To build the School portfolio, additional modules in programme stage 2, focusing on legal skills and ‘soft skills’, were proposed as part of the changes. There were plans, too, to integrate the professional expertise of the PG team into programme stage 3 of the LLB, to offer students greater industry exposure and to create ‘feed-through’ from UG to PG within the School.

The student group spoke very highly of the range of electives and expressed appreciation of the development of employability-focused modules.

### 7. The commitment to provide training resources around learning and teaching for staff.

The Panel expressed concern for the programme staff due to the teaching demands of the proposed programme. The increased variation of assessment, alongside planned IT developments, could significantly affect delivery.

The Senior team explained that this was considered within the strategy for the change, and that the School were taking a proactive approach. Included within the strategy was staff training, with a focus on technology-devised/driven teaching, and how this can be successfully integrated into the curriculum.

The School had already held meetings with LEaD to develop the new teaching approach (specifically the assessments), and that the School would be presenting their forward-plan at the learning conference in 2018.

The Panel commended the forethought demonstrated in this strategy, and the commitment to meeting staff development needs.

The Panel required the Department meet the following conditions:

- **To communicate the changes within the programme to current students, offer-holders and applicants as soon as possible, and to retain records of these communications.**

To ensure compliance with CMA regulations, the Panel was agreed that the changes should be communicated to all affected students, offer-holders and applicants, and their explicit consent obtained. Where consent cannot be achieved, the Panel was agreed that plans to allow students to continue their current course of study, should they wish, should be established.
All conditions must be met within 8 months of the Review date, assuming the Standards are confirmed and in place, and a response submitted to the Panel Secretary; the Panel Chair will determine whether the response sufficiently addresses the Panel’s concerns and will consult with other Panel members if required.

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

i) **To speak to central IT Services about the requirements for the creation of pathways, and to develop a plan for managing these.**

The meeting with the Senior and Programme teams highlighted the importance of IT in the new curriculum, especially around library resources, assessment and teaching delivery. The School confirmed that conversations with Library Services had taken place, and that plans to incorporate the existing resource were in place. The Senior team confirmed that conversations with IT consultants were underway and that University IT Services were being consulted, too.

The Panel were reassured that the School had adequately planned for these developments, but encouraged the School to continue working with IT Services, particularly around the planned development of pathways for students, and how these would be practically managed.

ii) **To create a School policy for the management of SSLC, including arrangements for staff attendance, to increase consistency within the minutes.**

The Panel noted that the minutes for the Staff-Student Liaison Committee, provided as part of the Review documentation, were inconsistent in their detail and presentation. The Panel also noted that staff attendance was erratic.

This was discussed with the Programme Team and it was agreed that a greater level of consistency could be introduced.

iii) **To investigate, and gather evidence for, the necessity of the 65% boundary for dissertation.**

The Panel discussed the necessity of the 65% requirement for enrolment to the Dissertation module with the Programme team. The Team explained that, historically, this was in place to protect students, who do not always understand the demanding nature of the Dissertation.

The Panel requested that additional evidence to support this be sought, and that the requirement be reconsidered once the evidence was gathered as this requirement could be excluding competent and committed students from the module.

iv) **To review the effectiveness of the induction week, and how students are communicated with during this time, with specific emphasis on how personal tutoring information is disseminated.**

The Panel was informed that communication within the School had been problematic in the past, and that this was particularly of concern around Personal Tutoring information and how this was disseminated to students.

The Student group confirmed that they felt communication was an issue (although they spoke very highly of the informal newsletter – Law Bore), and suggested that the School consider using social media to communicate with students as its usage was prolific among students.

The Programme team explained that Moodle and email were the primary methods of communications with students, but that communicating face-to-face in lectures and at events was becoming a more popular method of information delivery. The Team also reported that a newsletter had been developed, as there was some understanding that email could be less engaging for students.
The Panel acknowledged that, whilst social media communication could be a useful tool, that it isn’t supported by the University and cannot, therefore, be used for ‘official’ communications with the student cohort.

In terms of Personal Tutoring, the students expressed confusion around the arrangements for, and purpose of, Personal Tutoring (this will be addressed in more detail in recommendation vi). Although the Programme team confirmed that this information was disseminated during the Induction Week, the Panel was agreed that greater emphasis could be placed on this information, and that the effectiveness of the induction week could be reviewed in this context.

v) As per the action plan:

a. To review the balance of tutorial and lecture time.

b. To increase the opportunities for interactive learning.

The Panel noted that the current mode of delivery was quite traditional, relying on a division between lecture and tutorial time, alongside self-directed study. The Student group expressed the view that this was an ineffective method of delivery, explaining that tutorial time was too limited and that consistency between lectures was poor. Students also commented that the year-long assignation of tutorial groups was a point of significant frustration and could serve to disadvantage some students as they weren’t able to change groups. The Student group also responded positively to the proposed increase in interactive learning.

The Programme team reported that, although the teaching hours will remain largely the same, the distribution of this time will change, with a greater concentration on interactive learning being phased in. The changes to assessment were regarded as the priority for the Programme team, and implementing the changes to the assessments is recognised in the action plan for the Review. The Programme team acknowledged that the current model was no longer appropriate and pointed out that a new module, showcasing the preferred interactive approach would be piloted in 2018/19 for the GELLB students.

The Panel acknowledged that work on addressing points a) and b) was already underway in the School, and noted that this was also included in the action plan. The Panel offered its encouragement in implementing these changes as soon as was practical.

vi) To review the number of personal tutees allocated to tutors, with a view to significantly reducing the number of students per staff member.

The Student group reported some concerns about personal tutoring, particularly around the consistency of personal tutoring and how this could affect their progress. Whilst it was acknowledged that the principles of the system were observed, and worked in the majority of cases, the students expressed some confusion about the role of personal tutors and the arrangements which supported the system.

The Panel noted, though, some instances of excellent relationships between tutors and tutees, with tutors providing professional and academic guidance, as well as accessible pastoral support.

The School reported that the ration of personal tutees was currently approximately 60 students per tutee, and that this was being actively monitored with the aim of lowering this to 45 students per tutor. The School have also implemented a Senior Tutor role with the aim of supporting and training the personal tutors in this complex relationship.

The Panel was reassured that the School were actively addressing the concerns around personal tutoring, but recommended that reviewing, and ultimately reducing, the number of tutees per tutor should be a priority moving forwards.
vii) To introduce minimum requirements for feedback on written work and to develop a plan to monitor this.

The Panel acknowledged the varied response from the Student group regarding feedback on assessments, noting that one-to-one feedback was offered on a regular basis but that written feedback on coursework was not always consistently provided, varying in content and focus between members of staff.

The Panel was agreed that a greater degree of consistency, both in terms of volume and content of feedback should be expected, and recommended that the arrangements for feedback be reviewed in the first instance, and monitored moving forwards.

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.

Endorsement of Action Plan

The Panel endorsed the Action Plan.

Name of Secretary: Lucy Dawkins
Date of approval of report by Panel: 
Date of deadline set for School Response: December 2018

Periodic Review report

Programmes reviewed
MSc Health Management

Date of review
19th December 2017

Review participants

Review Panel members:
Chair: Dr Anton Cox
External Advisor: Professor Marco Mongiello (University of Surrey)
Internal Panel Member (School): Judith Sunderland
Internal Panel Member (Other): Maryann Kernan
Student Panel Member: Monica Miah
Secretary: Emily Thornton
Co-Secretary: Megan Butler

Meetings held during the day and attendees:

Students/Alumni

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Programme, Mode of Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


Programme Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Eamon Mckeown</td>
<td>Divisional Lead, Health Services Research &amp; Management Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Layther</td>
<td>Programme Director for the MSc Health Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Yiannis Kyratsis</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Senior Staff Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor Debra Salmon</td>
<td>School of Health Sciences /Chair of Board of Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Dave Flinton</td>
<td>Associate Dean, Education Quality &amp; the Student Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursula Smith</td>
<td>Associate Dean Post Graduate Taught CPPD And Workforce Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School co-ordinator: Jessica O’George

Preparation for review

Date of development day: 1st October 2016

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 period since the last Review: programme specification, module specifications, programme handbook, external examiner reports and responses, Staff-Student Liaison Committee minutes, student survey information, annual programme evaluation (including management data), destinations data and the School of Health Sciences School Plan. The action plan from the previous Periodic Review and relevant QAA subject benchmark statements were also provided.

Conduct of the review

The Reflective Review (which will be submitted to Educational Quality 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 programme, 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:

- The programme structure, pattern of teaching and programme routes
- Assessment methodology and feedback
- Placements and career development opportunities
- Prerequisites for the programme
- Competitor analysis, recruitment and future planning
- The development of related programmes offered at City
The Chair thanked the student, alumni, 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 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

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.

