Assurance Report to Council on Academic Quality and Standards (covering the 2017/18 academic year)

Summary

The Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) introduced revised arrangements in 2016/17 for monitoring the processes that Higher Education Institutions have in place to assure and enhance the quality of their programmes effectively.

Under this revised method each institution’s governing body was required to provide an Annual Assurance statement to HEFCE confirming the robustness of academic quality and standards. To enable this to happen, Council reviewed and agreed a reporting format which underpins the attached report.

In April 2018 HEFCE ceased to exist and its duties were formally inherited by the Office for Students (OfS). The OfS is the regulator for the higher education sector in England from 1 April 2018.

There is a continued expectation that institutions maintain effective oversight of academic quality and standards. City has agreed that the production of the annual assurance report on academic quality and standards is good practice and provides appropriate Senate and Council with appropriate oversight so will continue to be produced.

Student & Academic Services has led the development and drafting of the report in liaison with the Governance Team. The joint statement on student representation in quality and academic standards was updated in consultation with the Students’ Union.

The Action Plan in Appendix 1 within this report provides updates to the 2017/2018 actions identifying those that have been completed and those still ongoing. An Action Plan for 2018/2019 is being developed based on the enhancement activities noted within this report and will be shared electronically with EQC in October for comments in preparation for Senate.

The final report will be presented to Senate at its October meeting for review and to Council in its November meeting for approval.

Alison Edridge (Assistant Director, Quality and Academic Development)
Georgia Moustaka (Quality and Standards Officer)

Recommended Action

Education Quality Committee is invited to

- consider the Assurance Report on Academic Quality and Standards and recommend it to Senate.
Assurance Report to Council on Academic Quality and Standards (covering the 2017/18 academic year) – Progress Update September 2018

Part 1: Overview and Contextual Update:

The Office for Students (OfS) was introduced as the new regulator for the higher education sector in England from 1 April 2018. The regulator was established by the Higher Education and Research Act 2017. It replaced the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) and the Office for Fair Access (OFFA) and has formally inherited their responsibilities.

The requirement for Council to provide a statement on annual statement on quality and standards no longer exists under the new OfS regulatory framework. However, there is a continued expectation that institutions are able to demonstrate effective oversight of academic quality and standards within the new regulatory environment. The annual assurance report will continue to be produced to provide Senate and Council with the required oversight.

a) Sector developments and compliance:

The OfS now holds statutory responsibility for quality and standards. In August 2018, the OfS confirmed that City had completed its registration process to be included on the OfS Register of English Higher Education Providers. This confirms that City satisfies the initial conditions of registration including those relating to quality, reliable standards and positive outcomes for students.

The OfS is empowered to make arrangements for assessing the quality of teaching in the sector through continued development of the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF). In June 2017, City received a Silver TEF Award and will continue to hold that award until resubmission is required in 2019/20.

TEF ratings are currently given at provider level only. However, during 2017/18 and 2018/19, the OfS is carrying out subject-level pilots on behalf of the Department for Education (DfE) to find the most effective way of producing TEF ratings at subject, as well as institutional level. From 2019/20, TEF will be assessed and ratings will be published at subject and provider level.

b) Strategic update:

Education & Student Strategy 2016-2021 projects have been progressing throughout 2017/18. Key highlights include:

- The review of undergraduate programme assessment strategies was completed and funding for a second phase of the project has been secured.
- A further four undergraduate programmes embedded employability programmes within the curriculum.
- A refreshed Personal Tutoring Policy was approved and the Personal Tutorial Records System was rolled out across City.

The Strategy and associated implementation plan are being revisited in light of significant sector change and to integrate the development of a Student Experience Factors narrative, which describes a student journey where all the functions of the university are effectively working together to deliver a good student experience.
Developments to the Strategy and the accompanying implementation plan will be considered by Education and Student Committee in the autumn term 2018.

c) **Senate Academic Regulation and Policy changes**

During 2017/18 the following Regulations were updated and approved by Senate:

- Regulation 4 (Senate’s Committees)
- Regulation 19 (Assessment Regulations)
- Regulation 13 (Student Discipline Regulation)
- Regulation 12 (Library Services & IT Services)
- Regulation 10 (Fitness to Study)

During 2017/18 the following policies were updated and approved by Senate:

- Programme Approval
- Programme Amendment
- Periodic Review
- Programme Termination and Suspension
- University Admissions Policy: Complaints and Appeals Procedure
- Student Records Management and Records Retention
- Personal Tutoring
- Fitness to Study
- Student Attendance and Engagement
- Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs)
- Student Mobility
- Placements

d) **Compliance with external Frameworks:**

City’s quality assurance processes which are documented in the Quality Manual, are designed to be compliant with the UK Quality Code for Higher Education [http://www.qaa.ac.uk/quality-code/the-revised-uk-quality-code](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/quality-code/the-revised-uk-quality-code). The Quality Code is being revised under the OfS regulatory framework and implementation guidelines are expected to be published in November 2018. Information on City’s award-bearing programmes are available on our website and published prospectuses. City’s Short Guide to Quality and Standards is included at Appendix 3 for information.

e) **Strategic Information**

Summary details of City’s student and programme numbers, together with outcomes for the last 3 years, are included at Appendix 4.

f) **Student Representation and Feedback/Student Voice: (Collaborative Statement from City and the Students’ Union)**

Central to managing the quality of our educational provision and identifying the need for change is considering, and acting upon, feedback from our students. Feedback is gathered through City working closely in partnership with the Students’ Union (SU).
During 2017/18, student representatives continued to play a key role in informing change, including via Annual Programme Evaluations (APEs) and Periodic Review (see Part 2). Student representatives sat on a range of committees from Student-Staff Liaison Committees (SSLCs) through to Council. The Students’ Union also submitted standing reports to Education Quality Committee and Senate, providing a further dedicated opportunity for students’ views to be heard.

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

2017/18

Over this academic Year City, University of London Students’ Union has continued to work in collaboration with the University to strengthen student representation. A total of 729 Programme Reps were elected this year, a further increase on the 701 of last year. Further to this 97.5% of the reps received formal induction training either in person or online. To achieve this 35 sessions were delivered across two months and all campuses, in November the Union launched training on Moodle to accommodate for distant learners and placement students.

The Union continued using the high of the rebranded system to work within Schools, advising on elections and partnership work with students. This was underpinned by continuing use of a code of conduct with reps which sets out a minimum meeting attendance requirement.

With the introduction of the Office for Students this year the Union has worked in partnership with City to develop the institution’s registration application; this included the Access & Participation Plan, the Student Protection Plan and Compliance, Governance & Management oversight.

Due to a period of staffing shortages in the Union an overall Programme Representative satisfaction survey was not conducted this year, however the Union did launch its first ever Annual Survey providing us with the knowledge that 61.8% of students at City know who their Rep is. Next year a full satisfaction survey will be conducted.

In the National Student Survey (NSS) this year the Union has seen a 7% positive increase for Question 26 - ‘Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of the course’, placing the Union in the top quartile of Students’ Unions in London and helping us to achieve one of our prominent strategic KPI’s.
Part 2: Academic Quality and Standards (the Quality Framework)

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

a) Admissions

**Overview:**

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

**Principles:**

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

**Oversight and Operation:**

The Deputy President and Provost chairs the Undergraduate and Postgraduate Recruitment Working Groups. The Working Groups monitor the admissions policy and admissions criteria for all taught award-bearing courses.

**Year reflected on:** 2017/18

**Scope of Activity:**

The undergraduate cycle (for 2017/8 academic year entry) received 25,512 applications. This was a -3.1% decrease on 2016 (26,325) and -7.3% decrease on 2015 (27,529). The main cause of the decrease was a 23% reduction in applications within the School of Health Sciences – post the removal of the National Health Service (NHS) funding.

