

Periodic Review Update

Summary

This paper was received by Education and Student Committee in November 2016, and the recommendations were reviewed and approved.

Please be aware that minor amendments have been made to the Periodic Review timetable (page 8) to reflect the most up-to-date information.

This paper provides the following information on Periodic Review:

- Overview report on themes, and matters for consideration (page 2)
- Periodic Review Facilitation (forthcoming)
- Schedule for 2016-17 and reviews due in 2017-18 (page 8)
- BSc/MSc Speech and Language cluster (page 9)
- MSc Actuarial Cluster; MSc Insurance Risk and Management (page 17)
- MSc Real Estate Cluster (page 28)
- UG Sociology

Four recommendations.

Recommended Actions

Senate is asked to:

- **consider** the overview report 2015-16 and recommendations for City arising from Periodic Reviews.
- **note** the schedule of Periodic Reviews for 2016-17 and reviews due in 2017-18.
- **receive** the Periodic Review reports for the above Programmes/Departments.
- **confirm** the recommendations herein.

Publication: Open

Overview Report 2015-16

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

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

The 2015/16 Periodic Review Reports highlighted a small number of key themes, alongside some programme-specific themes, which are covered below. The report seeks to offer a flavour of the types of activities being undertaken in each area, and draw out what students, in particular, like about their programmes. It will address, too, areas of best practice and innovative or successful development initiatives.

The report covers the following Departments/Programmes:

- BSc Speech and Language Therapy; PgDip/MSc in Speech and Language Therapy; BSc Speech and Language Sciences.
- MSc Actuarial Science; MSc Actuarial Management; MSc Insurance & Risk Management.
- MSc Real Estate; MSc Real Estate Investment.
- UG Sociology Programmes

Note: UG Sociology programmes underwent Periodic Review in 2015/16. The report was pending finalisation at the time of writing.

Educational Offer/Effectiveness of Programmes.....	3
Academic Standards and Student Achievement.....	4
Student Support and Resources.....	5
Student Community, Engagement and Feedback.....	6
Alumni and Graduate Engagement.....	7

EDUCATIONAL OFFER/EFFECTIVENESS OF PROGRAMMES

PANELS HIGHLIGHTED THE FOLLOWING GOOD PRACTICE

A common theme noted by Panels was the way in which all programme and module change had been driven by the demands and requirements of the relevant professional bodies. The Programme Team for MSc Real Estate was particularly commended for its commitment not just to providing the most relevant teaching, but to ensuring that provision aligned with common structures across the Cass Masters programmes.

Also noted by Panels was the positive use of Visiting Lecturers (VLs) to enhance the learning experience of students. Whilst there were concerns about over-reliance on VLs, particularly from the perspective of quality management, the student feedback for VLs was very positive.

The Panels also commended all programmes for their ongoing commitment towards collaborative working practices, both with academic, industry and professional partners.

The Programme Team for Speech and Language Therapy (SLT) and Speech and Language Science (SLS) were particularly commended for their enthusiasm and commitment towards programme development, and their reflective and discursive practice in this process.

WHAT STUDENTS LIKE

Students in all Panels noted the optionality and variety within programmes as being a particular strength at City. Also noted were the contributions from VLs, both in terms of classroom learning and accessibility outside of the classroom, which student feedback suggested were highly valued (particularly in relation to Cass Business School).

DEVELOPMENTS SINCE LAST REVIEW

Panels noted that there had been significant changes in both the Speech and Language cluster, and the Real Estate cluster, specifically commenting on;

- Speech and Language Science (SLS) and Speech and Language Therapy (SLT) have undergone significant changes since the last review, in response to professional requirements and student feedback. The most challenging adjustment was the move to a more effective management system for placements, and this will be returned to later in this report. Also noted was the introduction of a common model for assessment feedback, the blending of topics and lectures to avoid repetition, and the introduction of clinical practice earlier in the programmes.
- MSc Real Estate and MSc Real Estate Investment had made complete or significant revisions to many of their modules, through the module amendment process, in response to strong trends in the market for graduates and changing industry needs. The Panel discussed, too the significant fee increase for these two programmes (from £18,000 to £23,000), and acknowledged that this more accurately reflected the prestige of Cass Business School and the unique environment which it offered.

PLANS FOR FUTURE

The Panels particularly noted the following:

- There was some confusion around the documentation provided by MSc Real Estate and MSc Real Estate Investment with some inconsistencies between the programme specification and the reflective review. It was agreed that a thorough review of programme and module specifications should take place to ensure consistency across all platforms, and to confirm that specifications accurately reflect classroom experience.
- The Panel discussed with the MSc Real Estate and MSc Real Estate Investment Programme Team the necessity of a change in the way the programmes are marketed following the fee increase. There was agreement that marketing needed to reflect the premium brand offered by Cass Business School.
- Whilst the Panels noted the many positive changes, it was noted that Speech and Language Science (SLS) and Speech and Language Therapy (SLT) had further development work to do in consolidating programme identity. The Panel suggested that addressing the balance between theoretical and clinical provision, encouraging module differentiation and separation, and a greater recognition of the separate learning experiences of SLS and SLT could aid this development.

ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

PANELS HIGHLIGHTED THE FOLLOWING GOOD PRACTICE

The Panel commended all Programme Teams for their evident commitment towards maintaining and improving the provision on their programmes, and for their enthusiasm for programme development. In particular, the Panel acknowledged the efforts of the Programme Team for MSc Real Estate which, despite a challenging time since the last review (due to staffing issues which are discussed later in this report), ensured that programme delivery and student experience had not been negatively impacted.

The Panel also noted the efforts of the Speech and Language Programme Team to reduce attrition, and in response to a requirement from Health Education England, through the introduction of a mandatory admission interview, involving stakeholders as well as academic staff. The Panel noted that this had improved attrition rates and that this would be monitored moving forwards.

Mindful of the influence of employer requirements, the MSc Actuarial and Insurance & Risk Management Programme Team sought to add value to their programmes via skills development modules which offer students, at no additional cost, the opportunity to improve their employability.

WHAT STUDENTS LIKE

The Panel specifically noted the possibility, on the MSc Actuarial Science, MSc Actuarial Management and MSc Insurance & Risk Management programmes, for professional body exemption. Whilst some students expressed disappointment that the actual number of exemptions achieved was lower than expected, it was agreed that the possibility for these exemptions was valued.

They also reported finding the information available through Moodle and lecture capture very useful.

DEVELOPMENTS SINCE LAST REVIEW

The Panel acknowledged the difficulties faced by the MSc Real Estate Programme Team in relation to staffing levels, following the departure and loss of staff since the last review. The Programme Team was praised by the Senior Team for its goodwill and dedication during this challenging time, and confirmed a new appointment, commencing in August 2016.

PLANS FOR FUTURE

- The Panel acknowledged the difficulty in identifying struggling students on the MSc Actuarial Science, MSc Actuarial Management and MSc Insurance & Risk Management programmes, as no formal feedback is received until March (having commenced studies in September).
- Senior staff within Cass Business School to continue to invest in the Real Estate cluster, in light of the potential and scope for development.

STUDENT SUPPORT AND RESOURCES

PANELS HIGHLIGHTED THE FOLLOWING GOOD PRACTICE

The Panel commended all Programme Teams for their responsive and caring attitude towards their students, as reported in student feedback and discussions with the Panel.

Students from each programme reported feeling fully supported in their studies. Particularly, students in the Speech and Language cluster stated that they could approach any member of the department, at any time, for support and felt comfortable doing this.

WHAT STUDENTS LIKE

- The academic support on offer to students on the Speech and Language UG cluster was supported by very positive NSS scores (in 2015 the three academic support questions gained scores of 92%, 97% and 96% respectively).
- Students from Cass Business School commented positively about the access to industry offered by the School, particularly through the careers service, which offers specialist information for each area of industry.
- Students studying for the MSc in Insurance & Risk Management were also very pleased that their programme included membership to the Insurance Institute, and reported that the location of Cass, on Bunhill Row, allowed access to free seminars and industry events, which were very beneficial.
- Students on the MSc Actuarial Science, MSc Actuarial Management programmes commented specifically on the accessibility and responsiveness of VLS, preferring email contact with VLS, and commending response times.