Although the Panel were able to confirm that the programme met the required academic standards, this review was not supported by sufficient student input in the form of either face to face participation or written evidence of prior consultation. For this reason the conclusions of this review are conditional on the following outstanding actions:

1. Provision of a full set of SSLC minutes for the last three academic years.
2. Provision of a full set of APEs for the last three academic years.

*The actions must be met by 28 February 2018 and a response submitted to the Panel Secretary; the Panel Chair will determine whether the response sufficiently addresses the Panel’s concerns and will consult with other Panel members if required.*

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

1. **Evidence of a comprehensive range of formative and summative assessments with sound feedback practices.**

The Panel were impressed by the variety of formative and summative assessments discussed in the Reflective Review, and discussed these with the student and alumni group, and the Programme Team. The Panel noted that the use of a variety of assessments with the opportunity for students to receive feedback was particularly important in strengthening students’ understanding of topics and it was highlighted as an area of good practice.

The Programme Team explained that the dissertation was an important component of the programme as it allowed students to undertake a large project, consolidated management skills...
and allowed for intelligent inquiry. They reported that an online exam had been introduced for the students and that online practice exams were available for students to practice skills.

The Programme Team reported that a number of assessments set were group assessments which allowed for reflective practice. The Programme Team explained that some group work encompassed the use of ‘work audit’, which meant students had to decide what they had each contributed to the assessment and award themselves a grade. They explained that this practice had been introduced in response to student feedback around the unfairness of the equal distribution of marks in group assessment. Whilst some students were not always happy with the process the Programme Team reported that the approach seemed to work well and was a fair approach which allowed students to reflect on their contributions. In addition, the Programme Team highlighted that group work helped to foster a community amongst the students.

The student and alumni group were positive about the variation of the assessments that were given. The alumni, particularly, underlined that each week students had to undertake some form of presentation or group work which was helpful in applying skills that had been learnt and improved students’ confidence. They explained that most modules required students to complete group work and individual work and they could see the benefit of both practices. The group highlighted that assessments prepared them for the real world, allowed them to establish good working relationships and developed their skills and knowledge. They explained that assessments set ensured that they were reflective on their own learning and practice. The alumni confirmed that reflective practice had been particularly essential when completing the dissertation and Research Methods module.

The students emphasised that feedback given on assessment had always been very constructive and had helped them to understand why they were awarded a particular grade and how they could improve in the future.

2. **Positive feedback about career development opportunities including unique placements and links to entrepreneurial activity such as City Sparks.**

The Panel discussed the internship programme and the programme’s links to entrepreneurial activity. It was clear that the placements were a unique selling point of the programme, which allowed the programme to stand out from the sector. The Panel discussed this with the student and alumni group, and the Programme Team.

The Programme Team explained that one of the biggest advantages to students on the programme was the opportunity they had to take up a specialised placement. The placements provided students with a chance to work on projects directly related to the programme and industry, improve their core business skills and gain real-life experience.

The Programme Team informed the Panel that a couple of teams from the programme had entered the CitySpark business competition which was open to all City students and recent alumni. They explained that they promoted the opportunity to students as it provided a rich opportunity to build their skills and experience.

The students emphasised the importance they placed on gaining a placement and agreed that this was a unique selling point of the programme. They confirmed that they had chosen to study at City, rather than direct competitor institutions, such as Imperial, as the programme had placement opportunities.

3. **Expert speakers supporting programme delivery including current and real-world case studies.**

The Panel were particularly impressed with the extensive list of affiliated expert speakers. It was seen as a key strength of the programme to have the diverse range of well-qualified expert
speakers, and the direct knowledge of the sector that they could impart. The Panel discussed the use of expert speakers with the student and alumni group, and the Programme Team.

The Programme Team explained that they had an extensive network of guest speakers which meant the programme stood out from other institutions offering a comparable programme and kept the content of the programme fresh.

The students were very positive about the expert visiting speakers delivering lectures. The students reported that speakers would bring in real life case studies related to what they were learning on the programme. They explained that most modules had visiting expert speakers who delivered interactive sessions which exposed the students to a variety of different learning experiences.

4. The International perspective of the programme.

The Panel were impressed by the efforts of the Programme Team to incorporate an international perspective within the programme. The Panel noted that this was very good practice as students were increasingly required to work in a more global and interconnected world. In addition, this aligned with City’s strategic goals as the Internationalisation Strategy, which encompassed strategic goals around becoming a leading global University, had recently been introduced.

The student and alumni group were very positive about the international outlook of the programme and how students were encouraged to research sector practice from around the world, rather than just focusing on the NHS. They explained that due to the majority of the cohort coming from the EU or other international countries, international perspectives and experience could also be discussed and incorporated into group work.

The Panel required the Department meet the following conditions:

1. To review all module specifications to ensure that these are in line with institutional regulations, policy and CMA guidance, and are internally consistent.

The Panel raised concerns around the accuracy of the module specifications. Specifically, the Panel noted that some module specifications stated that assessment feedback would be provided to students within four weeks of the submission deadline or assessment date. City’s policy specifies that assessment feedback should be provided to students within three weeks of the submission deadline or assessment date.

In addition, the Panel were concerned that the Strategic Management in Healthcare module specification stated that students would not be offered a resit attempt if they did not participate in the first attempt. City’s regulations specified that students would normally be offered one resit attempt. However, the Programme Team agreed that this needed to be amended and were confident that this rule had not been applied in practice.

The Panel raised concerns around how the aims and learning outcomes of the programme were reflected throughout the module specifications. Specifically, the programme specification states that the programme aims to equip students with transformational leadership capabilities. The Programme Team needed to ensure that students equipped with the necessary skills and experience to meet the specified learning outcomes throughout their modules and that these are highlighted in the module specifications.
The Panel were therefore of the view that all module specifications should be reviewed to ensure they were in line with City regulations, policy and CMA guidance. The Programme Team may need to work closely with LEaD during the review.

The condition must be met by 30 March 2018 and a response submitted to the Panel Secretary; the Panel Chair will determine whether the response sufficiently addresses the Panel’s concerns and will consult with other Panel members if required.

2. **Ensure the Programme is compliant with University policies such as those on feedback turnaround times, Personal Tutoring and office hours.**

Through discussions with the student and alumni group and review of the Reflective Review documentation, the Panel were concerned that some University policies that were in place were not being adhered to by the Programme Team.

The Panel noted that some of the Programme Team did not have specified office hours. Although the Programme Team confirmed they responded to emails, spoke to students on the phone and on informal occasions, it was a requirement of academic teaching staff to have specified office hours which are communicated to students.

The student and alumni group had highlighted that not all students on the programme had known who their Personal Tutor was or that they had been assigned one. All students should be assigned a Personal Tutor at the start of their programme and should meet them at specified times throughout the year. Personal Tutorial meetings were important to ensure that students learning needs were met and that broader personal and pastoral support could be given. The Panel noted that the Personal Tutorial E:Vision system was now also available for Postgraduate students.

The Panel noted that the Reflective Review documentation, particularly module specifications, specified that feedback would be provided within four weeks of the submission deadline or assessment date. This was not in line with City policy, which stated that feedback would be provided within three weeks of the submission deadline or assessment date.

The Panel noted that the programme had an online exam and were in agreement that as this would be a live assessment the Programme Team should ensure that it complied with City’s exam regulations. In addition, the Panel noted that the two Annual Programme Evaluation documents, that had been part of the Reflective Review documentation, were identical apart from the year of review. The Panel were concerned that this document had not been reviewed and updated and that quality assurance processes within the School had not been robust.

The Panel were therefore of the view that the Programme Team needed to ensure they were compliant with all University policies that were in place and amend current practice if that did not adhere to policy.

The condition must be actioned during the 2017/18 academic year and a response submitted to the Panel Secretary by 30 March 2018; the Panel Chair will determine whether the response sufficiently addresses the Panel’s concerns and will consult with other Panel members if required.
The Panel made a number of **recommendations** for areas where enhancements could be made to the programmes:

1. **The Programme Team and the School should meet to establish a plan for the future development of this programme. This should be informed by the School Vision, competitor analysis (including other global providers), likely recruitment patterns and expected staffing requirements.**

   The Panel heard from the Programme Team and the Senior Staff Team about their vision for the future of the programme.

   The Programme Team highlighted in the last five years the focus had been on core business skills, working more internationally due to the competitive international market and working across more sectors by drawing from different professions and industries. The Programme Team envisioned that in the next five years the focus would be on the sustainability of the programme and the continued emphasis on core business skills, innovation and employability. A bid for a joint research health centre at Cass Business School had also been put forward which would involve interdisciplinary research. The Programme Team hoped that if the new research health centre were to go ahead then the programme would be positioned within the centre, as a complimentary programme to the new Cass programme that had been designed. The Programme Team were of the view that a Business School may not be the right position for a programme such as this, but being placed within the School of Health Sciences was quite unusual.

