LONDON'S GLOBAL UNIVERSITY

UCL Academic Manual
2024-25

Chapter 9: Quality Review Framework

Chapter 9 is UCL's regulatory framework for monitoring standards, the student experience and strategic quality enhancement activities across UCL. It includes the regulations for Department and Faculty Education Plans, Internal Quality Review (IQR) and External Examining as well as Peer Dialogue, Student Partnership Committees (SPC), Student Representation on UCL Academic Standing Committees and Sub-Committees and Academic Committee Review Panels.

1 INTRODUCTION 4
2 FACULTY AND DEPARTMENT EDUCATION PLANS 5
2.1 Introduction 5
2.2 Faculty Education Plans 5
2.3 Department Education Plans 7
3 INTERNAL QUALITY REVIEW (IQR) 11
3.1 Introduction 11
3.2 Selection for an Internal Quality Review visit 11
3.3 The Review Panel 12
3.4 Review Visit Preparation 14
3.5 The Review Visit 16
3.6 The Review Outcomes 16
3.7 Implementing the Recommendations 17
4 EXTERNAL EXAMINING 19
4.1 Criteria for Appointment 19
4.2 Responsibilities of UCL 20
4.3 Responsibilities of the External Examiner 21
4.4 Nomination and Appointment 22
4.5 Student Contact with External Examiners 23
4.6 Entitlements of External Examiners 23
4.7 External Examiner Reports 24
5 PEER DIALOGUE SCHEME 25
6 STUDENT ACADEMIC REPRESENTATION 26
6.1 Introduction 26
6.2 Committee Structure and Process 26
6.3 Appointment of Representatives 26
6.4 Student Partnership Committee Meetings 27
6.5 SPC Terms of Reference 28
6.6 Lead Department Representatives 28
6.7 Faculty Representatives 29
6.8 Faculty Academic Representative Forums 29
6.9 Interdepartmental Degree Programmes 29
7 STUDENT REPRESENTATION ON UCL ACADEMIC STANDING COMMITTEES AND SUB-COMMITTEES 30
7.1 Representation at Departmental and Faculty Level 30
7.2 Student Academic Representatives 31
7.3 Representation via the Students' Union 31
7.4 Student Representation on UCL Academic Standing and Sub-Committees 31
7.5 Student Representation on UCL Non-Academic and Statutory Committees 32
8 ACADEMIC COMMITTEE REVIEW PANEL 34
8.1 Policy 34
8.2 Procedure 34
9 CORE PROGRAMME INFORMATION 36
10 MODULE AND PROGRAMME EVALUATIONS POLICY 37
10.1 Continuous Module Dialogue 37

10.2 Annual Programme Evaluations 37

1 Introduction

1. A risk-based, proportionate, outcome-driven quality and review framework is a vital tool for ensuring the security of academic standards and the quality of learning opportunities for students. UCL's Quality Review Framework integrates all key processes for monitoring standards, the student experience and strategic quality enhancement activities.

External Context

University College London (UCL) is responsible for the standard and quality of the awards made in its name and the quality of the programmes that lead to those awards. Responsibility for developing and delivering programmes is delegated to Departments which all aspire to excellence on taught or research programmes. These aspirations require regular monitoring, review, and constructive peer dialogue to provide the necessary assurance, both to the University and to our external regulators, such as the Office for Students, Ofsted, and our professional, statutory and regulatory bodies.

Purpose of the Framework

The Quality Review Framework should provide assurance to UCL of the following:

- Faculties and Departments have strategic oversight of, and take responsibility for, the academic standards and quality of their programmes, which includes undergraduate, postgraduate taught and graduate research programmes (including professional doctorates).
- All students are treated fairly, equitably and as individuals.
- Students have the opportunity to contribute to shaping their learning experience.
- Students are properly and actively informed at appropriate times of matters relevant to their programmes of study.
- There is sufficient external involvement in the design, approval, and review of the curriculum.
- Staff are supported to deliver high quality student experiences.
- Innovation and creativity in the design and delivery of the curriculum is actively supported.

Principles Underpinning the Framework

The following principles underpin the entire Quality Review Framework:

- Processes for monitoring quality ought to be proportionate to the risk to the student experience and academic standards.
- The framework must ensure that the student interest is being served.
- The framework should respect the academic expertise and administrative professionalism of staff in Departments and faculties.
- Students should be engaged in all elements of the framework.
- Processes must be conducted in a consistent and systematic fashion and be underpinned by robust, high-quality data.
- The framework should encourage and promote enhancement and sharing good practice.

2 Faculty and Department Education Plans

2.1 Introduction

1. These regulations set out the requirement for Departments and Faculties to produce and maintain education plans to address areas of identified risk to quality and standards.

2.2 Faculty Education Plans

2.2.1 Purpose of the Faculty Education Plan

1. A Faculty Education Plan (FEP) is a record of the enhancement activity that a Faculty has committed to undertake in a given academic year to improve the student education experience and/or student outcomes in specific departments or across the Faculty where they judge there is a sufficiently high risk to quality and standards that needs to be managed between the Faculty, Education Committee, and the University Management Committee.
2. A FEP must be focused on addressing issues that the Dean believes present a high risk to quality, standards, and the student experience as informed by their review of key education and student outcomes metrics, particularly those outlined in B3 of the Office for Students conditions of registration, in discussion with their Faculty Education Team, and the relevant Heads of Departments.
3. The FEP must be confirmed within sufficient time for conducting the activity within it, and to enable publication of the activity to students.

2.2.2 Producing and agreeing the Faculty Education Plan

Producing the Faculty Education Plan

1. Each Faculty will receive a set of data, agreed by the Quality and Standards Committee, each year. The data will normally be made up of a combination of student experience and student outcomes data, e.g., responses to internal and external surveys. This data will complement information already available to the Faculty, such as its External Examiner responses, feedback from its students, for example through SSPC and other student voice channels, and reports from Department committees.
2. The Dean, advised by the Faculty Education Team, and in conversation with the HEDS Faculty Partnership Team will use this data to identify programmes, departments or areas of work that appear to present a high risk to quality and standards within the Faculty.
3. Once agreed, the Dean will task the relevant Head of Department, or in the case of a Faculty wide issue, a relevant member of the Faculty Education Team, with developing a plan to address the specific areas of risk that have been identified. This plan must include:
    - A clear articulation of why this area has been identified for specific focus.
    - The actions that will be taken within the academic year to address the issue.
    - The timeline for completion of these activities within the academic year.
    - A clear articulation of what a successful intervention will look like.
    - An evaluation of the anticipated risks and/or challenges to achieving success, and the mitigations that have been identified.

- Clarity on additional support that might be needed from within the Faculty or other areas of UCL to help achieve the desired outcomes.

4. The Dean will review the proposed actions and, if felt appropriate, evaluate the resources that will be required to conduct the activity within it and allocate them appropriately. The HEDS Faculty Partnership Team will also identify areas that they can assist with.

Agreeing the Faculty Education Plan with University Management Committee

5. The Dean must submit the FEP to the Pro Vice Provost Education (Student Academic Experience) for discussion at the University Management Committee.
6. The University Management Committee will review the FEP and advise the Dean on areas that may need to be revised, strengthened, or reprioritised.
7. Once agreed with the University Management Committee, the Pro Vice Provost Education (Student Academic Experience) must submit the FEP for approval to the first meeting of the Quality and Standards Committee of the academic year.

2.2.3 Communicating the Faculty Education Plan

1. The Dean must ensure that the relevant Heads of Department and Faculty officers have a plan in place for communicating the activity that will be undertaken as part of the FEP to all staff and all students in the Faculty. The communication plan should be prepared alongside the FEP to enable rapid implementation of the plan once the FEP is approved.

2.2.4 Monitoring and reviewing the Faculty Education Plan

Monitoring progress within the Faculty

1. The Faculty Education Committee is responsible for monitoring the progress of the activity detailed in the FEP and, where necessary, for advising the Dean of the need to review the scope, the resourcing or the timeline associated with that activity.
2. To support this activity, the FEP must be a standing item for discussion on each Faculty Education Committee agenda.
3. The Dean is responsible for ensuring the successful completion of the FEP, and for reporting on progress to the University Management Committee.
4. The Dean is also responsible for ensuring that progress on the FEP is being communicated to students and staff within the Faculty.