The Unconditional Offer Scheme operated for specific programmes in the School of Arts & Social Sciences (SASS), Engineering as well as Radiography; this scheme was offered to 311 applicants and accounted for 117 enrolments. For the Conditional Offer Scheme, there were 1653 recipients mainly across SASS and School of Mathematics, Computer Science & Engineering (SMCSE); this accounted for 365 enrolments.

In 2017, the undergraduate reliance on Clearing for enrolment was 21% - a 4.4% decrease on 2016.

The 2017 cycle for postgraduate taught students (PGT) received 20,291 applications – this was a 10% reduction in 2016 numbers. From these applications, 5,346 new PGTs registered, against a target of 5,292.

The 2017 cycle for research students (PGR) resulted in 125 new PGRs registering against a target of 87.
Future Enhancements:

- The Undergraduate and Postgraduate Admissions and Recruitment Working Groups will continue their strategic focus looking at 2019 and beyond.

- There will be increased effort to improve the quality, and standardisation, of management information around admissions in conjunction with the Management Information project within the Modernising Administration for Students (MAfS) team.

- Information Technology and Admissions will develop a 3-5 year roadmap on the technological development required within admissions.

- The Admissions Policy will also be reviewed and revised during 2018/19.

b) Periodic Review

Overview:

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

Principles:

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

Oversight and Operation:

The Educational Quality Committee oversees this area and receives regular reports on activity and an annual overview report. This report is also received by Senate. School Programme Approval and Review Committees (PARC) have responsibility for overseeing actions including receipt of reports on progress with actions, a year after the review.

Year reflected on: 2017/18

Scope of Activity:

11 reviews were undertaken:
- (Cass) Masters in Innovation, Creativity and Leadership
- (Cass) MSc Quantitative Cluster
- (Law) LLB/GELLB
- (SHS) MSc Health Management
- (SHS) PG. Cert./MSc Medical Ultrasound (joint re-approval event with CASE)
- (SMCSE) MSc Construction Management and MSc Civil Engineering Structures
There are 4 Reviews in progress due to be completed by the end of October 2018:

- (SASS) MA English Cluster
- (SASS) PhD/D Journalism
- (SASS) PhD Sociology (all pathways)
- (SASS) PhD/DMA Music

**Outcomes from the reviews:**

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

**Process following Periodic Review:**

For each Review a report outlining conditions and recommendations is presented to the Programme Team and School PARCs. Programme Teams then build upon their Action Plans. All actions arising from the Period Review are now collated within the APE Action Plan replacing the ‘One year On Reports’.

It was acknowledged that one year was not sufficient to observe if actions taken were beneficial to the programme. To address this and to reduce duplication, the reporting of developments arising from periodic review have now been embedded within the Annual Programme Evaluation (APE) process.

The outcomes from all Periodic Reviews are reported to Educational Quality Committee. An annual overview report reflecting on key themes is presented annually to Educational Quality Committee and Senate.

**Particular strengths** were identified as the:

- commitment, dedication and expertise of the academic and professional staff
- rigorous academic content of the programmes under review
- diversity of the learning and teaching, and assessment methods used across all programmes reviewed
- inclusion of appropriate external expertise via guest lectures, visiting lecturers and advisory boards
- interdisciplinary approach to development activity.
Future Enhancements:

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

- to consider the growing importance of the Competition and Markets Authority (CMA) guidelines and the implications for programme development or significant amendments
- to provide greater clarity around the Periodic Review process, including improving the guidance for academic and professional services colleagues.
- to improve communications with students around changes to programmes and modules.
- to consistently implement the personal tutoring policy and to consider the new attendance and engagement policy.

The Periodic Review Policy and guidance were revised during 2017/18 to ensure alignment with the Education & Student Strategy, changes to the external regulatory environment and sector practice. Senate approved the proposed changes to the Periodic Review Policy and Guidance including a reduction in the time between periodic reviews from six to five years to align with sector practice.

c) Programme Development and Approval

Overview:

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

Principles:

The principles of Programme Approval at City are to:

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

Proposals should have significant staff and, where appropriate, employer and student input from the earliest stages of development. These must articulate, as far as possible, with PSRB (Professional and Statutory Regulatory Bodies) accreditations and Research Council requirements.
Significant amendments to existing programmes are also considered through the 
programme approval process.

**Oversight and Operation:**

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

**Year reflected on:** 2017/18

**Scope of Activity:**

**Stage 1:**
- 14 proposals (some covering more than one programme) were considered.
- 3 submissions were not approved, one is currently addressing the requirements of 
  Stage 1 and two have been postponed.

**Stage 2:**
- 12 proposals were considered, and all were approved
- 1 proposal was rejected but has subsequently met the conditions of the UPAC and 
  has been approved.

**Particular strengths** of new programme proposals were identified as:
- The breadth and currency of the provision under development.
- The quality and clarity of the documentation in a substantial number of proposals.
- The agility and innovation demonstrated in the proposals.
- The commitment and dedication of the programmes teams.
- The diversity of assessment, and teaching and learning methodologies in use across all 
  proposals.

**Future Enhancements to Process:**

- To ensure that proper consideration of marketing and recruitment cycles is observed, 
  and sufficient time to approve and implement new programmes is allowed.
- To consistently include consultation with students in the development process and 
  documentation.
- To note any potential CMA (Competition and Markets Authority) implications in the 
  consideration of significant approval, and to take the appropriate steps to mitigate these.
- Schools to work more closely with Learning Enhancement and Development (LEaD) 
  prior to Stage 2 submissions to ensure that programme and module specifications are in 
  line with University and external regulatory frameworks
The Programme Approval Policy and guidance was reviewed during 2017/18 and Senate approved the changes for implementation from 2018/19. The most significant change is that

- School Programme Approval and Review Committee (PARC) and University-level consideration at University Programme Approval Committee (UPAC) have been combined at Stage 1.

### New Programmes and Significant Amendments to Existing Programmes Approved in 2017/18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cass</td>
<td>MSc International Business (joint process)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass</td>
<td>Foundation Programmes (significant amendment) (joint process)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>LLM Maritime Law (Dubai) (significant amendment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SASS</td>
<td>MA English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SASS</td>
<td>PhD English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHS</td>
<td>PG Cert. Professional Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHS</td>
<td>Introduction to Optometry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCSE</td>
<td>MSc Artificial Intelligence (joint process)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCSE</td>
<td>MSc Airport Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCSE</td>
<td>MSc Internet of Things with Entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCSE</td>
<td>MSc Business Systems Analysis and Design (significant amendment) (by circulation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body Accreditations and Reviews

**Overview:**

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

**Oversight and Operation:**

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

**Year reflected on:** 2017/18
**Scope of Activity:**

- There were 93 programmes accredited by 69 PSRBs.
- There were two new PSRB accreditations - 1) MSc Global Supply Chain Management was awarded accreditation from Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport; 2) the Royal College of Speech and Language Therapy (RCSLT) moved its certification of the BSc/ PGdip/ MSc Speech and Language Therapy to accreditation.

**Recent Enhancements:**

In December 2017 Senate approved a revised PSRB Policy and revisions to the PSRB register which enhanced Senate oversight of PSRB activity across City. The register now captures the monitoring of accreditation action plans and additions and removals of accredited bodies from the register.