   The Senior Staff Team acknowledged the successes of the programme and confirmed that their focus over the next five years would be on the growth of student and staff numbers. Arising opportunities would be looked into, such as the option of distance learning and a possible collaboration with Cass Business School.

   The Panel were concerned that the action plan within the Reflective Review documentation was rather slim and that whilst the Programme Team and the Senior Staff Team both had clear ideas of how the programme would develop, they were very different views. The Panel felt that the Programme Team and the School should meet to collaboratively form a vision for the future of the programme which was informed by the School Vision, global competitor analysis and the likely student and staff recruitment patterns.

2. **The School should consider how the programme relates to wider offerings within the University, particularly within Cass.**

   The Panel noted that a new programme had been established within the Cass Business School and the Programme Team had been involved in the design of the programme. The Panel had some concerns that the programmes would be in competition with each other. The Programme Team had emphasised that the programme at Cass was designed for students who were already top executives, whereas their programme was designed for students at an earlier career stage. The Senior Staff Team had agreed that the programmes targeted very different markets and were not in direct competition with each other.

   However, the Panel still had some concerns about the collaboration and alignment of the two programmes as no clear plan was in place and were of the view that the School should consider how the Health Management programme related to other programmes within City.
3. The School should develop a specific set of KPIs to measure the success of this programme.

The Panel discussed how the programme measured the success of the programme. The Programme Team highlighted that they had looked at how much the market was willing to pay graduates from the programmes as a measure of success, and they knew of success stories, but they had not used average pay as a KPI as this was only part of success. They had examples of individual employability cases and showcased these on the website for prospective students. The Senior Staff Team noted that they saw the success as the increase in student numbers and acknowledged that they could have more stretching targets for student recruitment.

The Panel raised concerns that the students may have had a salary prior to enrolling at City, so looking at average pay was difficult to relate to value added, but agreed this could be used in addition to other measures. The Panel were of the view that collating and analysing employability and success data on the students would be beneficial in addition to case studies.

The Panel recognised that the programme was well established within the sector, however they felt that if targets for the programme were developed, particularly around employability and the growth of student numbers, the success of the programme could be quantified.

4. The Programme Team should revise their marketing and programme documentation to more accurately reflect the employability and professional development aspects of the teaching and assessment

The Panel were concerned that the programme documentation, particularly in relation to the opportunity of gaining a placement on the programme, were not entirely clear about what the employability and professional development aspects of the programme were. The Panel felt that any marketing materials that prospective students would view should accurately reflect learning outcomes and opportunities that students will be given on the programme.

5. The Programme Team should ensure that placements are managed through a fair and transparent process, and wherever possible integrated with existing School placement management mechanisms.

The Panel heard from the student and alumni group that there were inconsistencies in how different students were provided with placement opportunities. The students emphasised that gaining a placement opportunity was extremely important to them and that if they were not given this opportunity they would be very disappointed, as the opportunity was a key reason for many students to enrol on the programme at City.

The Programme Team explained that the opportunity to undertake a placement was not as part of a module on the programme, instead it was an additional activity. All opportunities for placements were advertised on Moodle and students could apply by sending a CV to the Programme Director. The Programme Director would make a decision about which students were given a particular placement, as each student would have different requirements and it was a match making process. The Programme Team would need to have confidence in a student undertaking a placement and if a student was struggling on the programme then a decision would be made as to whether going on a placement was a priority. Some students were sent out on a group placement rather than individually.

The Panel were therefore concerned about the transparency and fairness of how students secured a placement and felt it was unclear if all students would be guaranteed a placement opportunity or not. The Panel were concerned that if student numbers on the programme increased the
Programme Team may not have the resources and networks to find a suitable placement for all students.

6. The Programme Team should review how they support students’ learning needs, including links to the University’s broader personal and pastoral support.

Student and Alumni feedback indicted that some students had struggled with the financial module on the programme and with the preparatory online course students needed to complete. The Panel felt that opportunities for support with particular elements of the programme, including the preparatory course, were not always emphasised to students and they were not always aware that support was available.

In addition, whilst students had stated they were happy with the support they had received on the programme in relation to their learning needs, they were not always aware of wider support that City offered to students. In particular, English language and essay writing support was offered by central services and could be particularly helpful for some students on the programme who required additional help.

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 Educational Quality Committee following approval by the Board of Studies.

Endorsement of Action Plan

The Panel endorsed the Action Plan.

Name of Secretary: Emily Thornton
Name of Co-Secretary: Megan Butler

Date of approval of report by Panel: 20th July 2018
Date of deadline set for School Response: 20th July 2019
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School co-ordinator: Anita Machnicka

Preparation for review

Date of development day: 4th April 2017
Reflective review and supporting evidence
Panel members were provided with the Reflective Review document and supporting evidence two weeks ahead of the review. This included the following key documentation covering the preceding three years: annual programme evaluations, external examiner reports and responses, programme handbooks, and programme and module specifications.

Professional/ regulatory/ statutory body involvement
The MSc Air Transport Management, MSc Air Safety Management and MSc Aircraft Maintenance Management programmes are approved by the Royal Aeronautical Society from the 10th May 2017. The programmes are due to re-approval in 2021.

Conduct of the review
The Reflective Review (which will be submitted to the Educational Quality 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 programme, 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:

- Competitor analysis
- The course structure and its current choices of modules
- The extent to which Visiting Lecturers are engaged to teach aspects of the programmes
- Student support and induction
- Assessment methodology
- Programme and module specifications
- Resourcing of the programmes

The Chair thanked the students, alumni, 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 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;

• Confidence could be placed in the quality of the learning opportunities available to students.

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

5. **The Programme team for their effective management of their well-qualified and diverse visiting lecturers.**

The Panel discussed the wide use of visiting lecturers to teach the majority of the different programmes. Whilst initially concerns were raised about the reliance on visiting lecturers, during discussions with the programme team, and visiting lecturers themselves, it was clear that there was a robust and effective management system in place. The visiting lecturers reported that the new programme team had implemented an induction session for lecturers, with many of the visiting lecturers having taught on the programmes for numerous years. It was seen as a key strength of the programme to have the diverse range of well-qualified visiting lecturers, and the direct knowledge of the sector that they could offer to the students.

In particular, the Panel noted the list of substitute lecturers, who could take over if a visiting lecturer became unavailable, as an area of good practice.

6. **The Programme team for their energy, dedication and enthusiasm for the courses.**

The Panel were particularly impressed by the energy, dedication and enthusiasm presented by the programme directors, visiting lecturers and students for their programmes. Whilst the programme directors were relatively new to their roles their enthusiasm for developing and enhancing the suite of programmes was commended.

7. **The Programme team for the unique model and strong reputation of the programmes, which work well for the sector, and are mindful of the student need.**

The External Panel member praised the programme team for the strong reputation of the programmes across the sector. In particular it was noted that the unique and distinctive model of having multiple start dates across the year was well designed for the sector. Having modules held at different locations and at different times then allowed students to tailor their learning to their rigid work schedules. In particular, due to the nature of the sector, students would often have to cancel their attendance, and the model allowed them to pick up their studies more easily.
8. The Programme team for the engaging and useful student induction workshops.

The student representative and written feedback from students and alumni highlighted the usefulness of the student induction workshop. In particular a large proportion of the student cohort have not previously undertaken higher education, therefore the induction workshop serves as a useful process to familiarise students with the different processes. The student workshops were also seen as a valuable time for students to bond together as a student community, sharing ideas and networking.

The Panel required the Department meet the following conditions:

All conditions must be met by 30th July 2018 and a response submitted to the Panel Secretary; the Panel Chair will determine whether the response sufficiently addresses the Panel’s concerns and will consult with other Panel members if required.

1. To review the module specifications, updating terminology so that they are all clearly at FHEQ level 7, including more focused reading lists, ensuring hours per 15 credit module are 150 hours, and providing more detailed assessment information.

The Panel raised concerns around some of the clarity and consistency of the module specifications. In particular it was raised that some of the learning objectives needed to be clarified so that they were measurable, and worded at FHEQ level 7. In regards to reading lists the Panel noted that they should be more focused, for example, where books have been listed on the reading lists, it would be more beneficial to direct students to the relevant chapters.

For 15 credit modules it is expected that students spend 150 hours on their studies. Some of the module specifications submitted ranged from 55 hours to 200 hours. When the Panel met with the programme team they expressed that this had been rectified. Work therefore needs to be done to either confirm that the correct version of module specifications are being used across the institution, or further work done to align the level of hours required for each module.