DEVELOPMENTS SINCE LAST REVIEW

- The Panel noted that the Speech and Language Programme Team had worked collaboratively with UCL (the only other provider of Speech and Language programmes in

central London) to develop placement provision, ensuring each institution has equal access to placement opportunities. Bi-annual meetings, attended by both institutions, facilitate discussion and review.

PLANS FOR FUTURE

- Continuing the development of placement provision for the Speech and Language cluster, City will migrate from the current placement management system (PMP) to InPlace Placement Management system in 16/17. It is anticipated that UCL will migrate in the near future, too.
- Students from Cass (MSc Actuarial cluster and MSc Real Estate Cluster) both commended the careers service in Cass, but wondered if more variety might be offered, with additional engagement with small and medium-sized firms being offered.
- Students on the MSc Real Estate cluster reported feeling overwhelmed at the start of their programme. It was noted that more might be done, by way of induction, to mitigate this.
- Despite the positive feedback from students regarding VLs, the Speech and Language Programme Team expressed concerns that VLs and clinical tutors might not be as aware of the support on offer as Personal Tutors. This will be monitored moving forwards.

STUDENT COMMUNITY, ENGAGEMENT AND FEEDBACK

PANELS HIGHLIGHTED THE FOLLOWING GOOD PRACTICE

The Panel commended all of the students involved in the Periodic Review process for their engaged, articulate and thoughtful contributions. It particularly commended the innovative practices of;

- MSc Real Estate cluster students in the development and operational management of the Real Estate Society which had, at the time of the review, raised £15,000 for students in need of assistance.
- The Speech and Language Programme Team which, to recognise the contribution of placement partners, had participated in the Placement of the Year Awards. This allows students to recognise excellence in this area.

WHAT STUDENTS LIKE

Students from each Panel praised the quality of provision, citing industry expertise, location and support as the key points. In particular, students from the MSc Actuarial cluster reported that the diversity of their student body – with nearly 24 nations represented – was something that was valued both for its interest and for the international networking opportunities it afforded.

PLANS FOR FUTURE

The Panel noted that the PG Dip students, included in the Speech and Language cluster were not as engaged with their Personal Tutors as they might be, and raised concerns that the University's Personal Tutoring Policy may not be as rigorously enforced as it might be in this area. The panel recommended that this was monitored to ensure compliance.

ALUMNI AND GRADUATE ENGAGEMENT

PANELS HIGHLIGHTED THE FOLLOWING GOOD PRACTICE

- The Panel noted that alumni from Cass Business School (MSc Actuarial cluster and MSc Real Estate cluster), were quite involved with the School following their departure. In response, and with a view to developing alumni relations, the School is considering running masterclass attended by, or possibly delivered by, alumni.
- Alumni from Real Estate spoke very positively about the Real Estate Society. In particular, they were extremely positive about the annual conference.
- Alumni from the Speech and Language cluster reported feeling very supported by the School, even after they had left.

WHAT STUDENTS LIKE

The Panel noted that all alumni involved in the Periodic Review process spoke highly of their respective Schools. Of particular note, though, was the Cass Business School, whose alumni reported that the specialist knowledge, offered by the careers service was exceptional.

DEVELOPMENTS SINCE LAST REVIEW

The Panel understood that changes to Tier 4, and particularly Tier 2 visa requirements and conditions, may impact on the ability of international graduates to obtain entry and/or employment in the UK following their studies. This is of particular relevance to Cass Business School, but may hold implications for the School of Health Sciences, too.

RECOMMENDATIONS ARISING FROM PERIODIC REVIEW FOR UNIVERSITY CONSIDERATION

Panels did not identify anything for institutional consideration, however, the Education and Student Committee may wish to consider the following:

- To keep implementation of the revised Personal Tutoring Policy under review.
- To consider whether there is a need for a policy on Visiting Lecturers, particularly on a standardised induction to support consistency in ensuring Visiting Lecturers are welcomed to City and appropriately informed.

	PR	Last Review	Key contact	Prelim Mtg Date	Dev Event Date	Chair, Programme Director/student panel member, secretary	PR Day Date	Doc deadline (-1 month)	Chair	Sec	Internal panel member (School)	Internal panel member (Other)	Student panel member	External name and email address	Fee for ex
Legal Practice Course	Last Review 11/12	Sam Kearsley/Lorraine Price	30-Nov-16	05-Jan-17	TBC	29 March 2017	TBC	TBC	Abdullah Rahman with Helen Fitch				Byron Jones (Cardiff University)		
Graduate Diploma in Law	Last Review 11/12	Sam Kearsley/Lorraine Price	09-Jan-17	27-Feb-17	TBC	17 May 2017	TBC	TBC	Abdullah Rahman with Alison Edridge				Professor Ray Cocks (Keele University)		
BSc/PgDip Nursing	Last Review 11/12	Katy Beavers	TBC	01-Nov-16	TBC	29th June 2017	TBC	TBC	Helen Fitch with Lucy Dawkins						
MSc Health Management	Last Review 11/12	Waheeda Dhansey	TBC	01-Oct-16	TBC	27th April 2017	TBC	TBC							
BSc Optometry	Last Review 11/12	Waheeda Dhansey	TBC	02-Nov-16	TBC	28th April 2017	TBC	TBC	Alison Edridge with Lucy Dawkins						
UG Radiography Grouping	Last Review 10/11 (carried over from 15/16. Waheeda to confirm if School will postpone to 16/17 as recent changes will be implemented this year)	Waheeda Dhansey	TBC	01-Oct-16	TBC	22 June 2017	11-May-17	TBC	Nerida Booth				BSc Radiography (Diagnostic Imaging), Chris Cobb (c.cobb@uos.ac.uk), Lecturer in Diagnostic Radiography, University of Suffolk BSc Radiography, Radiotherapy and Oncology, Catherine Holborn (c.holborn@shu.ac.uk), Senior Lecturer in Radiotherapy and Oncology, Sheffield Hallam University		
MA Academic Practice		Pam Parker	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	Naomi Hammond?						
Doctoral Programmes		Kate Kelsey	TBC	TBC	TBC	Spring Term	TBC	TBC	Naomi Hammond?						
MSc Shipping, Trade and Finance; MSc Energy, Trade and Finance	Last Review 11/12	Mary Flynn	TBC	21-Nov-16	TBC	Jan/Feb 2017	TBC	TBC	Helen Fitch						
Quantitative Cluster	Last Review 11/12	Mary Flynn	TBC	TBC	TBC	Jun/Jul 2017	TBC	TBC							
Maths Grouping	Last Review 10/11 (carried over from 15/16)	Cat Edera/Michele Vermuelen	TBC	01-Jun-16	TBC	08 February 2017		Chris Hull	Nerida Booth	Seb Hunt			Zain Ismail (SU Vice-President Education)		
PG Aviation Programmes (MSc Air Safety management, MSc Aircraft Maintenance Management, MSc Air Transport Management)	Last Review 07/8	Cat Edera/Michele Vermuelen	16-Nov-16	(poss) July	TBC	01 April 2017	TBC	TBC	Lucy Dawkins (with support)						
MSc Energy, Environmental Technologies and Economics, MSc Maritime Operations Management and MSc Coastal and Marine Engineering Management	Last Review 07/8 (MSc Coastal and Marine due for first review in 16/17)	Cat Edera/Michele Vermuelen	16-Nov-16	(poss) July	TBC	01 April 2017	TBC	TBC	Lucy Dawkins (with support)						
MSc Construction Management and MSc Civil Engineering Structures	Last Review 07/8	Cat Edera/Michele Vermuelen	16-Nov-16	(poss) May	TBC	01 April 2017	TBC	TBC	Lucy Dawkins (with support)						
MSc Project management Finance and Risk	Should have had first review in 14/15	Cat Edera/Michele Vermuelen	16-Nov-16	(poss) May	TBC	01 April 2017	TBC	TBC	Lucy Dawkins (with support)						



Periodic Review Report – Speech & Language

Programmes reviewed

BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy (SLT)

Post Graduate Diploma/MSc in Speech and Language Therapy

BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Sciences (SLS)