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

**Overview:**

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

**Principles:**

**Assessment Standards and Outcomes**

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

**Assessment Feedback**

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

**Oversight and Operation:**

**Assessment Standards and Outcomes**

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

**Assessment Feedback**

Boards of Studies oversee the effective implementation of the timeliness of feedback and associated data on turnaround times.
**Year reflected on:** 2017/18 (Term One of the academic year 2017/18 up to and including the Examination Period of Autumn 2017/18)

**Scope of Activity:**

5 Briefing Sessions were delivered to 40 staff including Assessment Board Chairs, other academic and professional staff involved with the 2017/18 Boards. 99 Progression and final Assessment Boards were held between December 2017 and 13 August 2018, of which 35 (35%) were observed by Student & Academic Services on behalf of Senate. Overall, the Boards operated according to City’s regulatory framework with robust discussion and External Examiner contribution. Good practice was noted at many Boards and where risks or inconsistencies were noted, recommendations are being made to Senate on how practice can be improved.

An Industrial Action Quality and Standards Working Group was established by ExCo oversee implementation of actions arising from industrial action which impacted on teaching and assessment during the Spring term. A senior member of Professional Services staff from Student and Academic Services attended selected Assessment Boards in order to support discussions on decisions and actions in relation to the programmes affected by strike action.

The average compliance rate for assessment feedback turnaround was 89%, a 6% drop on the same period in 2016/7. Reasons for non-compliance were reported to Senate and ExCo. Senate and ExCo both requested 100% compliance.

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

---

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

**Overview:**

External examining is the principal means of maintaining UK academic standards. Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) appoint external examiners who are suitably qualified and experienced in their subject area. They offer advice on good practice and opportunities to enhance the quality of those programmes/modules and also offer a view of how standards compare with the same/similar awards in the sector. External examiners submit written reports providing independent feedback on academic content, assessment and the processes through which academic standards are achieved, maintained and enhanced, and programmes and modules then respond to any recommendations.

**Principles:**

An External Examiner is appointed to each programme or module. Boards of Studies may appoint additional External Examiners to cover specialised academic areas within a programme.

External Examiners are typically appointed for four years, with the possibility of a one-year extension. The External Examiner appointment process operates in line with the City’s External Examiners Policy, the relevant areas of the Assessment Regulations and both of which are informed by Chapter B7: External Examining of the Quality Assurance Agency’s ‘UK Quality Code for Higher Education’.
Oversight and Operation:

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

Institution-level responsibility is delegated via the Deputy President and Provost, to the Academic Lead for External Examiners. The Board of Studies (BoS) responsible for the programme considers nominations at School-level. At institutional level the nominations are considered by the appointed Academic Lead for External Examining. An overview of themes from External Examiner reports is presented to Educational Quality Committee and Senate each year.

Year reflected on: 2017/18

Scope of Activity:

City has in place approximately 250 External Examiner appointments, covering all taught programmes within City’s Schools and validated provision.

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

Particular strengths (as identified by External Examiners) include:

i. Programme Teams’ responses to constructive feedback to inform continual enhancement of programmes

ii. the variety and appropriateness of assessment on programmes and modules.

iii. Programme Directors’ and Module Leaders’ commitment to ensure that the content delivered to students is current and relevant.

iv. confidence in the quality and standards of the taught provision delivered and awarded by City.

Future Enhancements include:

i. the use of statistics and provision of data in advance of the Assessment Board in order to digest, analyse and interpret the information to facilitate a more informed contribution at the board.

ii. a review of the External Examiners framework, processes and reporting formats to align with new requirements (e.g. GDPR) to enhance current arrangements and ensure they continue to meet City’s requirements

Student and Academic Services in liaison with Assessment Board Chairs and professional staff will review the information provided at Assessment Boards in 2018/19.

---

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

Overview:

Procedures are in place for managing student complaints (about specific aspects of their experience), academic misconduct, academic appeals (against marks or decisions awarded by Assessment Boards), and for considering students presenting with
extenuating circumstances which may have adversely affected performance in assessment.

**Principles:**
Student cases are managed in accordance with the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education’s (OIA) Good Practice Framework\(^1\). The OIA framework is non-regulatory, and serves as operational guidance.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Year reflected on:** 1 January-31 December 2017 (This is due to the reporting requirements of the OIA)

**Scope of Activity:**

**Extenuating Circumstances**
Schools processed 4598 extenuating circumstances claims across undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes (5,309 in 2016/17). Of these, 2804 were accepted and

---

\(^1\) The OIA is an independent body set up to review student complaints. Free to students, the OIA deals with individual complaints against Higher Education Providers in England and Wales.
resolved. 93 claims were partially accepted and 658 were rejected. The remaining claims were returned or cancelled by students or staff upon students’ requests.

Academic Appeals
Schools processed 419 Stage 1 level Academic Appeals across all undergraduate and postgraduate programmes, a decrease from 530 in 2016. Student and Academic Services received 76 Stage 2 requests from students for review, a significant increase from 52 requests received in 2016. Of the 76 subject to final stage review, 10 were upheld and referred back to the relevant School for action.

Student Complaints
26 student complaints were processed by Schools, similar to 27 in 2016. 12 of these complaints progressed to the final review stage, of which one was upheld.

Academic Misconduct
Schools initially investigated 151 instances of alleged academic misconduct. Of these, 128 cases were upheld and a sanction applied. 5 cases were referred to the second stage. 2 cases were referred to the City Disciplinary Panel under stage 2.

Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) Activity
All institutions that subscribe to the OIA are required to issue a completion of procedures letter to confirm a student’s case has exhausted the internal procedures and may be eligible for review by the OIA. City issued 98 Completion of Procedures Letters in 2017, a significant increase from 60 in 2016.

In May 2018, the OIA published Annual Statements for all providers subscribing to the OIA in 2017. This covered complaint investigations by the OIA completed within the calendar year ending December 2017. Data provided in this Annual Statement revealed that in 2017, the OIA reviewed 21 cases against City, compared to 16 in 2016. Of these, 3 were considered ‘justified’, 2 were ‘partially justified’ and 11 were ‘not justified’. The remaining 5 cases were classified as Not Eligible and Withdrawn.

Particular strengths (within City) were identified as:

- There has been a noticeable decrease in the number of extenuating circumstances and academic appeals. The Student Case Management Forum shares good practice and a particular focus on resolving issues at an informal stage is encouraged.

- Through the Modernising Administration for Students initiative, the processing of extenuating circumstances and appeals has moved online. This has improved the student experience by increasing accessibility, transparency as well as improving efficiency and reporting of administrative processes.

Future Enhancements

- Through a new Student Equality and Diversity Officer and the online recording of student cases, work will be carried out on looking at protected characteristics in relation to Extenuating Circumstances, Student Complaints, Academic Appeals and Academic Misconduct. Identifying trends will support the provision of appropriate and, where necessary, tailored student support to particular types of students.
An increasing trend in the OIA’s consideration of complaints is a focus on procedural fairness, and whether procedures allow sufficient flexibility to permit special consideration of cases for good reasons. Work will continue throughout 2018/19 to review regulations ensuring sufficient flex to consider individual student cases in existing policies and procedures.

h) Research Degree Provision

Overview:

The Research Degrees Framework applies to all full and part-time research students, including those registered on a validated research degree programme, academic staff with a responsibility for the supervision and examination of research students, administrative staff who have a role in supporting academic staff and external stakeholders.

Principles:

The Framework contains core principles of City’s commitment to academic support and development of Research Students, alongside continuous development of our services.

Oversight and Operation:

Research degree policy and provision is overseen by Senate and supported through the Graduate School Committee, which is advisory to the Dean of the Graduate School.

Within Schools, Boards of Studies are responsible for the approval of the admission, monitoring and progress review, examination and award of individual research students, and for monitoring the delivery and evaluation of research degree programmes.

Year reflected on: 2017/18

Scope of Activity:

- 569 students, with 198 in writing up status
- 127 examinations

Enhancement activities undertaken during 2017/18:

- A task and finish group has reviewed the contractual arrangements for research students who teach and City studentships that include a contribution to teaching and teaching-support activity as part of the terms and conditions. A new Graduate Teaching Assistant (GTA) contract, which will standardise terms and conditions across City, is due to take effect from 2018/19.