Reporting on progress to the Quality and Standards Committee

5. The Quality and Standards Committee will agree a reporting schedule with each Dean.
6. The schedule should enable the submission of reports on the progress of FEP actions to a meeting of the Quality and Standards Committee at least once per term. Guidance on the format for these reports will be circulated to faculties each year. At a minimum, they will require:

    a) A commentary on any milestones that have been met.

    b) An outline of any changes to the FEP since the last report, and the reasons for those changes, for example reflection on data sets that have been published since the last update.

    c) An evaluation of the achievability of the FEP based on the remaining time and resource available.

d) Where necessary, an outline of support that the Faculty feels it needs to achieve success.

7. The Quality and Standards Committee is responsible for monitoring the progress of the activity detailed in the FEP and advising the Education Committee of any faculties that appear to be at risk of not achieving their actions.
8. The Education Committee is responsible for reviewing the recommendations of the Quality and Standards Committee and taking appropriate action, which may include escalation to another committee or role holder for additional scrutiny or action.

2.2.5 Supporting the completion of the Faculty Education Plan

1. Each Faculty will be supported by its HEDS Faculty Partnership Team to complete the actions outlined in its FEP.
2. The HEDS Faculty Partnership Team must meet with the Vice Dean Education and the Faculty Tutor at the start of each academic year to review the FEP and agree actions that the HEDS Faculty Partnership Team will undertake to support.
3. A follow-up meeting must be held at the six-month point to discuss progress and subsequent actions as appropriate.
4. The HEDS Faculty Partnership Team should update the Faculty Education Committee on its progress at agreed intervals.

2.2.6 Evaluating the Faculty Education Plan

1. The Dean, supported by their Faculty Education Team, will conduct a self-evaluation of their progress against the actions listed in the FEP and submit it to the Quality and Standards Committee in Term 3.
2. The Quality and Standards Committee will review the self-evaluations at its last meeting of the year. Based on their review, the committee may endorse the work undertaken and the progress made or take any other actions that it feels are appropriate and within its own remit. Where necessary, it may also make recommendations to other committees or role holders.

2.3 Department Education Plans

2.3.1 Purpose of the Department Education Plan

1. A Department Education Plan (DEP) is a record of the enhancement activity that a department has committed to undertake in a given academic year to improve the student education experience and/or student outcomes in areas that present a comparatively high risk.
2. A DEP must be informed by the review of key education and student outcomes metrics, through discussion with colleagues, both internal and external to the department, and in partnership with students.
3. The DEP must be in place at the start of the academic year to provide sufficient time for conducting the activity within it, and to enable publication of the activity to students.

2.3.2 Producing and agreeing the Department Education Plan

Producing the Department Education Plan

1. Each Department will receive a set of data, agreed by the Quality and Standards Committee, each year. The data will normally be made up of a combination of student experience and student outcomes data, e.g., responses to national and local surveys. This data will complement information already available to the Department, such as its External Examiner responses, and feedback from its students.
2. The Head of Department, advised by the Department Teaching Committee, will use this data to inform the development of the DEP. The DEP must include:
    - At least one priority area that will be targeted for enhancement activity.
    - A clear articulation of why this area has been identified for specific focus, with reference to the data.
    - The actions that will be taken within the academic year to address the issue.
    - The timeline for completion of these activities within the academic year.
    - A clear articulation of what a successful intervention will look like.
    - An evaluation of the anticipated risks and/or challenges to achieving success, and the mitigations that have been identified.
    - Clarity on additional support that the Department needs from the Faculty or other areas of UCL to help achieve the desired outcomes.
3. The activity within the DEP may be focused on a specific programme, an issue that affects multiple programmes, or feed into a larger project that will take multiple academic years to complete. However, it must be clear that the activity is focused on addressing a clear risk or need and is achievable within one academic year, even where it contributes to a longer-term project.
4. Where the Department has recently been through an Internal Quality Review, the Head of Department should ensure that the review recommendations are being addressed through the activity in the DEP.
5. Once the Head of Department has completed the DEP, they must evaluate the resources that will be required to conduct the activity within it and allocate that resource appropriately. This may include adjusting workload allocations, or budgeting for specific associated costs. Unresourced DEPs will not be successful and should not be approved.

Agreeing the Department Education Plan with the Faculty

6. Each Department must submit its DEP to the Dean of the Faculty, the Vice Dean Education, and the Faculty Tutor (or equivalent).
7. The Dean, advised by their Vice Dean Education and Faculty Tutor, must review, and approve the DEP for each Department.
8. If, following the review of a DEP, the Dean determines that the activity is not sufficient, is not achievable within the academic year, has not been properly resourced or has prioritized the wrong area, based on a review of the data, they may challenge the Head of Department to review and resubmit their DEP.
9. Once agreed with the Dean, all DEPs must be submitted to the first Faculty Education Committee of the academic year for formal approval.

2.3.3 Communicating the Department Education Plan

1. Heads of Departments must ensure that they have a plan in place for communicating the activity that will be undertaken as part of the DEP to all staff and all students in the

Department. The communication plan should be ready in time for the start of the academic year.

2. The communication plan must go beyond submission of the DEP to Student Staff Partnership Committees and should include plans for engaging the whole student body.

2.3.4 Monitoring and reviewing the Department Education Plan

Monitoring progress within the Department

1. The Department Teaching Committee is responsible for monitoring the progress of the activity detailed in the DEP and, where necessary, for advising the Head of Department on the need to review the scope, the resourcing or the timeline associated with that activity.
2. To support this activity, the DEP must be a standing item for discussion on each Department Teaching Committee agenda.
3. The Head of Department is responsible for ensuring the successful completion of the DEP, and for reporting on progress to the Dean.
4. The Head of Department is also responsible for communicating progress on the DEP to students and staff within the Department. To assist this, Heads of Department should ensure that the DEP is submitted to relevant Student Staff Partnership Committee and departmental meetings throughout the year.

Reporting on progress to the Faculty

5. Each Dean of Faculty must agree a reporting schedule with their Heads of Departments.
6. The schedule should enable the submission of reports on the progress of DEP actions to the Faculty Education Committee at least once per term. The Faculty should advise on the format these reports should take, but at a minimum, they should include:
    a) A commentary on any milestones that have been met.
    b) An outline of any changes to the DEP since the last report, and the reasons for those changes, for example reflection on data sets that have been published since the last update.
    c) An evaluation of the achievability of the DEP based on the remaining time and resource available.
    d) Where necessary, an outline of support that the Department feels it needs to achieve success.
7. The Faculty Education Committee is responsible for monitoring the progress of the activity detailed in the DEP and advising the Dean of any departments that appear to be at risk of not achieving their actions.
8. The Dean is responsible for following up with Heads of Departments judged to be at risk of not achieving their DEP milestones to either agree a plan for enabling the Department to achieve its original DEP milestones, or to agree an amended plan that is achievable within the remaining time and/or resource.

2.3.5 Evaluating the Department Education Plan

1. The Head of Department will conduct a self-evaluation of their progress against the actions listed in the DEP as part of the process of preparing the following year's plan.
2. Both processes are conducted in tandem to encourage the Head of Department to review with reference to the data that has been produced at the conclusion of the academic year.

The Head of Department should use that data to evaluate whether the actions have achieved sufficient impact, and if not, may choose to prioritise activity in the same area in next year's DEP.

3. The self-evaluation should be submitted to the Dean, the Vice Dean Education, and the Faculty Tutor alongside the DEP that is being proposed for the new academic year. Each Faculty can agree the format that this evaluation should take.

4. A Dean may, based on poor performance against a DEP, choose to include the Department in the Faculty Education Plan for the following year.

3 Internal Quality Review (IQR)

3.1 Introduction

1. Internal Quality Review (IQR) is UCL's central academic quality management and enhancement process. IQR is a risk-based programme of peer review, in which academic units of UCL which are identified as posing a significant risk to standards in one or more areas of their provision are intensively reviewed to identify areas where they can be supported to improve.
2. The main purpose of the IQR is to focus on those areas where the department has been identified to be performing significantly below the agreed benchmark in its education and student experience activity, to investigate the factors that may be contributing to that performance, and to recommend areas for enhancement that will ensure that those departments are providing a high-quality student experience, that safeguards academic standards and delivers good outcomes for all students.
3. The philosophy underpinning IQR is one of peer support and educational enhancement through the sharing of good practice. Through the review visit and the subsequent report and follow up, the process aims to enable colleagues in departments who are facing challenges in specific areas of their provision to learn from peers with expertise or proven good performance in those same areas.