It was noted that under the assessment section of the module specification that the information was often vague or unclear. In particular there were references to coursework ‘A’ and coursework ‘B’ and the meaning of these terms could usefully be clarified. Work should be done to review the assessment elements of each module specification to ensure it is clear to students what is expected for each module.

The Programme Team should continue to work closely with LEaD during these revisions.

2. To review the programme and module learning outcomes to ensure that they are aligned, this should include the use of module mapping. Further work should be done to ensure distinctiveness between the programmes.
The Panel noted that there was observed overlap between some of the different modules, and this was supported by student feedback. It was also noted that students could do any of the programmes, regardless of formal programme title, depending on which electives they chose. The Panel were therefore of the view that more work needed to be done to ensure the distinctiveness of the programmes from each other. The Panel set the condition that the programme team, working with LEaD should carry out module mapping for each of the modules against the different programme learning outcomes. This should then enable a more robust review of the programme and module learning outcomes, and help ensure that the three programmes are more distinct from each other.

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

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 Educational Quality Committee following approval by the Board of Studies.

1. To review the programme structure, with the potential to move towards more core modules and fewer electives. The review should also reflect on which modules are identified as core.

Alongside the condition to formally review the programme and module learning outcomes, the Panel also recommended a review of the programme structure. The External Panel Member when comparing the programme to competitors suggested moving towards a model of more core modules and fewer electives. This would then strengthen the distinctiveness of the programmes, ensuring that students had a strong core background in the respective fields. The student feedback showed that they felt they would be happy with less choice in the number of electives, if more information could be given to help students choose electives relevant to their core modules. Another alternative, if the programme team wished to remain with a 3 core modules structure, is to introduce “core electives” where students have to choose from a limited number of electives which are related to their core modules. The Panel also discussed if some of the modules could be rationalised together.

The Panel also recommended reviewing which of the modules are treated as “core”, and questioned if the current choice was the most appropriate.

The Panel, based on student feedback, discussed the possibility of extending the modules from 3 days to 4, particularly for core modules. This would then give students more time to digest and engage with the information prior to their assessments.

2. To review the sequencing of modules so that students can choose their core modules at an appropriate time in their programme.

Student feedback indicated that whilst the choice of modules, timing and location meant that the programme was suitable for students to make choices about their studies, the current timing/location for the core modules was not always appropriate. The student representative indicated that they had undertaken 3 elective modules before being able to take a core module for their programme. The Panel were concerned that this meant that students did not have the core background required to then take the different electives. Whilst the Panel acknowledged that the Programme Team run the modules across different countries, they recommended that this timing be reviewed. In particular the review should ensure that core modules can be taken at appropriate times for students in their studies.
The student feedback further indicated that as they had to do electives before their core modules, they were not always aware which electives would be most useful for them. Therefore reviewing this sequence would allow students to make more informed elective choices.

3. **To consider whether a viva voce is essential for the dissertation given growing student numbers.**

The Panel being aware of growing student numbers, and the high resource demand, noted that for the dissertation component of the programmes that students undertook a *viva voce* alongside submitting their formal written dissertation. The Panel noted that in other Schools and programmes for Masters dissertations the written submission was marked, but did not require the *viva voce* component. Therefore, the Panel recommended that the Programme Team consider where the *viva voce* is an essential assessment component, or if the written component could be marked on its own.

4. **For the School to consider further resourcing for the programme, building on the enthusiasm of the Programme Team.**

The Panel noted that the programmes were particularly resource intensive based on operating across three countries, running three programmes, and managing a large team of visiting lecturers. The Panel whilst aware that the programme team received central help regarding marketing, observed that the majority of the marketing of the programmes was done by the Programme Directors attending and presenting at conferences. The Panel having also commended the enthusiasm and dedication of the Programme Team recommended that the School consider further resourcing to support the continued development of the programmes.

5. **To introduce more formalised peer observation/module evaluation to ensure consistency, particularly around feedback.**

Student feedback indicated that whilst students valued the skills and industry experience of the visiting lecturers, there was a noted difference in the level of feedback received. The Programme Directors stated that they had undertaken some informal peer assessment of some of the visiting lecturers, and provided an induction session. The Panel whilst very impressed by the visiting lecturers who attended the Periodic Review Day recommended that the Programme Directors implement a more formalised peer observation/module evaluation process, reviewing each visiting lecturer. This would then work to ensure consistency across the visiting lecturers, ensuring that students receive a robust experience regardless as to their module choices, in particular around feedback.

6. **To review the Periodic Review Action Plan timelines in order to focus activity more quickly.**

The Panel appreciated the Action Plan proposed by the Programme Team, and the developmental nature of it. However, they noted that some of the timelines spanned 4-5 years, and that work should be done to focus activity to ensure the actions were achieved in a timelier manner.

7. **To consider including an English language proficiency qualification for admission.**

Whilst English is the sector standard language for the aviation industry, it was noted that the Programmes did not have a formal English language proficiency qualification for admission. The Panel therefore recommended that the Programme Team consider including a qualification to ensure that students were not unfairly disadvantaged based on their English language skills.
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Preparation for review

Date of development day: 18th April 2017

Reflective review and supporting evidence
Panel members were provided with the Reflective Review document and supporting evidence three 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, programme and module handbooks, Postgraduate Committee minutes, Staff-Student Liaison Committee minutes, Student Experience Committee minutes. The PSRB report and relevant QAA subject benchmark statements were also provided.

Additional information including: admissions data, supporting documentation for the University of Surrey partnership, additional student statements and Strategic Advisory Board terms of reference and minutes were also provided in advance of the event.

Changes to provision
The Programme Team provided a summary of amendments made to the provision since the last periodic review. Changes since the last periodic review had been limited to changes in module content. The Panel noted that on-going changes to provision are monitored and consulted on where re-approval or earlier periodic review may be warranted. It was confirmed that the cumulative effect of amendments since the last periodic review did not require re-approval via the current periodic review process.

Professional/ regulatory/ statutory body involvement
The programme is accredited by the Energy Institute (EI) as meeting the requirements towards Chartered Engineer (CEng) status. The programme has been accredited since 2003, with the most recent accreditation review undertaken in 2013 and valid from 2012-2017; the programme team is now preparing for a reaccreditation visit in Spring 2018, and reaccreditation was therefore outside the scope of this review.

The programme does not convey CEng status itself, and is reliant on students following a programme of modules and a dissertation with sufficient engineering analysis elements to pursue CEng status. These EI and CEng requirements are detailed in the programme handbook and students and alumni met as part of the review confirmed that they were aware of and understood the accreditation criteria should they wish to pursue.
Partnership provision

The programme has a long standing Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the Centre for Environment and Sustainability at the University of Surrey, allowing students to take up to two modules at the partner institution. The panel reviewed the partnership documentation, as well as considering practical arrangements with students and the programme team.

The programme team noted that the arrangements offers City students a chance to benefit from the sustainability expertise at the University of Surrey, and conversely for Surrey students to benefit from expertise in energy policy and economics at City. Student numbers in recent years indicate that a larger number of students from Surrey have enrolled on City modules than the reverse, though this may be indicative of enrolments at each institution. The review panel noted that assessment on City modules can be different for Surrey students enrolled (who are required to be assessed by 100% coursework to facilitate credit transfer) and therefore recommends that, should the School continue the academic partnership with Surrey, to revisit the MoU with Surrey to ensure that learning opportunities, support, assessment and academic standards are specified and equitable between the programmes involved.

Conduct of the review

The Reflective Review (which will be submitted to Educational Quality Committee with this report) provided the Panel with brief details of developments since the last periodic review. This was supplemented by a presentation from the Programme Director at the review event, which provided an overview of the history and context of the provision.

The Panel considered the educational offer, effectiveness of the programme, 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:

- Student recruitment and marketing
- Competitor analysis
- Programme structure and delivery
- Partnership arrangements with the University of Surrey, including assessment
- Role of the School Strategic Advisory Board/Programme Review Steering Group
- Training and support of visiting lecturers
- Professional development for programme staff
- Programme development and curriculum design
- Careers and internships support
- Equality, Diversity and Inclusion

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 educational development of the provision and the student learning experience
- Consolidation of areas of development and action planning in line with the University’s Education & Student Strategy (as evidenced through Annual Programme Evaluations)
- 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:

1. **The interdisciplinary nature of the programme, that should be used as a unique selling point of the programme**

   The documents provided in advance of the review and discussions with the Programme Team highlighted that the programme aims to balance the technical knowledge required of energy production and the location of the programme within the School of Mathematics, Computer Science and Engineering with an understanding of the political, economic and social factors that are influencing how energy is produced, stored and secured and how projects in the energy sector are managed and costed.