Date of review

16th June 2016

Review participants

Review Panel members:

Name	Role
Professor Peter Hungerford-Welch	Assistant Dean (Head of Professional Programmes), City Law School (Chair)
Dr Sophie Willis	Pre-Registration Programme Director, Conjoint Division of Midwifery and Radiography, School of Health Sciences (Internal Panel Member)
Professor Roy Batchelor	Cass Business School Course Director (Internal Panel Member)
Dr Judy Clegg	Course Director for the BMedSci (Speech) University of Sheffield (External Panel Member)
Neal Sumner	Senior Lecturer, Academic Educational Development (LEaD Representative)
Abi Moran	Validation & Partnerships Manager, Student and Academic Services (Lead Secretary)
Abdullah Rahman	Quality and Standards Officer, Student and Academic Services (Co-Secretary)

Meetings held during the day and attendees:

Name	Programme, Year, Mode of Study
Students	
Kate Clarke	BSc Speech and Language Science, Year 2
Tanya Son	BSc Speech and Language Therapy, Year 3
Dmitri Dolor	BSc Speech and Language Therapy, Year 3
Emanuela Akintude	PGDip Speech and Language Therapy, Year 1
Sophie Hay	PGDip Speech and Language Therapy, Year 2

Alumni	
Laura Gergees	BSc Speech and Language Therapy
Sophie Mohamed	BSc Speech and Language Therapy

Senior Team

Name	Title/Role
Prof Stanton Newman	Dean/Chair of Board of Studies
Matt Such	Chief Operating Officer (Interim)
Julie Attenborough	Associate Dean, Director of Undergraduate Studies
Maria Dingle	Associate Dean, Education (Quality and Student Experience)
Paul Turner	Division Lead, Language and Communication Science

Programme Team

Name	Title/Role
Paul Turner	Division Lead, Language and Communication Science
Dr Fiona Kyle	Programme Director, BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
Bernard Camilleri	Programme Director, PGDip/MSc Speech and Language Therapy
Dr Johan Verhoeven	Programme Director, BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Science
Lucy Myers	Lecturer for School Of Health Sciences (Language & Communication Science)
Abigail Levin	Lecturer for School Of Health Sciences (Language & Communication Science)

School co-ordinators: Waheeda Dhansey, Jessica O'George

Preparation for review

Date of development day: 1st February 2016

Reflective review and supporting evidence

Panel members were provided with the Reflective Review document and supporting evidence four weeks ahead of the review. This included the following key documentation covering the preceding three years: Programme Factsheets, List of teaching staff, Staff Survey, Recent City Alumni Survey, London SLT Managers Survey, Periodic Review Development Day Slides 2015, Map of shared teaching across programmes, Old to new curriculum mapping, Action plan - 2011 Periodic Review, Confirmation of School's Strategic Plan Programmes, Destination data BSc PGDip Speech and Language Science, QAA Subject Benchmark Statement Speech and Language Therapy 2001, HCPC Reports, Annual Programme Evaluations, Programme Handbooks, Programmes Specifications, Module Specifications, Student Survey Data, External Examiners Reports and Responses, Minutes from SLT Advisory Board Meetings, Minutes from SSLC Meetings, Minutes from LCS Programme Committee Meetings, Assessment Forum Terms of Reference, Training provided for Practice Educators, Agenda and minutes from Placement Coordinators' Network meeting, Minutes from SLT London Regional Managers Meeting.

Changes to provision

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

The Panel noted that on-going changes to provision are monitored and consulted on where re-approval or earlier periodic review may be warranted. It was confirmed that the cumulative effect

of amendments since the last periodic review did not require re-approval via the current periodic review process.

Professional statutory body involvement

The Profession of Speech and Language Therapy (SLT) is registered with the Health and Care Professions Council, (HCPC) which accredits the City University London speech and language therapy programmes. Graduates of the BSc Speech and Language Therapy and the Post Graduate Diploma in Speech and Language Therapy are able to register with the HCPC and practise as a speech and language therapist. Curriculum guidelines are laid down by the professional body; the Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists.

Conduct of the review

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

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

- Placements
- Careers advice and careers support
- Combination of clinical approach and research led teaching
- Support (e.g. IT & Library Resources)
- Personal tutoring
- Attrition rates
- Revised programmes for the future

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

Outcome of the review

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

- A reflective, enhancement focused, peer-review process drawing effectively on internal and external expertise and including constructive and challenging discussion of the academic provision
- On-going educational development of the provision and the student learning experience including continued alignment with relevant benchmark standards
- Consolidation of areas of development and action planning in line with the University's Education & Student Strategy

- Promotion of student engagement within quality and enhancement processes including the use of student feedback and contributions during the development process, receipt of the reflective review by student participants ahead of the review, and contributions on the day both via Panel membership and the student meeting

The Periodic Review Panel considered that:

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

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

1. The course tutors' responsiveness to, and support of, the students and their caring attitude towards students;

The documentation submitted and the discussions undertaken throughout the day clearly highlighted the Course Tutors' responsiveness to and support of the students and their caring attitude towards students.

Discussions with the students demonstrated that the students felt fully supported on the programmes. The students and alumni stated that they felt they could go to any member of the department for support at any time.

The feedback scores for the programmes, NSS for example, also showed the academic support on the programme was of a very high standard. In 2015 the three academic support questions gained scores of 92%, 97% and 96% respectively.

2. The commitment to working with partners, including placement partners and UCL, to enhance the student experience;

The Periodic Review submission demonstrated a number of areas where the Programme Team showed a commitment to working with partners to enhance the students' experience, these included;

Working with clinical and academic staff as well as service users to develop an interview process that met the mandatory requirements of Health Education England (more information in commendation 4)

Working with University College London (UCL), who are the only other providers of Speech and Language Therapy programmes in central London, to ensure both institutions have enough placement opportunities to facilitate the learning of all of their students. Both institutions currently employ a Joint Placement Management Partnership (PMP) system to support the sharing of placements, but this will change during the 16/17 academic year when City will move to a new system, InPlace Placement Management. It was reported that UCL were hoping to move to this system as well in the near future.

The reflective review document detailed how the bi-annual Placement Coordinators Network (PCN) Meetings help the Programme Team maintain close links with their placement providers. These meetings are held jointly with UCL and allow a platform for feedback and discussion directly with the placement providers. To recognise the contribution of the placement partners the department has, for the past four years, participated in the Placement of the Year Awards. Students on the programmes can nominate one individual and one team placement provider for recognition of excellence in placement provision.

3. The commitment to responding to issues that arise and taking action to address those issues;

The programme team are facing a number of issues with the current configuration of the programmes and the change in market conditions. There had been issues with placement matching and this is being addressed by procuring a new system. There have been issues with assessment feedback and the programme team have devised a common model which is a work in progress. There were issues around the configuration of the programmes in terms of finding a balance between the theoretical programme (SLS) and the clinical programme (SLT). These programmes are being re written to address these issues.

4. The steps taken to ensure the quality of the student intake through the use of an innovative interview process involving 4 mini-interviews involving stakeholders as well as academic staff;

The Panel noted that the attrition rates were a cause for concern and some programmes had a high number of students leaving. It was noted that attrition rate on the programme had increased when the tariff requirement for the programme had increased, but the interview selection process had been removed. The Senior team explained that these figure were monitored locally to ensure low attrition rates and were a University Key Performance Indicator (KPI). The NHS also closely monitor the list of registered students on the SLT programmes and quarterly reports are produced and submitted.

In order to lower attrition rates, and in response to the implementation of a mandatory interview requirement from Health Education England, interviews at admissions had been introduced to support appropriate selection of students. It was reported that this had improved attrition as the Programme Team were more able to select students who showed particular talent for the therapeutic requirements of the programmes as well as academic ability. The interviews are conducted by Programme staff, clinical placement tutors and service users; the Programme Team confirmed that all interviewers have been trained on equality and diversity. The programme team envisaged that this reviewed selection process will be refined in years to come.

The Department also facilitates a Speech and Language Therapy Advisory Board, which included a number of Practice Partners which meets three times a year and a Speech and Language Therapy User and Carer Group which meets annually. Both groups have supported that Department in how they can select the best students for the programme.