3.2 Selection for an Internal Quality Review visit

3.2.1 Criteria for selection

1. In time for the start of each academic session, a review of performance in key education and student experience measures, as agreed by the Quality and Standards Committee, will be conducted and based on that analysis, a list of departments will be identified as potential candidates for an IQR visit.
2. The measures that will normally factor into the analysis are listed below. There may be a need to consider measures beyond those listed below in cases where there is evidence of a risk to academic standards or the student experience that has not been directly flagged in the normal course of review. In such cases, a recommendation will be made to the Quality and Standards Committee.
    a) Student Outcomes:
    b) Student Experience (National Student Survey, Annual Programme Survey)
    a) Awarding Gaps
    b) Classification Outcomes

3.2.2 Confirming the visit

1. The Internal Quality Review Panel will, based on the analysis produced and the recommendations made, consider the list of departments that may qualify for an IQR visit.
2. The Internal Quality Review Panel may also consider other factors presented to them, as outlined above, to support them in making their recommendations. This

may include the distance from the last review visit, and a review of progress made as evidenced within the Department and/or Faculty Education Plan.

3. Heads of Departments that are nominated for an IQR will be informed by the Internal Quality Review Panel Chair (or nominee) and invited to arrange an initial meeting to discuss the reasons for the nomination and to receive guidance on the process of preparing for the review visit. They will also be asked to nominate a contact within the Department who is responsible for liaising with the Review Manager on all aspects related to the operational delivery of the review.
4. Heads of Departments that are not nominated for an IQR will be informed that they were considered by the Internal Quality Review Panel, and that their Dean will be asked to include them in the Faculty Education Plan for the year.

3.2.3 Repeat qualification for an IQR visit

1. As some issues can take more than one academic year to resolve, it is feasible that a department may, based on their metrics, qualify for an IQR in consecutive years, or within a short interval from their last visit.
2. In the interest of giving departments sufficient time to embed enhancements, while maintaining assurance that progress is being made, the following decision framework will be used:
    - Year 0: Department is nominated to receive an IQR visit in Term 1 and the visit happens in Term 2 or Term 3.
    - Year 1: As the review visit happened within the last year, there will not be immediate follow up, other than ensuring that IQR actions are being addressed through the DEP in line with 1.7.
    - Year 2: The Head of Department and Dean of Faculty are invited to meet with the Chair of the IQR Panel to discuss their progress against any Essential recommendations and, where necessary, will agree an enhanced reporting schedule and additional actions based on changes in the data since the review visit.
    - Year 3: The Department will be nominated for, and likely approved for, a new IQR visit.

3.3 The Review Panel

1. The IQR Panel will constitute a review panel for each visit. As far as possible, the constitution of the panel should be matched to the needs of the visit, based on the factors that contributed to the decision to conduct the review of that department.
2. The Review Panel Leader must be a senior member of staff directly involved in delivering and/or supporting education and the holistic student experience.
3. The maximum number of reviewers that should be appointed is ten, but a smaller, more agile panel may be appointed where appropriate to the needs of the visit. The Chair of the IQR Panel will confirm how many reviewers they think would be appropriate, and the relevant expertise required, with the Head of Academic Policy, Quality and Standards.

4. As far as possible, all internal members of the review panel must come from outside of the faculty to which the department being reviewed belongs.
5. All review panels must have at least one student reviewer, and one external reviewer who will be appointed based on either subject or issue specific knowledge.
6. All review panel members will undertake to read all supporting documentation, participate fully in interviewing staff and students ruing the review visit, and make appropriate contributions to the preparation of the final report.

Role of the Review Panel Leader

7. To conduct the pre-meeting with the Faculty leadership team, supported by the Review Manager and at least one other internal reviewer.
8. To chair the review panel's planning meeting, in which the leader will confirm the areas of exploration that are being assigned to each member of the panel.
9. During the review visit, to ensure that each interview session is conducted in a collegial and supportive manner, while ensuring that the relevant avenues for discussion are appropriately covered.
10. To agree with the other members of the panel, the main findings, and conclusions of the review visit, and to ensure that these are correctly recorded by the Review Manager.
11. To approve the formal report of the IQR visit once this has been agreed between the review panel and the Department being reviewed.

Role of the Student Reviewer(s)

12. To conduct the pre-meeting with the course representatives for all relevant programmes in the Department and produce the Student Submission in partnership with the Lead Department Representative.

Role of the External Reviewer(s)

13. External Reviewers play a vital role in assisting the team to identify key issues to be explored during the visit to the department. They can identify and make comparisons with similar provision or activity at other institutions and, where relevant, comment on the currency of the department's programmes, or their education and student experience related practices and processes, in the context of developments in the discipline and/or the wider sector.
14. An External Reviewer will normally be a senior member of staff involved in education or the support of education employed at another Higher Education Provider. They should either be appointed based on their knowledge of the discipline or because of their recognised capability in an area directly relevant to the reasons the Department has been nominated for review.
15. A reviewer will be identified by and nominated to the IQR Panel by the relevant Faculty Education Leadership team. They will have had no formal links to the Department within the previous five years and will have experience of conducting periodic review within their own institution, or external review on behalf of the QAA or another relevant professional body.

Role of the Review Manager

16. The Review Manager is responsible for facilitating communication between the Department and the review panel in preparation for the visit. This includes agreeing the date of the visit, answering any questions the Department may have about the process and their preparations, and agreeing deadlines for the submission of key documents.
17. The Review Manager is also responsible for supporting the review panel in their preparations for the visit, including arranging and attending preparatory meetings, preparing agenda for each interview, and agreeing attendees for each interview between the Department and the panel leader.
18. The Review Manager is responsible for recording the key points of discussion and outcomes of each of the interviews, and for drawing this together to support the review panel in reaching their final conclusions and recommendations. Subsequently, the Review Manager is responsible for drafting and coordinating the agreement for the final report.

3.4 Review Visit Preparation

3.4.1 Preliminary Meetings

Initial meeting with the Department

1. Following confirmation of the Department's selection for IQR, the Head of Department, the Director of Education, and the nominated contact person will be invited to meet with the Head of Academic Policy, Quality and Standards and the Review Manager. The purpose of this meeting is to:
   a) Explain why the department has been selected for IQR, and the specific evidence that was used to make that decision.
   b) Ascertain whether there are additional areas the department feels it would benefit from exploring as part of the visit.
   c) Agree what information the department will provide in its Self-evaluative statement and supporting documentation.
   d) In principle agree, agree which departmental teams the review panel should interview to explore the issues identified.
   e) Identify suitable dates to conduct the review visit.

Meeting with Faculty education leadership

2. Once the review panel has been appointed, the Review Panel Leader, the Review Manager, and at least one other internal reviewer will meet with the Dean, Vice Dean Education, Faculty Tutor (or equivalent) and HEDS Faculty Partner. The purpose of this meeting is to:
   a) Establish whether the Faculty has any specific areas it would like the review visit to explore.
   b) Understand the Faculty's perspective on the areas that the Department has faced challenges with, and their actions to address them.

c) Establish what support the Faculty has provided and continues to provide to help the Department to enhance its education and student experience.

Meeting with the course representatives

3. Prior to the review visit, the Student Reviewers and the Lead Department Representatives will co-lead a meeting with the department's course representatives. The purpose of the meeting is to:

   a) Facilitate a discussion of the key themes that the review visit will be exploring and understand the students' view of the department's efforts in addressing its challenges.

   b) Understand what, if any, changes, or enhancements the students feel would help the department to improve in the areas that are being reviewed.

   c) Enable the Student Reviewers and the Lead Department Representatives to co-create the student submission, which will be based on the themes and ideas raised during the meeting and will form part of the supporting documentation for the review visit.

3.4.2 The Self-evaluative Statement and the Student Submission

The Self-evaluative Statement

1. The purpose of the Self-evaluative Statement (SES) is to provide the department with an opportunity to reflect on the challenges it has faced in the areas for which it has been nominated for the review, and to outline actions and interventions taken to date to address them. This will help the review panel to understand the context within which the visit will take place.

2. In producing the SES, the department should be honest about what it is finding challenging, where it wants to get to in terms of enhancement and improvement, and the support it feels it would need to get there.