   The students and alumni met by the review team, the majority of whom had progressed from Engineering disciplines (noting that background can vary significantly by cohort), reported that breadth of programme content and engagement from visiting lecturers had exposed them to career opportunities and provided the skills to facilitate their progression in to careers which that they not previously considered.

   The Panel noted that it would be useful to capture the interdisciplinarity and unique strengths of the programme in promotional materials – [see Condition 5](#).

2. **Accreditation by the Energy Institute in fulfilling the academic requirements to pursue Chartered Engineer (CEng) status**

   Whilst the programme requires students to pursue Chartered Engineer status themselves upon completion, students met by the panel confirmed that Energy Institute accreditation had been an attractive feature of the programme and that achieving CEng status is a prestigious achievement. The review panel did however note that pursuing CEng status requires a particular curriculum to be followed and that the requirements could be made clearer to students. (see Conditions)

3. **The support provided by the Programme Office, particularly between blocks of study**

   The programme is block taught to facilitate part-time study, with one module typically taught in a week-long study block and two/three weeks of independent study in between. Programme staff and students met by the panel were in universal praise of the programme office and their support between weeks of study, particularly the Course Officer and the circulation of job/placement opportunities relevant the programme.

4. **Involvement of experts and alumni as visiting/guest lecturers to maintain programme currency/relevance**

   The programme makes use of a large number of visiting lecturers from energy suppliers, energy users and consultants in the energy sector to deliver guest lectures, convene certain modules and act as dissertation supervisors. Many visiting lecturers have been involved in the programme for a number of years and are therefore familiar with the learning requirements and expectations of being employed as a visiting lecturer. The use of visiting lecturers ensures that current issues in the sector...
are considered as case studies to module content and facilitates site visits, placement opportunities and dissertation projects.

The extensive use of visiting lectures did, however, present risks in ensuring consistency in teaching practice and access to academic support – see Condition 2

5. The strong industry focus of the programme

The wide use of external speakers and lecturers noted above lends a strong industry focus to the programme, further facilitated by two site visits that form part of the programme. One student met by the review panel pursued a dissertation topic with an external company, using an external advisor to support the project.

The School has also established a Strategic Advisory Board to support the development and continued currency of Masters programmes in the School.

6. The research-informed teaching and preparation of students for employment

The permanent programme staff are highly research-active and are able to balance both the academic requirements and learning outcomes expected of postgraduate taught study. In addition, maximising the input of external speakers and visiting lecturers embeds real-world experience in the academic content covered. These elements result in a programme with good employment outcomes and graduates with a breadth of knowledge to apply their energy knowledge in an industrial or business context.
The Panel required the Department meet the following conditions:

1. **To revise the proposed action plan and programme documentation (e.g. programme handbook) in light of the discussions and presentation undertaken as part of the periodic review event, identifying short, medium and long-term actions**

   The Programme Director provided a presentation on the programme as part of the review event, highlighting a number of proposed actions that corresponded with those identified by the Panel in advance of the review. Whilst the discussions at the review event provided clarification in a number of areas, the panel felt that the proposed action plan submitted as part of the reflective report did not capture in sufficient detail the conditions and recommendations highlighted in this report. Given the small size of the programme, the resourcing available to implement the agreed actions would need to be drawn out and a need to prioritise in to short, medium and long-term actions.

   It was agreed that the Programme Director would incorporate the information about the programme articulated and proposed future actions at the review event into the Reflective Review and other relevant documentation. Student facing documentation would be updated accordingly to reflect the additional information required as identified during the review.

2. **To foster greater consistency in the support provided by visiting lecturers engaged by the School, to include academic support and assessment feedback**

   Students were very positive in the use of visiting lecturers and the experience they could bring and share to the programme, however, the students noted that information on assessment criteria and the assessment feedback from elective modules led by visiting lecturers could be brief, making it difficult to know how to improve. More limited engagement of visiting lecturers with the University could also make them more difficult to contact for academic support, and there was concern for inconsistency in marking, though the School has a process for identifying marks that might be out of line with the broad trends.

   The School acknowledged that whilst the same expectations could not be placed on visiting lecturers as permanently engaged academic staff members, there was a need to support visiting lecturers more comprehensively to improve their engagement with the programme, establish consistency of practice and improve the student experience on the programme.

3. **To provide greater information on delivery patterns and elective modules prior to students commencing the programme, particularly in relation to the prerequisite knowledge required for modules and professional body requirements for pursuing Chartered Engineer (CEng) accreditation**

   The programme handbook outlines the mode of delivery and the programme of study students need to follow should they wish to pursue Chartered Engineer (CEng) status. The review panel met students and alumni who reported that, whilst they got used to the atypical mode of delivery of programme content the information could be provided more clearly, either at the start of the programme or in advance of enrolment. They did not consider that the programme scheduling, designed to support part-time students, should change, though it did make part-time employment or long-term placements more difficult to pursue.

   Given the breadth of programme content and the varied academic backgrounds of enrolled students (ranging from mechanical engineering to economics), students also reported that they would benefit from a deeper understanding the prior knowledge expected, particularly for more technical modules. Students would also welcome additional information about electives, for instance a short presentation on each, prior to making their option choices.

4. **Should the School continue the academic partnership with the University of Surrey, to revisit the Memorandum of Understanding with Surrey to ensure that learning opportunities, support, assessment and academic standards are specified and equitable between the programmes involved**
The current Memorandum of Understanding with the University of Surrey is broad in scope and approaching the time of renewal. The review team concluded that, given the current variance in assessment for Surrey and City students enrolled on City modules, that any new memorandum for credit sharing between Surrey and City should specify the academic standards expected at each institution and that learning outcomes for any modules encompassed can be assessed in a consistent manner between the two institutions.

5. To undertake a full market analysis for the programme to inform marketing activity and identify the unique strengths of the programme in the market

The preliminary documentation provided the review panel did not identify competitor programmes. In discussion, the programme team was able to identify a number of competitor programmes, ranging from those with an engineering focus to those focused on sustainability and/or business management.

In contrast, the MSc EETE includes coverage of energy and policy, politics climate and behavioural change. The review panel agreed that the programme offered a unique, relevant and desirable opportunity for students to synthesise issues relating to energy production and management. This interdisciplinarity makes it suitable for those from a broad range of backgrounds, but recruitment activity did not reflect the uniqueness of the programme and the interest in a distinctive programme that would be expected as a result.

The review team therefore concluded that a comprehensive market analysis needed to be undertaken to clarify the unique features of the programme, including content, location and industry links, and identify the means by which these features can be harnessed to aid recruitment.

All conditions must be met by 30th September 2018 and a response submitted to the Panel Secretary; the Panel Chair will determine whether the response sufficiently addresses the Panel’s concerns and will consult with other Panel members if required.

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

1. To develop targeted careers support, to include mentorship and internship opportunities arising from the programme of study

Students confirmed that they had contact with the University’s Careers Service during their programme, including email communications of relevant opportunities and a talk on the mentoring scheme. Given the industry links embedded in the programme, however, the review panel noted that there were limited opportunities for placements and internships, either integrated with or during the programme of study. Whilst this might not be practicable owing to the mode of delivery, the programme team should consider how such opportunities might be made available and/or facilitated.
2. **To update programme and module specifications to ensure consistency, in liaison with Learning Enhancement and Development (LEaD)**

Programme documentation, including programme handbooks and module specification had been revised to incorporate incremental changes to the programme, such as a new Energy Economics and Finance module; however, the programme handbook was missing components that would be expected from the standard City, University of London template. The programme lead acknowledged that the module specifications needed reviewing for consistency and currency and the support that would be available from LEaD.

3. **To actively promote gender equality and diversity in the marketing and development of the programme**

The Senior Staff Team reported that the programme had a more gender balanced profile than other masters programmes in the School, and that School-level actions were being taken to promote gender diversity such as an Athena SWAN submission and development of student case studies (3/4 female). The review team endorsed these actions, but recommend that issues of equality, diversity and inclusion are explicitly considered as part of the full market analysis.

4. **To undertake professional development activity with all teaching staff to ensure consistency in assessment feedback and use of technology to support feedback, in liaison with LEaD**

Students and alumni reported to the panel that assessment between modules felt inconsistent, and that brief feedback on some assignments made it difficult to improve. The most recent external examiners report also noted that whilst written feedback was adequate but that evidence of other feedback was unclear. Programme staff, including visiting lecturers, may benefit from training in the use of Moodle to deliver more detailed feedback and/or using alternative tools e.g. audio feedback.

5. **For the School to be proactive in the support of programme directors and academic teams**

Since the last periodic review of all postgraduate taught programmes in the school in 2008, the school has had two changes in programme director, the most recent in 2016/17. The new programme director has focussed on changes to module content in response to student feedback, as well as minor modifications to the diet of assessment. In view of the strategic issues relating to student recruitment and marketing for a distinctive and relevant programme, the review panel recommends that the School provide additional support to the programme director and academic staff in implementing the conditions and recommendations made, as well as considering how programme directors can support each other in addressing strategic issues as they arise.

