



Senate

Paper Title	Annual Assurance Report to Council
Outcome requested	Senate is asked to note the annual report on academic assurance, prepared for Council.
Points for Senate members to note and further information	<p>Council is required to give full assurance to the Office for Students on the mechanisms that are in place to improve the student academic experience and student outcomes, and to ensure that academic standards are appropriately set and maintained.</p> <p>The report provides details of each of the processes that combine to provide assurance on the maintenance of academic standards and the continuous improvement of the student experience.</p>
Questions for Senate to consider	n/a
Regulatory/statutory reference points	<p>The Office for Students Regulatory Framework Higher Education and Research Act 2017 UK Quality Code for Higher Education (Quality Assurance Agency) The Higher Education Code of Governance (CUC)</p>
Strategy and risk	Strategic Aim 3: to provide all our students, wherever based, an education that is judged internationally to be of the highest quality, and which exploits innovations in teaching, learning and assessment.
Reporting/consideration route for the paper	Approved by Council on 29 November 2019
Authors	Academic Registry and Council Secretariat
Sponsor	Professor Colin Bailey, President and Principal

1

Annual Assurance Report 2017-18

This report provides background reading for the annual assurance report to Council for 2017-18. It details the arrangements and policies in place at Queen Mary for the continuous improvement of the student academic experience and student outcomes, together with mechanisms for managing academic standards.

1. Periodic reviews of schools and institutes

1.1 Each school and institute at Queen Mary undergoes a periodic review every six years to assess the currency of its provision in light of developments in the discipline and to evaluate local mechanisms for improving the student experience on a continuing basis. The review also evaluates the effectiveness of academic governance structures and tests whether institutional policies and procedures are operating as intended to assure and enhance the standards of the provision.

1.2 Each review is conducted by a panel comprising:

- the Vice-Principal (Education);
- the QMSU Vice-President (Education);
- the Vice-Principal (Research), or a nominee from the Doctoral College;
- a member of staff from another Faculty;
- a member of staff from the Academic Development team;
- the Dean (or Deputy Dean) for Education;
- two external reviewers with expertise in the discipline and the management of academic quality and standards;
- representatives from the Academic Registry and Council Secretariat.

1.3 The panel engages in a series of meetings with students and members of staff, and also considers a detailed Self-Evaluation Document and supporting documentation requested from the school or institute under review. Panels normally meet before the day of the review to agree lines of enquiry and to consider the desk-based review of provision by the specialist external reviewers.

1.4 A detailed report of each periodic review is prepared by the Academic Registry and Council Secretariat, highlighting issues to be addressed and examples of good practice to be shared. In future, recommendations will be classified on the basis of their importance. The school or institute is required to prepare and implement an action plan in the light of the report, which is monitored by the Education Quality and Standards Board after three months, and again after twelve months. In order to facilitate sharing of good practice across schools and institutes, it has been agreed that from 2018-19 reports and action plans will also be considered in future at the faculty level.

1.5 Periodic reviews were conducted during 2017–18 in the following schools and institutes. A summary of the issues identified is provided as an appendix to this report .

Barts Cancer Institute – 6 December 2017

William Harvey Research Institute – 29 March 2018

Wolfson Institute for Preventative Medicine – 10 May 2018

Institute of Dentistry – 14 June 2018

1.6 A revised form of partnership review for major partnerships was introduced in 2016-17. The purpose of partnership review is to undertake a 'health-check' to inform the partnership renewal process and informs the next periodic review of the sponsoring school or institute. The review of the partnership between Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications and the School of Electronic Engineering and Computer Science took place in April 2017. The review of the partnership with Nanchang University, offered in collaboration with the School of Biological and Chemical Sciences and the School of Medicine and Dentistry, took place in October 2018.

2. Programme approval

2.1 Institutional processes for programme approval are designed to comply with the expectations and indicators of best practice contained in the UK Quality Code for Higher Education. They include a significant role for an External Adviser to provide independent and objective feedback on new programme proposals and benchmarking of academic standards. External Advisers are usually senior members of academic staff who combine discipline expertise with experience of programme development elsewhere in the higher education sector. They are provided with formal guidance on their role, and there must be evidence that they have discharged their role adequately, and that the school or institute has responded appropriately to their comments, before a new programme gains approval. A review of the guidance for External Advisers, together with their submissions, was undertaken during 2017-18; revised documentation has been provided for 2018-19 and beyond with a view to optimising the commentary received on proposed new programmes of study.

2.2 Programme approval processes are overseen by the Taught Programmes Board (TPB), which has an overview of the academic standards of programmes and modules across Queen Mary. TPB has a specific remit for the detailed consideration of new programmes of study and associated modules, as well as programmes and modules that are delivered collaboratively, or through distance learning, or that involve work-based learning. Responsibility for minor amendments to existing programmes and modules is instead delegated to Learning and Teaching Committees in schools and institutes, which must be constituted in accordance with the Academic Governance Framework. TPB reports to each meeting of the Senate on its work, as well as the activities of the Learning and Teaching Committees. 70 new programmes were approved in 2017–18. The Board has also been involved in the approval of modules which were offered through the Queen Mary Summer School programme. Membership of the Board includes senior members of academic staff, students and Professional Services staff (including academic development, e-learning and quality assurance specialist), all of whom receive an induction on their role.

3. Annual Programme Review

3.1 The Annual Programme Review (APR) process is designed to provide an annual review of taught provision, focusing on any issues requiring immediate attention and distilling areas of best practice. The structure of the APR process utilises the ongoing monitoring that takes place in schools and institutes and combines this with data and other relevant information. The APR process was revised for 2017-18 as follows:

- The review process is risk-based and will focus on programmes where issues have been identified over the course of the academic year.
- There is no longer a formal requirement for an APR meeting but the Deans for Education will request a response on any particular issues or themes.
- The process enables the identification of good and innovative practice which is shared with the Academic Development team.
- Schools and institutes are expected to share their APR documents with their Teaching and Learning Committees and Student-Staff Liaison Committees, capturing feedback from these forums.
- Schools and institutes can make greater use of the information captured over the year on their Student Experience Action Plan (SEAP) or their Taught Programmes Action Plan (TPAP).

- The process includes a revised APR dataset which gives a more comprehensive overview of the student lifecycle.
- Issues identified by the APR process will be included in the school/institute Student Experience Action Plan to ensure that these are addressed over the forthcoming year. The faculty will have an overview of any areas of concern and will add these to its own monitoring plans.

3.2 Programme teams will continue to undertake the review of each programme, or cognate group of programmes, and these reviews continue to form the basis of the APR process.

3.3 The teaching and learning provision within Academic Development is also part of the annual programme review process, as is the experience of associate students. Provision offered with an external partner is part of the school/institute's annual review process but partnerships will also be reviewed with input from the Global Development Office with a view to the identification of any emerging trends or issues for consideration in relation to collaborative partnerships.

3.4 Some themes that schools and institutes were asked to consider in their review processes for 2017-18 were as follows:

- Consideration of the programme portfolio with a view to identifying programmes which were no longer attractive to a viable number of students.
- The number of students who were not eligible to progress from Year 1 to Year 2 of a programme. High rates of ineligibility to progress whilst not directly linked to the non-continuation rate used for TEF might prove to be an indicator of the direction of travel for this metric.
- Issues constraining growth in student numbers whether due to resources or physical space.

4. Module Evaluation

4.1 The evaluation of student satisfaction at the level of the module is an important feedback mechanism for all taught programmes at QMUL. The collation of this feedback and consideration of the quantitative and qualitative data received is considered as part of each school and institute's programme monitoring processes, alongside other sources of information such as student data, other surveys and academic input. Module evaluation is undertaken as one strand of QMUL's commitment to supporting a range of opportunities for students to engage in educational enhancement and quality assurance processes.

4.2 The module evaluation questionnaire comprises a set of core statements that are included on all questionnaires to allow comparability between modules. These statements are based on a five point Likert scale with responses ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. There are different statement sets for taught and dissertation modules in order to reflect the nature of the module. Schools and institutes are able to add their own statements to the core statements in order to seek feedback on specific issues related to the discipline.

4.3 Module evaluation data is collated and analysed within ARCS with summary reports sent to schools and institutes for consideration. ARCS produces a series of comparison reports for schools and institutes for benchmarking purposes, together with data for the Student Experience, Teaching and Learning and Assessment stocktake, Student-Staff Liaison Committees and Annual Programme Review (APR). Module evaluation reports are also published to assist students with selecting modules for the following year.

4.4 The majority of schools and institutes continue to use paper-based questionnaires as these have tended to provide a better response rate. However, it is now felt appropriate to give more consideration to moving to the use of online evaluations only. This will make capturing the data more efficient and will allow for a quicker return of results to staff and students. This proposal is being taken forward in 2018-19 as one of the work streams of the Going for Gold strategy; part of the work

stream will involve a careful consideration of strategies to increase online response rates (58% response rate for paper-based questionnaires, 36% for the online version in 2017-18).

5 External examining

5.1 Each taught programme, or cognate group of modules in some disciplines, has an external examiner. The purpose of the external examiner system is as follows:

- to ensure that Queen Mary's degrees are comparable in standard to those awarded by other UK universities;
- to ensure fairness and consistency in assessment procedures and student classification;
- to scrutinise the effectiveness and appropriateness of the assessment system;
- to assure the wider community of the standard of Queen Mary's degrees and the fairness of its assessment procedures

5.2 Queen Mary's external examiners are appointed in accordance with nationally agreed appointment criteria, as is required by Chapter B7 of the Quality Assurance Agency's *UK Quality Code for Higher Education*. The formal responsibility of each external examiner is to the President and Principal; while the external examiners' reports are processed by the Academic Registry and Council Secretariat (ARCS), an external examiner may make a confidential report to the President and Principal at any time.

5.3 In addition to external examiners at subject and module level, Queen Mary also has an external member of its undergraduate and postgraduate Degree Examination Boards (DEBs). External examiners attend Queen Mary's Subject Examination Boards (SEBs) and the use of external members for DEBs mirrors this approach, with the external members being drawn from among professional services staff with relevant experience (usually an academic registrar or equivalent) from another university. The external member comments on the conduct of the Degree Examination Boards, the academic regulations, assessment governance and any related issues for further consideration.

5.4 Schools and Institutes are required to respond to each report from each external examiner where any issues of concern are raised, and to lodge a copy of their response with ARCS. A summary of issues raised by external examiners is considered by the Education Quality and Standards Board which monitors emerging themes.

5.5 In 2016-17, the majority of examiners (91% UG & 91% PG) confirmed that the curriculum design of Queen Mary programmes were *Good* the remainder being *Satisfactory*. No programmes were reported as having *Poor* curriculum design. No institutional concerns were raised by external examiners or the external member in 2016-17; reports are still being collated for 2017-18. Areas highlighted as 'best practice' have been commended and shared within Faculties. Particular issues raised by externals so far in 2017-18 have included:

- Broad confidence that assessment policies and procedures were appropriate and had been followed properly, with citations of cases, noting instances where academic staff had gone above and beyond threshold standards.
- Prompt communication and assistance from the Professional Services staff involved with Subject Examinations Boards.
- Discussion of the actions taken to mitigate the industrial action, commending Queen Mary for taking decisions in the interest of the students without compromising academic standards.
- Marking trails, resolution of differences between markers, and overall module statistics were commended and criticised in equal measure. There was evidence of some excellent practice but this was not always consistently applied across schools and institutes.
- A minority of external examiners raised concerns over the award of marks at the upper end, though with not suggestion of grade inflation. External examiners recommended a review of the assessment schemes on 'older' modules to ensure that these remain sufficiently discriminatory.

- Some externals commented on a rise in extenuating circumstances claims, especially where these resulted in numerous late summer resit examinations.
- A very small number of externals commented upon classification schemes – notably whether or not the first year marks should count towards classification at UG level, and whether particular regard should be paid to the dissertation mark in classification at postgraduate taught level.
- The vast majority of comments were positive, and confirmed that external examiners had confidence in Queen Mary’s academic standards.
- The report of the External Member was positive and expressed confidence in Queen Mary’s academic standards. Three areas of concern were raised: the need for clarity of approach in mark scaling; a need for better reporting tools and data sets for examination boards; and (following the approval of a revised late work submission policy) a need to undertake analysis of which student groups submitted work late, and why. The Education Quality and Standards Board has agreed to address these points in detail at its meeting in October 2018.

6 Summary of data for the Academic Assurance Report

6.1 The following data tables have been produced using PowerBI dashboards managed by the Strategic Planning Office. The data presented is intended to give an indication of Queen Mary’s current position in key areas related to the Teaching Excellence Framework such as student satisfaction with teaching and graduate employability. The data suggests Queen Mary’s trajectory in preparation for submission for TEF5 in 2019-20 and highlights areas where developments are required to improve outcomes and student experience.

1. National Student Survey (NSS) responses for TEF categories;
2. Non-eligibility to progress from Year 1 to Year 2 (or Year 0 to Year 1 for Foundation Degree programmes); and
3. Destination of Leavers from Higher Education (DLHE) highly skilled employment or higher study measure.

Further explanatory notes on the data including the relationship to TEF are provided at the end of the appendix.

Authors: Katherine Bevan, Alice de Havillan, Simon Hayter, Jane Pallant, Emma Rabin, Strategic Planning Office
November 2018

Appendix 1: Data for the Academic Assurance Report
Appendix 2: Periodic Review outcomes

TEF Metrics Analysis

Overview

The data presented in this appendix come from a suite of dashboards that have been developed to enable colleagues to see trend and contextual information relating to National Student Survey (NSS) and Destination of Leavers of Higher Education (DLHE) survey results and the internal QM eligibility to progress measure.

The information presented gives an indication of the trajectory of the core TEF metrics but please note that in some cases the populations are different from those in TEF e.g. the progression stats include international as well as home students. In the case of the progression figures the measure is not the same as the TEF one (eligibility to progress at QM V actual continuation in HE). The notes at the end explain the difference.

Please note that where the TEF presents the measures using the HECOS subject coding (CAH2) this data, where possible, present the results using the QM organisational structure (programmes or schools). This enables colleagues to see how the performance in their area contributes to the overall subject results.