3. The SES should reflect on the data provided to the department, such as its performance against key education and student experience metrics, as well as its own locally held information, such as its enhancement plans, Student Partnership Committee minutes, and responses to external examiners' reports. These sources of information should be provided as appendices with clear cross references within the SES.

4. The template format for the SES will be approved by the IQR Panel and published each year and provided to each department at its preliminary meeting.

The Student Submission

5. The purpose of the Student Submission is to complement the SES, which is produced by the staff leading education in the department, with a corresponding and co-equal reflection on the same information from the student body, as represented through the Course Representatives.

6. The Course Representatives will support the production of the Student Submission through the preliminary meeting chaired by the Student Reviewers and the Lead Department Representatives. The Student Reviewers and the Lead Department Representatives will then co-write the Student Submission.

7. The template format for the Student Submission will be approved by the IQR Panel published each year and provided to each Lead Department Representatives and Student Reviewers prior to their meeting with the Course Representatives.

3.5 The Review Visit

1. The purpose of the visit is to reach, through a series of collegiate and collaborative discussions, a collective understanding between the department and the institution, through the review panel, of the key factors contributing to the challenges the department is facing, and to agree a set of realistic and useful recommendations that will enable the department to enhance its education and student experience.
2. A review panel's visit may last between 1-2 days, depending on the extent of business, the size of the department, and the number of interviews it has been deemed necessary to schedule.
3. The review panel will agree with the Department in advance of the visit a detailed timetable of interviews to be conducted. These interviews should align with the issues covered in the SES. A sample timetable is available in the IQR Guidance provided to departments for the IQR.
4. At some point during the day, the following role holders should always be interviewed:
    - The Head of Department.
    - The Chair of the Department Teaching Committee.
    - The Lead Department Representatives (UG and PGT, as appropriate).
    - Programme Leaders for all relevant programmes.
    - A range of staff who teach on or support the delivery of the relevant programmes.
    - A range of students from the relevant programmes.

3.6 The Review Outcomes

3.6.1 Summary of Key Findings

1. The Review Manager will draft a summary of key findings within five working days of the conclusion of the review visit. This will be circulated to the Review Panel Leader for approval and sent to the Head of Department and Dean of Faculty with a note that the fuller draft report, which will contextualise all recommendations, will follow in 25 working days (noting that timelines may be adjusted to accommodate Review Panel members leave and other commitments).

3.6.2 The Review Report

1. The report of the IQR visit will be drafted by the Review Manager, agreed with the review panel, and forwarded to the Head of Department within 25 working

days of the last meeting of the review team (noting that timelines may be adjusted to accommodate Review Panel members leave and other commitments). The Department will then be asked to comment on any factual errors.

2. The report will set out recommendations for improvement in the following categories ‘essential’, ‘advisable’ or ‘’desirable’ and, where appropriate, identify good practice and/or make affirmations of actions already under way. Where appropriate and applicable, the report will also set out what support may be available to help the department or programme concerned to meet expectations and within what period.
3. Actions will be contextualised so that it is clear why a recommendation is being made, and how it is intended to support the Department.

3.6.3 The Department Action Plan

1. The department or programme concerned will, in consultation with the review panel and normally within four weeks of receipt of written feedback, produce a written plan detailing the follow-up action that it will take in response to the recommendations in the IQR Review Panel report for approval by the Chair of the IQR Panel and will be shared with and discussed at the Quality and Standards Committee and reported to Education Committee.
2. The action plan must be realistic and commit to making progress against each recommendation within an agreed timeline.
3. A copy of the report and action plan will be sent to the relevant Dean for information and should be submitted to the next normal meeting of the Faculty Education Committee for discussion.

3.7 Implementing the Recommendations

3.7.1 Relationship with the Department and Faculty Education Plan

1. As qualification for an IQR is indicative of a serious risk to quality and standards in one or more areas of the Department’s provision, it is expected that a Department working to implement an IQR action plan will undertake more enhancement activity in an academic year than other departments.
2. All actions related to essential recommendations must be added to the Department Education Plan (DEP) for the duration of those actions. They must also be added to the Faculty Education Plan (FEP), as they are actions being taken to address a significant risk to standards. These actions will then be tracked via the regular report to Quality and Standards Committee, and the conversations with the HEDS Faculty Partnership teams.
3. The Department must table the IQR action plan at each meeting of the Department Teaching Committee, alongside the DEP to identify when and how to incorporate the actions that will be taken to address advisable and desirable recommendations into the DEP.

3.7.2 Relationship with the IQR Panel

1. At the start of each academic year, the IQR Panel will receive the agreed Department Education Plan and review it against the IQR Action Plan to monitor progress against the recommendations of the review panel.
2. Where the IQR Panel is concerned that progress against a specific recommendation is insufficient, it may ask the Quality and Standards Committee to explore this further with the Department.

3.7.3 Annual Progress Conversations

1. Once a year, each department that is working to address an IQR Action Plan will meet with their Vice Dean Education and/or Faculty Tutor, HEDS Faculty Partnership Lead, and a senior member of the Academic Policy, Quality and Standards team.
2. The purpose of the meeting is to identify where progress has been made against the action plan, what actions the department plans to focus on next, and any assistance the department may need to make progress on their outstanding actions.
3. These meetings are not a monitoring point, as this will be conducted via the other methods listed above, but an opportunity to identify support and development needs.

4 External Examining

1. External examining provides one of the principal means of maintaining UK academic standards within autonomous higher education providers. External Examining is therefore an important part of UCL's Quality Review Framework (QRF). The following regulations are applicable only to taught programmes of study, including Undergraduate, Initial Teacher Education and Postgraduate.

4.1 Criteria for Appointment

1. External Examiners must be appointed for all taught programmes delivered by UCL and academic partner institutions.
2. External Examiners must be competent in assessing students' knowledge and skills at higher education level; expert in the field of study concerned and have appropriate academic and/or professional experience and authority.
3. External Examiners appointed to programmes must meet any specified qualification requirements of the relevant Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies.
4. External Examiners must be from outside UCL and must not be involved in teaching on the programme, or be involved in current or recent collaborative activity with the staff or students of that programme.
5. Former members of UCL staff and former UCL students must not be appointed as External Examiners before a lapse of at least five years. It must also be ensured that all students taught by that former member of staff have left the programme being examined.
6. External Examiners should not normally hold more than one other substantive External Examinership in addition to their appointment for UCL.
7. External Examiners should not be appointed to examine a single module unless there is a good reason for doing so.
8. External Examiners for undergraduate Boards of Examiners must be eligible to work in the UK.
9. A member of the academic staff of a College of the University of London other than UCL, or any other external institution with which UCL has service teaching arrangements, may be appointed as an External Examiner. It is imperative that the Board of Examiners at UCL, on which the appointee will serve, so far as can be anticipated, is examining no students from the appointee's college.
10. An External Examiner will not be appointed from a department/division in which a member of UCL staff is serving as an External Examiner. Boards of Examiners must check these details with staff in their Department and with the nominee prior to submitting the nominee's details.
11. Only one External Examiner from the same department/division or Faculty of an institution will be appointed to examine the same programme at any one time.
12. An External Examiner may be appointed from the same department/division or Faculty of an institution only after at least two years have elapsed since the termination of the previous appointment from that department/division or Faculty.
13. Exceptions to the foregoing stipulations may on occasion be permitted, for example, in the case of subjects taught only in a very small number of institutions or subjects with an unusually high number of specialisms. These exceptions must be granted by the Quality and Standards Committee (QSC) Chair or nominee. Requests for exceptions should be sent to examiners@ucl.ac.uk.

14. External Examiners must declare, at the time of appointment, or continuation in appointment, any interest in or connection with any student or staff on the programme for which they are acting as External Examiner whether that interest or connection is personal or professional. If such an interest or connection exists, the External Examiner in question should not be appointed or re-appointed. The Chair of the Board of Examiners is responsible for managing this process and should notify any cases to the QSC Chair or nominee, via examiners@ucl.ac.uk.

15. After serving for a period of four consecutive years, (or five years if an extension to service was approved by the QSC Chair or nominee) an External Examiner is not eligible for re-appointment for a period of five years. The period of service is defined as the period of service as an External Examiner at UCL and not as the period of service as External Examiner to a particular Board of Examiners.

4.2 Responsibilities of UCL

1. At the time of nomination Departments and Student & Registry Services should provide the External Examiner with sufficient information to enable him/ her to make an informed decision as to whether or not to accept the appointment.