6. **To explore how the central London location of the course can be maximised, to include links with industry and the wider University of London (e.g. LIDC)**

The location of the programme in central London provides an ideal location for deep partnership and collaboration with nearby energy suppliers and consultancies in both programme delivery, placement opportunities and recruitment as part of continuous professional development. A full market analysis should consider how City’s location can be maximised to provide a unique selling point to the programme. The review panel also noted that links with the University of London, such as the London International Development Centre (LIDC), may support interdisciplinary research relating to the programme and an additional route for international student recruitment to be considered.

*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 Educational Quality Committee following approval by the Board of Studies.

Endorsement of Action Plan

The Panel did not endorse the Action Plan.

- The review panel did not feel the proposed action plan captured the breadth of issues discussed as part of the review event, and the pertinent issues identified by the programme director in presenting to the panel. – see Condition 1
- The review panel did not feel the proposed action plan adequately identified small, medium and long-term actions required in view of the small programme size and commensurate staff resource available to implement changes. – see Condition 1

Helen Fitch, Assistant Registrar (Quality)
Richard Alderman, Assistant Registrar (Research Degrees)

Date of approval of report by Panel: 15th August 2018
Date of deadline set for School Response: 31st October 2018

Periodic Review report

Programmes reviewed
- MSc Marine Operations and Management
- MSc Coastal and Marine Engineering and Management

Date of review
24th January 2018

Review participants

Review Panel members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Julie Attenborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External panel member</td>
<td>Ben Saunders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal panel member (school)</td>
<td>Veselin Rakocevic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal panel member (other)</td>
<td>Edward Iredale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student panel member</td>
<td>Georgina Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Alison Edridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-secretary</td>
<td>Rachel Scott Halls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meetings held during the day and attendees:

Students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Programme, Year, Mode of Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Peter Cook (PC)</td>
<td>Current student (2016) MSc Maritime Operations and Management, part-time, London</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Written submissions were received from students of MSc Maritime Operations and Management, Piraeus, MSc Coastal and Marine Engineering and Management, and alumni of both courses.

Senior staff team:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor Roger Crouch</td>
<td>Dean, School of Mathematics, Computer Science, and Engineering/Chair of Board of Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Basch</td>
<td>Chief Operating Officer, School of Mathematics, Computer Science, and Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat Edera</td>
<td>Head of Academic Services, School of Mathematics, Computer Science, and Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Abdulnaser Sayma</td>
<td>Associate Dean (Postgraduate Studies)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Programme team:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor John Carlton</td>
<td>MSc Programme Director for MSc MOaM and MSc CoMEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Stringer</td>
<td>Module leader: Marketing for Marine Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Uma Patel</td>
<td>Module leader: Professional studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Module leader: Research skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain Malcolm Parrott</td>
<td>Module leader: Maritime Operations and Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. Simon Culshaw</td>
<td>Module Leader for Environmental Issues and Offshore Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qin Zhang</td>
<td>Postgraduate Course Operations Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucyna Piechnik</td>
<td>Postgraduate Course Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School co-ordinator: Lucy Piechnik

Preparation for review

Date of development day: 21st April 2017

Reflective review and supporting evidence
Panel members were provided with the Reflective Review document and supporting evidence in advance 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 (excluding 2014/15), Programme Management Committee minutes, Staff-Student Liaison Committee minutes, programme handbooks, and module specifications. The action plan from the previous periodic review and relevant QAA subject benchmark statements were also provided.

The Panel requested additional documentation covering the Industry Advisory Group minutes and terms of reference (for past 2 years), and the terms of reference and membership of the MSc Coastal and Marine Engineering and Management consortium board. These were reviewed after the meeting.

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

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

Professional body involvement
The MSc Maritime Operations and Management and the MSc Coastal and Marine Engineering and Management are accredited by the Institute of Marine Engineering, Science and Technology (IMarEST), the Institute of Chartered Shipbrokers (ICS), and the Royal Institution of Naval Architects (RINA).

The accreditation by the ICS gives exemptions against ICS professional qualifying exams. IMarEST accreditation allows graduates of the course to apply for recognition as a Chartered Marine Technologist.
The Panel received a document from the ICS granting exemptions against certain modules from 2016/17. No documentary evidence was provided for the RINA and IMarEST accreditation. However, information on the IMarEST website indicates that the MSc Maritime Operations and Management was accredited for the 2009 cohort to the 2015 cohort.

**Partnership and consortium provision**

The MSc Marine Operations and Management course is delivered in London and at the Lloyd's Register Education Centre, Piraeus, Greece. The teaching is delivered by the same staff across both locations, with local administrative support provided in both London and Piraeus.

The MSc Coastal and Marine Engineering and Management is delivered by a consortium of engineering schools sponsored by the European Union and funded by the EU Erasmus Programme. The consortium is made up of The Norwegian University of Science and Technology (Trondheim, Norway), City, University of London, University of Southampton, Polytechnic University of Catalunya (Barcelona, Spain), and the Technical University of Delft (Delft, The Netherlands). The Panel was provided with the consortium agreement and the minutes the 2017 meeting of the consortium board. The consortium would be making a submission for a further phase of funding for the programme in the coming months.

The Panel was provided with the Academic Partnership Coordinator (APC) Annual Reports 2015-16 for the MSc Maritime Operations and Management, and the APC Annual Reports for 2015-16 and 2016-17 for the MSc Coastal and Marine Engineering and Management. These were reviewed after the meeting.

Staff on both programmes were involved with the development day and the Reflective Review. The consortium board was not involved with the Reflective Review.

**Conduct of the review**

The Reflective Review (which will be submitted to Educational Quality 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 programme, 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:

- The reliance on visiting lecturers (VLs) to deliver the course, including resilience of the course, and ensuring VLs are delivering quality teaching, and the management of VL contracts
- The fit and purpose of the port visits to the curriculum and ongoing development of the students
- The block teaching structure of the course, including the scheduling of assessments and the pressure on students

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 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 and contributions on the day both via Panel membership and the student meeting
The Panel noted that the student participants had not received the Reflective Review prior to the 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:

1. **The promotion of gender equality throughout marketing activities and recruitment to the course.**
   
   The Panel noted the good practice of profiling female role models in the *Making Waves* newsletter and the gender balance of the Piraeus cohort in 2017. Student feedback was positive about the diversity of the course and the Panel noted comments regarding the benefits of visits to female students who, traditionally, have had less experience with these locations.

2. **The engaging and interesting newsletter, Making waves**
   
   The Panel was impressed with the newsletter’s engaging style and content, and noted that it creates a sense of community for applicants, students, and alumni. The Panel noted that *Making Waves* has played a part in the marketing and recruitment activities for both courses, and ensures that alumni keep in touch and are profiled as role models. The Panel noted that it provides an additional channel for the promotion of internship opportunities to students based at both London and Piraeus.

3. **The work of the Industry Advisory Group to ensure relevancy of the programme**
   
   The Panel was impressed with the composition of the Industry Advisory Group, consisting of senior people in industry, accrediting and other professional bodies, and the Honourable Group of Master Mariners. The Panel discussed with the Programme Team the role of the group and noted that it informs the team of grass roots issues in industry. The Panel noted that the group reviews two modules per meeting, conducting a curriculum gap analysis to ensure that the content of the curriculum is relevant to the needs of the industry and, therefore, students’ employability. The Panel also noted an additional benefit of the group; ensuring that employers see the courses as relevant to practice.

4. **The variety and range of guest lectures and visits to external organisations**
   
   The panel noted that these visits were of benefit to the students, ensuring the connection between theory and practice and providing connections to industry. The students commended the visits to external organisations such as the International Maritime Organisation (IMO) for enhancing their understanding of the subjects taught, being able to see the theory in practice. Students both with and without relevant industrial experience agreed that these were useful and that the whole course prepared them for future employment.

5. **The commitment of staff to both the programmes and the students, including the commitment to ensure students achieve the highest standards**
   
   The dedication and commitment to the programmes and the students was evident throughout the day, and from the written submissions from alumni and students in Piraeus. It was clear that students are encouraged to achieve the highest standards through the enthusiasm and knowledge of the teaching staff. The Panel agreed that the wealth of experience provided by the Programme Team was a key factor in the success of the courses and the sense of pride that the students expressed at their achievements.