- Work was completed to record data to allow a new institutional performance indicator on PhD completion rates to be reported. This metric, and its enhancement, is vital in positioning City to be eligible for participation in future Doctoral Training Partnerships/Centers.

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

- New guidance to support PhD by prior publication was prepared.
- A three-year cycle for the review of all research degree policies was approved by Graduate School Committee.
- A review of research student support was commissioned by the Vice-President (Research and Enterprise), with a series of meetings held. The final report is due in autumn 2018.

**Future Enhancements:**

- The system used to record and monitor research degree progress will be reviewed and replaced. This is intended to enhance engagement and provide better information to support improved completion rates.
- Institutional data warehousing for research degrees will be developed further, in order to allow senior committees to review annual progression, upgrade, completion, and examination statistics to support timely completion and inform strategic enhancements.
- The cyclical review of research degree policies will review and revise a number of policies, particularly those relating to timely progression and completion. Issues of equality and diversity will also be embedded into the policy review process.
- Learning Enhancement and Development (LEaD) is introducing a new Establishing a Teaching Persona course to support research students new to teaching, in supplement to the mandatory Learning, Teaching and Assessment module required of research students who teach

**Overview:**

**Partnerships**

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

**Validation**

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

Principles:

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

Oversight and Operation:

School Boards of Studies are responsible for overseeing quality and standards matters relating to partnership provision. For validated provision, a Course Board oversees quality and standards for each validation partnership and comprises representatives from City, the validation partner and an external advisor appointed by City. The Collaborative Provision Committee oversees the development and implementation of City’s quality and standards framework for both validation and partnerships.

Year reflected on: 2017/18

Scope of Activity:

• Partnership provision: 1397 students on 28 partnership arrangements.

• Validated provision: 487 students on 8 programmes at 5 institutions. The two institutions at which programmes were due for revalidation in 2017/18 successfully completed the revalidation process: Trinity Laban Conservatoire of Music and Dance; and INTO City, University of London.

Activity in 2017/18:

The new Collaborative Provision Committee met for the first time and established a programme of business, addressing a recommendation in City’s last institutional review by the Quality Assurance Agency. The Committee consolidated the validation and partnerships activity of the two committees it replaced, and also recognised the need for a process for considering international partnership proposals which did not fall under the definition of collaborative provision.

Future Enhancements:

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

• Enhanced delivery of guidance for academic and professional services staff in Schools relating to the approval process for partnership programmes will be embedded.
• Support will be given for the development of a process for considering international partnership proposals in collaboration with the Internationalisation Committee as part of implementation of the Internationalisation Strategy.

Part 3: Educational Quality Support and Enhancement

a) Annual Programme Evaluation

Overview:

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

Principles:

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

Oversight and Operation:

APEs are completed for all programmes. Tailored approaches exist for collaborative provision and research degrees.

When compiling APEs, programme teams review programme-related management information and External Examiner reports. They also reflect on various sources of student feedback considered throughout the year. This includes:

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

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

Year reflected on: 2016/17 (APEs compiled in 2017/18 reflected on the previous academic year)

Scope of Activity:

- 84 Undergraduate APEs submitted
- 133 Postgraduate Taught APEs submitted
- 30 Postgraduate Research APEs submitted

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

APE workshops were held to support timely submission of APEs, alongside workshops particularly focused on the thematic elements around assessment and progression.

**Particular strengths** identified included:

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

**Enhancements**

- The overall timelines for the process have been revised to enable sufficient time for peer review of APEs within Schools prior to submission.  
- Introduction of improved processes for the identification and dissemination of good practice by External Examiners and School Associate Deans (Education).  
- A review of the APE process will be undertaken during 2018/19 to support improved alignment with Education & Student Strategy developments and the new external regulatory framework, in particular the development of subject-level TEF.

---

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

**Student Surveys**

**Overview:**

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

- Your Voice 1 (Undergraduate (UG) Year 1 internal survey)  
- Your Voice 2 (UG Year 2 internal survey)  
- National Student Survey (NSS) (UG Year 3, national survey)  
- Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES) (PGT students, national survey)

**Principles:**

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

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

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

**Year reflected on:** 2017/18

**Voice 1 and Voice 2**

- In both surveys 75% of students surveyed were overall satisfied with their experience.
- Learning Resources was the best performing section in Your Voice 1.
- Learning Community was the best performing section in Your Voice 2.
- For both surveys the Students’ Union section recorded the lowest results, a decrease compared to 2017.

**NSS**

- Overall satisfaction was 82% (City maintained its score from 2017 with the national average dropping to 83% from 84% in 2017).
- For student satisfaction (average of questions 1 to 25) City has moved up from 9th in London in 2017 to 4th this year.
- The Students’ Union question recorded the lowest score however, it increased significantly on 2017 and positions us 3rd in London up from 14th.

**PTES**

- Overall satisfaction was recorded as 77% (compared to 78% in 2017).
- The highest score was for Resources and Services with 84%.
- The lowest results were recorded for Dissertation or Major Project (with 68%) and Organisation and Management (with 71%).

**Future Enhancements:**

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

The Deputy President will lead on NSS action planning, supported by Student and Academic Services for 2018/19. There has been work to track trends between the Your Voice and NSS surveys, including looking at protected characteristics and what support is needed for students at risk of progressing.

c) **Module Evaluation**

**Overview:**

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

**Oversight and Operation:**

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

**Year reflected on:** 2017/18

**Scope of Activity:**

- **Term 1**: 901 modules were surveyed
- **Term 2**: 1211 modules were surveyed

  - 29% of modules achieved a response rate of 80% or above (compared to 30.5% in 2016/17)
  - 21.6% of modules received scores of 4.5 or above for overall satisfaction (compared to 28.4% in 2016/17)
  - 5.7% of modules received a score of 3.5 or less for overall satisfaction (compared to 7% in 2016/17)

**Future Enhancements:**

The current module evaluation process has been in place since 2011 and has expanded to encompass all taught undergraduate and postgraduate modules. In July 2018 Senate received a report on a review of the current process and endorsed the action plan which focussed on future enhancements based on proposed work within 6 themes: 1) the scope of module evaluation; 2) roles and responsibilities; 3) staff and student communication and engagement; 4) data; 5) survey timings and format; 6) reporting. The action plan will be progressed during 2018/19 academic year for implementation of the updated process in 2019/20.

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

**Overview:**

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

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

Oversight and Operation:

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

Year reflected on: 2017/18

Outcomes:

The current policy has now been in place for two years and monitoring as noted above is undertaken within Schools. However, there is an option for those engaging with the process to submit an anonymous reflection about their review.

An analysis was undertaken of the 48 reflections that were submitted during the first year 2016/2017 and these demonstrated that staff engaging with the process had used the review process to look at face to face teaching and online, teaching materials and curricula and assessment and feedback activities thus ensuring a range of academic practice can be reviewed. Participants were very positive about the process and the opportunity to engage in a reciprocal review and discuss their practice with each other. There were examples of good practice being shared about engaging students in class, ensuring materials for students took account of inclusivity and meeting student needs as well as providing feedforward for students in assessment feedback.

In addition, staff and research students who undertake the first module of the MA Academic Practice Learning, Teaching and Assessment all have to complete peer review as part of this module which introduces them to the process of peer review when they first start to teach. This involves approximately 160 staff and students annually. It enables them to see the value of this process early in their career and many have reported how much they enjoyed the process and that they would continue to engage in this.

Part 4: Governance Framework

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

Senate met on four occasions in 2017/18. The meeting of Senate scheduled for 7th March was held but was inquorate, as 14 elected Senators and 4 student Senators had indicated they would not attend due to the industrial action then underway.