TEF3 Core Metrics

1. NSS Measures

The table on the following page shows NSS scores per question section for 2017 and 2018. Teaching, Assessment and Feedback and Academic Support are core metrics for TEF 3. Learning Resources and Student Voice will be added to the core metrics for TEF5.

The Office for Students produces a benchmark for QM for each question used in the NSS. The OFS benchmarks shown below are an average of each benchmark score as OFS does not supply aggregated scores for each section.

CAH2 Subject Area	Teaching			Assessment and feedback			Academic support			Learning resources			Student Voice		
	2017	2018	2017 vs 2018	2017	2018	2017 vs 2018	2017	2018	2017 vs 2018	2017	2018	2017 vs 2018	2017	2018	2017 vs 2018
Biosciences	73.1	81.8	8.7	52.6	53.7	1.1	61.8	65.6	3.78	83.0	80.7	-2.32	62.6	68.3	5.69
Business & management	72.6	69.1	-3.5	60.8	61.7	1.0	68.4	68.2	-0.27	84.3	83.3	-0.94	61.9	59.6	-2.29
Chemistry	78.2	79.0	0.8	60.8	64.3	3.4	73.9	70.2	-3.7	73.0	78.7	5.7	70.3	66.3	-4.02
Communications & media	96.5	84.0	-12.6	79.2	64.2	-15.0	85.2	77.4	-7.83	81.5	85.5	4.05	76.2	56.0	-20.19
Computing	75.5	71.9	-3.5	50.0	54.3	4.3	68.5	65.6	-2.92	81.6	82.5	0.87	60.0	60.2	0.2
Creative arts and design	85.9	94.6	8.7	74.1	71.0	-3.2	81.6	84.2	2.62	78.2	78.2	-0.01	63.0	57.9	-5.07
Economics	81.5	73.8	-7.6	75.2	63.4	-11.8	82.5	78.1	-4.4	86.2	84.0	-2.28	72.5	60.7	-11.8
Engineering	72.3	72.0	-0.3	51.4	48.8	-2.6	71.7	70.3	-1.36	75.4	71.4	-4.05	62.3	56.7	-5.65
English studies	90.4	88.2	-2.1	77.1	65.7	-11.4	83.9	73.5	-10.39	82.3	73.3	-8.92	64.8	60.6	-4.24
Geographical & environmental studies	88.7	83.8	-4.9	76.6	75.3	-1.3	81.5	74.2	-7.27	80.7	85.0	4.28	69.1	68.0	-1.07
History	91.0	92.4	1.4	72.5	71.6	-1.0	76.4	81.1	4.72	72.0	78.4	6.39	63.3	67.5	4.19
Languages, linguistics & classics	89.7	86.9	-2.8	81.9	79.0	-2.9	81.6	84.8	3.26	77.7	79.9	2.16	70.6	70.4	-0.18
Law	84.9	86.9	2.0	71.4	64.8	-6.6	70.7	67.2	-3.51	80.4	80.2	-0.22	62.6	56.5	-6.08
Mathematical sciences	76.5	72.3	-4.2	72.1	68.8	-3.3	74.7	75.2	0.53	78.1	77.0	-1.12	69.1	63.8	-5.28
Medicine and dentistry	91.1	89.2	-1.9	72.8	72.2	-0.7	82.4	82.1	-0.34	91.7	89.9	-1.76	83.2	80.2	-3.05
Pharmacology, toxicology & pharmacy	-	79.2	-	-	51.4	-	-	64.8	-	-	75.9	-	-	66.7	-
Physics & astronomy	83.3	77.6	-5.7	79.4	71.1	-8.4	83.7	74.6	-9.1	80.7	70.4	-10.33	70.9	62.9	-7.98
Politics	82.1	82.2	0.1	66.1	66.6	0.5	78.8	73.8	-5.06	73.2	72.4	-0.76	61.7	60.5	-1.15
Psychology	85.4	64.4	-21.1	74.0	45.8	-28.1	73.6	50.6	-22.99	83.3	75.3	-8.02	69.8	55.8	-13.97
Sociology, social policy & anthropology	-	60.4	-	-	14.6	-	-	36.1	-	-	69.4	-	-	31.3	-

Subjects allied to medicine not otherwise specified	-	86.4	-	-	73.9	-	-	87.9	-	-	95.5	-	-	79.6	-
Technology	82.1	76.1	-6.0	63.6	33.7	-29.9	80.3	68.1	-12.13	87.7	72.5	-15.19	75.9	57.6	-18.32
QMUL	82.13	80.19	-1.9	67.12	63.54	-3.6	75.58	72.83	-2.8	81.62	79.88	-1.7	67.88	64.34	-3.5
Office for Students Benchmark	84.5	83	-0.44	70.5	69.75	-2.83	78.67	77.33	-1.42	86.33	85.67	-1.07	69.5	68.75	-2.79

2. Continuation Measure

The following tables shows the internal progression measure. This shows the % of students who are not eligible to progress after their first year of study. It does not relate directly to the continuation measure because that includes students who did not progress at QM but did continue their studies at other institutions. It also includes some repeating students who continue at QM but are not progressing on the course as anticipated. The internal progression measure also includes overseas and EU students whereas the TEF continuation measure only includes UK domicile students.

Year 1					
Faculty	School	Not Progressed %			2015/16- 2017/18 Change
		2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	
HSS	BUSM	7%	10%	12%	
	ECON	6%	10%	5%	
	ENDR	11%	11%	16%	
	GEOG	5%	9%	12%	
	HIST	9%	10%	6%	
	LAWS	7%	11%	7%	
	SLLF	15%	17%	18%	
	SPIR	13%	13%	15%	
HSS Total		10%	11%	12%	
S&E	COMP	19%	18%	18%	
	ELEC	25%	21%	21%	
	MATH	17%	23%	13%	
	PHYS	19%	13%	21%	
	SBCS	6%	6%	4%	
	SEMS	14%	19%	14%	
S&E Total		13%	15%	12%	
SMD	DENT	14%	6%	19%	
	ICMS	8%	5%	6%	
	SMED	5%	9%	9%	
	WHRI	5%	5%	7%	
SMD Total		7%	8%	10%	
Grand Total		11%	12%	12%	

Foundation Year					
Faculty	School	Not Progressed %			2015/16- 2017/18 Change
		2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	
S&E	COMP	29%	20%	67%	
	ELEC	14%	45%	33%	
	MATH	26%	14%	24%	
	PHYS	16%	29%	40%	
	SBCS	17%	24%	24%	
	SEMS	25%	27%	9%	
S&E Total		22%	25%	20%	
Grand Total		22%	24%	20%	

Employment Measures

Whilst the highly skilled employment or higher study measure will continue to be used for TEF5, the employment or further study measure will not.

School	Highly Skilled Employment or Graduate Study			2014/15- 2016/17 Change
	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	
Geography	60%	60%	76%	
History	70%	65%	66%	
Law	86%	78%	81%	
SPIR	91%	69%	77%	
SMB	60%	66%	75%	
SED	70%	56%	65%	
SEF	79%	72%	79%	
EECS	80%	81%	75%	
Math	68%	59%	72%	
SBCS	73%	70%	71%	
SEMS	71%	70%	76%	
SPA	73%	7%	80%	
Blizard	-	71%	100%	
Dentistry	100%	96%	99%	
SMD	100%	99%	100%	
WHRI	100%	92%	-	
QMUL	78%	71%	77%	

Explanatory Notes

NSS	
What the data shows	<p>The results for each of the TEF core metric question groupings are presented (Teaching, Assessment and Feedback and Academic Support) along with the Student Voice and Learning Resources responses. The Student Voice and Learning Resources questions were not core metrics for TEF3 but will be for TEF5.</p> <p>The subject areas show the Queen Mary subject (CAH2) results for 2017 and 2018, where the publication threshold was met. These areas do not necessarily map directly to schools/institutes and areas may be split between schools.</p>
Data Source	NSS results for 2017 and 2018. Publicly available subject (CAH2) results
Student Population	The population includes all final year students from 2017 and 2018 who completed the NSS survey.
How the results relate to TEF	<p>The population is consistent with the populations used in the TEF core metrics.</p> <p>The Subject CAH2 results are used in the TEF. TEF3 used the 2015, 2016 and 2017 results. TEF4 will use 2016, 2017 and 2018 results.</p>
Where to find the Dashboard	https://app.powerbi.com/groups/me/apps

Eligibility to Progress	
What the data shows	The tables show the % of the cohort of new entrants who were not eligible to progress at the end of their first year at QM. For students on integrated foundation programmes this means year 0 and for other students it means year 1.
Data Source	The progression codes are taken from SITS following the conclusion of the late exam boards.
Student Population	<p>The population includes all new undergraduate entrants (Home, EU and International Fee status).</p> <p>All students who were enrolled in a given academic year are included.</p>

Eligibility to Progress	
How the results relate to TEF	<p>The TEF continuation measure shows the proportion of students who continued their studies in the UK HE sector the year after they entered. The continuation measure can only be calculated once two complete HESA returns have been submitted. The continuation rate of the 2015/16 intake cohort was not published until March 2018.</p> <p>The QM not eligible to progress measure shows the proportion of new entrants who were not eligible to progress to the next stage of their studies at QM (either because they ceased to study at QM or because they had to repeat or retake a year).</p> <p>So the two measures are not directly comparable. However the not-eligible to progress rate is the best early indicator of the trajectory of the TEF continuation.</p>

Employment	
What the data shows	The data shows the TEF employability measure of those in highly skilled employment or further study by school.
Data Source	DLHE survey results for the cohorts finishing in 2014/15 to 2016/17
Student Population	The data show home, undergraduate students (which is similar to the TEF population).
How the results relate to TEF	<p>The employment and highly skilled employment measures replicate the way that the TEF measure is constructed.</p> <p>The TEF3 results contain the DLHE results for the 2013/14, 2014/15 and 2015/16 cohorts. For TEF4 the 2013/14 results will be dropped and the 2016/17 results will be added in.</p>
Where to find the Dashboard	https://app.powerbi.com/groups/me/apps

SCHOOL OF PHYSICS AND ASTRONOMY (Review Date: DECEMBER 2016)			
Recommendation	Planned action(s)	3 month update (EQB FEBRUARY 2017)	12 Month Update (EQSB: DECEMBER 2017)
1	That the existing peer review exercises be extended to include all those offering teaching, including PhD students, to provide valuable professional development and quality assurance mechanisms	Peer review for PhD student demonstrators to be introduced beginning October 2017	Action initiated - Teaching committee Chair actioned to set up PhD peer review including creation of a PhD specific peer review document (alongside a new initiative in PhD marker training)
2	That the School leadership team review the workload allocation model to ensure it provided an effective system for ensuring staff were expected to undertake a fair workload without being overly prescriptive or detailed.	The allocation will be more course grained and there will be a revision of all time allocations for different roles in the next academic year.	Action in operation - Teaching allocation for next year is under review and an initial revision of the WAM is underway.
3	To review formal mechanisms for progression and submission to ensure consistency in processes for second and third year PhD students, and provided strategies for increasing the submission within four years.	To adopt the best practice across the school in terms of monitoring PhD progression and completion.	Action in operation - Best practice has been adopted by all research groups in terms of monitoring PhD progression. There are now strict progression hurdles in place in all groups. There have been changes in personnel responsible for PhD progression and monitoring in at risk groups. The new personnel provide good data on all PhD students thus making assessment transparent both for individual students and research groups.
4	To consider additional networking opportunities for PhD students including greater focus on networking with the University of London institutions, and looking to institutions outside those of the South East Physics Network.	We will be proactive in seeking opportunities for our PhD students to mix in the University of London network.	Action initiated - London Triangle meetings for PhD students (which are currently built around seminars) will be extended so as to allow great networking opportunities for PhD students. This is for CRST. The TYC and the PPRC also has cross London seminar activity that PhD students can use and which supports networking.
5	That PhD students' workloads were reviewed and monitored by the School to ensure that students undertake appropriate quantities of teaching and marking.	Achieve consistency and appropriate level for PhD student marking and teaching.	Action in operation - A detailed review of marking and demonstrating the role of PhD students in these activities was undertaken. There is now a school wide rule on the amount of PhD marking and there has been detailed instructions to module organisers to provide a proscribed amount of material for assessment per week. This has been monitored closely and module organisers have been explicitly informed where changes are needed.
		Action in operation - A new initiative to be introduced in 2017 is for 1st year core modules to have a single integrated course work so as to allow a close monitoring of consistency in amount and difficulty across all modules.	No further update
6	To review and analyse the alignment with national rankings to develop a strategy to improve student satisfaction and thereby NSS results and sector ranking, especially in regards to ensuring full understanding of different metrics used for aspects of rankings including student-spend.	Analyse and understand metrics for tables. Aim to increase NSS results.	Action initiated - A key understanding of "spend per student" metric has allowed us to better allocate resources.
		Action initiated - Creation of a "living document" on actions to improve student experience, this has had a focus on student feedback but encompasses the whole of teaching with a goal to rise in NSS ranking. There is a general drive within the School to make assessment more regular and structured for the year 2017-2018.	Action in operation - A key understanding of "spend per student" metric has allowed us to better allocate resources.
		Action in operation - Creation of a "living document" on actions to improve student experience, this has had a focus on student feedback but encompasses the whole of teaching with a goal to rise in NSS ranking. There is a general drive within the School to make assessment more regular and structured for the year 2017-2018.	Action in operation - Creation of a "living document" on actions to improve student experience, this has had a focus on student feedback but encompasses the whole of teaching with a goal to rise in NSS ranking. There is a general drive within the School to make assessment more regular and structured for the year 2017-2018.
7	To engage more with QMUL regulations including the Fitness to Study regulations and procedures.	School to engage with QMUL regs on Fitness to study	Action in operation - Student support officer to receive training in the area.
8	To explore additional avenues within industry for sources of matched research funding for studentships.	Seek new industrial contacts	Action still to be addressed - Use Sepnet contacts to initiate new relationships with industrial partners. More focussed approach to industry led by group heads.
			Action initiated - Use Sepnet contacts to initiate new relationships with industrial partners. More focussed approach to industry led by group heads especially in CCMMP. Dr Adrian Bevan (PPRC) is directly leading a new industrial relations initiative based on data science. This is on two main fronts: the development of a degree apprentice scheme with industrial partners in this area and PhD DTC partnerships. Further work is planned to develop more industrial contacts in the DS area including CRST who have developed contacts in deep learning.
9	To ensure that mathematical provision within the curriculum was reviewed so that where students without A Level Maths were recruited to the programme they were provided with the appropriate support to fully engage with the programme and that there is sufficient core mathematics at higher levels. Furthermore, consideration should be given to the current admissions criteria with respect to Maths qualifications.	We believe the core content of the curriculum is appropriate but we do acknowledge that there are severe difficulties with provision. It is our goal to improve the execution of foundation year modules.	Action in operation - We will contribute an extra module alongside the current three modules that SPA provide which will allow the reduction in class size. We will also look changing the faculty that deliver these modules as we are now prioritising foundation year teaching.
10	To review elements of the curriculum to ensure that modules synchronised across the programmes and that homework, tutorials and lectures aligned appropriately within the curriculum.	Review curriculum as a whole	Action in operation - Substantial revision of 1st year so as to include QMUL model. Meet IoP accreditation. Astro modules reconfigured to avoid repetition and allow 4th year extension. Maths provision reviewed for years 3 and 4.
11	To review the student expectations in regards to weekly turn-around times for feedback on homework tasks, and consider utilising fourth year undergraduate students for some marking.	Improve consistency of homeworks tasks and turn around times. This is viewed as a key issue for the school.	Action in operation - New 1st year integrated homeworks to be introduced 2017. Current homework marking and feedback have been monitored closely to improve quality of feedback and turn around time.
12	That all notes provided by staff on QMPlus be legible, and preferably typed.	We accept that notes should be legible.	Action initiated - We remain alert to all QMplus pages and check that they are suitable.
			Action in operation - We remain alert to all QMplus pages and check that they are suitable.
13	That the Faculty continued to develop Key Performance Indicators to provide a basis for engaging Schools with relevant data and ensure monitoring of provision across the Faculty.	N/A	Action in operation - The Faculty has developed and is continuing to further develop KPIs related to the student experience and education. A Faculty-level appointment has been made to support this, who will start in May 2017.
14	The Panel recommended to QMUL that procedures surrounding staff increments, bonuses and promotions be communicated clearly to ensure that metrics are clear and the process is transparent.	N/A	Action in operation - Guidance on the Staff Bonus Scheme and the Academic Promotion Scheme are provided on the HR Website and our HR Partners are happy to take any queries. Most increments happen automatically therefore there is no policy but if there is a query about the process a HR partner should be contacted. This year we provided Academic Promotion workshops to prepare staff for the process. However, we will take into consideration the comments of the panel and we will think about other ways to make sure our processes are communicated including a review of their positioning on the HR website page when it is reviewed.
15	The Panel recommended to QMUL that the announcement of studentship allocations be provided earlier to ensure that Schools are able to utilise external matched funding sources to supplement QMUL funding.	N/A	Action in operation - The Dean and Deputy Dean for Research are reviewing the S&E PGR studentship allocation process and will take the comments made in the SPA review into account as part of the review.