5. The patent enthusiasm for developing new programmes out of the existing successful provision that was demonstrated;

This was demonstrated during the meeting with the Programme Team. It was clear from the self-evaluation submission and discussions that, while the proposed changes to the programme had come about as a result of the changes to the way Speech and Language Therapy students are funded through their studies, the Programme Team were extremely enthusiastic to review the programme to find a way to make the student experience on the programme more fulfilling. This included: the introduction of clinical practice at a much earlier stage in the programme, the blending of topics and lectures to reduce the amount of repetition on the programme and to better demonstrate the link between theory and practice, linking speech development and phonetics together and better support for personal development – these proposals were in direct response to student feedback. In addition, efforts had been made to reduce the amount of repetition in the syllabus and the teaching of

research methods would be enhanced. The Panel felt that this demonstrated a very enthusiastic team doing their best to further improve the programmes.

6. The reflective approach that has been taken to course design and development, with openness to feedback and suggestions, including active engagement with LEaD;

The Panel was particularly impressed with the level of consultations and discussions that took place in preparing the documentation for the Periodic Review – see commendation 7 below.

7. The active consultation process about the course redesign proposals involving staff, students and key stakeholders: the Panel considered this a model of good practice.

The Periodic Review and proposed changes in the funding structure had prompted an intensive review of the strengths and weaknesses of the programme. The Programme Team undertook a full consultation on the changes proposed including: an online survey of staff, where they were offered several options for the reconfiguration of the programmes; the Periodic Review Development Day where full discussion of the options was undertaken; Programme Committee Meetings; meetings with clinical partners at the Speech and Language Therapy Advisory Board and focus groups and Staff Student Liaison Committee meetings.

8. The students, in their meeting with the panel, particularly commended Steve O’Driscoll for assistance with library research resources and Dr Johan Verhoeven for supporting Speech and Language Science students with careers advice.

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

1. To build on the work that is being done, particularly in the context of the planned course development, to ensure that the Speech and Language Science provision has a distinct identity, presented in a way that makes it clear that this provision is not less important than the Speech and Language Therapy provision, and to review the marketing for the Speech and Language Science provision both internally to graduates of City and also internationally;

During discussions with Speech and Language Science (SLS) students and alumni it was clear that there was some dissatisfaction with the identity of the programme as distinctly separate to the Speech and Language Therapy (SLT) programme. This was mainly due to the students sharing a large number of modules with the SLT students, but being a smaller cohort, always being in the minority. This was particularly evident in modules where there was a focus on placement learning as SLS students did not undertake placements as part of their programme. Both staff teams recognised that this had been an issue with the programme and noted that they had worked with teaching delivery staff to encourage differentiation within the syllabus, however work still needed to be done to embed this.

The Panel were surprised to hear that it was envisaged that the SLS programme would in the most part remain unchanged should the proposed restructure be implemented. However, it was noted that it was proposed to change some of the current elective modules to become core modules so there was less module sharing. The Panel encouraged this and suggested the Programme Team focus on this to ensure the programme had more of an individual identity. It was suggested that the programme may benefit from the development of a more international or research based focus which would open it up to the international and non-

clinical market. For example, it was suggested that the programme could also be marketed with a link to other programmes in other Schools such as Psychology or English.

2. To ensure that Speech and Language Science students receive clear advice on which optional modules might be less appropriate for them due to clinical content;

Students on the SLS programme commented that in some cases elective modules they had chosen had a particular clinical focus which, as professional clinical placements are not part of the SLS syllabus, they felt unprepared for. The Programme Team commented that while the elective module in question did have a clinical focus, the main focus was to introduce new clinical skills and not review skills that had been introduced during placement activities. It was also recognised that SLS students tend to take these modules as they are hoping to progress to the PGDip programme, despite the fact they would be able to access the module as part of the PGDip. The Panel therefore agreed that greater care could be taken in advising SLS students on their elective module choice to avoid this situation in future, even if some of the students on the programme are hoping to progress on to clinical learning through the PG Dip programme.

3. To ensure compliance with the University's Personal Tutoring Policy, and to guarantee that information given to students clearly articulates who students should approach for advice;

Following consultation with students, in some cases, particularly on the shorter PG Dip Programme, Personal Tutors did not seem to play an active role in the student lifecycle and there was a focus on clinical tutors providing all support. For PG students there were no mandatory meetings required with Personal Tutors but students were encouraged to meet with their tutors in the first term. However, the students stated that, due to their intensive timetable, this was not always possible. It was confirmed through meetings with the Senior School Team and Programme Team that Senior Personal Tutors were responsible for monitoring the system and ensuring that it is working at ground level. The Panel however noted that this was not always the case and the new University Personal Tutoring policy was not being actively implemented. The Panel were concerned that, while the clinical tutors, some of whom are Visiting Lecturers were actively offering support to students, they may not be as aware of all the support available to students provided through the University, in the same way as official Personal Tutors were.

4. Given that there will be a transitional period during which the present provision and the revised provision will be running in parallel, to ensure that the staff resources required for this transition are identified well in advance so that appropriate budgetary provision can be made, and to ensure that the experience of the students on the courses that are being phased out is not adversely affected by the transition to new programmes;

The Programme Team and Senior Staff Team both acknowledged that the implementation of the proposed new programmes would require a large amount of planning and scheduling to ensure the needs of all students continued to be met through the transitional period. In particular, it was noted that there may well be an increased workload for some Programme Staff and that this may need to be supported by additional Visiting Lecturers. It was also noted that the Programme Team needed to pay particular attention to the number and distribution of placements available to ensure that students on the outgoing programme did not miss out on placement opportunities. It was acknowledged that how the School planned to address and budget for these issues would need to be presented in the programme approval submissions to the University. It was also suggested that the School should liaise with Student and Academic Services to ensure the proposed timeframe for approval meets with the requirements of the University. It was noted that a mapping process will take place and a plan will be put in place to ensure that all elements are addressed and problematic issues can be addressed with additional support.

5. To keep the new process for managing placements under review, so that any problems can be identified and addressed quickly.

The students described issues around the appropriateness and the distribution of placement places. However, the Programme team explained that the similarities in placements are mainly due to the large number of child focused placements, reflecting the most common form of therapy provided. They are usually in mainstream schools with a nursery and primary school. Due to nature of the therapy there are not as many adult placements opportunities as there are child placements. Therefore there are issues in balancing this between students. It was also clear that while some students in the second year of the undergraduate programme may request an adult placement, it is more appropriate to give these to students at a later stage in the programme. The students in the lower year may feel that they are somehow missing out, however the Programme Team assured the Panel that the best efforts are made to give the students a wide range of experiences across the years of the programme. It was also noted that sometimes a placement falls through and there is little the Department can do if and when this happens and the School has to source a new placement quickly. In these cases, it can be a challenge to find a similar placement so some compromises need to be made. It was envisaged that the new InPlace Placement Management System would address a number of the issues currently faced by the teaching team and the students, but the Programme Team were encouraged to keep the new system under review to ensure it was meeting the needs of the students, the placement providers and the placement partner, UCL.