The composition of Senate, set out in Ordinance C1, is at Appendix 2. The Appendix also gives details of attendance at Senate in 2017/18 and contains a table showing the attendance at meetings of Senate of lay members of Council. Key topics covered in Senate meetings included the following:

Major Approvals: Governance of Senate Sub-Committees, Research Students Who Teach Guidance, Approval of three Interdisciplinary Centres, APE Template for Research Degrees.

Senate Regulation Approvals/Revisions: Regulation 19 Assessment Regulations/Programme Regulations, Regulation 4 Senate’s Committees, Regulation 10 Fitness to Study Regulation and Policy, Regulation 13 Student Disciplinary Regulation, Regulation 5D School Learning and Teaching Committees.

Senate Policy Approvals/Revisions: Fitness to Study Policy, PSRB Policy, Sabbatical Leave Policy for Academic Staff, Conflict of Interest Policy, Personal Tutoring Policy, University Admissions Policy, Programme Approval Policy, Programme Amendment Policy, Periodic Review Policy, Programme Termination and Suspension Policy, Student Records Management Policy and Retention Schedule.


Senate Governance Framework

In 2017/18, Senate approved an Educational Quality Committee as a formal sub-committee. Educational quality had previously been considered by the Education and Student Committee, an advisory committee to the Deputy President and Provost. Educational Quality Committee oversees, on behalf of Senate, academic quality and standards and the Committee’s remit includes supporting enhancement and dissemination of good practice. The Committee communicates with the revised Education and Student Committee (which now formally reports directly to ExCo on strategic matters), Collaborative Provision Committee and Graduate School Committee. The revised arrangements strengthen Senate’s direct oversight of quality and standards and assurance to Council.

b) Reports on the operation of sub-committees of Senate including Boards of Studies

Senate necessarily delegates many activities critical to quality and standards to its Sub-committees, notably its Boards of Studies and its Assessment Boards. Details of Senate delegations are at Appendix 2. Senate at each meeting receives verbal updates as well as minutes of all its Sub-committees and also of two Executive Advisory Committees which are concerned with academic quality and standards, the Graduate School Committee and the Research & Enterprise Committee.

Key areas of work carried out by sub-committees of Senate during 2017/18 included the following:

AGC: Scrutiny of Senate Regulations 4, 5, 10, 13, 19, 28, Office for Students Consultation, consideration of Internal Audit Reports into Annual Programme Evaluation & Periodic Review and AGC, Membership of Senate Sub-committees, Senate Governance Arrangements,
Governance Arrangements for Education and Student Experience, Composition of Senate, Ordinances A1 and C1, Sabbatical Leave Policy, Appointment of Chair of SREC, Research Ethics Reporting.


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


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

Student progression, student satisfaction, student employability and research inputs and outputs are all scheduled as topics for discussion at each meeting of the Executive Team and the Executive Committee as part of the first section of the agenda (covering the ‘Big 6’ issues for City).

Additionally, the Executive Committee:

Discussed: NSS results and Student Satisfaction, Student Recruitment, Modernising Administration for Students (MAfS) project, Personal Tutoring, Research Students Who Teach, Office for Students Consultation, Attendance Monitoring, the Vision and Strategy 2026.

Approved: Actions taken in response to modules scoring <3.5 in module evaluations, Office for Students Application, Establishment of Industrial Action Quality and Standards Working Group, Interdisciplinary Research Centres.

Industrial Action Quality and Standards Working Group

An Industrial Action Quality and Standards Working Group, chaired by the Deputy President and Provost, was established by ExCo in March 2018 to oversee implementation of actions arising from industrial action which impacted on teaching and assessment during the Spring term.

The Working Group considered information provided by Schools on programmes/modules impacted by the action, identified areas of risk, reviewed measures taken to mitigate the impact on students, and issued guidance. Senior members of Student and Academic Services attended key Assessment Boards to ensure that academic quality and standards were maintained.
Part 5: Key findings of independent reports on quality and standards (i.e. that sit outside the quality and standards framework)

a) Internal Audit Reports on quality and standards
Internal Audit carried out the following audits relating to City’s quality and standards framework and reached the following judgements:

- Programme development: a full level of assurance could be given to the adequacy and effectiveness of systems of internal control

The outcome of the internal audits, along with their recommendations will be reported to the Audit and Risk Committee as well as Senate. Actions relating to quality and standards will be embedded in work overseen by relevant Senate sub-committees and Executive advisory committees.

b) Other independent reports
An external consultant was commissioned to undertake sector benchmarking as part of a review of provision of support for postgraduate research students agreed by ExCo. The external consultant’s report has been received by the Steering Group for the review, Graduate School Committee, ExCo and Senate. The external consultant’s findings will be taken into account in determining the overall recommendations arising from the review.

Sources of further information
For further information shortened links to relevant information are below:

City, University of London Quality Manual: https://goo.gl/5qwsuF
City, University of London – Academic Committees (Agendas, Papers and Minutes): https://goo.gl/hU7N8S


Chair of University Councils Annual Reporting Guidelines: https://goo.gl/qX5kaT
OIA guidance: https://goo.gl/HwEjnY
Office for Students (OfS): https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/
## Appendix 1: Action plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Summary of work to be undertaken</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Key Contact</th>
<th>Expected end date</th>
<th>Oversight</th>
<th>Current status – August 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education and Student Strategy</td>
<td>The Education and Student Strategy approved in 2014/15 will be revised to support the Vision 2026, new KPIs in satisfaction, progression and employability and readiness for the TEF.</td>
<td>Deputy President and Provost</td>
<td>Megan Butler (Senior Strategy Support Officer)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Education and Student Committee (ESC)</td>
<td>The Strategy is currently being revisited in light of significant sector change, the development of the Student Experience Factors and to provide more direction and clarity. A representation of the Strategy and an accompanying implementation plan will be submitted to Education and Student Committee in October 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernising Administration for Students (MAfS)</td>
<td>A number of projects are being undertaken within the Programme to improve underpinning systems and processes that support the student journey. This is a large-scale institution-wide programme of work which is planned to take place over the next 3 years. A One-Year on report was made to SIPCO by the Director of Student &amp; Academic Services in September. MAfS is supporting City in KPIs in student satisfaction and progression as well as operational effectiveness</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>Melanie Sanderson (Programme Manager (MAfS))</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>MAfS Project Board</td>
<td>Completed – The refreshed Programme vision has been approved by the MAfS Board and by ExCo. The overall programme is progressing as expected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student Engagement