2. Student & Registry Services issue an appointment email clarifying information on payment of fees and expenses and details of UCL's academic regulations. This appointment email acts as a four-year contract letter for the External Examiner.

3. Departments should ascertain whether or not External Examiners have any access requirements or require any reasonable adjustments in order to carry out their duties, as outlined in UCL's Equal Opportunity Policy.

4. UCL will pay expenses promptly on receipt. The fee will be paid on receipt of the External Examiner's report, provided that it is submitted via Portico within one month of receiving the email with the Portico report link (this email will be sent within a week of the Board of Examiners meeting).

5. Postgraduate External Examiners are registered at UCL as self-employed and are therefore required to declare their income and payment of any sums owed to the HMRC directly.

6. Departments should take the opportunity to meet new External Examiners either online or in person ahead of their first Board of Examiners, to ensure that this meeting is not the first time at which they meet the generality of academic staff.

7. As a minimum, Departments must provide new and continuing External Examiners with the following information by the start of the academic year:

    i) Name(s) and contact details for the Chair of the Board of Examiners, Board Administrators and Examinations Liaison Officers.

    ii) The date(s) of meetings of Board of Examiners to which the External Examiner is invited.

    iii) The Terms of Reference, Constitution and Membership of the Board (e.g., number of Internal Examiners and any interdepartmental/ interdivisional involvement).

    iv) The number and subject area of other External Examiners appointed to the Board.

    v) The Student Handbook or equivalent, Programme Summary and/ or syllabus and module information.

    vi) The programme regulations to be used in determining student Progression, Awarding and Classification.

    vii) Marking criteria.

viii) Reports of External Examiners from the previous cycle and the departmental responses.

ix) Timescales for the external examiner process including when to expect items for review, and when to expect access to Moodle/ IT systems.

4.3 Responsibilities of the External Examiner

1. The primary responsibilities of a Taught Programme External Examiner are to assure themselves that summative assessment tasks are being set at an appropriate level and standard and to submit an annual report via Portico, based upon their professional judgement, about the following aspects of the programme(s) they examine:

   i) Whether the academic standards set for the programme qualifications are appropriate.

   ii) The extent to which the assessment processes are rigorous, ensure equity of treatment for students and have been fairly conducted within UCL's regulations and guidance.

   iii) The standards of student performance in the programme, or parts of programmes, which they have been appointed to examine.

   iv) To formally delegate authority to Sub Boards to make decisions on their behalf.

   v) Where appropriate, the comparability of the standards and student achievements with those in some other higher education institutions in the UK.

   vi) Identify comparable practice.

   It is not an External Examiner's responsibility to mark any form of summative assessment.

2. The External Examiner's Report Form requests External Examiners to suggest recommendations based on areas of concern not satisfactorily resolved at the meetings of the Board of Examiners.

3. The form must be completed on Portico (UCL's student and assessment record system) within one month of receiving the email with the Portico report link (this email will be sent within a week of the Board of Examiners meeting), so that External Examiner's comments can be taken into account for the next academic session. Please refer to the External Examiners webpages for details on the External Examiners Reporting procedures: https://www.ucl.ac.uk/srs/academic-policy-and-quality-assurance/external-examining. Payment of the External Examiner's fee is authorised when the report is received via Portico by Student & Registry Services and within the required timeframe.

4. External Examiners should consider the totality of the degree in respect of both the syllabus and examination. A major part of their role should be devoted to those modules and assessment elements which are the main determinants of the degree classification. (In some cases this will not be possible as External Examiners are appointed to examine specific module(s) and not a full programme).

5. External Examiners will comment on the appropriateness of new methods of assessment.

6. External Examiners should review new summative assessment tasks to ensure that they are being set at an appropriate level and standard for the module.

7. To review students' assessments, External Examiners will be sent a representative sample of a range of assessments that will enable them to make an informed judgement as to whether the internal marking is of an appropriate standard,

	consistent and fair to all students. This representative sample must include work from all modules the External Examiner oversees.
8.	External Examiners may be invited to attend oral / practical examinations and assessments as observers.
9.	External Examiners may recommend to the Board of Examiners changes to the marks already arrived at by the Internal Examiners if these appear to them to be inappropriate. Where significant changes are recommended by External Examiners it is essential for them to see all the assessments for that component of the assessment.
10.	When reviewing students' assessments External Examiners should comply with data protection regulations, maintaining confidentiality of the content of students' work.
11.	External Examiners will be sent details of other local responsibilities which may exist for the programme(s) they examine.

4.4 Nomination and Appointment

4.4.1 Process of Nomination

1.	The Chair of a Board of Examiners must take account of the appointment criteria specified in Section 4.1 'Criteria for Appointment' when nominating an External Examiner for all or part of a taught programme, and submit details via the **External Examiner Details Nomination Form**.
2.	External Examiners must be appointed before the start of the academic session so that they can approve assessment tasks in good time. Nominees must not be asked to undertake any duties until their appointment is formally approved.
	Further Guidance
1.	On approval by Academic Policy, Quality and Standards, the External Examiner is appointed by UCL for a period of 4 years.
2.	Chairs of Boards should consider the travelling distances involved from a proposed External Examiner's place of residence to UCL, practicalities of travel and the likely costs to UCL in expenses, noting that Student & Registry Services is only able to reimburse up to certain values, and any additional sums will be charged to the relevant department / division. Please refer to the UCL Expenses policy.
3.	The appointment of overseas External Examiners should be limited.
4.	It is the responsibility of the Chair of the Board of Examiners to verify eligibility of UG External Examiners to work in the UK. The guidance set out on the UCL Human Resources - Immigration website should be followed.
5.	Boards of Examiners should avoid appointing excessive numbers of External Examiners.

4.4.2 Period of Appointment

1.	External Examiners are appointed for a period of four academic years.
2.	In exceptional circumstances, External Examiners may have their four-year term extended for one further academic session only, subject to the approval of the Quality and Standards Committee. Chairs of Boards of Examiners are responsible for requesting extensions for their External Examiners via submission of the form: Extension Request for UCL External Examiners.
3.	If it is decided that an External Examiner will finish their term before the four-year period is completed, the Chair of the Board must formally notify the External Examiner concerned and inform the Chair of Quality and Standards Committee of the decision via examiners@ucl.ac.uk with a brief statement of reason.

4.4.3 Continuation of Appointment

1. An External Examiner has the right not to seek continuation in appointment at any time during the period in which they are eligible to serve. See point 4.4.4.2 below for details on early termination of appointment.
2. If an External Examiner interrupts his/her service, the interrupted period does not count when calculating the total period of service. examiners@ucl.ac.uk should be informed of any interruption of service before the interruption takes place.

4.4.4 Termination of Appointment

1. UCL reserves the right not to continue the appointment at any time during the period that the External Examiner is eligible to serve. External Examiners will be formally notified by the Chair of the Board as outlined in Section 4.4.2 Period of Appointment.
2. If the External Examiner wishes to terminate their appointment, this should normally be arranged to take effect at the end of an academic year, but in any case is subject to three months' notice.

4.5 Student Contact with External Examiners

1. UCL is required to provide details of its External Examiners, for information only, to students, including the name and institution of the External Examiner.
2. Students must not make direct contact with External Examiners regarding their individual performance in assessments. Appropriate mechanisms are available to raise these concerns through the procedures set out in Chapter 6, Section 7: Academic Appeals Procedure. External Examiners should inform examiners@ucl.ac.uk should a student contact them.
3. External Examiners may be given an opportunity to meet students to ascertain their thoughts about the strengths and weaknesses of their educational experience at UCL. This is not something that is routinely offered to External Examiners but can be arranged by the programme / board administrators should the External Examiner wish to meet students.

4.6 Entitlements of External Examiners

1. External Examiners are entitled to withhold their approval to decisions of the Board of Examiners under the following circumstances:
    - i) They are in a dispute with those decisions which cannot be resolved at Board of Examiner level.
    - ii) They are not satisfied that the examination procedures have been properly carried out.
    - iii) They perceive serious deficiencies in the examination procedures. In all such exceptional circumstances the matter in question will be referred directly to the UCL Quality and Standards Committee.
    - iv) External Examiners have the right to raise matters of serious concern at the highest level of UCL, either with the Chair of Quality and Standards Committee or Vice-Provost (Education & Student Experience). When all institutional avenues have been exhausted, External Examiners may contact QAA through its Concerns scheme route.