Abi Moran

Abdullah Rahman

Date of approval of report by Panel: 07/07/16

Date of deadline set for School Response: INSERT

Periodic Review report

Programmes reviewed

MSc Actuarial Science

MSc Actuarial Management

MSc Insurance & Risk Management

Date of review

Thursday 30th June 2016

Review participants

Review Panel members:

Name	Role
Stephanie Wilson	Chair: School of Mathematics, Computer Science & Engineering.
Professor Michael Tamvakis	Internal (School) Panel member: Course Director, MSc Energy, Trade and Finance Faculty of Finance (Internal Cass School Panel Member)
Professor Jean Chalaby	Internal (non-School) Panel member: School of Social Sciences (Internal University Panel Member)
Professor Pauline Barrieu	Externals: Professor in Statistics Deputy Head of Department, Department of Statistics London School of Economics (External Expert)
Henry Johnson	Chief Actuary, Lloyd's Of London (<i>Recently Retired</i>) (External Expert)
Nerida Booth	Secretary for the Review Day Student & Academic Services

Meetings held during the day and attendees:

Students/Alumni:

Name	Programme, Year, Mode of Study – Full-Time
Graduates	Shahana Sundaresan – MSc Actuarial Science
	Kesavchandran Padmanabhan Nair – MSc Insurance & Risk Management
	Christina Asfour- MSc Insurance & Risk Management
Students	Amuthabavan Amirthalingam, MSc Actuarial Management
	S Theven Subramaniam, MSc Actuarial Management
	Richie Lahoti – MSc Actuarial science
	Dominique Lagha – MSc Actuarial Science
	Jyotsna Rawat – MSc Insurance and Risk Management

Programme Team

Name	Title/Role
Dr Andreas Tsanakas	Course Director, MSc Actuarial Science

Dr Vali Asimit	Course Director, MSc Actuarial Management
Dr Cherie Chen	Course Director, MSc Insurance and Risk Management
Dr Douglas Wright	Senior Lecturer, Admissions Tutor, MSc Actuarial Management
Dr Ioannis Kyriakou	Senior Lecturer, Admissions Tutor, MSc Actuarial Science
Dr Hugh Hutcheson	Lecturer, Admissions Tutor, MSc Insurance & Risk Management
Hanna Anders Alison Sands Zoe Owen	MSc Admissions Manager MSc Academic Quality and Standards Manager MSc Course Operations Manager
Professor Pam Parker	LE&D representative

Senior Staff Team

Name	Title/Role
Professor Marianne Lewis	Dean
Professor Jo Silvester	Deputy Dean
Dr Nick Motson	Associate Dean, MSc Programme
Professor Ben Rickayzen	Head Faculty of Actuarial Science and Insurance
Dr Simon Parker	Associate Dean Academic Quality and Standards
It was noted that Dr Lorenzo Trapani, Associate Dean Teaching & Learning, was expectantly unable to attend for reasons outside his control.	

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

Preparation for review

Date of development day: 28th April 2016

Reflective review and supporting evidence

Panel members were provided with the Reflective Review document and supporting evidence five weeks ahead of the review day. This included the following key documentation covering the preceding three years: annual programme evaluations (including management and survey data), external examiner reports and responses, Programme Management Committee minutes, Staff-Student Liaison Committee minutes, programme handbooks, Advisory Board minutes. The Report from the previous Periodic Programme Review (2011) along with the School's response to that Report and action plan were also provided.

Professional/ regulatory/ statutory body involvement

The **MSc Actuarial Science** and **MSc Actuarial Management** rely on accreditation by the Institute and Faculty of Actuaries (IFoA), and both programmes have been fully accredited by the IFoA since 2006. The IFoA's requirements drive the content of the syllabus, particularly the *Core Technical Modules* (for the MSc Actuarial Science), the *Core Application subjects* and the *Specialist Technical subjects* for the MSc Actuarial Management.

Students with an average module mark of 65% or more are eligible to seek exemptions from the corresponding professional body exams. Where students fail to reach this overall average, they can

still obtain exemptions subject-by-subject on the basis of the examination mark obtained in each individual module.

The MSc Insurance and Risk Management is accredited by the Chartered Insurance Institute (CII) and the Institute of Risk Management (IRM). Students who pass the programme may claim up to 210 credits towards the Advance Diploma examinations of the CII; or, may seek exemptions from the examinations of the IRM.

Conduct of the review

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

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

- **Educational offer**

The student group that met with the Panel described the courses (they were currently registered on or were a recent graduate of) in very positive terms, and confirmed that their experience reflected their expectations as set out in the prospectus and other information they received about the programme and School prior to commencing the course. Students were clearly attracted by the potential to apply for exemptions from the relevant professional body. In the meeting the students expressed the view that the number of modules they were able to get exemptions for smaller than they had expected. (see note above regarding eligibility for exemptions). Some students expressed disappointment about this situation – and suggested some changes to the programme that could better enable students to manage the workload and potentially achieve higher marks (see Course Design and Curriculum). Some students acknowledged that they may not perceive the course to be good value were they not able to achieve any exemptions – but there was an overall agreement that the opportunity to do the Course with potential exemptions for a good number of modules was valued. Given the nature of the programme, students attributed value to the location within City of London. The curriculum was seen as relevant to their needs. The Insurance & Risk Management MSc was considered to be more risk management-orientated than many similar programmes in other institutions, and for those students who were more interested in risk management this was very attractive. The range of electives was extensive, and the industry-focus through links via alumni and staff was of interest to many students. For those students taking a break from work to study, the fact that it was possible to complete the course over one year allowed them to minimise the time away from the work environment.

During their studies the students found the course to be, on the whole, well-designed though there were some changes that they might like to see the Programme team consider (as discussed under Course Design and Student Support). The diversity of the student co-hort - with students from approximately 24 countries – presented welcome opportunities for students to network and to benefit from a wide range of experience. Students on the MSc Insurance & Risk Management value the free membership of the Insurance Institute, and the location of Bunhill Row enables students to

easily attend free seminars and other business events at lunchtime, and this was seen as very helpful to gain industrial insight.

The curriculum was very much determined by the professional body requirements set out in order for graduates of the programmes to seek exemptions. The Programme team sought to add value through skills development – modules which Cass pays for and therefore there is no cost to student. For these modules students do not receive credit – the benefit is entirely development of “soft” skills. The Programme team are mindful that employers are keen to see these types of skills demonstrated by graduates. The Programmes try to make good use of their industrial connections in order to have VLs with expertise and experience deliver content that is considered beneficial to students.

- **Competition, marketing & recruitment, and fees**

The Panel noted that the Reflective document outlined the very competitive environment these courses were exposed to. The fees comparison in the Reflective Document shows that fees for these programmes are amongst the highest in the comparison group. In the context of significant competition, along with the impacts of the recent EU referendum, and the increased cost of living in London, there is a clear risk for programmes in terms of recruitment. The Panel also noted the declining numbers of admissions for the MSc Actuarial Science.

The School acknowledges that the market presents some challenges (internationally, within the EU and in the UK). Tier 4 is the School’s biggest challenge for recruitment, and this issue affects all the other UK institutions in the comparison market. It should be noted that the application numbers for Actuarial Management are self-limiting, in that an applicant needs certain pre-requisites before they can seek entry to the programme; however, the School is also aware that there are increasing numbers of students graduating from Actuarial Science programmes (at City and elsewhere) which are a potential market for the MSc Actuarial Management

The School is confident in its brand and the value of its offer for each of the programmes. The Actuarial Management programme is quite niche, and the Insurance & Risk Management is seen as unique in its content. Compared to other institutions within the UK and outside of London, Cass is very well connected to industry and well-placed to provide an excellent student experience and networking opportunities.

The School manages recruitment for the Master programmes as a whole, for consistency and to manage the potential risks. There are no admissions targets for individual programmes. All the programmes experience fluctuating recruitment from year to year. The School management team monitor the numbers closely and review the offers made to applicants regularly – when the number of offers reaches the upper limit, the course is closed to applications. The risk is spread across the suite of Masters programmes, and where programmes need additional support that is arranged. The Programme aims to manage its recruitment to these programmes to ensure that no more than 90 students are on the programme – as this is maximum capacity for the available teaching spaces. In some cases it has been possible to split a programme into two streams to increase capacity, but the School is mindful this presents new challenges in terms of managing resources.

Managing the suite of Masters programmes with this approach has meant a recent rise in the fees for the MSc Actuarial Science in order to bring the fees for this programme into line with all other specialist Masters programmes within Cass. The School is opposed to the idea of reducing the fees

as this could be misunderstood as a lack of confidence in the programmes, and would send the wrong message to any potential applicants. The Programme team are not aware of any students raising the fees as an issue. Within the comparison market, Cass' fees could be seen to be in the middle of the market. None of the Student Group the Panel met with raised the cost of tuition fees as an issue. The Panel noted the possible fee reduction for students moving to the MSc Actuarial Management from the Actuarial Science programme.