SCHOOL OF ELECTRONIC ENGINEERING AND COMPUTER SCIENCE (Review Date: MARCH 2017)				
Recommendation	Planned action(s)	3 month update (EQSB: November 2017)	12 Month Update (EQSB: March 2018)	
1	To foster a stronger sense of community amongst staff and students whilst also exploring mechanisms for building collegiality amongst staff.	<p>For students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Voice system to better capture their views and respond to any problems more rapidly. • Tech-based social events such as hackathons to be run <p>For staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organise more social gatherings <p>For both:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explore better use of all types of social media to improve communications. This includes use of email newsletters, Twitter, Facebook and keeping the news and seminar series updated on the EECS website. 	<p>Action initiated - Student Voice implemented September 2017.</p> <p>Action initiated - Game Jam to be run in January 2018. Future events to be planned.</p> <p>Action initiated - Free tea and filter coffee in the hub to be organised for all staff at regular times on a first-come first-serve basis. To be trialled as an experiment in November and December 2017.</p>	<p>Action in operation - Student voice has been relatively successful and a new launch campaign will happen in the new academic year.</p> <p>Action in operation - Game Jam went well in Jan 2018.</p> <p>Action in operation - Coffee experiment was at least partially successful and is now a permanent fixture, with thoughts of extending the hours.</p> <p>Action in operation - The web site is still a cause for concern: it is slow to update and not very flexible.</p> <p>Action in operation - EECS staff are being encouraged to produce videos and web demos of their work (and some had already done excellent work on this)</p> <p>Action initiated - We are trialling using Slack channels for communication within one of our research groups; limited success so far.</p>
2	That the Senior Management Team should take a proactive approach to leadership in order to shape the future direction of the School, including: a) the development of a clear vision and focus for the School in an inclusive manner; b) formally capture how the School's research enriches teaching at both the module and programme level, including reference to research-informed teaching in promotional materials, module proposals, programme specifications and module and programme outlines; c) the development of a time-bound action plan to resolve any outstanding issues with the merger of the Electronic Engineering and Computer Science schools; d) in-line with the University's approach, the development of an international strategy as there is a heavy dependency on EU and international students and staff; e) the development of a proactive student recruitment strategy which includes visits to key markets and makes use of the undergraduate programmes as conversion springboards for postgraduate-taught programmes; f) the development of a clear and more gender diverse recruitment strategy, as part of the School's Athena SWAN action plan; g) the development of a clearer understanding of School Key Performance Indicators (KPIs); h) the development of a clearer understanding of competitors, key markets and benchmarking; i) the development of a strategy to address low NSS scores to improve the student experience.	Development of a clear narrative to be discussed and updated at SMT and School Meetings with regular progress updates.	<p>Action initiated - Outline presented at September Away Day with some updates at October School Meeting. First written draft in preparation for circulation to SMT in November.</p>	<p>Action initiated - This is still a work in progress but the single most important point has been clearly communicated: that we need to significantly improve the percentage of our students who obtain good degrees.</p>
3	Formally capture how the School's research enriches teaching at both the module and programme level, including reference to research-informed teaching in promotional materials, module proposals, programme specifications and module and programme outlines	Audit of each module to provide examples of where research informs or enriches teaching – where appropriate	<p>Action initiated - To provide one example of where research informs or enriches teaching – where appropriate – and provide this information in the module descriptor. Use all the data provided in the communications listed.</p>	<p>Action initiated - work on this is ongoing.</p>
4	Develop a time-bound action plan to resolve any outstanding issues with the merger of the Computer Science and Electronic Engineering departments	Change the name on each department building to be Electronic Engineering and Computer Science	<p>Action initiated - To be completed by April 2018.</p>	<p>Action in operation - Estates report that the building convention for QMUL will now allow this naming change.</p>
		When making future placements of staff and research groups, be more flexible as to where they are placed.	<p>Action initiated - Still ongoing. See also regular coffee plan above.</p>	<p>Action in operation</p>
5	In-line with the University's approach, develop an international strategy as there is a heavy dependency on EU and international students and staff	Conduct review on international recruitment, joint ventures, and partnerships. Identify priorities and develop an integrated school international strategy.	<p>Action still to be addressed - EECS has a very good intake on international students. 2017 figures are at 112% of target for UG International and 153% of target for PGT International.</p> <p>Review on Joint Ventures shows that EECS has established 13 partners: 8 in China, 3 in India, 1 in Iraq and 1 in Thailand; 2 new partnerships with AdMU and KU Leuven are under developing. Additionally some initial meetings regarding collaborations with KTH Sweden. TNE student population has grown to nearly 2700. Details of which can be found in Appendix 1</p> <p>EECS priorities on international were identified and aligned with the college International Recruitment, Partnerships and Global Opportunities teams. EECS has been and will continue to be involved in college international visits to promote QM and EECS.</p> <p>An integrated school international strategy is to be produced.</p>	<p>Action initiated - Currently waiting for a meeting with VP International to inform the EECS International Strategy</p>
6	Develop a proactive student recruitment strategy which includes visits to key markets and makes use of the undergraduate programmes as conversion springboards for postgraduate-taught programmes	The school will continue to visit the overseas markets for PG students, wherever possible linking with visits arranged by either International partnerships or International student recruitment.	<p>Action initiated - A meeting was held with the central teams on Sept 21st to review overseas opportunities and possible visits.</p>	<p>Action in operation - PG recruitment is very strong, with applications up by 44% from last year, and now accounting for over half of taught PG applications to S&E</p>

		The number of home PG students is increasing. We are participated in an S&E MSc taster week in 2016/17 aimed at current students.	Action initiated - Planning for the MSc taster week is started though the arrangements are not yet confirmed.	
7	Develop a clear and more gender diverse recruitment strategy, as part of the School's Athena SWAN action plan	Continue with Athena Swan Action Plan	Action initiated - This recommendation is not completely clear to us. In particular it is not clear whether the panel is concerned with recruitment of students or staff or both (the recommendation comes at the end of a section that deals with both). As far as students are concerned, gender balance is covered under the current Athena Swan Action Plan (1.all and 2.1). As for staff this is under 3.1-3.4 albeit not in the context of a "recruitment plan", which we have never had for staff. Additionally some work on this is part of the bid for the Institute of Coding.	Action initiated - The School continues to implement the Athena Swan Action Plan.
8	Development a clearer understanding of School Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)	A new narrative is being written to address the KPIs and to indicate progress on them to staff on a regular basis.	Action initiated - Draft to be written by HoS and refined by SMT November 2017.	Action initiated - Still needs more work a bit more work but the main points are there (such as percentage of good degrees)
9	Develop a clearer understanding of competitors, key markets and benchmarking	In the area of UG teaching, competitors are other London colleges. We are actively reviewing whether the entry requirements should be raised to be the same as KCL.	Action initiated - Incremental changes to UG entry requirements have been made for 2018 entry.	Action in operation - At PG, our market is mainly overseas (86% of applications, up by 49%), then home (12% of applications, up by 31%). EU is only 2% and decreasing. The overseas PG market is very diverse. The policy challenge is to increase quality. The programme changes – fewer, clearer – at UG have not affected applications (up by 14% overall). By applications: home students are 58% (+7%), EU 15% (+31%) and overseas 27% (+23%).
		For both UG and PG, we are focussing recruitment around a smaller number of high quality taught programmes. We will analyse the changing pattern of PG recruitment	Action initiated - The number of UG programmes for 2018 entry has been reduced.	
10	Develop a strategy to address low NSS scores to improve the student experience	Addressed in the EECS Student Experience Action Plan (SEAP)	Action initiated - Addressed in the EECS Student Experience Action Plan (SEAP)	Action initiated - Addressed in the EECS Student Experience Action Plan (SEAP)
11	The usefulness of the staff appraisal should be examined with teaching and module evaluations reviewed and discussed as part of the appraisal process	Provide mechanism so that module report forms can be accessed by appraisers as standard during appraisal – contact HR for guidance on this	Action still to be addressed - Appraisal system is centrally administered but includes a mechanisms for adding notes to appraisals. These notes can incorporate file uploads, but it is not clear whether upload can be automated, or must be done manually for or by each individual.	Action initiated - Module report forms being made form-based on OMPlus, but otherwise no further progress. Policy for peer observation developed but not rolled out due to issues of adding extra work during strike period.
		Introduce peer observation of teaching and provide mechanism so that report forms can be accessed by appraisers as standard during appraisal.	Action still to be addressed - Module report forms are kept centrally and can be made accessible to appraisers. There is no significant confidentiality issue over this. Peer observation forms could be subject to similar process, but with more confidentiality issues.	
12	The School should end the delivery of a large number of important functions by temporary associate lecturers. This should be resolved within the School's short and long-term planning processes	Audit current temporary associate lecturer contracts and current temporary lecturer contracts, and assess roles being carried out by such staff and the reasons for the use of such contracts rather than regular permanent contracts. HoS to take forward any changes in policy needed through planning process. Director of Taught Programmes to keep under review the quality of delivery by temporary lecturing staff.	Action initiated - The School does not recognise the current situation as being one where "a large number of important functions" are delivered by temporary associate lecturers. Audit carried out. During this academic year we have nine (9) staff employed as Temporary Associate Lecturers Grade 5. Of these, one is employed to lead our contribution to the Science and Engineering Foundation Programme on the grounds that their skillset includes effective teaching of students at that stage of development. Another is employed to coordinate student projects. This is a vital function, but the lecturer in question is a retiree, a former senior lecturer in the School, who previously served as Academic Dean of the Faculty. In terms of skills and reliability there is no compromise in using him rather than a member of full-time permanent faculty. A third is employed to assist with laboratory work and is working directly to their module lead, who is a permanent full-time member of faculty. The remainder are employed to cover temporary lack of staff for reasons such as maternity leave. We currently employ five (5) lecturers on temporary contracts. Four cover teaching buyouts arising as the result of fellowships, or commitments on large grants for members of permanent teaching staff. One is on secondment as a lecturer from a permanent position as a (highly skilled, post-doctoral) technician. We do not view any changes in our use as necessary. We intend to continue to monitor the use of such contracts and be prepared to report on the quality of work we are receiving as a result.	Action initiated - A further audit will take place as part of the workload allocation cycle.
13	Encourage all staff with teaching responsibilities to engage fully with the Teaching Recognition Project and to apply for fellowships through the Higher Education Academy	Continue engagement with project on current lines.	Action initiated - Engagement is ongoing. We are currently carrying out an audit of progress and will arrange a by invitation writing session for staff close to submission during this semester.	Action initiated - Audit carried out and target staff contacted. The School continues to engage with this project. Established staff are progressing slowly through the ADEPT Direct scheme.