4.7 External Examiner Reports

4.7.1 Distribution of Reports and Response to Reports

1. The process for considering External Examiners' reports is set out in the External Examiners' Reporting Process (refer to the External Examining webpage: https://www.ucl.ac.uk/srs/academic-policy-and-quality-assurance/external-examining)).
2. Access to these documents will be provided to students via UCL's student records system, Portico, and should also be discussed at Departmental Student Partnership Committees.
3. A flow chart for the External Examiner Reporting process is available on the External Examining webpage.

4.7.2 Monitoring of Reports and Responses

1. Education Services will monitor responses to all reports. A step by step process for monitoring External Examiners' reports and responses to the reports and a flow chart for the External Examiner Reporting process is available on the External Examining webpage: https://www.ucl.ac.uk/srs/academic-policy-and-quality-assurance/external-examining. In order to help faculty and departmental internal processes, an optional template to record departmental Chair of Board responses to External Examiners' recommendations is at Annex 9.4.1 (please note that this document cannot be uploaded to Portico as a departmental response).
2. External Examiners will be asked to make recommendations within their report and grade these as Essential, Advisable or Desirable. The report must make clear whether or not there are, in the Examiners' opinion, any risks to academic standards on the module/programme. If External Examiners are satisfied that no recommendations are required, they should clearly state this in the relevant sections of the report. They are asked not to leave sections blank. The definitions for the three categories are as follows:
    i) **Essential**: Serious areas of concern which, in your opinion, place academic standards and/or the student learning experience at immediate risk and requires action before the start of the next academic year.
    ii) **Advisable**: Areas of concern regarding threshold standards which, while currently being met, in your opinion, could be significantly improved.
    iii) **Desirable**: Areas where, in your opinion, there is potential for enhancement.
3. A designated member of academic staff should be available to respond to External Examiners' recommendations within the specified timeframe. The Chairs of Boards of Examiners must ultimately be responsible for drafting a response if the designated academic has conflicting responsibilities.
4. APQS will prepare annual reports on matters of general interest and concern for wider dissemination to Quality and Standards Committee.
5. A Department's (or partner institution's) annual main meeting of the Board of Examiners for a programme at which an External Examiner is present should include early in its agenda a copy of the report and the Department's response for the previous year.

5 Peer Dialogue Scheme

Enhancing research-based education at UCL

UCL requires every member of staff with teaching responsibilities (including PGTAs and staff with honorary appointments*) to engage with UCL's Peer Dialogue scheme at least once a year: https://www.ucl.ac.uk/teaching-learning/student-partnership/student-voice-and-surveys/peer-dialogue

Academic Directors of Education have specific responsibilities regarding Peer Dialogue and should refer to the resource marked Template for Academic Directors of Education, under Additional Resources.

*See the guidance for more details.

6 Student Academic Representation

6.1 Introduction

1. UCL Regulation for Management 12.1 provides as follows: “In each academic Department [1] there shall be at least one departmental Student Partnership Committee (SPC). Each Student Partnership Committee shall meet regularly in each academic year to enable joint working between staff and students, through discussion and agreement of priorities for improving students’ educational experience.”
2. The purpose of student academic representation is to enable partnership working between students and staff throughout UCL. Representative Student Voice should shape and influence education and student experience activity in departments, faculties, and across UCL.
3. Arrangements for academic representation are overseen by the UCL Student Partnership Committee (SPC), with staff and student membership from UCL departments, faculties, professional services, and the Students’ Union. The SPC reports to Education Committee.
4. Academic representation at UCL is conducted in partnership with the Students’ Union, who shall:
    i) Ensure effective promotion of representative roles together with faculties and departments. Provide induction training for representatives, and further opportunities which support them in their role.
    ii) Ensure information is available to students and staff on who holds representative positions, and to provide contact information where appropriate.
    iii) Provide guidance for both students and staff, including relevant information, support, and examples of best practice.

6.2 Committee Structure and Process

1. Each Department shall normally have one Student Partnership Committee. A Department may wish to establish a separate SPC for postgraduate or research students.
2. Meetings with representatives at a programme level, though encouraged, do not constitute SPC meetings, except in the case of inter-departmental programmes. Departments should avoid complex SPC structures that disperse the Student Voice.
3. The minutes of SPC meetings and feedback from representatives should be a standing item for discussion on the agenda of the Department’s Teaching Committee (and/or doctoral-education equivalent).
4. The Department should ensure that its calendar of committee meetings facilitates timely discussion of issues raised by SPCs.

6.3 Appointment of Representatives

1. Departments should appoint representatives for each of the following:
    i) At least one representative for each year-group in each taught programme of study. Where appropriate, each representative may instead be appointed to represent a linked cluster of taught programmes.
    ii) At least one representative for early years research students (students in their first or second years) and for later years research students (students in their third year or beyond), or the equivalent periods for part-time research students.
    iii) For programmes offered on a part-time basis, there should be at least one part-time representative for the programme.
2. Programmes with large year groups should consider appointing more than one

representative per year group. Departments with a small number of programmes should consider appointing representatives for different pathways or specialisms within that programme.

3. All representatives must be members of an SPC; the role should not be split between multiple students, nor should different representatives be invited to attend different meetings of the same SPC.
4. All representatives must be appointed by process of election. All elections, including those where only one candidate is standing, should include a 'Reopen Nominations' (RON) option to encourage and support the accountability of representatives to the students they represent.
5. The appointment of representatives should be completed by the close of the October appointment schedule which is agreed and circulated by the UCL SPC (EdCom) in advance of each academic session. The details of representatives should be reported to the Students' Union via the designated contact in the Faculty.
6. Should a representative step down during their term of office prior to the term two reading week, the representative should be replaced by any method approved by the SPC Co-Chairs.
7. Any replacement representative's details should be reported to the Students' Union via the Faculty in the same manner as during appointment of the Student Academic Representatives in October.
8. The SPC may choose to invite additional students to attend the meeting to ensure a diverse membership that can effectively reflect students' views and perspectives.
9. All departments should take steps to ensure their representatives attend training arranged by the Students' Union as part of taking up their role.
10. The term of office for each representative is 12 months from the date of their appointment in October, or the end of their studies, whichever is sooner. At the close of each students' term of office, the role must be re-elected.
11. Any representative appointed later through replacement or co-option will also end their term of office in October. SPC meetings in advance of the October appointment of representatives may utilise the returning membership of the SPC.

6.4 Student Partnership Committee Meetings

1. SPC membership in each department will be set following consultation between students and departmental staff but must include the following:
   i) Head of Department (or Deputy)/Programme Director/Senior member of academic staff
   ii) At least one member of staff responsible for undergraduate students
   iii) At least one member of staff responsible for postgraduate taught students*
   iv) At least one member of staff responsible for research students*
   v) All student academic representatives in the department
   vi) Where applicable, a committee member of each department society.

   * May not be required where there is a separate committee graduate or research-student SPC.
2. Each SPC will have joint Co-Chairs, one student and one staff member, who are responsible for agreeing each meeting's agenda. The student Co-Chair should be the Lead Department Representative, who will be appointed by a process specified by the Students' Union.
3. Departments will nominate a member of professional service staff responsible for each SPC, who will act as secretary. SPC minutes should clearly indicate who has attended, and their role in relation to the Committee.
4. Staff membership of the SPC should not form a majority.
5. An SPC must meet at least twice each academic year (typically once per term). Additional meetings, including to discuss matters that might have a particular impact on students are encouraged.
6. The agenda shall be circulated to all SPC members normally at least one week before the date of a meeting of a Committee. The agenda should also be made available to all relevant students.

7. The unconfirmed minutes of an SPC meeting, as approved by the Co-Chairs, should be shared with all relevant students, within ten working days of the meeting. These minutes should also be emailed to sscc@ucl.ac.uk within this timeframe.
8. The unconfirmed minutes should also be reported to the Department and Faculty Education Committees (and/or doctoral-education equivalent), along with the Faculty Academic Representative Forum.
9. A template for the SPC agenda and minutes is available at Annex 9.6.1.