Students reported becoming aware of the Programmes via various routes: some reported being referred to the programmes via information provided by professional bodies (eg. CII); some students reported being aware of Cass, but not these particular programmes until they looked further into what Cass offered. One student stated that Cass was not so well known in Singapore but they were aware that the Central Bank of Malaysia sends all their sponsored students to Cass. One student was aware of City and its programmes via Widening Participation activities at their 6th Form College. The School team put substantial efforts into considering what domestic and international markets to recruit from. The programme has no particular preference for students being Home, EU or overseas – however, from the point of view of converting an offer to an admission, a Home student is seen to be more assured. Having a diverse range of countries from which students are actively recruited spreads the risk associated with changes in these different locales which the School has little control (political change, currency fluctuations, trends in preference for location of overseas study) and minimise the risk to the School associated with these fluctuations in the international market.

The programme is actively seeking to recruit from students within City and in other UK institutions from both within the subject area of Actuarial Science but also in other mathematical or technical based subjects. Cass have made efforts to market to potential students in overseas institutions where Cass have connections or partnerships. The School is developing hubs in Dubai (a physical presence) and in China and Europe (virtually). The School is taking steps to make the most of international partnerships and networks via corporate partners and alumni. The Programme Team were looking to make more of the alumni – hosting masterclasses attended by, or possibly run by, alumni, and to encourage alumni to recruit potential applicants. The IRM and Actuarial Science programmes both offer Q&A sessions online to engage with potential overseas applicants from.

Other marketing and recruitment activities are being looked at – including creating a local poster campaign. Following PSR, the School has one member of staff for marketing and one for recruitment - and so, are very limited in the nature of marketing and recruitment it can do and in its capacity. Ideally, the School would prefer a less centralised marketing and recruitment service, but for now this is the arrangement. The School does find it challenging to ensure the central marketing staff properly understand the particular characteristics and the needs of each of its programmes (and staff and students). It is difficult to ensure that the strong Cass brand is communicated, when the University's marketing and recruitment is focused on the institution as a whole. The School is clear that it is selling a premium product, and believes this warrants appropriate allocation of resources and the correct approach to ensure the message about the quality of the programmes is clearly communicated in any marketing and recruitment activity. The School sees its priorities in marketing are: to elevate its brand, encourage sustainable innovation and develop global networks. The School is aware that more work needs to be done to showcase the quality of these programmes and highlight the unique offer to potential applicants. The Programme Team noted that the

University was developing its website, and this will assist marketing and recruitment. Cass' competitors may appear to be ahead in terms of marketing & recruitment – and the School were looking to ways to approach marketing and recruitment differently; but, being realistic about what could be achieved internally, the School may look to potentially outsourcing its marketing.

- **Course design and curriculum**

The Panel noted that the curriculum was driven by the requirements of the professional bodies, but was interested in whether there was any scope for the Programme team to be innovative in the way in which the core curriculum was delivered and the potential for additional content to be introduced to students' benefit. The Reflective Document indicated there had been significant changes to the Insurance industry in recent years, and the Panel were keen to hear more from the Programme team about how it intended to respond.

The Programme team acknowledged that the curriculum has not changed much for Insurance & Risk Management in the last few years – but the context and environment for this area of work has changed. The Programme team seek to reflect this via the content delivered by VLs – this is seen to be where industrial application of the content is best presented. Guest lecturers are invited to speak on specific current topics. In this way new content can be introduced without impacting on the Programme's accreditation. The MSc Actuarial Science is focused on technical skills and computation, and the MSc Actuarial Management seeks to expand a student's skill-base, especially their writing skills which were unlikely to have been developed in a technical course which students are likely to have done prior to commencing this programme. It was noted that students can pursue particular interests via the extensive range of electives available to students.

The Student Group commented that CT1-8 are only available in Terms 1 and 2 – which is often too intense for most students to take and pass these modules with a mark that would allow an application for exemption. It was suggested that the Programme team consider making changes (e.g. moving core modules to Term 3) to ease the burden on students and allow more Core modules to be passed for exemptions. Alternatively, it was suggested that the course be delivered over two years. The Programme Team noted that students may like to spread Core modules into Term 3, and this has been considered. However, Term 3 is the only real opportunity for staff to include content which develops professional development skills/research skills and other content not dictated by professional bodies. The School has decided not to push Core modules into Term 3 as the potential benefits to students of the non-Core modules are important to add value to the degree.

The Panel noted that students were interested in having more support in the lead up to examinations (tutorials, workshops, mock exams) and whether it might be possible to include more sessions like this. The Programme team were open to consideration of including more of these types of sessions, however they are restricted in how they can design sessions, due to stipulations by Timetabling that room may only be booked in three hour slots. This discourages scheduling smaller groups meeting for shorter period of time.

- **Professional development opportunities for students, employability, exemptions**

The Professional Development Module seeks to expand on the technical aspects of the course and develop careers skills or "soft" skills. This module is offered as an optional module, and delivered in the evenings by the Careers Service.

Students found the Professional Communication module very helpful – however there seemed some confusion about the requirement of assessment on this module, and that passing this module was a pre-requisite for pursuing research later in their studies. Whilst the Programme team make this clear to students via the Handbook and information provided during Induction, this was not always fully appreciated by students. The Programme team noted that students may have an unrealistic expectation that this module will be easy – it can be challenging as it represents a new range of skills that students may not have developed yet. This programme has no credit attached to it to avoid adding unduly to the credit load of the programme. The Programme team are looking to change the assessment to improve the student experience of this module. The Panel suggested it could be given a very small credit or be a pass/fail module – to encourage students to place more value on the module. Students reported that it is useful to have the timetable of what will be covered over the course of the module, so that if a student cannot attend one session they know they may be able to cover that at a later point.

The Programme team are happy with the employability rates of its graduates. There is no formal monitoring of exemptions sought or granted - though this information was available and could be collated were the Programme to decide to do so. The Programme team noted that students tend to place more weight on the importance of exemptions than employers do – employers are keen to see a student's broader set of (including soft) skills. The Programme team does not recommend that students attempt to seek all exemptions, as it is a lot of work but if a student is able to, this could be beneficial.

It has already been noted that Tier 2 changes mean a more difficult experience for overseas students who wish to gain post-study employment in the UK. The focus of those students whilst on course has appeared to have shifted – and it has been noted that these students are also less inclined to see exemptions from UK professional bodies. The School is looking at reviewing the careers service with a view to better cater to international students.

- **Student support**

The Panel noted that the data in the Reflective Document indicated that some students are struggling – high levels of resits, the high number of student who are awarded a pass (as opposed to a Merit or above) - and that the Reflective document states that students can often feel overwhelmed when first starting course. The Panel were keen to know how students experienced the programme, and what mechanisms the Programme and School had in place to support struggling students.

The Students who met with the Panel reported that they could understand that some students could initially feel overwhelmed by the course – especially on the Actuarial Management course as this is a very different from the kind of technical undergraduate course a student is likely to have done. Students reported they felt well-supported. Lecturers were very accessible, and prompt and helpful when responding to student queries. Students are well-aware that VEs are not best placed to offer office hours, and are very happy to engage with teaching staff via email. One member of the Programme Team has offered students meetings via Skype and this was reported by students to be very helpful. Students were aware of Personal tutors but, generally, did not make use of this support. Where students reported that they had contact with their Personal Tutor, they found them helpful.

As students did not tend to make use of office hours, and seemed to prefer to contact staff via email, the Programme team do not operate office hours.

Students are mindful that the material delivered in the course is very dense so found resources made available via Moodle to be helpful - especially for recapping information delivered in lectures. Some students relied on this material and made little use of the library. Lecture capture and Echo360 were considered really helpful – and students would like more modules to use lecture capture. The Bloomberg terminal was found useful. The student group interviewed by the Panel reported that the CT5 module was considered by students as being very supportive– and it was suggested that it would be helpful to roll this out to other modules. The various support modules – SmartWisdom, VBA – were found to be useful for those students who used them. Those students in the Student Group who were aware of other students who had utilised the English language course reported it to be considered useful – though it was noted the Saturday morning delivery was not popular and this likely had a negative impact on attendance.

Students were happy with the feedback mechanism – through programme director or course reps – and saw their feedback being appreciated.

Career support service was considered useful in developing job seeking skills, and other professional development opportunities. The Tier 2 changes presented difficulties for those students affected, but students were aware that this is outside the School's control.