		Run one targeted by invitation writing session for EECS staff per semester.	The School is an active participant in this project. The current situation is: New staff are registered on either the PGCAP or increasingly the ADEPT-100 experiential frameworks. Existing staff are encouraged to seek FHEA status by the ADEPT-direct application route. The School Away Day 2015 included a presentation and a writing exercise for existing staff. This has been followed by a sequence of writing workshops both open and targeted. Staff are invited to attend the writing workshops organised by Educational Development, and informed of submission deadlines through internal mail. Our ADEPT-100 support team is led by John Schormans and this year has been expanded to include him, Karen Shoop (for Mile End staff) and Vindya Wijeratne (JP staff) as School Academic Development Mentors (SADM's). Staff applying through the ADEPT-Direct route are supported by Edmund Robinson and John Schormans, who give feedback on draft proposals and assistance in their development. A triage list is kept of staff who need to follow the ADEPT-Direct route, and individual staff are targeted for completion. We do not pursue staff likely to retire in the near future or staff who are not currently teaching by reason of buyout.	
14	Peer observation of all elements of the learning experience (teaching in lectures, labs and on the VLE) is undertaken on a regular basis and that mechanisms for the wide dissemination of best practice in teaching and learning are explored and delivered	Develop process for peer observation. Develop distribution mechanism so that relevant parties can access documents. Run first round of observations this academic year to feed into current round of module review/appraisals.	Action initiated - A draft process is under consultation Action initiated - A first round of observation should take place this year in time for the current round of module review and appraisal.	Action initiated - owing to strike action this did not take place. Planned introduction is for next year.
15	Continue to review of the reasons for the relatively low number of students undertaking industrial experience and encourages the continued support to increase the number	Continue with IE structure and plans	Action initiated - The School believes that the number of IE students is significant given we are one of the only schools in QMUL to offer this pathway on all our UG and PGT degrees. The PGT with IE is one of a few number in the country and is therefore trailblazing. The School will continue to work to improve numbers.	Action initiated - We continue to see growth in this area we consider the School to be a trailblazer in. However, we are working continually on growth.
16	Evaluate response mechanisms to student feedback, including: the development of a detailed action plan in response to NSS results with actions to address feedback directly at appropriate levels	Addressed in the EECS Student Experience Action Plan (SEAP)	Action initiated - Addressed in the EECS Student Experience Action Plan (SEAP)	Action initiated - Addressed in the EECS Student Experience Action Plan (SEAP)
17	Make the provision of examination results surgeries in line with QMUL's policy on this informal stage of the appeals process	EECS will provide exam surgeries. Review underway of the best way to implement this	Action initiated - There will be a two weeks period after publication of exam marks in June for exam surgery meetings. The meetings will be between examiner and students, usually, one-to-one meetings. There will be two types of surgeries: 1. Discussion of the exam paper and its marking scheme (expected answers). 2. Discussion of the marked paper (for selected students; procedure to be decided). The introduction of exam surgeries has resource implications. 1. Effort to organise the surgeries: teaching support. 2. Effort for the surgery meetings: examiners. 3. Training examiners for exam paper surgeries; plan to be devised. 4. Effort for marking such that papers are ready for surgery: examiners. For 2018, EECS estimates 8,000 exam papers, and at 2 minutes extra time for marking each paper such that it is ready for surgery, there are 250 to 300 hours to be added to exam marking. The DAQ and DoTP will be meeting with the DoTP of SBSCS to discuss sharing of best practice in this area.	Action initiated - Following consultation with SBSCS (who can be seen as running surgeries as best practice). These will be implemented in September 2018 for returning students. The process for this is in development.
18	The School, within its strategic planning discussions, should identify the optimal mix and number of modules that can support its ambitions in breadth and quality. The School should reflect on student workload for each module to ensure students are not being over-assessed and to enable the provision of timely feedback	Review of both UG and PGT offering is currently under review, with submissions for change to be submitted February 2018.	Action initiated - Addressed in the EECS Student Experience Action Plan (SEAP)	Action initiated - Addressed in the EECS Student Experience Action Plan (SEAP)
19	The School, in conjunction with the University, examines the possibility of introducing a pathway approach within a smaller number of programmes. Through this examination, the School should identify which programmes to introduce, grow or discontinue	Review of both UG and PGT offering is currently under review, with submissions for change to be submitted February 2018.	Action initiated - The School is reviewing the offering, see point above, additionally, the school has substantially reduced the number of core programmes for entry in 2018 and 2019 (4 CS related, 4 EE related). However, this number is then increased by the addition of the options such as MSci, MEng (some programmes), year abroad (all programmes), industrial experience (all bachelors programmes) and foundation year (to be determined). If all these options continue to be treated by the college as entirely separate programmes, it is likely that we will end up with over 50 programmes, generated from the 8 core programmes. This could be avoided if the review's recommendation of a 'pathway approach' were taken up by the college. EECS is very much in favour of this approach but as far as we are aware it is not at present available to us.	Action in operation - MSc programme have also been reduced for 2019-20 entry. We are not aware of further progress on the college plans for the 'pathway' approach.
20	Undertake a rigorous review of its programme specifications to address errors and inaccuracies. Student involvement in this review would ensure that these documents are clear and helpful to students. Following this review, programme specifications should be reviewed on an annual basis, in line with the requirements for QMUL's Annual Programme Review	Review of existing programme specifications Remove core information held elsewhere Review annually after programme and module amendment submission by Programme Coordinators Student's involvement: The annual review team will invite student representatives to participate in the review of the information provided to students.	Action initiated - There is a risk regarding the consistency of programme specs if information is provided in more than one place, for example, the exam/CW split for a module mark. Where information was detected to be inconsistent, the relevant programme organisers have been notified and they were asked to check the information thoroughly and update them where necessary. This task has been completed by Oct 2017. Guidance regarding the policy 'provide core fact in one place only' will be given to module organisers in the context of the standardisation of the QMPlus module pages (establishing a minimum standard for QMPlus module pages).	Action in operation - Annual process now in place.
21	As a matter of urgency, review how and when information is provided to students, specifically: module outlines, breakdown of assessment weightings, assessment criteria, final year project information, including an outline, word count, assessment criteria and identifying	Review all module pages on QM+ and create a template for all to cover the points identified	Action initiated - A review is currently underway of the QM+ modules pages for EECS. This review will have an output of creating a template to be used by all modules.	Action initiated - All of this is continuing, further detail and new initiatives can be seen in Updated SEAP

<p>a project supervisor; external examiner reports, sharing and discussing the reports with students at the SSLC; establishing a minimum standard for QMPlus module pages.</p>	<p>Improve the communication for the projects</p>	<p>Action initiated - The UG project process has started much earlier in 2017 for 2017-18 students. The handbook has been completed and shared. A review group has been working on a new process for UG projects within EECS.</p>	
	<p>Share external examiner reports at SSLC meetings</p>	<p>Action initiated - For 2017-18 the concept of external examiners and their reports will be introduced to the current programme reps. All reports will be communicated at SSLC going forward.</p>	
<p>22 Introduce an effective mechanism to address issues when they occur in postgraduate-research supervision</p>	<p>Increase awareness of the role of Interdependent Assessor in the supervisory panel of each PhD student</p>	<p>Action initiated - The role of the Independent Assessor is covered in the Induction session for new Academics and in the supervision refreshment courses.</p>	<p>Action in operation - In addition to the active role of Research Students Administrator in interacting with PhD students, the research committee has decided to introduce from the new Academic Year a formal slot for a private conversation between the Independent Assessor and the PhD student at the end of the Stage 1 and Stage 2 vivas, following the model already in place in other schools of the Faculty.</p>
	<p>Increase awareness of the role of the PG research administrator</p>	<p>Action initiated - Postgraduate research student are introduced to the role of their supervisory panel in their induction sessions (individual with the postgraduate research administrator and as a group in the yearly School research induction).</p>	
	<p>Introduce formal private discussion slot during yearly progression between the postgraduate student and the Independent Assessor</p>	<p>Action initiated - The formal private discussion at the yearly progression is being considered at the November research committee meeting.</p>	
	<p>Increase awareness of the process to address issues via the PG research administrator, the Director and the Deputy Director of Graduate Studies.</p>		
<p>23 As part of professional development, research ethics and integrity should be addressed as compulsory parts of the postgraduate-research curriculum. Formal training should be in place for Teaching Assistants/Demonstrators</p>	<p>Increase awareness of the PhD Researcher Development Programme RD107 Planning and Managing your ethical research project.</p>	<p>Action in operation - The inclusion of RD107 as compulsory part of the postgraduate curriculum is being considered at the November research committee meeting. Postgraduate research students are introduced to the role of the QM Research Ethics Committee in the yearly School research induction.</p>	<p>Action initiated - Demonstrator training discussed but not implemented. Roll-out impacted by strike action during the relevant period.</p>
	<p>Increase awareness of the feedback mechanisms available through the QM Research Ethics Committee</p>	<p>Action initiated - This is part of the School's current plans. Discussions with Educational Development took place over the summer, but we were not able to deliver the hoped for training in the period before the start of the first semester. Our intention is to deliver training before the end of the semester. This has been partly mitigated by efforts to increase the demonstrators' own sense of professionalism and awareness of the expectations that are on them (thus directly addressing two key concerns raised by students and staff). These issues were addressed during a dedicated session on planning for Demonstrator Training held at the EECS School Away Day. A first batch of name badges and lanyards have been introduced and are in use, successfully. In sum the first three actions have been carried out and the last is in development.</p>	
	<p>Revise recruitment materials to emphasise professionalism</p>		
	<p>Increase awareness of expectations laid out in current handbook amongst both demonstrators and staff.</p>		
	<p>Introduce a system of name badges and lanyards to identify demonstrators.</p>		
	<p>Introduce approximately six hours of demonstrator training.</p>		

SCHOOL OF INSTITUTE OF HEALTH SCIENCES EDUCATION (Review Date: MAY 2017)				
Recommendation	Planned action(s)	3 month update (EQSB: November 2017)	12 Month Update (EQSB: May 2018)	
1	The Panel commended the international outlook and ambition of the Institute, and recommended the continuation of a measured approach to development in this area	The Institute is continuing to pursue further international opportunities.	Action initiated - There is more to be done in Malta, building on the MB BS programme that has already started: a postgraduate surgical course is planned for next year and collaborations have already been established with the QMUL Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences. Beyond Malta, we continue to pursue an opportunity in the Channel Islands and a number of collaborative ventures in Eastern Europe working with the same partners with whom we have an excellent relationship in Malta. Throughout, we are mindful that we must not overstretch ourselves and risk damaging already established, highly successful ventures.	Action in operation - The first six months since the start of the Malta programme has consumed much more time than we planned for, having encountered a number of unanticipated and unpredictable problems. Despite that, the course is going well and the other aspects of our collaborations with Malta, outlined here, have continued to progress. Our potential work in the Channel Islands has not progressed over the past six months because we are still waiting for clarification from the Department of Health of the regulatory position of such a venture. Similarly, the work in Eastern Europe has not progressed because the organisation with whom we were working on this, VGH, were taken over in Malta and their future and our involvement with it remains unclear.
2	The Panel commended the introduction of the MSc Physician Associate Studies but recommended that the Institute acts promptly on student feedback relating to organisational issues and other teething problems emerging from the newly established programme. The Panel further recommended that the Annual Programme Review at the end of the first year should consider student feedback and organisational issues in the context of future expansion of this programme.	We shall collate feedback for the Annual Programme Review in Nov 2017.	Action initiated - At the time of the Periodic Review we had significant challenges with administrative support for the programme through extended absence for sick leave and subsequently replacement of staff. We have worked hard to improve organisational matters which in large part have their root in the accelerated timeframe in which the programme was developed and the under resourcing of the programme initially.	Action in operation - According to the business plan agreed by SEG prior to the programme starting in 2017 we have now fully recruited to the projected faculty (2.5fte) staff with the exception of replacing the Head of Programme (HOP) 0.5fte who unfortunately resigned at the end of the academic year 2017. Sandra Nicholson who is Head of Centre, a very experienced educationalist, agreed to lead the programme until a new lead is recruited. We now have a full time administrator who started at the beginning of the year 2018. These changes have meant that we have a clear organisational structure, line management and probation of staff, and day to day operational systems. This has been supported by an administrative review within IHSE which has seen the staff of the student office take on oversight and placement recruitment activity. Bearing in mind these stabilising factors and overall positive student feedback from 2017, we recruited to target in January 2018.
3	Continue to develop opportunities and support systems to: a) Allow students to shape and direct their learning based on their individual interests through Special Study Components; b) Enable all students to develop their independent learning skills and reach their potential; c) Enable students to explore the range of possible career paths (within and without medicine) available to them.	(a) Students are given full opportunity and actively encouraged to create and organise their own SSCs in years 1, 2, 4 and 5. (b) MedPro module includes specific focus on self-directed learning and developmental skills (c) Students can access QMUL Careers and Enterprise Centre, student societies and external bodies such as the Royal Society of Medicine.	Action in operation - (a) Students are given guidance on a one-to-one basis based on their interests to help them create SSCs of their own. Approximately 15% of students organise their own SSCs in years 1 and 2, and approximately 30% in years 4 and 5. All students are required to organise their own elective in year 5. Action in operation - (b) MedPro Module introduced in October 2017 conforming to the four key overarching aims and objectives of the QMUL Model. Action in operation - (c) Clear career advice is signposted in all student literature and online	No further update No further update No further update
4	Review possible alternative academic and pastoral support systems with the aim of providing a greater level of consistency and continuity to students throughout the MBBS programme.	Review student support and progression services	Action initiated - A Review of Student Support and Progression services is underway and will report in Dec 2017	Action in operation - The Student Support review is completed and the report is supported by the Dean for Education and SMD Executive Board. Recommendations for change made and an implementation plan is under construction
5	Further develop awareness of the mental health services available and address the perception that students will be negatively impacted if they seek help for mental health issues.	Review student support and progression services	Action initiated - A Review of Student Support and Progression services is underway and will report in Dec 2017	Action in operation - The Student Support review is completed and the report is supported by the Dean for Education and SMD Executive Board. Recommendations for change made and an implementation plan is under construction
6	Consider mechanisms for ensuring greater consistency across standards of mentoring, clinical placements, and the teaching and marking of PBL.	Ensure Service Level Agreements are in place with all Trust partners who provide clinical placements for students Review of all PBL material by a working group led by Head of years 1 & 2	Action initiated - Mentoring is managed as part of Student Support Services and is therefore part of the Student Support and Progression Review Action initiated - The last SLA was put in place in October 2017 and should provide a clear mechanism for ensuring consistency across clinical placements Action initiated - PBL material is reviewed as part of an ongoing process led by head of year / module leads.	Action in operation - The Student Support review is completed and the report is supported by the Dean for Education and SMD Executive Board. Recommendations for change made and an implementation plan is under construction. Action in operation - The SLAs are in place and will provide a clear mechanism for ensuring consistency across clinical placements Action in operation - PBL material is reviewed as part of an ongoing process led by head of year / module leads. In 2018 we appointed a new Lead for PBL/CBL in IHSE (appointed as a job share).
7	Strategically review mechanisms for obtaining sufficient student survey responses to enable the analysis of representative student feedback.	Strategically review mechanisms for obtaining sufficient student survey responses to enable the analysis of representative student feedback.	Action initiated - Student surveys have now been completely reviewed, revised and streamlined. We shall review student response throughout the year.	Action in operation - We are monitoring response rates over this academic year and working with the Student Union and SSLCs to promote engagement.
8	Establish a standard, transparent policy regarding feedback to students covering appropriate expectations for different forms of formative and summative assessments, and ensures that the policy is clearly communicated to students. Encourage students to develop their feedback-seeking behaviours.	Produce a document to be added to the MBBS assessment and progression handbook explaining the types of feedback available to students.	Action initiated - First draft of document to go to Medical Assessment Committee in October 2017.	Action in operation - Feedback document agreed by MAC in October 2017. It will be added to the MBBS Assessment & Progression handbook for 2018/19 which will be taken to MEC in May 2018.
9	Continue to consider more effective use of QEngage to provide a mechanism for detecting those students who may not be engaging fully and require support.	Continue to consider more effective use of QEngage to provide a mechanism for detecting those students who may not be engaging fully and require support.	Action still to be addressed	Action initiated - We have been unable to progress with Q Review as we continue to have variable room bookings without QReview facilities. We have recently asked for our Senior Common Room to be updated with Qreview and continue to liaise with IT over this issue.
10	Continue to seek suitable space for educational needs; specifically, an appropriate OSCE facility, whether that be in the new Life Sciences development or elsewhere.	Continue to seek suitable space for educational needs; specifically, an appropriate OSCE facility, whether that be in the new Life Sciences development or elsewhere.	Action initiated - The Institute strongly agrees with the Panel in making this a priority. We have highlighted the importance of this and asked (and frequently reminded) colleagues to keep these aspirations in mind during the ongoing planning for developing the Whitechapel campus.	Action initiated - Previous plans for the development of the Whitechapel campus have changed. While the aspirations outlined here remain on our agenda, we have not been able to progress them over recent months and will not be able to do so until the plans for the campus become clearer