6.5 SPC Terms of Reference

1. To act as a focal point of student engagement and partnership in the Department, bringing staff and students together to celebrate successes, to reflect on challenges, and to jointly identify priorities for change in the future.
2. To report on priorities and agreed actions to the Department and Faculty Education Committees (and/or doctoral-education equivalent), along with the Faculty Academic Representative Forum.
3. To ensure joint student and staff discussion at every meeting, focusing on:
    a) Any areas of concern raised by the Student Representatives or other SPC members.
    b) The content of and progress against the Department Education Plan.
    c) UCL ChangeMakers or other staff-student led projects including discussion of project proposals and tracking of progress of the projects throughout the year.
    d) Opportunity for the Lead Department Representative to report on work they have been conducting on behalf of the SPC, including their attendance at any Faculty or institution level meetings.
4. To ensure joint student and staff discussion at least once during every Academic Session of:
    e) Proposals for new programmes and revisions to existing programmes.
    f) Outcomes of institutional and national surveys, and activities leading from them.
    g) Matters raised through external examiners reports and the department's responses to those recommendations.
    h) Student employment outcomes and other careers and employability related data.

5. To facilitate greater communication between students and staff, and report key actions, discussions, and recommendations to the wider student body.

6.6 Lead Department Representatives

1. The Department will be responsible for the appointment of the Lead Department Representative through a process specified by the Students' Union.
2. The Lead Department Representative(s) will be responsible for leadership of the SPC, ensuring the effectiveness of student voice in influencing and shaping their learning experiences.
3. The Lead Department Representative(s) should be invited to join their Departmental Teaching Committee (and/or doctoral-education equivalent). Other student representatives may also be invited where appropriate.
4. Where appropriate, the Lead Department Representative can be called upon to attend departmental and Faculty meetings to represent the SPC. They can also take chair's action to approve changes to policies and documents that require action before an SPC can be convened. Where such action is taken, the Lead Department Representative must be allowed time to consult with the SPC to gain wider student feedback and the chair should provide a full report to the next formal SPC meeting.
5. Any Faculty with only one Department is not required to appoint a Lead Department Representative. For such faculties, the duties of the Lead Department Representative should be carried out by the Faculty Representative(s).

6.7 Faculty Representatives

1. The Students' Union will be responsible for the election of Faculty Representatives for each Faculty.
2. The Faculty Representative(s) will be responsible for the leadership of representatives in the Faculty, ensuring the effectiveness of students' voices in influencing and shaping their departments. They will also represent their Faculty in institution-wide forums and the Students' Union.
3. The Faculty Representative(s) must be invited to join their Faculty Education Committee (or doctoral-education equivalent). Other student representatives may also be invited where appropriate.

6.8 Faculty Academic Representative Forums

1. Each faculty should operate a forum which brings together faculty staff, Faculty representatives, and the Lead Department Representatives (or their nominee) from each SPC in the faculty.
2. The purpose of this forum will be to identify shared priorities within the faculty and any action required to address such priorities, and to involve students with faculty decision-making. The Faculty Education Committee, Faculty Research Degrees Committee and/or the Faculty Representatives may additionally wish to utilise the forum as a sounding board where they identify a need for greater student involvement with particular matters.
3. A staff lead for the forum should be established, who should be a member of the Faculty Education Committee and/or the Faculty Research Degrees Committee. The staff lead and the Faculty Representatives will be responsible for agreeing the agenda and format of each meeting.
4. This forum should meet at least twice each year.
5. Faculties may wish to operate more than one forum to cover different levels of study.
6. The format of this forum is not required to be a committee meeting, and creative approaches to considering business are encouraged, i.e., workshop-style items.
7. A record of each meeting should be taken and circulated to attendees. This may be in the form of summary notes rather than formal minutes.

6.9 Interdepartmental Degree Programmes

1. Interdepartmental degree programmes may wish to have separate programme-based SPCs, but in line with regulations for management instruction, these are not required where there is a suitable alternative (e.g., reps from these programmes are included in the SPCs for the Home department for the programme).

7 Student Representation on UCL Academic Standing Committees and Sub-Committees

Policy

1. UCL and the Students' Union provide many opportunities for students to engage with UCL's policy- and decision-making in all areas of teaching, learning and support. Students can have a say in the way the University is run. There are many opportunities. The page below summarises these.

7.1 Representation at Departmental and Faculty Level

- Student Partnership Committee (SPC)

1. Every Department should have at least one Student Partnership Committee (SPC) (see Section 6) which meets at least three times each academic session (typically once each term). SPCs provide the opportunity to feedback to lecturers and departmental administrators about issues that have impacted on programmes and modules. These may include good or bad ways in which lectures, tutorials, labs etc. have been delivered which can be addressed by the teaching Department, or they may include university-wide issues such as library or computing facilities, or even noise caused by building works. Departments take these comments very seriously, and the main matters arising from the minutes of the SPC meetings are considered by the Students' Union and the UCL Student Partnership Committee (see Section 7.4).

- Departmental Teaching Committee (DTC)

1. Every Department should hold a Departmental Teaching Committee (DTC) meeting each term, where changes in programmes, modules, teaching and assessment are agreed and monitored. All DTCs should invite the student Lead Department Representative to membership of the Committee (see Section 6.6) and consider inviting other student representatives where appropriate.

- Faculty Education Committee (FEdCom)

1. All of UCL's academic Departments belong to a Faculty which provides governance and support to the way in which Departments are managed. All Faculties have a Faculty Education Committee (FEdCom) which meets termly. All FEdComs should invite the student Faculty Representative to membership of the Committee (see Section 6.7) and consider inviting other student representatives where appropriate.

- Faculty Research Degrees Committees (FRDC)

1. Faculties may also hold a Faculty Research Degrees Committee (FRDC) meeting each term. The FRDC should include three Research Student Representatives in its membership and attendance may rotate depending on availability for meetings. The FRDC may also wish to invite the student Faculty Representative to its meetings.

- Faculty Academic Representative Forums

1. Faculties should also hold a Faculty Academic Representative forum. The forum should include Faculty Representatives and the Lead Department Representatives (or their nominee) from each SPC in the faculty.

- Further Information

1. For more information on your SPC, DTC, FEdCom, FRDC or Faculty Academic Representative forum, students should contact their undergraduate or postgraduate tutor or the Faculty Office.

7.2 Student Academic Representatives

1. Student Academic Representatives are elected to represent students' views to UCL. Student Academic Representatives sit on various committees at a programme (such as SPCs), faculty and university level, at which they act as the voice of students, ensuring that UCL takes into account the needs of students in its decision-making processes. The Student Academic Representative scheme is managed by the Students' Union, and students can be representatives at both a departmental and faculty level. For general enquiries, please visit the Students' Union website.

7.3 Representation via the Students' Union

1. The Students' Union is run by students for students. Apart from providing social spaces, support services and extra-curricular activities, the Students' Union is an important political forum for all students. Students at UCL are automatically members of the Students' Union and have access to all its facilities and support. The Students' Union is run by Student Officers who are elected each year by the membership. Students can speak to one of these officers if they have any issues with which Officers may be able to aid or support them.

7.4 Student Representation on UCL Academic Standing and Sub-Committees

1. Many of UCL's formal committees have student representation. On most of these committees, the student representatives comprise one or more of the Students' Union's elected Student Sabbatical Officers, who you may speak to if there are issues that you wish to raise at meetings of these committees.
2. The Student Partnership Committee (SPC) deals with issues relating directly to students, both academic and relating to the wider student experience. It reviews university-wide issues raised at SPCs and also looks at the data received from student surveys. Many of the agenda items are raised by students via the Students' Union. SPC currently has eleven student members and three student sabbatical officers. These student members are nominated by the Students' Union. If you are interested in being nominated to serve on SPC, then please contact Simon To, Leadership Development & Change Manager, Students' Union: simon.to@ucl.ac.uk.
3. Current student representation on UCL's formal academic committees is as follows:

Academic Board

- Education Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)
- Postgraduate Students' Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)
- Thirteen elected full-time students, including at least one from each Faculty, with the proportion of undergraduate and postgraduate students determined to reflect the overall student population.