The Programme team agreed that identifying struggling students was a challenge. It was noted that following commencing their programme in September students do not receive formal feedback (that is, the results from assessments) until March. The Programme team have undertaken some analysis and this showed no correlation between a student's academic attainment before they enter the programme and their performance on the course. The Programme team observed that this would indicate it is often personal issues which impact on a student's performance. The School provides students with support via Personal Tutors, but students do not always utilise this support. It was also noted the University Extenuating Circumstances policy is available to students who feel that personal circumstances have adversely affected their performance, and students are actively referred to this at various times throughout the year.

The Panel noted that overseas students were at risk where English language skills were an issue – the School noted that it is the standard in the HE sector to not seek English language qualifications where a student has completed their undergraduate studies in the UK. As many students are coming from a technical undergraduate course, they may have not had a chance to develop their language skills. Where a student is considered to need additional English language support, they are referred to the English language course.

- **Visiting Lecturers and managing staff changes**

The Panel noted that the programmes appear to rely on Visiting Lecturers (VLs) to deliver a good portion of teaching. It was acknowledged that this ties in well with the importance the programmes place on having high level practitioners sharing their industrial experience with students. However, this does present a risk in terms of assuring teaching quality and student accessibility to staff who have a very limited relationship with the School and Faculty.

The School confirmed that it currently has no formal policy for managing VLs, however this is an area that is currently under consideration within the School, and it may look to develop a more formal

approach for oversight and development of VLs in the coming year. VLs can come to the Programme's attention via industry connections, or they may approach the Faculty directly themselves. In any event, the Head of Faculty will meet with the proposed VL, and will invite them to present a sample-lecture to a number of staff. Following this, feedback is given and a decision is made about whether the individual would be suitable to teach on the programme. The Head of Faculty takes responsibility for mentoring the VL – and, they along with other teaching staff, use peer observation and shadowing to support and develop a VL's skills and monitor the quality of their teaching. The University's Policy on teaching observations was not clear on how this applied to VLs. The Programme team would arrange to observe teaching delivered by VLs were any issues to be raised. VLs are invited to attend an induction at the beginning of the year, familiarised with Moodle and other programme-related requirements (Assessment and Feedback Policy, and marking turn-around times). VLs are also invited to attend departmental meetings and other staff events, however, given these people are often fully employed it is rare that many VLs attend these sessions. The teaching delivered by VLs forms part of the accreditation process, and the Programme team is very motivated to ensure this is of the highest standard. It should be noted that student feedback rates are consistently very high, and this demonstrates students are very satisfied with the teaching delivered by VLs.

The portion of teaching delivered by VLs varies across the programme. The Actuarial Science programme uses VLs for the technical subjects mainly. The Actuarial Management usually uses VLs for the specialist areas (like pensions). The Insurance and Risk Management relies on the highest volume of VL teaching - this is perhaps more than the Programme team would ideally like, but there are very few academics teaching in the area so much of the teaching must be delivered by VLs. It should be noted that the risks associated with VLs is mitigated by the fact that many are teaching on the programmes for at least three years.

On-going support for VLs was informal mainly via contact with the Course Director – VLs will require varying amounts of support at different times of their experience and the time of year

The Panel were concerned that there may be a risk of the Programme at times struggling to cover teaching with so many VLs – however, the Programme team were confident that this is not an issue as through connections in the Alumni network and the Advisory Board, the Programme has managed to cover any teaching commitments.

The Programme team are not aware of any problems being raised by students in relation to accessibility of VLs or communications. The Student Group reported that VLs were usually very prompt at replying to email enquiries, which seemed the most popular means by which to contact VLs, and this worked well.

In terms of management of staffing levels, it was noted that the age profile of teaching staff was a potential issue for the Insurance & Risk Management programme in a few years. The School noted this risk: the IRM was the most at risk due to its reliance on VLs and the very few academic staff who specialised in the area. However, the School was confident that recent actions to recruit staff will address this risk.

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

Outcome of the review

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

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

The Periodic Review Panel considered that:

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

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

- Reflective Document was well-written, informative and the supportive documentation was thorough;
- Students who met with the Panel were articulate, enthusiastic and impressed the Panel with their engagement in the Review process;
- Commitment and motivation of teaching staff and their responsiveness to students
- High student satisfaction with the quality of provision which is demonstrated via module evaluation and the student feedback on the day of the Review;
- Connectivity to the profession – evidenced by the quality of teaching provided by Visiting Lecturers;
- Professional Development Module and the Careers Service which the students clearly find useful and see as adding value to their degree

The Panel **endorsed** all the Development Actions set out in the Reflective Document with additional recommendations in relation to the following:

- Development 1 – the Panel recommend the Programme team consider extending this to all Core Modules
- Development 3 – the Panel recommend the School create a clear strategic marketing plan for all programmes, and work to strengthen the local marketing team; and in particular consider a more internationalised approach to marketing. The Panel further recommend that the School & Programme team seek to make use of the alumni;

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

- The School develop a Strategic Plan for the three programmes, including marketing and recruitment, admissions, curriculum development, covering the next five years;
- The School works towards setting admissions targets by a more transparent approach;
- The Programme team identify ways to make more use of alumni – in terms of promotion of programmes, recruitment and careers development for students;
- The Faculty reconsider the issue of office hours – not necessarily to put an office hours policy in place, but to be clearer about how students may access staff in person;
- The School consider development of a formal Visiting Lecturer Policy to provide consistency in the support provided for VLs and provide oversight of the VL's contribution to the programmes. Additionally, the School or Programme Team should consider introducing a more formal induction for VLs (e.g. a yearly event for all VLs);
- The Programme team consider potential mechanisms by which struggling students can be identified as early as possible in the academic year – this might be done via the Professional Communication Module;
- The Programme team consider introducing tutorials for all modules that do not currently have tutorials in place to support examination preparation.

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

Nerida Booth

Date of approval of report by Panel: 29th July 2016

Date of deadline set for School Response: 26th October 2016 (next Board of Studies)

Periodic Review report

Programmes reviewed

MSc Real Estate

MSc Real Estate Investment

Date of review

19th February 2016

Review participants

Review Panel members:

Professor Nigel Duncan	Professor of Legal Education (City Law School) Chair
Umar Chaudhery	Vice President Student Union (Education)
Dr Vali Asimit	Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Actuarial Science and Insurance Internal (Cass School Panel Member)
Connie St Louis	Connie St Louis, Senior Lecturer in Journalism (SASS) (Internal Panel Member)
Kirsty Summers	University Standards Advisor, UK Higher Education Policy Manager, RICS
Professor Colin Jones	School of the Built Environment Heriot-Watt University
Laura Tull	Academic Development Officer, Student and Academic Services (Lead Secretary)

Meetings held during the day and attendees:

Students/Alumni

Myles Grover	Graduate
Jack Sullivan	Graduate
Katie Wykes	MSc Real Estate 2015-16
Rishil Khurmi	MSc Real Estate 2015-16
Nathanael Yishak	MSc Real Estate Investment 2015-16
Jennifer Heinrich	MSc Real Estate Investment 2015-16
Maria Ankelmann	MSc Real Estate Investment 2015-16

Programme Team

Mark Andrew	Course Director, MSc Real Estate
Stephen Lee	Course Director, MSc Real Estate Investment
Tony Key	Head of Real Estate
Sotiris Tsolacos	Visiting Lecturer
Alex Moss	Visiting Lecturer
Sarah Sayce	Visiting Lecturer
Patrick Bond	Visiting Lecturer
Charles Follows	Visiting Lecturer

Chloe Crayden	Course officer
Hanna Anders	MSc Admissions Manager
Alison Sands	MSc Academic Quality and Standards Manager
Patrick Baughan	LEaD Liaison

Senior Staff

Professor Marianne Lewis	Dean
Professor Andrew Clare	Associate Dean, MSc Programme
Professor Paulo Volpin	Head Faculty of Finance
Dr Lorenzo Trapani	Associate Dean Teaching & Learning
Dr Simon Parker	Associate Dean Academic Quality and Standards

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

Preparation for review

Date of development day: 19th November 2015

Reflective review and supporting evidence

Panel members were provided with the Reflective Review document and the supporting evidence approximately six weeks ahead of the review. This included the following key documentation covering the preceding three years: annual programme evaluations (including management and survey data), external examiner reports and responses, Staff-Student Liaison Committee minutes, programme handbooks, module evaluations and MSc exit survey data.