11	Clarify the information provided to students on the MSc Physician Associates regarding the use and availability of QReview, and liaise with the eLearning team about possible options for mobile capture.	Clarify the information provided to students on the MSc Physician Associates regarding the use and availability of QReview, and liaise with the eLearning team about possible options for mobile capture.	<p>Action initiated - No information regarding QReview has been given to the students. Very few of the small seminar rooms within the Garrod, have video capture available.</p> <p>We are waiting for feedback from the eLearning team with regard to the feasibility of mobile video capture.</p> <p>The programme aspires to develop a flipped classroom model and this aspiration was shared with the students.</p> <p>We would like to be able to give the PA students access to the MBBS pages on QMplus. We plan to bring a paper to MEC requesting this.</p>	<p>Action initiated - We have been unable to progress with Q Review as we continue to have variable room bookings without QReview facilities. Whilst the SCR has been secured for regular teaching for the 2018 cohort this again does not present a satisfactory QReview possibility.</p> <p>Curriculum aims and objectives contained within bespoke module handbooks are available on QM Plus.</p>
12	Consider more fully developing (beyond general practice) the additional places that will be available in other hard pressed specialties e.g. psychiatry.	Consider more fully developing (beyond general practice) the additional places that will be available in other hard pressed specialties e.g. psychiatry.	Action still to be addressed	Action in operation - A new bid for additional medical student places with a focus on general practice and psychiatry in their education has been granted by HEFCE and supported by HEE
13	Clarify the reporting pathways between all groups and committees within the governance structure.	Produce a diagram outlining all reporting pathways.	Action in operation - A diagram outlining all reporting pathways has been updated and clarified	No further update
14	Reach a conclusion about OSCE assessment strategies, and ensures that any internal changes or pilots are communicated centrally so that QMUL can ensure that students have accurate information, and any changes are considered and, where necessary, approved through the appropriate channels.	Create a task and finish group to address current issues with the OSCE including reasonable adjustments for SpLD learners.	Action initiated - Two meetings have taken place to discuss issues and agree the new OSCE format. When the task and finish group has completed its work the recommendations will be discussed at the Medical Assessment Committee.	Action in operation - Two meetings have taken place to discuss issues and agree the new OSCE format. When the task and finish group has completed its work the recommendations will be discussed at the Medical Assessment Committee. Recommendations of the task and finish group were approved at MAC and are currently being implemented for the current academic year. Students will be given extra time in the OSCEs should they have a confirmed diagnosis of a SpLD or as approved by DDS.
15	Develop further mechanisms for disseminating good practice in teaching and learning.	To develop materials suitable for inclusion on relevant websites and other IT platforms (e.g. Twitter) to showcase best practice.	Action initiated - Review of teaching methodologies included in Curriculum '18 review of MBBS course. Completion of a series of open meetings highlighting best practice.	Action in operation - The review of teaching methodologies and materials has been facilitated by the employment of Clinical Teaching Fellows (CTF). These individuals contribute to the development of novel teaching materials on the Schools online teaching platforms. Dissemination of good practice is conducted through meetings with both academic and clinical teachers throughout the year (e.g. GP trainer's day, Clinical Teachers day etc.). Electronically circulated newsletters are also available.
16	Continue to analyse data in the following areas, and use the results of the analysis to change practice if needed: a) Student attainment and differential attainment of different categories of students; b) Equality and diversity of applicants compared with accepted students.	Data to be considered following Exam Boards and reported to Quality Education Committee.	Action initiated - The Medical Assessment Committee (MAC) will be considering progression data. These reports will then be examined to try and analyse the differential attainment of different categories of student	Action initiated - The Medical Assessment Committee (MAC) will be considering progression data. These reports will then be examined to try and analyse the differential attainment of different categories of student.
		Applicant data to be analysed and considered at Quality Education Committee.	Action initiated - Application data has been requested from ARCS. Following the receipt of this analysis will be undertaken and a report provided to QEC.	Action initiated - Application data has been requested from ARCS. Following the receipt of this analysis will be undertaken and a report provided to QEC.
17	Critically review the success and sustainability of the Certificate in Clinical Foundation Studies.	Angela Rowlands to provide a detailed review of the first CCFS year.	Action initiated - Report submitted to Rebecca Lingwood, Anthony Warrens and Jo Brown.	Action in operation - There has been interest in the course from other countries and the Dean for Education has requested that we double the intake for next year.
18	Ensure that the MSc Physicians Associate programme is covered by same professionalism monitoring systems as the MBBS		<p>Action initiated - Meeting scheduled with Governance Officer on Friday 20/10/17 to discuss this and other governance matters.</p> <p>A private members bill calling for regulation of the PA profession has had its first reading in Parliament.</p> <p>A consultation document regarding regulation of the PA profession has been produced by the DoH and is currently out to comment.</p> <p>Until such time as the regulatory environment for PAs is clarified, it would be our intention to follow parallel processes to MBBS.</p>	<p>Action initiated - No further update is available concerning nationally agreed PA regulation.</p> <p>We have made adaptations to follow parallel MBBS professionalism processes such as developing and outlining an absence policy. We have reiterated the importance of PA professionalism by adopting an MBBS professionalism points system to identify professionalism lapses and hence provide remediation</p>
19	External Examiners reports to be submitted to the SSLC, as per QMUL policy.	Upon completion of all external examiner replies, the replies along with the external examiner report will be forward to the relevant SSLC	Action initiated - Replies are being compiled	Action initiated - Replies are being compiled
20	Make more effective use of the appraisal system for academic staff.	Academic staff to be emailed to feedback for their views on the appraisal system and how this could be made more effective.	Action initiated - Once this feedback is received, it will be collated and the Institute will consider how to respond.	<p>Action in operation - Few replies were received, the content of which indicated general satisfaction with the current appraisal process and provided no clear indication of how appraisees would like the process changed to be more "effective".</p> <p>However it is clear that the SMD is moving towards a more "objective" appraisal system and the Institute plans to incorporate the data collected within SWARM to enhance appraiser-appraisee discussions during the 2018-19 cycle</p>

BLIZARD INSTITUTE (Review Date: June 2017)			
Recommendation	Planned action(s)	3 month update (EQSB: February 2018)	12 Month Update (EQSB: October 2018)
1 The Institute should define its unique selling points, in order to develop a clear strategic vision.	Production of Education Strategy and 5 year plan	Action initiated - In September 2017 The Institute held a retreat for all staff involved in Education. One of the key discussion points from the event was branding and a clear strategic vision for the future. This remains a complex question, which is affected by internal organisational issues and external market changes. The Institute aim to produce a full education strategy in 2017-18.	Action initiated - The Blizard Institute continue to develop their education portfolio and expanding both faculty and support staff structures to meet demands for growth. However it has not been possible to put in a firm 5 year plan as this will require input from SMD faculty, strategic planning and other central service teams. It must be considered part of a wider discussion relating to resources and capacity.
2 That via the Educational Activity Survey the Institute: a) Develops a transparent and sustainable workload allocation model for staff, ensuring that expectations are clear; b) Ensures that academic staff are on the appropriate contracts.	Design and Implementation of local teaching data collection exercise- BEAM	Action in operation - The Blizard Institute have now completed the design and delivery of a new Educational data collection exercise called BEAM. Uptake from 138 academic staff members surveyed has been 98%, and data is currently being prepared for analysis. It is hoped that this information will lead to more effective use of educational resources, fairer allocations of MBBS teaching activity, and improved programme design, development and sustainability.	Action in operation - The BEAM survey system is now in its second cycle, having produced a thorough and comprehensive set of data for all education staff. Changes are being made to improve compatibility with the SWARM system, which will be running alongside it. Data from BEAM has been used to ensure academic staff are on appropriate contracts.
	Job plan type review for all educational staff based on activity	Action in operation - The Institute have undertaken comprehensive staffing reviews of all programme suites, with the aim of reducing dependency on external staff and providing sustainability. As a result of this review, the Institute have recommended the creation of a new junior academic post to support operational delivery in education. Several new programme suites will be allocated additional academic staff for activities such as marking, feedback and academic supervision.	Action in operation - Posts approved and current at various stages of recruitment. Annual discussions with programmes regarding resource planning and student capacity are taking place in November/December each year.
3 Further development of induction process for new staff.	Development of new internal CPD training programme for educational staff	Action initiated - Plans are currently underway for the production of a short internal training programme for staff involved in taught programme delivery. This will cover practical elements of programme management, such as understanding of regulations and QA processes and other internal support structures.	Action initiated - The Blizard have outlined key areas for academic training, based on recent student survey data. These are being translated into development of 4 x specialist training afternoons covering Teaching and Assessment, Module Organisation, Personal Tutors and Academic Advisors and Exam Boards and Assessment. The Blizard also plan to run a training afternoon for programme leads, which covers topics relating to wider academic and student management.
4 That the promotion practice is reconsidered to: a) Ensure that the appropriate value is given to both research and educational achievement including the mandatory acquisition of a teaching qualification or HEA Fellowship; b) Recognise the wider contributory factors for promotion as per the revised QMUL guidelines.	Systematic monitoring and promotion of HEA membership.	Action in operation - This question formed a major part of the Educational retreat in 2017. HEA fellowship uptake amongst Institute staff remains low, and the Blizard Institute Education Committee are currently reviewing ways to increase. Teaching staff are also being encouraged to apply for promotion, which is discussed at appraisal. An open door policy for teaching staff to discuss this with Institute Director is now in place.	Action in operation - The Blizard continue to promote HEA membership amongst academic staff, with a specific focus on those with TS job plans. In 2017-18 the Institute managed to get 22.3%percentage of relevant staff enrolled on/completed HEA accreditation.
5 That the Institute: a) Ensures that appropriate processes are in place to monitor and maintain the quality of teaching delivered by non-QMUL staff; b) Provides better training to staff about governance and quality assurance processes; specifically, in relation to the development of programmes and modules.	Production of engagement and expectations template for all external contributors	Action initiated - A template has now been produced for all non-QMUL staff who are planning to engage with Blizard Institute Taught programmes in any capacity. The template clearly outlines expectations and deadlines associated with work and includes details of any remuneration that is expected in line with QMUL financial guidelines.	Action in operation - A template for 'non-substantive academic engagement' has been produced for programmes with external contributors. This clearly outlines expectations, deadlines and the type of recognition that will be given for input- eg. Honorary contract, external lecturer payment.
6 A comprehensive review of all programme specifications, and the development of a mechanism for ensuring that this information is kept accurate and up to date.	Review of Programme Specifications	Action initiated - All programme specifications have been reviewed, and outstanding/required amendments to be put through teaching and learning committee in time for 2018-19 delivery.	Action in operation - All Programme Specs are now up to date.
7 That the Institute formalises its academic and pastoral support structures to ensure that these are clear, objective, and sustainable for students at all levels.	Provide clarity and consistency across academic and pastoral support structures	Action initiated - Information regarding available support structures and academic expectations relating to students' support have been circulated to programme teams, but a thorough review and consolidation of this delivery remains outstanding.	Action in operation - The Blizard continue to work on promoting the important of personal tutors/academic supervisors, tying in with discussions relating to staffing resources and academic training.
8 That the Institute develops mechanisms for monitoring and ensuring student engagement, as well as establishing clear identities for all students. Consideration should be given to including guidance about the appropriate use of social media in programme handbooks.	Ensure regular records of engagement are collected, and issues concerning engagement on distance learning programmes are addressed.	Action initiated - The Institute on-site programmes all maintain regular engagement logs, including attendance registers and card readers for undergraduate students. Ensuring engagement by distance learning professional students remains challenging.	Action in operation - All onsite programme have now switched to using electronic attendance card reading to monitor attendance.
9 A review of the Institute's assessment strategy, to ensure that all assessments are appropriate for the learning outcomes of the module. In particular, it is recommended that the Institute reconsiders the use of open book MCQs on the Trauma Sciences programmes.	Review of assessment suitability for all taught programmes	Action initiated - A full review of assessment, marking and feedback across the Institute is currently being undertaken. In addition to this, programme teams have been encouraged to review individual assessments in light of module feedback, and a number of changes have been made on the Trauma Sciences, Aesthetics and Global Health programmes.	Action in operation - Individual programmes have reviewed quality of existing assessments, but further discussion needed on quantity of assessments and timing in relation to certain programmes.
10 That the Institute: a) Develops a consistent, transparent, and sustainable policy for providing feedback to students on all programmes; b) Considers mechanisms for clarifying and managing the expectations of both staff and students in relation to feedback.	Review of marking and feedback policy	Action in operation - Full review and proposed standardisation of feedback mechanisms (where possible) is currently underway.	Action in operation - Review conducted in April 2018, with a number of standardised templates being produced to fit the various types of PGT/UG assessment offered by programmes. Programmes have been provided with guidance for generation of appropriate marking criteria (rubrics).
11 That the Institute considers holding SSLC meetings more frequently, or develops more informal mechanisms for receiving and addressing student feedback more promptly.	Review SSLC meetings and other mechanisms for addressing student feedback.	Action in operation - SSLC meetings to be held 3 times per year, however programme teams have been encouraged to develop closer links with their representatives in the hope that more issues can be addressed locally and in a timely manner.	Action in operation - The Blizard are happy that mechanisms for student feedback have improved, moving from a 'you said we did' mentality to a 'we noticed we changed' system of operation. Students are still encouraged to address local level issues promptly with programme administrators in the first instance.
12 That the Institute continues to investigate possibilities for providing dedicated space for postgraduate taught students.	Find more suitable teaching space	Action still to be addressed - Demand for dedicated postgraduate teaching space remains, but resources are currently unavailable to create space that is required. The senior common room (SMD) has now been more widely promoted to PGT students as a venue for socialising and group study. The faculty continues to suffer from a shortage of larger size (30-50) capacity teaching rooms.	Action still to be addressed - Suitable space on Whitechapel campus remains problematic, particularly with increasing numbers. Options for space at Mile End remain open in some cases, but this presents timetable issues for students moving between campuses. No suitable social/study space for PGT students in Whitechapel, as Senior Common Room now in use for teaching.
13 A Faculty-level review of journal needs to ensure that appropriate resources are available for staff and students	Conduct a full review of specialist journals required for all programmes	Action still to be addressed - Review has not yet been undertaken	Action still to be addressed - Review has not yet been undertaken