Academic Committee

- Education Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)
- Postgraduate Students' Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)
- Equity and Inclusion Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)

Education Committee

- Education Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)
- Equity and Inclusion Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)
- Postgraduate Students' Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)
- One taught graduate student, nominated by the Students' Union
- One undergraduate student, nominated by the Students' Union

Library Committee

- Education Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)
- Postgraduate Students' Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)

Research Degrees Committee

- Postgraduate Students' Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)
- One research student, nominated by the Students' Union

Student Partnership Committee

- President, Students' Union (ex officio and Co-Chair)
- Education Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)
- Postgraduate Officer (ex officio)
- Eleven student members with one from each faculty nominated by the Students' Union

7.5 Student Representation on UCL Non-Academic and Statutory Committees

Council and its Committees

Council

- Education Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)
- President, Students' Union (ex officio)

Finance Committee

- President, Students' Union (Student Observer)

Work Health and Safety Committee

- Two Student Observers, nominated by the Students' Union

Honorary Degrees and Fellowships Committee

- President, Students' Union (ex officio)

Discipline Committee

- One student, registered at UCL, nominated by the Students' Union (normally as and when the Committee needs to be convened)

Discipline Review Body

- A registered student of another university institution within the University of London, to be appointed by the Chair in consultation with the Registrar of UCL, as and when the Review Body needs to be convened.

University Management Committee and its Committees

Change and Digital Portfolio Review Committee

- One student member nominated by the Students' Union

Research, Innovation and Global Engagement Committee

- One student member nominated by the Students' Union

Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee

- Equity and Inclusion Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)
- Five student members nominated by the Students' Union

Estates Management Committee

- Union Affairs Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)

8 Academic Committee Review Panel

8.1 Policy

1. All UCL academic units are required to operate within, and to deliver their programmes in accordance with, UCL's established academic regulatory and procedural frameworks. UCL has in place a number of quality assurance processes to monitor that this is the case and which are designed to identify and resolve any problems which might arise.
2. However, from time to time there may arise an academic quality assurance-related problem within an academic unit or academic programme, which, due to the urgent or serious nature of the problem, cannot be dealt with, or fully resolved, by applying UCL's standard quality assurance processes. In those exceptional circumstances, the Chair of the Academic Committee may establish an Academic Committee Review Panel to conduct a special investigation of the academic unit/programme concerned. The purpose of the special investigation will be for the Review Panel to ascertain the nature and extent of the problem, and to recommend to the Chair of the Academic Committee on what further action should be taken to resolve the problem.
3. In all such cases, the following procedure is followed.

8.2 Procedure

1. Details of any case which might merit investigation by an Academic Committee Review Panel should, in the first instance, be submitted to, and discussed with, the Secretary to the Academic Committee. The Secretary, on behalf of the Chair of Academic Committee, will ascertain whether UCL's standard quality assurance processes have been exhausted or whether the nature of the problem is such that it cannot be addressed within the scope of those standard processes. Once this preliminary discussion has taken place, the Secretary to the Academic Committee will forward the details of the case to the Chair of the Academic Committee, who will decide whether to establish a Review Panel.
2. If the Chair of the Academic Committee decides to establish a Review Panel, it will comprise:
    - Two members of Academic Committee, including at least one Faculty Tutor, who are not members of staff of the Faculty in which the academic unit or programme concerned is based; one of whom will be appointed as Chair of the Review Panel.
    - A senior member of academic or administrative staff, who is not a Faculty Tutor.
3. The meeting(s) of the Review Panel will be attended by an administrative secretary, normally a member of Education Services staff nominated by the Director of Education Services or Director of Student Operations as appropriate, Student & Registry Services, who will take notes of meeting(s) and assist the Review Panel in the preparation of its report. The Review Panel will normally be expected to complete its work within eight working weeks.
4. The Chair of the Academic Committee will inform the academic unit or programme concerned why a Review Panel has been established and that the Review Panel will wish to conduct discussions with relevant staff and/or students.
5. In conducting its review, the Review Panel may request from the academic unit or programme concerned all such documentation and may meet with whichever staff and students as it deems necessary. UCL staff are expected to cooperate fully with the Review Panel at all times.
6. The Review Panel will meet as least once:
    - To consider the relevant documentation
    - To interview appropriate persons

- To prepare its report.

7. The Review Panel's provisional report will be sent to the Head of Department or other person responsible for the academic unit or programme concerned. That person will be entitled to notify normally within five working days necessary factual corrections to the report but will not be entitled otherwise to take issue with its findings and recommendations (except where the Head of Department or other person concerned claims that these findings and recommendations are based on factual error).
8. The Review Panel's final report and recommendations will be sent, via the Secretary to the Academic Committee, to the Chair of Academic Committee. A copy will be sent to the Head of Department or other person concerned for information. The Chair of Academic Committee will decide what, if any, further action is necessary in the matter.
9. The Chair of the Academic Committee will report to the Academic Committee that a Review has taken place according to the required procedure and may, if he/she thinks it appropriate, report to the Academic Committee further details of the Review.
10. The recommendations of the Review Panel will indicate what follow-up action is expected on the part of the academic unit or programme concerned and within what period. The academic unit or programme concerned will, in consultation with the Review Panel, produce a written plan detailing the follow-up action that it will take in response to the recommendations for approval by the Chair of the Academic Committee.
11. The Chair of the Review Panel will check with the academic unit or programme concerned in due course that such follow-up action has been taken and will advise the Chair of the Academic Committee as necessary.

9 Core Programme Information

The Standard Text for the Core Programme Information can be found on the UCL Academic Manual website, in Chapter 9: Quality Review Framework.

1. The Core Programme Information (CPI) should be provided to all current UCL Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate students (including MRes students).
2. The CPI should be included in a single location such as a student handbook, Moodle site, website or intranet.
3. The CPI represents the minimum information that should be provided to all students. As such, programmes are encouraged to add local information where appropriate.
4. Programmes are free to change the formatting, numbering and order of items, but, where marked ‘Centrally Provided’ the text itself must be included in its current form. However, departments may change specific terminology to reflect local practice (e.g., ‘Programme Director’ for ‘Programme Leader’).

10 Module and Programme Evaluations Policy

10.1 Continuous Module Dialogue

1. A continuous module dialogue process should take place throughout the running of all taught modules. The purpose of this is to encourage regular dialogue between staff and students, thereby ensuring the student voice is heard, misunderstandings are clarified, and staff are able to make any required changes or reinforce information before the module ends.
2. The dialogue process should take place no fewer than 3-4 times per term between the start and end of the module. This should replace any end of module evaluations (MEQs) unless there are any additional external accrediting body requirements.
3. The dialogue should be initiated by asking students a small number of questions in a pulse survey within a synchronous session, initially focusing on the key areas of teaching, resources and assessment information (suggested questions are provided in the guidance) and then discussing the results. The results will be available in real time and will be the prompt for staff-student dialogue in that or the following session.
4. It is recommended that staff use Mentimeter to poll students, and staff can adapt the focus of questions as the module progresses and the outcomes from the dialogue process become clear.
5. There is no requirement to report the results of the pulse surveys beyond the module, but staff should use the results to engage in a dialogue with students so that changes can be made or a rationale given if a change is not appropriate.
6. Departments (or faculties, where appropriate) are responsible for capturing that a module dialogue process has taken place and any resulting changes. Responsibility for delivering the module dialogue process rests with the department and there are no central reporting requirements, however it is recommended that the Continuous Module Dialogue Capture survey template (provided in the guidance and tools) is disseminated by the department to Module Leaders and this information is used to complete the Departmental Summary Form (Annex 9.10.1).

10.2 Annual Programme Evaluations

1. All taught students will be given the opportunity to reflect on their programme as a whole and provide feedback on their experience at key points during their time at UCL through the following surveys:
   - New to UCL (all new students)
   - Annual Programme Survey (APS) for all continuing undergraduate students and postgraduate taught students
   - National Student Surveys (NSS) for undergraduate finalists
   - PGT NSS for all postgraduates
2. Annual programme evaluations (APE) will be managed and analysed centrally and will replace any existing locally managed programme surveys, except where these are required for external compliance.
3. As part of APE, students will be able to see a list of the modules they have taken and will be given the opportunity to reflect on the programme as well as any particular modules they wish to highlight through a free text response.

4. Departments will be asked to support central efforts to collate all programme level evaluations by reminding students to complete surveys and including links to summaries of changes made in response to previous feedback.
5. Evaluation results will be analysed by Education Services and then disseminated back to departments for discussion and circulation as per the existing process for NSS and New to UCL.
6. Each department must have in place mechanisms for closing the feedback loop, whereby students are informed of any actions which have been taken in response to the programme evaluation. Whilst the final responsibility for this rests with the department, it is recommended that the closing the feedback loop guidance should be followed to ensure the ongoing feedback cycle is supported.