<p>| NSS 2016 action planning | Meetings will take place with programme teams and the Deputy President and Deputy Head of | Completed | Senate | Completed - Meetings have taken place and action plans for each programme produced. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Summary of work to be undertaken</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Key Contact</th>
<th>Expected end date</th>
<th>Oversight</th>
<th>Current status – August 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provost regarding the outcomes of the NSS 2016 to support action planning.</td>
<td>and Provost</td>
<td>Student Experience and Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ Union Strategy</td>
<td>Work will be undertaken in close collaboration with the Students’ Union on how outputs from the new SU Strategy and new City Vision and Strategy can collectively maximise impact for students and meet KPIs.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS &amp; SU</td>
<td>Megan Butler (Senior Strategy Support Officer)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Students’ Union Board of Trustees</td>
<td>A workshop has been organised with the SU to discuss the implementation plan for the refreshed Education and Student Strategy and how the university and the SU can work collaboratively moving forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression data analysis</td>
<td>An analysis of recruitment and progression data will be undertaken to improve understanding of which students are failing to progress and why. The work will also identify gaps in current data that hinder our understanding of progression issues, so that these gaps can be filled. Improved data and understanding of it will inform a Progression Improvement Programme and planned future decision-making in this area. A Progression Improvement Working Group of ExCo has been established and a plan of work has been presented to Council.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>Emily Thornton (Progression and Strategy Support Manager)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>ExCo and Council</td>
<td>This work is on track. Further student data analysis has taken place and specifically, in clusters correlation has been tested for significance in order to establish causal impact. Further nuanced work has been developed to take forward in collaboration with the Student Equality and Diversity Officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG Assessment Strategy Review</td>
<td>This review will examine and revise assessments strategies across City’s undergraduate programmes to ensure that: Assessments for each programme are clearly mapped against learning outcomes</td>
<td>LEaD</td>
<td>Prof. Pam Parker (Deputy Director, LEaD)</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>The project for this year has now come to an end although a toolkit is being prepared to be launched in September which will have some literature reviews, guidance documents and case studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Summary of work to be undertaken</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Key Contact</td>
<td>Expected end date</td>
<td>Oversight</td>
<td>Current status – August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The volume and spread of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding for a second year has been secured and we are currently advertising a two day a week learning development opportunity. The project will work with Schools to identify one or two programmes that Schools would like to focus on for assessment and / or feedback development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assessments are authentic and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Each programme team has a clear plan for the on-going evaluation of impact against on student satisfaction, retention, progression and employability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Representation Review</td>
<td>The Students’ Union and City will seek to ensure our students are able to effectively engage in decision-making about their academic and broader experience at different levels of decision-making through a review of student representation undertaken during 2017/18. This will examine the effectiveness of existing feedback mechanisms in capturing the student voice particularly in relation to programme enhancements and overall student experience.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS &amp; SU</td>
<td>Shereen Sally (Deputy Head of Student Experience and Engagement)</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>The SU have undertaken a review of programme representatives and produced a number of recommendations and an action plan as a result. This was submitted to the September 2017 Education and Student Committee. The SU and City will work collaboratively to ensure deadlines for actions are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Support for Students Review</td>
<td>Personal Support for Students will be reviewed as an enabling project of the Education and Student Strategy. The project will examine the personal support offer at City in the context of student feedback, best sector practice and current work to improve Personal Tutoring.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>Emily Thornton (Progression and Strategy Support Manager)</td>
<td>July 2019</td>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>This work continues to progress. Information and guidance supporting the refreshed Personal Tutor Policy for students and staff has been produced. The Personal Tutorial Records System (MAFS) has been rolled out across City with 85% of all personal tutors accessing the system in 17/18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Summary of work to be undertaken</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Key Contact</td>
<td>Expected end date</td>
<td>Oversight</td>
<td>Current status – August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Mentoring</td>
<td>The CityBuddies scheme is currently an opt-in peer mentoring scheme which matches current City students with new undergraduates on the same course to provide support during their first months. During 2018/19, the scheme will be expanded and become an opt-out programme so that all first year students will be paired with a mentor before they start on their programme.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>Ben Butler (Student Development Manager)</td>
<td>July 2019</td>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>The longer term expansion of the scheme requires that 800 students be recruited to be CityBuddies. Currently just under 450 students have registered to become CityBuddies. This gives us potential capacity to support 1800 incoming students if the demand is there. This is significant expansion on previous years and provides us with an opportunity to pilot opt-out in specific programmes. Wider engagement from staff within Schools would support ongoing recruitment of mentors. Materials have been provided to help staff publicise the scheme across programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement and Attendance Monitoring</td>
<td>Effective attendance monitoring will allow us to better engage with our students and therefore improve student progression and the student experience as a whole. This project aims to provide technological enablement to support the monitoring of student attendance of all students, supporting the Attendance and Participation Policy to better engage with all our students, to improve progression/retention and to improve the student experience, in general.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>Melanie Sanderson (Programme Manager (MAfS))</td>
<td>July 2020</td>
<td>MAFS Board</td>
<td>Procurement of the attendance monitoring software is near completion following tender submissions, supplier demos and user experience demos. A report will be presented to ET &amp; Deans to gain approval for the implementation path for the system and related processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Summary of work to be undertaken</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Key Contact</td>
<td>Expected end date</td>
<td>Oversight</td>
<td>Current status – August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Surveys</td>
<td>During 2017/18, strategic adjustment to new NSS question set and implications for City within sector</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>Shereen Sally (Deputy Head of Student Experience and Engagement)</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>ESC</td>
<td><strong>Completed</strong> – Documentation was produced for staff on the new question set, which included guidance on how to help students understand what they were being asked in the survey. Your Voice 1 and 2 questions were adjusted to align with the new NSS questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Surveys</td>
<td>During 2017/18, strategic adjustment to operation of new DLHE (called 'Graduate Outcomes') and implications for City within sector</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>Brendan Bacon (Head of Careers)</td>
<td>July 2018</td>
<td>ESC</td>
<td><strong>Completed</strong> – Co-ordination between Careers, Registry &amp; DARO for the submission of student data required for the new Graduate Outcomes Survey has taken place. A business case for a new specialised Careers Consultant providing services for graduates has been approved and recruitment is currently underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctive Offer</td>
<td>Pilot of an Employability Award</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>Ben Butler (Student Development Manager)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>The deadline for the first wave of students completing the award was the end of July 2018. 14 students have received the Gold Award and four students are in receipt of the Silver Award. While the engagement numbers have been lower than anticipated, the depth and quality of written reflections is impressive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Summary of work to be undertaken</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Key Contact</td>
<td>Expected end date</td>
<td>Oversight</td>
<td>Current status – August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careers Registration project</td>
<td>All new and returning students are asked to complete a questionnaire upon enrolment and graduation which will provide new insight into students’ views about their employment readiness. The scheme has received positive feedback from Schools and is supporting the Careers Service in targeting support for students.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>Brendan Bacon (Head of Careers)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>Completed – 2017/18 has been the first year we have a complete picture of our students’ career readiness from all year groups. The data is available to Schools and is being used by the Careers Service to inform priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic review of Widening Participation Outreach framework</td>
<td>A comprehensive review of our Widening Participation Outreach framework will be undertaken. Findings will inform our understanding of the preferences and needs of WP students making the transition into university life.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>Sarah Wood (Widening Participation Manager)</td>
<td>Review will be presented to ExCo in Autumn 2017.</td>
<td>ExCo</td>
<td>The review findings and WP vision for City have been received by ExCo and the actions agreed. A member of academic staff within each School has been identified as a key contact for WP outreach. This group will meet twice yearly from 2018/19, format and terms of reference to be agreed. WP Outreach vision, mission and purpose complete. Evaluation framework has been implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Summary of work to be undertaken</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Key Contact</td>
<td>Expected end date</td>
<td>Oversight</td>
<td>Current status – August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distinctive Offer Benchmarking Framework</strong></td>
<td>This project will consider what is unique or distinctive about the curriculum offered at the University. It will draw in existing initiatives looking at aspects of the curriculum including research and practice inspired teaching, employability, entrepreneurship and internationalisation. Scoping activity will take place in early 2017/18 to develop project aims and identify outputs, alongside developing a project timeline.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS and LEaD</td>
<td>Megan Butler (Senior Strategy Support Officer)</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>A toolkit will be created over Summer 2018 which will include sector research, case studies, best practice examples and video guidance. The project team are currently gathering resources for the toolkit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employability in the Curriculum</strong></td>
<td>This project to integrate employability development into the curriculum is focused on the delivery of specific employability modules and broader work with programme teams to look holistically at the curriculum and how employability development can be integrated within teaching and learning pedagogy. Scoping activity will take place in early 2017/18 to develop project aims and identify outputs, alongside developing a project timeline.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>Brendan Bacon (Head of Careers)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>A further four embedded employability programmes added in the curriculum this academic year and one in the 2018/19 academic year. Our LLB module will be changed from a core 1st year module to an elective at 2nd year from 2019/20. This project will feed into the Distinctive Offer project for which we are currently collating resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Summary of work to be undertaken</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Key Contact</td>
<td>Expected end date</td>
<td>Oversight</td>
<td>Current status – August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD for Educational Practice</td>