BARTS CANCER INSTITUTE (Review Date: December 2017)			
Recommendation	Planned action(s)	3 month update (EQSB: May 2018)	12 Month Update (Expected at EQSB: February 2019)
1	Consideration is given to developing a clear internationalisation strategy, and ensuring that the appropriate mechanisms are in place to monitor the quality and standards of any partnerships.	BCI will review its current international partnerships/collaborators and identify potential gaps and opportunities. To be reviewed at BCI TLC.	Action in operation - BCI is actively pursuing a Joint MSc in Laparoscopic Surgery and Surgical Skills with the University of Malta. Initial discussions have commenced with the International University of Malaysia.
2	Clarify and formalise the peer observation process for academic staff, and consider including PhD demonstrators in the process as a mechanism for supporting and developing their teaching skills.	Currently all academics who teach are required to submit a peer observation form along with their appraisal document. Currently only one form is required per academic year.	Action initiated - The percentage return on peer observation forms will be calculated following the annual appraisal cycle and reported to the BCI Board. Academic staff will be emailed at the beginning of each semester to remind them that they must complete the peer observation process. A list of peer observations will be compiled and circulated, including allocated observers for each staff member. To be introduced in 2018/19. BCI TLC to approve the introduction of the peer observation process to student demonstrators. If approved, this is for implementation AY2018/19.
3	Develop mechanisms for recording the activities of academic staff, including: a) Clarifying the teaching contribution requirements for all academic staff, and ensuring that these activities are accurately recorded; b) Ensuring that the scorecard system takes account of approved periods of absence from the Institute; c) Ensuring that the scorecard system is reviewed within the context QMUL's HR policies and processes.	Currently using SWARM (piloted in 16/17) to capture teaching, research and other scholarly activity.	Action initiated - a) SMD Academic Performance standards will be communicated to staff as part of BCI's review of Academic Scorecards. Action initiated - b) Inclusion of approved periods of absence on Academic Scorecards to be reviewed by SMD SMT and, if agreed, implemented in next cycle. Action initiated - c) The Academic Scorecard is revised alongside the SMD/QMUL process. Staff performance is assessed against SMD performance requirements.
4	Consider processes for reviewing draft examination papers to ensure consistency across modules, where appropriate.	A standard format for all exams on the MSc Cancer programmes was agreed for implementation in 2018/19 in response to the comments of the External Examiner	Action in operation - It was agreed at the BCI TLC in October 2017 to standardise exams on the MSc Cancer programmes as follows: 15 credit modules 30 MCQs 4 x 20 mark SAQs 7.5 credit modules 18 MCSS 4 x 10 mark SAQs Only the total mark for each SAQ was standardised – tutors could break this down into subparts as appropriate. The only exceptions were CANM937 and CANM938 where the exam has a different weighting. This has been implemented in 2017/18.
5	Consider mechanisms for recognising individual efforts within group assignments, potentially through the introduction of anonymous 360 peer review.	Any changes to be introduced for 18/19	Action initiated - To be discussed at BCI TLC. Consultation to take place with SSLC representatives.
6	Clarify and publicise the feedback turnaround policy for students.	At the BCI TLC in December 2017 a standardised feedback timeframe of 4 weeks was agreed.	Action in operation - The agreed timeframe has been communicated to current students. Action initiated - Feedback turnaround details will be included in programme handbooks, module guides and on coursework submission sheets from 2018/19
7	Review the work required by postgraduate-research students for the 9-month and 18-month progression points to ensure that students are not overburdened unnecessarily and these progression points are supportive of the students' future successes.	9 and 18 milestone reports are SMD/QMUL requirements and BCI guidelines are designed around these. To be discussed at the BCI PGR tutor meeting, SMD Graduate Studies Committee and with the Research Degrees Office.	Action still to be addressed
8	Undertake more focussed analysis of the PTES scores, and agree some measurable actions to address any notably low or declining scores.	Chart the 3 year trend in answers following receipt of 2018 PTES results. Review at TLC.	Action still to be addressed - PTES results are reviewed at BCI TLC. As a national survey, BCI has no control over the questions nor does BCI have detailed knowledge of student's other commitments. It is therefore difficult to gauge whether responses to questions such as "The timetable fits well with my other commitments" are appropriate.
9	Develop a more transparent and sustainable system for pastoral support.	All PGR students have an assigned postgraduate tutor assigned to them for the duration of their studies.	Action in operation - Following discussions at the BCI TLC & BCI PGR tutor meetings, postgraduate tutors have been reallocated. 2 new tutors were appointed and all CRFs now have a clinical postgraduate tutor. All PGR students have received an e-mail to confirm who their tutor is. PGR students are notified of the tutor when they enrol and advised to arrange an introductory meeting in their first 3 months.
		Review PGT mentor scheme.	Action initiated - Currently students have 3 x 1-2-1 meetings with their Programme Director (mid-way through SEM 1 and after the release of provisional SEM 1 and SEM 2 results). PGT students also have a list of mentors that can be approached, but they are not assigned a specific tutor. At the March 2018 BCI TLC it was agreed that for 2018/19 PGT students would be assigned a named mentor each. The purposes of the scheme would be summarised as part of induction.
10	Consider mechanisms for further integrating postgraduate-taught students into the Institute community. QMSU and BLSA should continue to be invited to attend future induction sessions for these students.	Continue to invite QMSU to BCI induction events AY 2018/19 Discuss at the PGR SSLC whether PGT students could be invited to participate in BCI PhD Forum events. PGT students to be invited to attend monthly BCI mixers.	Action in operation - BCI invited the QMSU to the PGT induction in AY 2017/18. Details of BCI weekly seminars are included in the PGT weekly update e-mails.
11	Continue to develop careers events for postgraduate-taught students.	BCI will continue to develop a careers events for PGT students	Action initiated

12	Consider additional opportunities in London to expose students to external organisations and events, such as the flagship seminars at the Francis Crick Institute.		<p>Action in operation - Details of the Cancer Interest Group at the Francis Crick Institute have been posted on BCInet.</p> <p>Opportunities relevant to PGT students are included on the BCI QMplus landing page and in weekly update e-mails.</p>	
13	Consider developing more robust and sustainable statistics training for postgraduate-research students.	For discussion at TLC. BCI PhD Forum workshops are recorded and made available to PGR students via QMplus.	Action initiated - The PhD Forum have offered 2 statistics workshops. These have been recorded to be shared on QMplus.	
14	The Panel commended the initiative of the Ian Hart Vacation Scholarships, and recommended that the Institute review the funding arrangements to consider whether the scheme could be made more accessible to students from lower income households.	The current scheme is funded through a CRUK clinical training grant.	Action in operation - SMD has initiated a living wage payment for students undertaking Ian Hart and Rod Flower scholarships.	
15	Increase efforts to encourage established staff, for example through the promotion process, to gain recognition of their teaching by applying for HEA Fellowship.	Encourage established staff to gain recognition of their teaching by applying for HEA Fellowship.	<p>Action in operation - BCI has introduced a new training and mentoring scheme for academic staff which mandates that all staff must achieve HEA fellowship. The benefits of HEA fellowship have been conveyed to established staff.</p> <p>All HEA fellowship status is monitored within BCI. Achievement of fellowship will be an appraisal objective where appropriate.</p>	
16	Develop a clear strategic plan for managing space issues in the short and medium terms	Various space plans and proposals have been submitted to SMD.	Action initiated - BCI is awaiting the outcome of an application to Barts and the London Charity to fund development of the Joseph Rotblat Building to provide more laboratory and office space in the short to medium term whilst planning permission is sought to re-develop the John Vane Science Centre.	

WILLIAM HARVEY RESEARCH INSTITUTE (Review Date: March 2018)			
Recommendation	Planned action(s)	3 Month Update (EQSB: October 2018)	12 Month Update (Expected at EQSB: May 2019)
1 Consider a prize for research-led teaching.	PGR committee to consider whether annual student-nominated prize for 'supervisor of the year' or similar could be instituted	Action initiated - This has been agreed and PC currently drafting the process for award for approval by education committee	
2 Monitor the career outcomes of students at UG, PGT and PGR levels.	This would benefit from a centralised approach as will be required across all programmes for TEF. Also linked to QMUL recommendation 'QMUL reviews alumni support and communication via an alumni email'. Therefore, first actions are: discussion at UG meetings (intercalated committee); PGT meetings (Teaching and learning committee) and PGR meetings. WHRI to follow up standardised approach eg survey via alumni email addresses	Action initiated - On agenda for the first meetings of the Autumn term for: SUTL (UG) TLC (PGT) PGR committee (PGR) to aim for a centralised approach. WHRI institute manager working on developing an alumni group which may also provide a route for data collection.	
3 Appropriate quality assurance mechanisms should be in place to monitor the teaching contributions of external professional practitioners and those on honorary contracts, in consultation with Academic Development.	a) Initial discussion about the practicalities of this with the SMD head of QA b) Development of guidance based on agreement with head of QA for Programme leads regarding quality monitoring of external teachers c) Inclusion of guidance in staff handbook under development	Action in operation - MD has discussed with SMD Head of QA and also reviewed information provided by other institutes where applicable – information has now been included in the Staff Education Handbook.	
4 The Panel commended the clarity of the programme specifications for the MSc/PGDip in Endocrinology and Diabetes and MSc/PGDip Clinical Drug Development, and recommended that the review of other programme specifications should continue using these as a template.	Review of specifications currently underway. Awaiting meeting with registry about some specific issues – date pending Registry personnel availability	Action in operation - Specifications completed.	
5 The Panel commended the 'You Said, We Did' feedback provided for the MSc in Sports and Exercise Medicine, and recommended that this approach should be utilised in other programmes.	This model already discussed and shared at WHRI education day as well as at an education committee meeting. SEM staff asked to share their templates for use on other programmes. Reminder and template to be re-sent to all programme directors	Action in operation - Model and template from SEM previously shared and reminders and redistribution on agenda for Oct 2018 Education Committee meeting.	
6 The Panel commended the positive balance between formative and summative assessments used in the MSc/PGDip in Clinical Endocrinology and the MSc/PGDip in Sports and Exercise Medicine. The Panel recommended that this model should be explored for other programmes.	Programme leads to review at management committee meetings 2018.	Action initiated - Assessment discussion listed as agenda item under 'training' for education committee October 2018. This will initiate a quality discussion with the aim of leads initiating their own review over the coming academic year.	
7 Include student representation on the Education Board and other decision-making bodies.	Invite SSLC lead annually to attend education board ex officio in Autumn term 2018	Action initiated - New student intake currently enrolling, once SSLC lead is selected they will be invited to the education board.	
8 Clarify and publicise the feedback turnaround policy for students	Development of WHRI education staff handbook signposting all relevant regulation and expanding guidance where necessary (eg. Including feedback guidance and reference to QM policy etc)	Action in operation - Education handbook completed, reviewed and amended and made available to all staff via link to WHRI intranet. Includes information and links around student feedback policy and recommendations.	
9 Ensures that student feedback is disseminated to staff in a consistent manner, particularly in relation to varying approaches within WHRI and SBCS			
10 Examine assessment in a number of areas, including: a) Consistent application of QMUL policy in relation to potential plagiarism; b) The timing of assessments to avoid the issue of coursework bunching for students; c) Reviewing the 100% coursework on some Distance Learning programmes to ensure that adequate cross-checks are in place to confirm student identity; d) Reviewing the MCQ and SAQ approach to assessment in the BSc Pharmacology and Innovative Therapeutics to ensure that the marking burden did not escalate.	(a) Development of WHRI education staff handbook signposting all relevant regulation and expanding guidance where necessary (eg. Including plagiarism etc) – can act as basis for later audit if needed. (b),(c),(d) Programme leads to review. These items to be added to TPAP and reviewed at Education committee	Action initiated - Assessment discussion listed as agenda item under 'training' for education committee October 2018. This will initiate a quality discussion with the aim of leads initiating their own review over the coming academic year.	
11 Ensure that SSLCs are running with an approved agenda and that the external examiner reports are considered at these meetings, in line with QMUL policy.	SSLC agenda and meeting dates to be reviewed and set for the incoming students (currently it is still the enrolment period)	Action initiated - SSLC's already in place and use the QMUL agenda. To timetable once per term and release dates in advance (note that this may mean some students who are studying at distance or variable mode may not be on campus on specified dates.) External examiner reports to be added as a standing agenda item for reporting.	
12 Timetable a specific event where PGT students can complete the PTES in order to improve response rates.	Single event will not catch all students particularly not distance learners or where students timetables do not match the date, however this will be tabled as a social/coffee/SSLC meeting during the period that PTES is running.	Action still to be addressed - PTES results and very low response rates across the board for this year noted; for next year clear dates will be set out as well as a more concerted campaign for distance learners.	