The Senior Team discussed the pride felt by the School in the programmes. The Panel noted that the programmes closely align to the professional practice course in the School and cater for a sector where there is a demand for formal training and education. The Panel noted that the programmes align with the School’s strategic aims.
The students acknowledged the model of one week intense modules followed by an assignment was challenging but developed their study and time management skills and was beneficial to those students who are balancing their studies with employment. The Panel noted the early provision of a teaching schedule was particularly important for part-time students in employment. The Panel agreed with the Programme Team that the modules build upon each other and are tied together with common themes through the Professional Studies module and the dissertation.

Students observed that the order in which the core modules are delivered has changed for the 2017/18 academic year, and this improvement was welcome. The Panel noted the responsiveness of the Programme Team to make such changes in response to feedback and in order to enhance students’ learning.

The commitment to the development of the programme through the Industry Advisory Group, research active staff, and the gap analysis undertaken was noted.

The Panel noted that the students were aware of the pastoral support available to them and were grateful for being made aware of it, particularly for international students. The students commented positively on the responsiveness of the Programme Team in answering questions and providing support should they have to miss a class.

The Panel noted the praise that both students and staff gave to the Course Officer, Lucy Piechnik, for her communication and efficiency.

The Panel required the Department meet the following condition:

1. Ensure that students are notified of the assessment and feedback schedule for the programme, with a clear statement of when assessments are due and the date by which they can expect results and feedback.

Students indicated to the Panel that they were unaware of when they can expect assessment results and feedback and this has caused them additional stress and anxiety. The Panel agreed that the Programme Team should ensure that a schedule of assessment and feedback be provided to students at the start of the course.

All conditions must be met within one year of the date of the Review and a response submitted to the Panel Secretary; the Panel Chair will determine whether the response sufficiently addresses the Panel's concerns and will consult with other Panel members if required.

In addition, the Panel identified some documentation errors and issues, which would need to be addressed by the Programme Team, although these did not affect the outcome of the Review. A list will be shared with the Programme Team, and will include the gaps in documentary evidence noted above relating to professional body accreditation. Updated documentation to address these issues should be provided to Student and Academic Services.

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

1. The programme team should ensure more timely communication on the content of elective modules

It was noted that in 2016/17 students were given information on the electives’ content and teaching in the induction week. This did not happen in 2017/18 and the Students commented on this lack of clarity. The Panel agreed that this information should be provided to students as early as possible to allow them to make informed decisions.

2. The programme team should provide greater support and learning resources for the Marine Economics and Accounting module, and review this module at the next Industry Advisory Group meeting.
The students discussed the Marine Economics and Accounting module at length. Whilst the students understood the value of the module, there was a strong feeling of dissatisfaction with the learning resources provided, with particular emphasis on the accounting aspects of the module. The Panel noted that the lecturer was clearly knowledgeable in the field, but there were no supplementary resources for students to refer to after the lectures. The Panel agreed that supplementary resources should be developed to support the students outside the classroom in their further study and later reference. The Panel agreed that this would usefully be discussed at the next Industry Advisory Group meeting.

3. The programme team should review and improve the communication of the learning objectives of the port visits, and ensure that students understand the rationale and value of a variety of visits.

The Panel discussed the port visits with the students and the programme team. There was strong feeling from the students, and from the written submissions, that one port visit was enough as ‘once you’ve seen one port you’ve seen them all’. The meeting with the Programme Team revealed a clear rationale behind the number of port visits both to provide real world examples of concepts taught on the programmes, and for students’ career development and employability. The Panel agreed that this needs to be communicated early in the programme to the students to ensure that they are aware of the learning objectives and rationale behind multiple port visits and to encourage their attendance.

The Panel noted the clear value of the port visits and visits to external organisations, allowing students with limited industry experience to reflect on for their portfolio assessment for the Professional studies module, and as practice for any future applications for Chartership through production of an evidence based report.

4. The programme team should set clear expectations regarding the availability and location of library resources to students at both Piraeus and London.

The students described disappointment that they felt there were not enough Library books for the course, and with the restrictions placed on electronic books. The Panel agreed that the Programme Team should liaise with the Library on the number of physical resources available in line with the Reading List Policy. The Panel agreed that there is a wealth of resources available to the students in London at the University’s own library and the Lloyd’s Register Library to which access is available, and, in Piraeus, through the Laskiridis Foundation Library. The Panel agreed that this could be communicated more clearly to the students, together with setting clear expectations about what can be expected from a library, including any licensing restrictions on electronic resources.

5. The team should keep the succession planning of VLs under review

The Panel noted comments from the students and the Programme Team that VLs teaching with other lecturer’s materials at short notice is challenging, for both the lecturer and the students. The Panel agreed that the succession planning for VLs to ensure resilience should a VL be taken ill or leave their role was vital, and noted the recent work undertaken to build in a more robust approach to VL delivery. The Panel recommended that the work done by the Programme Team to provide a back-up lecturer who is well versed in the teaching materials continues on a regular basis.

6. The School should review the efficiency of generating contracts for VLs and enhance their internal processes

Much of the day and documentation focussed on the programme’s reliance on VLs. The Panel noted that the turnover of VLs teaching on the course had been high. The Panel agreed that this was a result of the University’s compliance with IR35 legislation, with many VLs choosing not to
become directly employed by the University rather than via a company and ceasing the VL relationship with the University. The Panel acknowledged that the School has viewed this as a risk to the programmes, and has adequately mitigated against it by finding high quality VLs who are prepared to be on the University payroll. The Panel was confident that now these changes have been made staffing issues experienced on these programmes will stabilise.

The Panel recognised that steps have been made within the School to streamline the VL recruitment process, and recommend that a further review should be undertaken to ensure that internal processes for the generation of VL contracts are in-line with HR policy and guidance.

7. **The VL handbook being developed by the Programme Team should be rolled out as soon as possible**

The Panel noted the changes made to communicating expectations and standards to VLs since the programmes were launched. This includes clear setting of marking schemes, improved and consistent moderation of assessments, and the communication of expectations regarding setting coursework, marking turn-around times, and the provision of feedback.

The Panel was pleased to hear of the development of a VL handbook to address some of the quality assurance issues surrounding VL appointments, and recommend that this be completed and rolled out as soon as possible.

The Panel was assured that the teaching standards of VLs were consistently reviewed and any issues arising from student feedback were addressed. The Panel noted that VLs follow an induction process to ensure consistency in marking standards, and that there is administrative support available in the Department to assist VLs and provide clear and timely information regarding what is required of them.

8. **The minutes of the annual programme meeting should be received by the School’s Postgraduate Committee**

The Panel agreed that the minutes of the annual programme meeting where student module feedback is considered and responded to should go to the Department’s Postgraduate Committee for consideration. This will ensure that any issues arising are considered and directed through the correct University channels.

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.

**Endorsement of Action Plan**

The Panel endorsed the Action Plan in the Reflective Review.

Secretary: Alison Edridge

Co-secretary: Rachel Scott Halls

Date of approval of report by Panel: 2nd February 2018

Date of deadline set for School Response: 31st May 2018
Joint CASE (Consortium for the Accreditation of Sonographic Education) Reaccreditation/ Periodic Review report

Programmes reviewed
MSc Medical Ultrasound

Date of review
20th February 2018

Review participants

Review Panel members:

Chair: Professor Laurence Solkin
CASE Lead Accréditor: Simon Richards
CASE Co-Accréditor: Valda Gazzard
CASE Shadow Accréditor: Mel Williams

(not in attendance)
Internal Panel Member (School): Sarah Campbell
Internal Panel Member (other): Dr Oliver Kerr
Student Panel Member: Lily Thomas
Secretary: Dr Katy Beavers
Co-Secretary: Dr Alexander Rhys

Meetings held during the day and attendees:

Students/Alumni:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Programme, Year, Mode of Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Cox</td>
<td>Current Student (2016 intake)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilal Sulanki</td>
<td>Current Student (2017 intake, Student Representative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noorayen Alware</td>
<td>Alumni (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasnain Ahmed</td>
<td>Alumni (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nana Anane-Bonfoh</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra Drought</td>
<td>Obstetric and Gynaecology Ultrasound Manager, Chelsea and Westminster Hospital NHS Foundation Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sujata Patel</td>
<td>Lead Ultrasound Manager, London North West Healthcare NHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Hamilton</td>
<td>Superintendent Ultrasonographer, East and North Hertfordshire NHS Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Chandler</td>
<td>Ultrasound Manager, East Surrey Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilary Haskins</td>
<td>Ultrasound Superintendent, Chelsea and Westminster Hospital NHS Foundation Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Frater</td>
<td>Superintendent Radiographer, Northampton General Hospital NHS Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(participated by telephone)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Programme Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gill Harrison</td>
<td>Programme Director, MSc Medical Ultrasound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison Harris</td>
<td>Clinical Co-ordinator, MSc Medical Ultrasound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacquie Torrington</td>
<td>Lecturer, MSc Medical Ultrasound, Module Leader Obstetric Ultrasound</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reflective review and supporting evidence

Panel members were provided with the Reflective Review and Action Plan document and supporting evidence more than four weeks ahead of the review. This included the following key documentation covering the period since the last Review: annual programme evaluations (including management and survey data), external examiner reports, Programme Management Committee minutes, Staff-Student Liaison Committee minutes, programme handbooks, clinical handbooks, programme and module specifications, Development Day notes, SWOT analysis and outcomes, overview of the outcomes and responses from the previous CASE accreditation report, destination data, student survey information, and assessment mapping documents. The action plan from the previous Periodic Review and CASE accreditation event, and relevant QAA subject benchmark statements, alongside the City Education and Student strategy, were also provided.