<td>There is currently a range of CPD for staff to improve their learning and teaching practice, and this initiative will look at how this is targeted for staff who occupy different roles and at different points in their careers. It will also consider the range of CPD on offer and how to improve engagement with staff across the University. Scoping activity will take place in early 2017/18 to develop project aims and identify outputs, alongside developing a project timeline.</td>
<td>LEaD</td>
<td>Prof. Pam Parker (Deputy Director, LEaD)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>The CPD provision for all staff is reviewed annually in line with institutional priorities but also taking account of School activity. Ethical approval is in place to explore different career progression and identify some key CPD staff have taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating and Sharing Local Initiatives (best practice)</td>
<td>During 2017/18, an evaluative framework will be used to evaluate best practice across City with reference to initiatives designed to improve progression.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>Emily Thornton (Progression and Strategy Support Manager)</td>
<td>July 2018</td>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>Pilot evaluations have been conducted on selected programmes across the institution. Resulting case studies, using a range of mixed-methods evaluation techniques, will be written up in an evaluation toolkit, scheduled to be published on City’s staff intranet in September 2018. After the successful take-up of the logic model in its pilot year, approval of future and current Access and Participation Plan funded activities will be subject to a robust evaluation strategy using the evaluation matrix as outlined in the forthcoming toolkit in order to establish a robust evidence base of the effectiveness of each funded stream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Summary of work to be undertaken</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Key Contact</td>
<td>Expected end date</td>
<td>Oversight</td>
<td>Current status – August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing Active Learning Initiative (DALI) Project</td>
<td>This is a rolling project to redesign of the technology within learning spaces at City. During 2016/17, the first year of the initiative, learning spaces will be updated with new teaching equipment. Planning will also take place for the programme of works for 2017/18.</td>
<td>LEaD</td>
<td>Prof. Pam Parker (Deputy Director, LEaD)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>The project is currently in year 3 and progress across the summer is on schedule at present. The interim year 2 evaluation has been reviewed by the project board and a new ethical approval is in place to explore the teaching in these rooms and the impact of the changes. A business case for year 4 will be going to RAMB in October 2018.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Quality Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Summary of work to be undertaken</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Key Contact</th>
<th>Expected end date</th>
<th>Oversight</th>
<th>Current status – August 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senate Placements and Work Based Learning policy and guidance</td>
<td>Development and implementation of revised Placements Policy and guidance concluding work initiated in 2015/16.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>Alison Edridge Assistant Director (Quality And Academic Development)</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>EQC</td>
<td>Completed – The revised Policy and Guidance were approved in July 2017 and implemented at the start of the 2017/18 academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Senate policy on the appointment of research supervisors</td>
<td>A revised policy on the appointment of research supervisors was implemented in 2015/16 as part of the action plan to improve completion rates. When approving the policy, Senate agreed that a review should be undertaken of how it had been implemented by Boards of Studies during 2015/16.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>Richard Alderman Assistant Register (Research Degrees)</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>Further guidance is currently being developed on the role of external supervisors and consultants. This will be presented for approval to Senate in October 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Summary of work to be undertaken</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Key Contact</td>
<td>Expected end date</td>
<td>Oversight</td>
<td>Current status – August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy on extensions for submission of assessed work</td>
<td>Arrangements for extensions to deadlines for the submission of assessed work are currently set and managed at School level. The need to establish an institutional-level policy in this area was identified as a priority by Schools through the review of the Senate Assessment Regulations undertaken in 2015/16.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>Helen Fitch Registrar (Quality)</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>EQC and Senate</td>
<td>Policy proposals have been approved by Education Quality Committee (EQC) and the revised policy will be submitted to Senate in 2018/19. Further details regarding implementation are still required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Research and Progress system for research students</td>
<td>Research and Progress (RaP) is the system used to record and monitor the progress of City’s research students. The system licence is due for renewal in 2017. A review will be undertaken to consider future requirements and on-going fitness for purpose.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>Richard Alderman Assistant Register (Research Degrees)</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
<td>Graduate School Committee and ESC</td>
<td>System licence to be renewed to September 2019 to allow review to complete/access to historic data. Work on identifying systems requirements and developing business case underway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Senate and sub-committees and reporting arrangements</td>
<td>During 2016/17 Education and Student Committee, AGC and Senate have discussed proposals for the establishment of a new sub-committee of Senate which would report directly to Senate on matters of educational quality and standards. It is anticipated that the committee will commence work during 2017/18 following formal approval through Senate.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>Helen Fitch Registrar (Quality)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>A new sub-committee of Senate, Educational Quality Committee, has been established to provide a clear line of sight for Senate for quality and standards matters. Work is being undertaken to align its activities with the work of the revised Education and Student Committee (which will report ExCo) to ensure a joined up approach to oversight of relevant business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module evaluation</td>
<td>The current module evaluation process has been in place since 2011 and has expanded to encompass all taught undergraduate and postgraduate modules. A review of the operational processes has been undertaken and Senate will receive a report on current practice and opportunities for learning.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>Helen Fitch Registrar (Quality)</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>EQC and Senate</td>
<td>Completed - Research has been undertaken with Schools and S&amp;AS relating to all aspects of module evaluation and a report was circulated to stakeholders during Term 2. The review report includes a number of recommendations for consideration by ExCo, Senate, and the relevant School.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Summary of work to be undertaken</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Key Contact</th>
<th>Expected end date</th>
<th>Oversight</th>
<th>Current status – August 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>enhancement during the Autumn term. This will ensure that module evaluation remains fit for purpose and continues to align with City’s current priorities and other internal and external developments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schools and the SU, and a new Module Evaluation Policy for approval to be implemented in 2018/19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body Accreditations and Reviews</strong></td>
<td>Education and Student Committee has approved a review of the PSRB policy during 2017/18, this will be informed by the recommendations from the Internal Audit which took place in 2017.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>Helen Fitch Assistant Registrar (Quality)</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>EQC</td>
<td>Completed - The PSRB Policy and Register have been revised to strengthen School and Senate oversight of PSRB accreditation, and respond to current internal and external reporting requirements. The frequency of reporting to Educational Quality Committee has been increased to twice a year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme Approval Policy Review</strong></td>
<td>Education and Student Committee has approved a review of the Programme Approval Policy during 2017/18. This review will develop the Programme Approval Policy to align to City’s Vision and Strategy, the Education and Student Strategy, as well as the Teaching Excellence Framework, tighter regulations from the CMA and changes in the national regulatory framework. This will be further informed by the piloted Programme Approval process piloted in Cass during 2016/17.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>Georgia Moustaka Quality and Standards Officer (QUAD)</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>EQC and Senate</td>
<td>Completed - Formal consultation has taken place with Boards of Studies, School Professional Staff and the Students’ Union. The revised policy and guidance have been approved. Support for schools will be made available to ensure effective implementation for 2018/19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Periodic Review Policy Review</strong></td>
<td>Education and Student Committee has approved a review of the Periodic Review Policy during 2017/18. This review will develop the Periodic Review Policy to align to City’s Vision and Quality Standards Officer (QUAD)</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>Georgia Moustaka Quality and Standards Officer (QUAD)</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>EQC and Senate</td>
<td>Completed - Formal consultation has taken place with Boards of Studies, School Professional Staff and the Students’ Union. The revised policy and guidance have been approved. Support for schools will be made available to ensure effective implementation for 2018/19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Summary of work to be undertaken</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Key Contact</td>
<td>Expected end date</td>
<td>Oversight</td>
<td>Current status – August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy, the Education and Student Strategy, as well as the Teaching Excellence Framework, tighter regulations from the CMA and changes in the national regulatory framework. This will be further informed by the recommendations from the Internal Audit which took place in 2017.</td>
<td>(QUAD)</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>Georgia Moustaka Quality and Standards Officer (QUAD)</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td><strong>Completed</strong> - Support for schools will be made available to ensure effective implementation for 2018/19.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Amendment Policy Review</td>
<td>Education and Student Committee has approved a review of the Programme Amendment Policy during 2017/18. This review will develop the Programme Amendment Policy to align to City’s Vision and Strategy, the Education and Student Strategy, as well as the Teaching Excellence Framework, tighter regulations from the CMA and changes in the national regulatory framework.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>Georgia Moustaka Quality and Standards Officer (QUAD)</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>EQC and Senate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Suspension/Withdrawal Policy Review</td>
<td>Education and Student Committee has approved a review of the Programme Suspension/Withdrawal Policy during 2017/18. This review will develop the Programme Suspension/Withdrawal Policy to align to City’s Vision and Strategy, the Education and Student Strategy, as well as the Teaching Excellence Framework, tighter regulations from the CMA and changes in the national regulatory framework.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS</td>
<td>Georgia Moustaka Quality and Standards Officer (QUAD)</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>EQC and Senate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment feedback turnaround</td>
<td>On-going work to ensure compliance with the turnaround times for providing students with feedback on assessed work. Non-compliance reports and action plans</td>
<td>S&amp;AS and Schools</td>
<td>Helen Fitch Assistant Registrar (Quality)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>EQC and Senate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current practice is being analysed to inform updates to policy and guidance to strengthen this process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Summary of work to be undertaken</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Key Contact</th>
<th>Expected end date</th>
<th>Oversight</th>
<th>Current status – August 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Degree Completion Rates</td>
<td>On-going work to implement the action plan developed during 2015/16 to improve research degree completion rates.</td>
<td>S&amp;AS and Schools</td>
<td>Richard Alderman Assistant Register (Research Degrees)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Graduate School Committee</td>
<td>KPI work has been completed with Schools on populating historic data and will be reported through Graduated School Committee and Senate on an annual basis. Policy revisions on annual progress monitoring to go to School Boards of Studies for consultation in Autumn 2018.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Senate Composition - Ordinance C1.3