13	The Panel commended the student led William Harvey Research Institute (Pharmacology) Society and recommended that similar societies be encouraged and supported within the Institute, by working with the Barts and The London Students' Association and QMSU.	BL Endocrine Society already in place and has been running for the past 3 years; BL SEMS society created and incorporated into London-wide SEMS Society already; other programmes to investigate similar links	Action in operation - Links in place for: pharmacology, endocrinology, forensics, sports and exercise medicine.	
14	Data on applicants and participants should be reviewed with a view towards widening participation.	Data reviewed after each intake and each intake marketing adjusted accordingly	Action initiated - first intake demographics reviewed (and reported to Athena SWAN); further intakes will continue to have data collected routinely	
15	Clearly signpost students to resources available at the Mile End and Charterhouse Square campuses and make supervisors aware of the resources across QMUL in order to direct students to support available.	Add this information wherever not already present into course handbooks and into the staff handbook under development	Action in operation - Course handbooks all updated for this year.	
16	Consider mechanisms for ensuring an integrated experience for students on the WHRI/SBCS allied programmes.	BSc Pharmacology Committee newly formed April 2018; purpose includes for Module leads to give updates, review teaching, share good practice and discuss ways to enhance the student experience and also to be aware of QMUL academic regulations. Item to be passed to that committee who can report back via education committee. Good practice can be shared with module leads on other SBCS modules.	Action initiated - BSc committee continues to meet – due to report at the end of the academic year.	
17	Encourage and support PGR students to gain teaching qualifications.	Students to be signposted to qualifications consideration to be given to time commitment required for CILT and PgCAP balanced against research targets	Action still to be addressed - because these courses enrol in Autumn term and report of uptake not due back until end of academic year.	
18	Robust structures should be put in place to support strategic growth in the future, including: a) Monitoring administrative staffing levels to support future growth of the Institute; b) Consistent application of QMUL's academic regulations across all taught programmes; c) A review of the Institute's mechanisms for managing academic standards and quality assurance, in line with QMUL's policies and procedures; d) Appropriate training in place for staff on QMUL's policies and academic regulations, especially with regard to assessment offences.	Recent review (January 2018) with workload allocation and increase in administrative staff agreed. Recruitment currently underway. Annual review of administrative support part of workload planning process.	Action initiated - Additional administrative staff now in place (administrative support from SBCS still pending recruitment to vacant post); workload review in light of student enrolments by January 2019.	
19	Examine the composition of the student body, particularly with respect to widening participation in line with QMUL's policy.	Data review of all enrolments for the past 3 years by gender, overseas/home/EU status and any other characteristics recorded on on SITS for evaluation at education board. This is aligned with an Athena SWAN action plan objective and therefore we will work with Neil Rayment on accessing the PGT data.	Action initiated - UG data reviewed and benchmarked – discussion / dissemination at education committee PGT data being reviewed together with other institutes – first report will be at Athena SWAN SAT meeting in November 2018 PGR data currently being gathered and reviewed.	
20	Review the programme information provided to students, including programme specifications, handbooks, and prospectuses, to ensure: a) Consistency of information, particularly with regards to reducing the variability within the course handbooks; b) That student expectations were managed, for example with respect to opportunities for clinical experience.	Programme specification review underway	Action in operation - Programme handbooks redrafted and reviewed for the current intake.	
21	Develop the peer observation of academic staff, including: a) Ensuring that peer observation was discussed during staff appraisals; b) Ensuring that peer observation was recorded as having happened; c) Reviewing the allocation of peer observations to ensure diversity and that it was not a reciprocal arrangement between two members of staff.	Peer review new arrangements already underway	Action initiated - Peer observation process and pairings disseminated for 2018/19. Data on completion for review at the end of the academic year.	
22	Review the work allocation model SWARM to assess the allocation and weighting and ensure that it does not underestimate workloads.	Currently under review as part of centre reviews – data being returned to centre leads by May 2018	Action initiated - SWARM individual data reviewed as part of the performance management process – individual concerns have been discussed. Overall change in SWARM tariffs currently under discussion and amendments are being reported back to SMDEB.	
23	Recommendation to QMUL: Review alumni support and communication via an alumni email.		Action still to be addressed	
24	Recommendation to QMUL: Review the assessment policy regarding the threshold difference for double-marking, particularly for scores on the pass/fail boundary.		Action still to be addressed	

WOLFSON INSTITUTE OF PREVENTIVE MEDICINE (Review Date: May 2018)			
Recommendation	Planned action(s)	3 Month Update (EQSB: Expected February 2019)	12 Month Update (Expected at EQSB: May 2019)
1	Greater acknowledgement of the level of fellowship with the Higher Education Academy (now AdvanceHE) achieved by existing staff.		
2	Any programme proposals exploiting the growth areas in mental health/preventive neurology be taken forward as a priority.		
3	The Institute's Executive Board should take a proactive approach to leadership to shape the future direction of the Institute, including: a) a development of Institute-specific objectives in relation to both teaching and research, and alignment of the two; b) a stable staffing strategy for UG teaching commitments; c) more robust business cases to secure teaching resources to support current and future postgraduate provision; d) institute-specific strategies for PGT and PGR student experience, teaching and learning; e) management and improvement of teaching spaces; f) provision of adequate study spaces and resources for postgraduate students; g) greater interaction/collaboration between the individual Centres in relation to postgraduate teaching.		
4	Build on collaborative work with the School of Biological and Chemical Sciences in respect of the following: a) a) that methods are introduced to improve teaching quality and administration; b) b) introductions of more formal links with Abnormal Psychology; c) c) the active promotion of its PGT programmes to BSc Psychology students.		
5	The Institute Director to meet with the SMD Senior Executive to examine the Institute's challenges in teaching and learning. During this process, the Institute should identify areas for review with a view to potential improvements in its provision, including: a) policies for staff recruitment and investment in new activity ahead of obtaining student numbers/fee income; b) promoting master's programmes for intercalation; c) offering a Psychiatry module as part of IBSc Neuroscience; d) UG teaching and communications with IHSE concerning amendments to the MBBS timetable and related teaching issues.		
6	Consider phasing out the delivery of teaching by short-term teaching fellows in favour of longer (albeit fixed-term, if necessary) teaching focused appointments to ensure consistency in teaching and improve student experience.		
7	Utilise a transparent work allocation model, e.g. SWARM, to monitor allocations and to identify key stress points in teaching, research and administration to help to inform a clear staffing strategy.		
8	Review policies on fee setting, bursaries and student-number targets in line with a more financially robust recruitment and staffing strategy.		
9	Further discussions should take place to consider delivery through or at least utilising Queen Mary Online.		
10	Review the part-time structure of programmes, including, for example, the introduction of 30-credit modules for part-time provision.		
11	Appropriate quality-assurance mechanisms should be in place to monitor the teaching contributions of regular external professional practitioners, e.g. peer teaching observation.		
12	The Institute should no longer remove topics from examinations due to poor quality lecture capture or staff absence. If a pre-recording cannot be made available, alternate arrangements should be made so that the content can be assessed.		
13	Develop a clear PhD recruitment strategy to improve its ability to recruit to funded places		
14	Reviews mechanisms for supporting postgraduate-research students including: a) embedding training requirements and career-development planning into its PhD induction and progression mechanisms, with a career development plan to be completed for each postgraduate student by end of month one of their studentship by the supervisor(s) and the student; b) ensuring comprehensive guidance is given on how to access QMUL short courses also at other campuses; c) developing a short module in Statistics suitable for the Institute's PhD students to be taken in year one of their studentship; d) enabling the auditing of modules to fill knowledge gaps either in attendance or access to material through the VLE; e) regular monitoring of supervisors to ensure that they adhere to QMUL policies; f) providing closer guidance especially during the first year of doctoral studies, to enable students to pursue a sustainable research project; g) more accurate record keeping to monitor both student and supervisor activity; h) resuming regular PGR-specific SSLC meetings.		
15	Continued investment (staff and finance) beyond current funding to maintain the MEDPRO/QMUL Model initiative.		
16	Establishment and sustained running of a PGR SSLC.		

17	<p>Provide greater opportunities for (international and home/EU) student interaction, including;</p> <p>a) access to study support at Charterhouse such as printing and study space;</p> <p>b) assistance with the creation of student-led societies;</p> <p>c) more formal links with the sites of support offered at Mile End (Advice and Counselling, Disability and Dyslexia Service and Academic Writing). This included running part of the induction session at Mile End;</p> <p>d) enabling a wider collaboration with other parts of SMD in Charterhouse and Whitechapel.</p>			
18	<p>Review the possible causes for the poor attendance of the recent Careers workshop in light of its previous popularity.</p>			
19	<p>Conduct a demonstration on how to access feedback on the VLE form part of the student induction.</p>			
20	<p>Assist PGT teaching teams to enable more opportunities for staff to meet/communicate with students on an individual basis for pastoral and academic support.</p>			
21	<p>Meet with the SU to discuss relaxation of the policy that students must make a purchase if they wish to use the Shield Café as an informal study space.</p>			

EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (Review Date: May 2018)			
Recommendation	Planned action(s)	3 month update (EQSB: October 2018)	12 Month Update (Expected at EQSB: May 2019)
1	<p>Queen Mary Senior Executive (QMSE) conducts a holistic review of educational development activities, with particular focus on:</p> <p>a) Ensuring that new academic staff receive appropriate workload dispensations in order to meet the probation requirement to achieve a teaching qualification and the institutional target to achieve HEA Fellowship;</p>	<p>Establish current university and individual School policies for time allocation related to obtaining a teaching qualification as part of probation</p> <p>Submit a report to QMSE, before the end of Semester B of 2018/19, that presents a) these data, b) an analysis of them against the expected time to spend on the established pathways to meeting probation, and c) recommendation for change of policy</p>	<p>Action initiated - We have now reviewed the existing institutional policy and are designing a survey aimed at identifying the specificities in the amount of time allocated per category of probationary staff for each academic School.</p>
	<p>b) Clarifying the continuing professional development expectations for academic staff post-probation</p>	<p>Establish current expectations for CPD in teaching and learning of post-probationary staff by academic School.</p> <p>In the QMSE report mentioned in a), summarise and include the above findings, and make a recommendation for a minimum set time allocation for CPD in teaching and learning for all staff – on and post-probation.</p>	<p>Action initiated - The survey above will comprise a question on Schools' expectations for engagement in CPD in teaching and learning by category of post-probationary staff</p>
	<p>c) Working with schools / institutes to ensure that existing academic staff receive appropriate workload dispensations to enable them to engage with continuing professional development (including but not limited to educational development activities) in order to enhance their practice</p>	<p>Meet with Schools' management to clarify time expectations of existing CPD opportunities and pathways for probationary and post-probationary staff, and explore ways for supporting both categories in a personalised way through both the Educational Development activities and School based and other developmental options.</p> <p>The negotiated outcomes from the meetings to be summarised and included in the report to QMSE (from a) and b) above) in support, and to provide context for the report recommendations for staff time allocation for probation- and post-probation engagement in CPD.</p>	<p>Action initiated - An initial contact with each School is in preparation and due before the end of October 2018.</p>
	<p>d) Clarifying and formalising (if appropriate) the intentions and expectations for the provision of educational development activities to Teaching Assistants (or equivalent) and non-QMUL staff contributing to the delivery of QMUL programmes</p>	<p>Establish current policy and practice in the Schools.</p> <p>Include the findings and make recommendations for standardising the expectations for engaging in educational development activities by TAs and non-QMUL staff teaching on QMUL programmes in the report to QMSE mentioned in a), b) and c) above.</p>	<p>Action initiated - We are including specific questions in our survey (see a) and b) above) about the Schools' expectations for engaging in training, development, and qualifying for teaching of their TA and non-QMUL teaching staff.</p>
	<p>e) Addressing the sustainability of the Teaching Recognition Project following the retirement of the current Project Manager and the ending contracts of the supporting staff</p>	<p>Review the current processes for teaching recognition at QMUL.</p> <p>Design a revised teaching recognition scheme that retains the best practice from its predecessor, the Teaching Recognition Project, and gears the processes of application, mentoring and support of applicants, and reviewing of applications towards the new institutional targets for staff teaching qualifications as part of the 'Going for Gold' (GoG) strategy.</p> <p>Submit a proposal paper outlining the new scheme to QMSE before the end of Semester B, 2018/19.</p> <p>Submit a Major Changes application to Advanced HE for the accreditation of the proposed changes to the scheme</p>	<p>Action in operation - 1. Educational Development and the wider Academic Development have commenced a process of simultaneous review and re-design of the teaching recognition scheme.</p> <p>2. To ensure objectivity, the scheme will be reviewed independently (Ian Roberts, Head of Leadership and Professional Development) and the outcomes will be included in the revised scheme</p> <p>3. In the interim, we:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have revised and re-launched the preparatory workshops for applicants, in view of feedback and to meet demand with the launch of GoG • Are liaising with Schools about identifying prospective applicant mentors and application reviewers out of existing teaching qualified staff, and have already secured an average of 5 new mentors per Faculty • Have launched new training for mentors and reviewers
2	<p>Review the parity of the taught and CPD pathways to fellowship, developing clearer guidance about the merits, differences, and appropriateness of the different pathways to, and levels of fellowship.</p> <p>The outcomes of this review should be formally considered together with schools / institutes and QMSE to accommodate the variety of views and staff development needs, and to agree a mutually beneficial way forward.</p>	<p>Review the equivalency, in terms of impact on individual practice and success at qualifying to teach, between the formal taught programmes in teaching and learning and the CPD alternative – the ADEPT 50 and ADEPT 100 point-based schemes, for probationary staff.</p> <p>Submit a paper outlining the findings to the Dean-of-Education-Advisory-Groups by Faculty, and discuss ways forward with the Deans and School Directors of Education.</p> <p>Submit a report with recommendations based on 1. and 2. to QMSE by the end of 2018/19.</p>	<p>Action initiated - A survey of participants on the point-based scheme is being designed right now, as a first step of data gathering on the schemes' impact on and suitability for training and developing probationary staff alongside the formal taught programmes; the survey (and possibly focus groups) results will be compared to existing data on the impact of the taught programmes on participant practice, and the programmes' participant evaluations.</p>