Changes to provision

The documentation included an overview of amendments made to the provision since the last Periodic Review.

The Panel noted that on-going changes to provision are monitored and consulted on where re-approval or earlier Periodic Review may be warranted. It was confirmed that the cumulative effect of amendments since the last Periodic Review did not require re-approval via the current Periodic Review process.

Regulatory Body Involvement

The MSc Medical Ultrasound is subject to the scrutiny and approval of the Consortium for the Accreditation of Sonographic Education (CASE). The reaccreditation event took place concurrently with the University Periodic Review event. The CASE report will be informed by the University Periodic Review report.
**Conduct of the review**

The Reflective Review and Action Plan (which will be submitted to 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 programme, 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:

- Working relationships with Practice Managers and other external contributors to the Programme (visiting lecturers, etc).
- Programme Team interaction with students and alumni, in terms of responses to queries, and general levels of support throughout the programme.
- Possibility of extending the maximum period of registration.

The Chair thanked the Practice Managers, students and alumni, Programme team and Senior Management 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 educational development of the provision and the student learning experience including continued alignment with relevant benchmarks/ CASE standards.
- Consolidation of areas of development and action planning in line with the University’s Education & Student Strategy.
- Promotion of student/alumni engagement within quality and enhancement processes including the use of student/alumni feedback and contributions during the development process, discussion with student/alumni participants ahead of the review, and contributions on the day both via Panel membership and the student/alumni meeting.

The Periodic Review Panel considered that:

- confidence could be placed in the proposed action plan for the programme;
- 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:

1) **The MSc Medical Ultrasound Programme Team was commended for a well- respected and well-managed programme. This respect had been evident in all of the individual meetings during the joint Periodic Programme Review/ Re- accreditation event.**

The Panel noted the positive comments from participants in each meeting throughout the day. The MSc Medical Ultrasound programme and Programme Team were consistently praised during the series of meetings. A common theme in all meetings was the attentiveness and approachability of the Programme Team in all areas, such as the provision of timely feedback to students, provision of CPD information of interest to alumni, and good working relationships with Practice Managers.

2) **The MSc Medical Ultrasound Programme Director was commended on the very high quality of the documentation provided to the panel in advance of the event.**

The documentation was provided to CASE and the Panel prior to the Christmas break, well in advance of the published deadline. It was clear and comprehensive, with a large amount of supporting evidence provided.

3) **The innovative teaching and learning methods used inside and outside the classroom were commended by the Panel.**

The Panel recommended the teaching and learning methods employed by the Programme Team such as the flipped classroom method, and the use of games and on-line quizzes to enhance student-learning, all of which were particularly praised by the students and alumni.

4) **The panel commended the high level of student support provided by the Programme Team.**

5) **The high level of engagement with alumni by the Programme Team was commended.**

During the meeting with students and alumni, it was noted that Programme Team members were very quick to respond to student queries, and would make themselves available to discuss any issues with students in person. Students felt very well supported throughout the programme, and alumni confirmed that this support extended beyond graduation. Alumni had formed a Facebook group, to which the Programme Team were regular contributors in terms of areas such as recent developments in the field, or CPD opportunities.

6) **The Programme Team’s engagement with SU and stakeholders was commended.**

As stated above (recommendation 1), the Programme Team had developed and sustained very good working relationships with stakeholders such as Practice Managers and visiting lecturers. Practice Managers commented how they were generally supported by the Programme Team. A number of cases were highlighted where Practice Managers had experienced difficulties with students. The Programme Team had always been quick to respond during such incidents, offering to attend the practice placement if necessary to offer assistance and moral support to the Practice Manager and student.
7) The Programme Team’s engagement and support for student collaborative research was commended by the Panel.

The Panel noted that the School of Health Sciences and University strategies were clear about the need to develop a research culture amongst students. In response to this, it was noted that the Programme Team provided students with support in preparation for presenting their work at conferences and study days, and also offered support to publish their work, recognising and highlighting the important link between research and clinical practice.

During the meeting with Practice Managers, one Practice Manager stated that they now only used students from City, due to the students consistently being well-rounded and employable sonographers.

8) The innovative teaching on ergonomics by the Programme Team, in terms of how to stay safe whilst scanning, was commended by the Panel.

The Panel noted that members of the Programme Team were actively researching and publishing on ways to reduce risk of injury to radiographers and sonographers whilst scanning. The outputs of this research were then shared with students during teaching sessions. Students were also invited to attend private assessments undertaken by members of the Programme Team if they felt that their own practice was harming them in any way. At and after such assessments, students were provided with recommendations on how to improve their scanning technique in order to reduce the risk of further injury in the future.

The Panel required the Programme Team to meet the following conditions:

1) The Programme Team was advised to seek an exception to the Senate Regulations, to extend the 5-year maximum registration period.

At all of the meetings comprising the event, this issue had been raised. It was felt that the maximum 5-year registration period particularly disadvantaged female students, who may have one or more pregnancies during their studies, in addition to any student wanting to take a break in their studies consolidate and build professional clinical competency between the end of the PG Diploma phase of the programme, and starting the dissertation, which would enable students to exit with an MSc upon completion. It was noted that City was currently able to take students who had completed their PG Diploma at another Institution, and who wanted to complete their MSc studies at City, but were unable to take their own students who had completed a PG Diploma at City, and were wanting to continue to complete the MSc, outside the 5-year maximum registration period.

2) During the meeting, it became apparent that a number of students who were financially supported by Trusts had received threatening letters from the University, and had been excluded from access to the University and its systems (email, library, Moodle, etc), if their fees were paid late by Trusts. It was noted that this was something which students had no control over, and for which they were therefore being unfairly and unacceptably penalised. The Panel advised that the Programme Team should again follow this issue up with the University Finance Office, to ensure that this type of communication was sent to the Trusts responsible, rather than to the individual students.
During the meetings with the students and alumni, and also with the Programme Team, it had been noted that students had been excluded from University systems, as a result of failure by Trusts to pay fees on time. The Programme Team expressed great concern that students were receiving threatening letters related to an issue over which students had no control. The Programme Director additionally noted that suspension from University systems, such as Moodle, further penalised students on the MSc Medical Ultrasound, as much of the teaching was delivered via the ‘flipped classroom’ method. This meant that students who had been excluded from University systems such as Moodle were also prevented from effectively participating in the classroom-based teaching sessions.

All conditions must be met within one year of the date of the Review and a response submitted to the Panel Secretary; the Panel Chair will determine whether the response sufficiently addresses the Panel’s concerns and will consult with other Panel members if required.

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

RECOMMENDATIONS

1) The Panel recommended that the Programme documentation was made more specific to the subject (MSc Medical Ultrasound), as it was noted that a number of the aims and learning outcomes were fairly generic in nature.

   The Panel noted that some of the programme documentation provided was generic in nature, and did not specifically mention the domain of Medical Ultrasound. The panel felt that such modules would be enhanced with the inclusion of subject-specific learning outcomes, to highlight the necessary specific skills.

2) The Programme Team was advised to review the potential for delivering vascular and MSK (musculoskeletal) teaching.

   The Panel noted that the Practice Managers had expressed an interest in other subject areas (vascular and MSK were given as examples). It was queried how the Programme Team felt regarding developing additional provision in such areas. The Programme Director noted that the Programme Team was interested in developing broader areas of provision, but noted that they currently did not have the expertise to deliver areas such as vascular, and would need to buy-in such expertise if such additional subjects were to be included in the programme.

3) Investigate the purchase and use of a SMOTS camera to deliver some of the clinical teaching for the programme.

   The Panel recommended that a SMOTS camera was purchased, to enable the capture of live feeds from demonstrations on the simulation machines in the clinical teaching aspects of the programme. This would enhance student learning from simulation. It was noted that the skills suite was currently too small, and that the purchase of a SMOTS camera would help to alleviate this issue.
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.

**Name of Secretary:** Dr Katy Beavers  
**Name of Co-Secretary:** Dr Alexander Rhys  
**Date of approval of report by Panel:** 23rd March 2018  
**Date of deadline set for School Response:** 25th March 2019