i. The following Ex-Officio members:
   a) President (Chair)
   b) Chairs of the following Standing Committees of Senate:
      • Boards of Studies
      • Academic Governance Committee
      • Educational Quality Committee
      • Research Ethics Committee
      • Collaborative Provision Committee
   c) Vice President (Research & Enterprise)
   d) Dean of City Graduate School
   e) Director of Student and Academic Services

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

ii. Non Ex-Officio members
   Elected members of Category A staff to equal the number of ex-officio staff posts and to include at least two from each of the academic discipline Board of Studies areas (i.e. excluding the Board of Studies in Learning Development). All are elected for a period of three years, renewable. Category A staff comprise the entire electorate for this election. One additional elected member from Category B Staff (with an alternate) where the Category B staff comprise the entire electorate for that election.

   Note:
   Category A staff = Staff on full time and fractional academic staff contracts but excluding research assistants and research fellows.
   Category B staff = Staff on Visiting Hourly Paid Lecturer Contracts

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

   Note:
   The Trustee Board may delegate its power to make nominations to the Students’ Union Executive Committee.

   Other officials will attend Senate to present papers or take part in discussion when invited to do so. The Director of Library Services will always be invited to attend.
## Senate Attendance 2017/18

### Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President (Chair)</td>
<td>Professor Sir Paul Curran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy President &amp; Provost</td>
<td>Professor David Bolton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Presidents</td>
<td>Professor Richard Verrall (Deputy Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Student &amp; Academic Services</td>
<td>Ms Susannah Marsden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chairs of the Standing Committees of Senate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BoS in Arts &amp; Soc Sciences</td>
<td>Professor Chris Greer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BoS in Business Studies</td>
<td>Professor Marianne Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BoS in Mathematics, Comp Sci &amp; Eng.</td>
<td>Professor Roger Crouch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BoS in Health Sciences</td>
<td>Professor Debra Quinsee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BoS in Law</td>
<td>Professor Carl Stychin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BoS in Law (March 18-)</td>
<td>Professor Chris Ryan (Interim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BoS in Learning Development</td>
<td>Professor Susannah Quinsee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Ethics Committee</td>
<td>Professor Ron Douglas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Ethics Committee (Jan 18-)</td>
<td>Professor Peter Ayton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dean of City Graduate School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor Laurence Solkin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Elected members of academic staff to equal the number of ex-officio staff posts and include at least two from each of the Board of Studies areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Soc Sciences (to Jul 18)</td>
<td>Professor Giulia Iori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Soc Sciences (to Jul 20)</td>
<td>Professor Jean Chalaby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Soc Sciences (to Jul 19)</td>
<td>Professor Mireia Jofre-Bonet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Soc Sciences (to Jul 20)</td>
<td>Dr Rachel Cohen (Senior Elected Senator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Soc Sciences (to Jul 20)</td>
<td>Dr Xeni Dassiou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business (to Jul 18)</td>
<td>Professor Charles Baden-Fuller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business (to Jul 19)</td>
<td>Professor Anthony Neuberger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business (to Jul 20)</td>
<td>Dr Elena Novelli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences (to Jul 20)</td>
<td>Dr Dave Flinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences (to Jul 20)</td>
<td>Dr Arl Agrawal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths, Comp Sci &amp; Eng (to Jul 19)</td>
<td>Dr Arti Agrawal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths, Comp Sci &amp; Eng (to Jul 19)</td>
<td>Dr Anton Cox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths, Comp Sci &amp; Eng (to Jul 18)</td>
<td>Professor Abdulsaner Sayma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law (to Jul 18)</td>
<td>Professor Susan Blake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law (to Jul 18)</td>
<td>Mr Keith Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law (to Jul 18)</td>
<td>Mr Sarwan Singh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### One additional elected member from the Visiting Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Liam Devine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Soc Sciences (to Jul 18)</td>
<td>Ms Katerina Perelygina, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Soc Sciences (to Jul 20)</td>
<td>Ms Kristina Perelygina, President (2018 -)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Soc Sciences (to Jul 19)</td>
<td>Mr Malek Arab, VP Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Soc Sciences (to Jul 20)</td>
<td>Mr Tuna Kunt, VP President (2018 -)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Soc Sciences (to Jul 19)</td>
<td>Ms Zulfiqar Riaz, VP Activities &amp; Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Soc Sciences (to Jul 18)</td>
<td>Ms Nazia Bharde, VP Activities... (2018 -)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Soc Sciences (to Jul 20)</td>
<td>Ms Aurora Herrera, Research Student Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Soc Sciences (to Jul 18)</td>
<td>Mr Andrew Tripoli, PGT Rep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

- Please see minutes of Meeting 283 Item 3
Lay Members of Council – Senate Attendance 2017/18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date of Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms Phillippa Hird</td>
<td>11th October 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dame Lynne Brindley</td>
<td>13th December 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no Council member available to attend</td>
<td>16th May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Hunada Nouss, member of Council</td>
<td>11th July 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Governance and Senate Delegation Structure
Appendix 3: Quality and Standards Short Guide

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

High quality programmes require appropriate student support and information.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Further Information

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>8175</td>
<td>8390</td>
<td>8960</td>
<td>9239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>4625</td>
<td>4845</td>
<td>4850</td>
<td>4860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>7690</td>
<td>8045</td>
<td>8330</td>
<td>8608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other European Union</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>1615</td>
<td>1551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-European Union</td>
<td>3505</td>
<td>3650</td>
<td>3860</td>
<td>3940</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Number of Programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Class of Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:1</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:2</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>