Changes to provision

A number of amendments to the MSc Real Estate and MSc Real Estate Investment programmes had been made as a result of the previous Periodic Review in 2010/11. Under the new course structures, the revised MSc Real Estate had been positioned to be a general real estate programme suitable for both UK and overseas entrants to the industry. The revised MSc Real Estate Investment had been positioned towards the real estate financial instruments end of the sector. The documentation noted that there had been substantial or complete revisions to the content of various modules since 2011, notably in Real Estate Investment & Financial Analysis, Advanced Quantitative Methods, Real Estate Modelling and Market Dynamics, Real Estate Debt Markets, Real Estate Capital Markets (MREI) and in Property Valuation (MRE). Changes to modules had been made through the programme amendment process and were in response to strong trends in the underlying market for real estate graduates, the positioning of each degree against changing industry needs and the requirement to align the provision with the structures common across Cass Masters programmes.

Only one significant change had taken place in the last year, which was a change in the timing of the delivery of two core modules in the MSc Real Estate Degree. The team's primary goal had been to consolidate the new course structures through monitoring of student intake numbers, attainment and destinations, and feedback.

Professional/ regulatory/ statutory body involvement

Both programmes continued to be accredited by the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors. It was noted within the programme specification that the RICS no longer offers its own exams and entry is

gained via an accredited programme, followed by an assessment of professional competency (APC), after two years structured practical experience. Student participation in the RICS is encouraged through an introduction to the Institution on the first day of the induction period, and by encouraging them to enrol as student members of the Institution.

Conduct of the review

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

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

- The allocation of staff resources, in particular the number of permanent teaching staff and the use of visiting lecturers on both programmes.
- Staff and student engagement with Cass careers service and industry links.
- The implications of increasing the fees for the two programmes and the potential development of marketing strategies as a result of this.
- The purpose and function of the student led Real Estate Society.

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

Outcome of the review

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

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

The Periodic Review Panel considered that:

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

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

- The innovative nature of the Real Estate Society, particularly the student led conference.

The Panel was interested to explore the purpose and function of the Real Estate Society. One of the students interviewed played a key role in the running of the society, and outlined its aim to unify students with a common interest and passion in real estate. It was noted that the annual conference was a key event for the society, where high profile guest speakers were invited to speak on a theme related to the industry. Students reported that £15,000 had been raised in the previous year through ticket sales, with the proceeds going to students in need of assistance. In addition to this, the society also runs workshops which students can sign up to. The Alumni interviewed were extremely positive about the event.

- The academic and administrative teams for their commitment to both programmes and their response to the challenging period since the last review.

It was acknowledged that current staff had faced a challenging period since the last review took place. The senior team praised both academic and administrative teams for ensuring that neither the delivery of the programmes or student experience had been impacted in a negative way. The programme team agreed that it was felt that the programmes had not suffered as a result of staff's dedication to the provision. It was noted that visiting lecturers had reported that they had received excellent administrative support.

This was reinforced through the student panel meeting, where students that were interviewed spoke positively about the teaching on both programmes, and the support offered by the programme team.

The Panel made the following **Conditions** for areas where enhancements could be made to the programmes:

- To conduct a thorough review of programme and module specifications to ensure that they accurately reflect the programmes as they are currently taught and that language is student facing. Ensure that this is reflected on the website and moodle.

There was some confusion around the documentation that had been provided to the Panel, with some inconsistencies between the programme specification and information within the reflective review document. It was agreed that a thorough review of programme and module specifications should be conducted to ensure that they accurately reflect what is currently being taught by the programme team. The Panel agreed that this should be extended to ensure that all student facing platforms provide consistent and accurate information.

- For the School to appoint a new senior member of academic staff.

It was evident from the Reflective Review document that the real estate faculty had been under-resourced in relation to permanent members of teaching staff since the previous review, with teaching voids on core modules being filled by increased workloads for current full-time staff members. It was noted in the documentation that no faculty replacements had been made following two staff departures in 2010 and 2013 and the loss of Mr George Herd in 2014.

The senior team confirmed that an appointment had been made which was due to commence in August 2016, with a second appointment pending. The senior team was keen to move forward with these positive developments with the view of strengthening the teaching team. The Panel agreed that a new senior member of academic staff should be appointed as planned.

The Panel made the following **Recommendations** for areas where enhancements could be made to the programmes:

- For senior staff within the School to continue investing in the programme in light of the excellent potential and scope to develop the real estate provision.

It was acknowledged by the senior team that there had been an under investment from the School in the area of real estate. It was agreed that the two programmes were extremely solid but steps needed to be taken by the School to ensure that the provision reaches its full potential. The senior team praised the programme team for the additional work load that they had taken on due to the under resourcing of permanent teaching staff, and recognised that the programme and students had not been disadvantaged because of this good will and dedication. This was evident in the student panel meeting where those interviewed reported a positive student experience on both programmes.

- To review the commonality of the two programmes and consider incorporating a joint international real estate investment module.

- The Panel discussed the content of the programmes, and noted that there was only one common module between the two. The programme team emphasised that the programmes are distinct in their aims and outcomes and this would continue to be the case. The Panel queried whether the expertise/programme content was in place if there are plans to target international students through specific marketing activity. The programme team responded that students currently have the option to take a module in international markets. It was agreed that it would be useful for the programme team to review the commonality of the two programmes and consider incorporating a core joint international real estate investment module.

- To clarify to students the level of quantitative knowledge required and consider providing an online resource prior to induction. In light of the different requirements of the programmes, consider providing separate induction schedules.

Students that met with the Panel reported that some students had felt overwhelmed by the level of quantitative skills required. It was acknowledged that whilst the teaching was effective, more could be done to address this during induction. As the requirements for the two programmes are different, it was acknowledged that separate induction schedules may be more appropriate. It was also discussed that the standard of mathematics required could be made clearer as stating that students must have a background in maths was quite vague. For example, some students reported that they had not taken the subject since GCSE. It was agreed that a summer course or pre course material could be sent to students in advance in order to provide further preparation for this element.

- To increase and develop more effective marketing in light of the increase in fees.

The Panel discussed the significant increase in fees for the two programmes from £18,000 in 2015/16 to £23,000 in 2016/17 which would set City's fees significantly higher than competitors. The senior team noted that this would be comparable with other postgraduate programmes in Cass Business School but acknowledged that it will not be evident if this will have an impact on student's numbers until next year.

The programme team noted that discounts/bursaries have historically made it easier for students, and expressed concern that if they were removed then more marketing effort would be required. It was reported that Phase 1 was already underway, where an enhancement of the web content had been undertaken. Phase 2 would include videos and hopefully more targeted promotion of the programmes abroad.

Students that were interviewed responded that the higher fees may have had an impact on some student's choice to apply to study real estate at Cass, as compared to other institutions the increased fees would be significantly higher. However students also acknowledged the prestige of Cass Business School and the unique environment that it offers.

The Panel agreed that the School should consider increasing and developing effective marketing strategies in light of the increase in fees.

- To develop careers support to engage more with small and medium sized organizations as well as larger corporate organizations.

The senior team noted that the small careers team at Cass caters for around 1400 students, which includes subject specific events including real estate.

The alumni that were interviewed reported that although students needed to be proactive in finding out what services were offered, the Cass careers service had been extremely

helpful as each Masters programme had a specialist contact who was up to date with opportunities within the relevant industry. Current students also reported that the careers service had good relationships with industry, which aided students to get exposure to larger graduate scheme firms. Students that were interviewed felt that there could be more variety in the type of organisations that Cass careers service engaged with, for example financial firms or emerging markets to cater to a variety of students.

Students raised the issue that the University's January exam period coincided with when students were required to complete job applications and attend assessment centres. The programme team acknowledged that this was a problem for students on the programmes, but the exam period unfortunately could not be changed to accommodate the timing of the assessment centres.

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

Name of Secretary:

Laura Tull, Academic Development Officer

Date of approval of report by Panel: 18th March 2016