3	Consider more frequent and diverse mechanisms for effectively communicating with staff in schools / institutes and with HR about the provision and opportunities available	<p>Identify named contacts from within Educational Development for each School, for direct liaising on School CPD needs</p> <p>Set up a system, negotiated with Schools, of regular (e.g. biannual) data reporting from us to the Schools on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of School based staff who have engaged in Educational Development activities • The general evaluation of such activities by all participants 	<p>Action initiated - We have now identified contacts from the team for each School, and are in the process of initiating contact (to take place via the Academic Development initiated contacts mentioned under Recommendation 1, c) above).</p>	
4	Continue to identify additional and alternative mechanisms for identifying and disseminating best practice across QMUL.	<p>Establish a data bank of good practice from the existing and future submissions through the formal taught programmes (assessment) and teaching recognition scheme (applications); this will initially be for use within Academic Development only.</p> <p><u>Develop an open, QMUL wide resource.</u></p>	<p>Action still to be addressed</p>	
5	Ensure the provision of clear, consistent feedback to participants, which will inform their future practice.	<p>Run standardisation sessions for feedback on assessment for existing and new programme tutors</p> <p>Clarify and accentuate the programme assessment criteria around application to practice</p>	<p>The programmes team has now introduced regular moderation meetings prior to assessment submission on every module, at which all markers involved with the particular module assessment consider how best to enhance the consistency, quality and focus on application to practice of the feedback. As part of that, they look at past feedback on the same assessment. The first moderation meetings are taking place in October 2018.</p> <p>The team reviewed and revised the generic programme assessment criteria in time for the launch of the September'18 programmes. The new criteria focus strongly on analysis and demonstration of the application to participant's practice, and so will markers' feedback.</p>	
6	<p>Work to ensure that the redesigned taught programmes:</p> <p>a) Account for the diverse disciplinary backgrounds of participants by ensuring that course materials do not focus too heavily on one particular subject area</p>	<p>Link programme content and resources to the data bank of good practice (from Recommendation 4. above)</p> <p>Subscribe through QMUL Library to a comprehensive online database of periodicals and e-books in higher education that cover the spread of disciplines represented on the programmes and at QMUL</p>	<p>Action in operation - In the interim of developing the data bank of good practice, we have now begun to develop learning resources in the forms of short video interviews, demonstrations and case studies of good practice by QMUL staff who have been identified by Schools and through the Educational Development's own activities. The first resources have already been included in the preparatory activities of our modules.</p> <p>We have subscribed to a comprehensive online database of education literature (journals and e-books), which is open to programme participants, all Academic Development staff, and all staff in Schools and Professional Services.</p>	
	b) Encourage a critical approach and provide opportunities for participants to explore and interrogate content	<p>Continue to ensure there are sufficient opportunities for staff on the programmes to feedback on this aspect of their learning experience.</p> <p>Add a question to the module evaluations OR the end of module open feedback session (the last 30 min of the final module session) on the experienced level of critical engagement with the programme content and resources.</p> <p>Continue to review our learning resources for currentness</p>	<p>Action in operation - We have reviewed and revised the design of module sessions to allow for more group critical appraisal of theory, and exploration of theory to education practice at university, within and across the academic disciplines and related services.</p> <p>We have updated the module reading lists and preparatory activities for each session with the most recent, cutting edge pedagogic research</p>	
	c) Adopt a contextualised approach to prepare participants for the diverse student population of QMUL	<p>Introduce into the module teaching around the institutional dashboards around the student body, as these become available</p> <p>Continue to draw on QMUL based research into student engagement, attainment, and attendance (e.g. by Engagement, Retention and Success; in Academic Development), and on other research into the QMUL specific learner and learning context.</p>	<p>Action in operation - We have dedicated sessions in each of the programme modules to student learning, experience and engagement in the QMUL context</p> <p>We continue to update the content and learning activities on the modules with the outcomes of recent research into QMUL student success</p>	
7	Consider offering some shorter, more informal development sessions in order to encourage engagement of staff who may not have the capacity to attend more formal activities that require a greater time commitment.	<p>Review the current provision of CPD for staff, including that run centrally by Educational Development and what we run with Schools, and seek closer links and alignment with the CPD provision in the Schools.</p> <p>Develop, together with the rest of Academic Development, a new framework for CPD that streamlines and coordinates related activities within, between and alongside the Schools.</p>	<p>Action initiated - Discussion and drafting of a new model for an institutional CPD framework are under way in Academic Development; the outcome will be consulted on with Schools and Faculties before the end of Semester A, 2018/19</p>	
8	Develop a systematic approach to researching and evaluating the impact of their programmes on participants, both in the short and longer terms.	<p>Continue to conduct our research into the impact of the taught programmes on participant practice</p> <p>Feedback our findings to the Schools on a regular basis (e.g. biannually)</p> <p>Communicate participant module evaluations of the programmes to the Schools and EQSB</p>	<p>Action in operation - We continue our long-term research on the learning gain of participants on the programmes against programme outcomes</p> <p>We launched from September 2018 research into staff wellbeing on the programmes, and continue with our research into the development of cohort identity on our face-to-face programme variants</p> <p>We are presenting the results from 1. at the November'18 Action Research workshop for QMUL staff organised by the International Education Group at QMUL</p>	

9	Results of this research should be distributed across QMUL as a mechanism for encouraging engagement by staff in the schools / institutes.	Feedback our findings to the Schools on a regular basis (e.g. biannually) Communicate participant module evaluations of the programmes to the Schools and EQSB	Action in operation - We are presenting the results from Recommendation 8.1.1 (learning gain) above at the November'18 Action Research workshop for QMUL staff organised by the International Education Group at QMUL	
10	Work with QMSE to: a) Ensure that an appropriately trained Academic Development Mentor is appointed within each school / institute in order to ensure the parity of experience for all taught programme participants b) Ensure that the appointed Academic Development Mentors within schools / institutes receive appropriate workload dispensations to undertake their roles effectively. Consideration should be given to making this a dedicated role within each Faculty	Collect data on the appointment of School Academic Development Mentors (SADMs) by School, and the workload dispensation such mentors receive Review and co-develop with the Schools, through the Deans of Education Advisory Groups, the SADMs' role description in order to standardise it and the related workload	Action still to be addressed	
11	Consider more formal and sustainable mechanisms for developing and supporting Academic Development Mentors	Update the training and support for SADMs in view of the action plan for Recommendation 10. above.	Action initiated - In the interim, we are launching a Mentors forum, the first of which is planned for November 2018. The forum will include SADMs – who have until now acted as mentors on all QMUL CPD pathways (taught programmes, point-based schemes, and teaching recognition scheme) – alongside other staff who only mentor on the teaching recognition scheme. We plan the forum to meet two-, three times a year, and to be a space for mentors to exchange and discuss good practice, challenges, and recommendations for senior QMUL committees.	
12	Updates the webpages and the Academic Development Mentor Handbook to ensure that all information is accurate and up to date. Consideration should also be given to providing a list of the Academic Development Mentors in each school / institute on the webpages in order to increase visibility of these contacts	Update the information for SADMs (the Mentors Handbook and QM Plus SADM course), and all QMUL staff (via the relevant Educational Development webpages) in view of the action plan for Recommendation 10. above.	Action initiated - We have updated the handbook and the website content on Academic Development Mentors, launched a video introducing the mentors and their role as part of a preparatory package for participants on the taught programmes ahead of their academic induction, and continue to invite the mentors to the induction so they can meet with their mentees before the start of programme.	
13	Formalise the registration and monitoring of participants on the ADEPT pathways to fellowship by using a QMPlus page to track engagement and progression with this route.	Review the process for registering and monitoring of participants on non-credit bearing pathways (specifically the point-based schemes) on the basis of the action plan for Recommendation 2. above. Review and implement a new system for registering and monitoring participants on the teaching recognition scheme	Action initiated - We have started a review of the related processes on the teaching recognition scheme, and are launching revised registration and progression monitoring from November 2018.	

INSTITUTE OF DENTISTRY (Review Date: June 2018)			
Recommendation	Planned action(s)	3 month update (EQSB: October 2018)	12 Month Update (Expected at EQSB: May 2019)
1	Improvements to the SED when preparing for the next periodic review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Involving a range of staff and students in the production of the documentation; Providing relevant and up-to-date information in the supporting documentation; Ensuring that descriptive information was evidenced by data and metrics which were tracked over time. 	Note for next review. Action in operation - Review in 2018 coincided with examination season so student availability restricted. Further clarification requested on up to date information and metrics	
2	With the support of the Faculty and Queen Mary, explore the potential of developing a closer working relationship with the Trust through a joint committee on planning and resources.	Trust Partnership Board and Service Level agreement to be established Action in operation - 1st meeting of Board due Autumn 2018. Service level agreement awaiting signature	
3	Revitalise and strengthen the Dean's Executive Group going forward.	Scope and membership increased. New Dean due to take office in January 2019. Action in operation - 1st meeting took place September 2018	
4	Review PGR recruitment strategies and explore potential diversification into other markets.	Widening PhD advertising Meet with QMUL International Recruitment Manager Action in operation - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New full time PGR administrator appointed New PhD projects advertised on FindaPhD Web site redesigned and PGR funding information being added New PGR funding opportunities are being circulated by email to all academic staff Research and PGR Administrator present on QMUL stand at IADR London 2018 to increase profile 	
5	Undertake a systematic approach to the annual programme review the PGT portfolio to identify priority areas for further development.	 Action initiated - Linked to Cost benefit analysis	
6	Conduct cost-benefit analysis of running small postgraduate programmes and to consider whether there was a potential to have a future recruitment drive. Increasing PG numbers would also mitigate against potential issues of student isolation in small cohorts.	Working with QM Admissions to improve the recruitment process. Working with the international office to explore new areas for recruitment Cost benefit analysis being undertaken Action initiated - Meetings with Admissions and International office took place over Summer 18 New staff appointed to oversee the process within the Dental School Cost benefit analysis due to be completed during Autumn 18	
7	Review programme specifications, with consideration of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> That the programme specifications should be reviewed annually for each current programme, and should be updated on current ARCS templates; That the information held in programme specifications should be consistently aligned with what is published online on websites and in handbooks; That the D Clin Dent programme specification should be updated for the next APR to correctly reflect the conjoint arrangement with the Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh. 	Programme specifications to be reviewed during Autumn 18 D Clin Dent specification to be updated Autumn 18 Action initiated	
8	Review training provision for PhD students who deliver teaching, including for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Running a session on teaching and assessment methods; Delivering a 'teach your first lesson' session; Inviting PhD students who teach to relevant parts of the staff development days. 	Introduction to teaching programme being developed within the Institute of Dentistry Exploring opportunities for students to become involved in teaching Students to be invited to Staff Development Days Action in operation - The Doctoral College has been informed of the title of the teaching course in order to add CPD points. Content and dates for this course to be finalised in Autumn 18. Director of Graduate Studies and PGR Administrator to have a meeting with Director of Taught Programmes and Director of Undergraduate Programmes to discuss PGR teaching opportunities in Autumn 18	
9	Review timetabling processes to ensure that any cancellations or changes are effectively communicated to students.	Meetings with students planned to explore best way of cascading information Action initiated - New Year leads appointed. SSLC to be consulted on communication.	
10	Deteriorating equipment at the outreach centres should be upgraded at the earliest opportunity to avoid any potential risks to the attainment of intended learning outcomes or safe patient treatment.	Options analysis of Outreach centres being undertaken. Trust Partnership board and Service Level Agreement established to facilitate and streamline equipment replacement.	Action initiated - Due to be completed by Autumn 2018. 1st meeting of Partnership board due in Autumn 2018. Service Level agreement signed September 18
11	Reinstate a form of consistent and purposeful peer observation of teaching and that the Institute should liaise with the Queen Mary Educational Development team to progress this work.	Process being developed Action initiated - Staff Development Day	
12	Develop a feedback policy which provides a clear timeframe for returning feedback. The development of a policy should also articulate a minimum level of feedback to ensure consistency in the feedback provided to students.	Policy review to be undertaken Action initiated - Assessment Leads and Dental Quality Assurance committee to oversee process	
13	Consider ways of gathering patient feedback in order to satisfy the recommendation of the General Dental Council (GDC) before the next visit. It was suggested that the Institute should consider simple mechanisms, such as paper questionnaires for a year group, or another pilot initiative which might advance this work.	Pilot paper based exercise begun September 2018 Action initiated - Pilot study due to be completed by end of Autumn term 2018. Early data encouraging.	
14	Encourage improved student engagement with handbooks, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Running a QMPlus quiz at the start of the academic year; Providing handbooks in a searchable format on QMPlus, either as a PDF Handbook or searchable QMPlus Handbook; A lecture dedicated to reviewing the content of the handbook. 	Students receive Year and course specific induction programme including reference to Handbooks Handbook design to be reviewed Action initiated - Inductions took place in September 18. Dental Quality Assurance to review handbooks.	

15	The Student Experience Action Plan should be further developed, with actions related to addressing the concerns from the NSS about feedback and organisational management.		Action in operation - SEAP updated to include NSS action plan and Periodic recommendations September 18. Feedback review initiated	
16	Recommendation for the Faculty: explore the issue of resources for providing access to dental journals for postgraduate students.	Journal provision to be reviewed.	Action initiated - Meeting with library forum	