



UCL

UCL Academic Manual 2017-18

Chapter 6: Quality Review Framework

Chapter 6 is UCL's regulatory framework for monitoring standards, the student experience and strategic quality enhancement activities across UCL. It includes the regulations for Annual Student Experience Reviews (ASER), Internal Quality Review (IQR) and External Examining as well as Peer Observation of Teaching, Staff-Student Consultative Committees, Student Representation on UCL Academic Standing Committees and Sub-Committees and Academic Committee Review Panels.

Table of Contents

1	INTRODUCTION.....	4
2	ANNUAL STUDENT EXPERIENCE REVIEW (ASER).....	6
2.1	Purpose of ASER	6
2.2	Publication and Circulation of ASER Data.....	6
2.3	The Role of the Quality Review Sub-Committee	7
2.4	ASER Evaluative Reports and Development & Enhancement Plans	7
2.5	ASER and Dissemination of Good Practice	8
2.6	Publication of ASER Reports	8
2.7	ASER and the National Student Survey	8
2.8	ASER and Student Evaluation Questionnaires	8
3	INTERNAL QUALITY REVIEW (IQR)	9
3.1	Introduction	9
3.2	Summary of IQR.....	9
3.3	The Review Team	10
3.4	Departmental Contact	14
3.5	Preliminary Briefing	14
3.6	The Self-Evaluative Statement and supporting material.....	14
3.7	The IQR Agenda and Visit to the Department	17
3.8	The Interview Programme	17
3.9	Oral Feedback to the Department	18
3.10	The IQR Report	18
3.11	Follow-up.....	20
3.12	IQR Panel/QRSC	21
3.13	Dissemination of Findings of IQR Report	22
4	EXTERNAL EXAMINING	23
4.1	Criteria for Appointment	23
4.2	Responsibilities of UCL	24
4.3	Responsibilities of the External Examiner	24
4.4	Nomination and Appointment	26
4.5	Student Contact with External Examiners	27
4.6	Entitlements of External Examiners.....	28
4.7	External Examiner Reports	28
5	PEER DIALOGUE SCHEME.....	30
5.1	What is the Peer Dialogue Scheme?.....	30
5.2	What do I need to do?	30
5.3	Option A: Collaborative enhancement of a specific area of practice	30
5.4	Option B: Pair-based Teaching Observation	31
5.5	Option C: Reflection and dialogue with Student Reviewers	31
5.6	Peer Dialogue follow up (Options A, B and C)	31
6	STUDENT ACADEMIC REPRESENTATION.....	33
6.1	Introduction	33
6.2	Committee Structure and Process.....	33
6.3	Appointment of Representatives	33

6.4	Staff Student Consultative Committee Meetings	34
6.5	SSCC Terms of Reference.....	35
6.6	Lead Department Representatives	35
6.7	Faculty Representatives	36
6.8	Interdepartmental Degree Programmes	36
7	STUDENT REPRESENTATION ON UCL ACADEMIC STANDING COMMITTEES AND SUB-COMMITTEES.....	37
7.1	Representation at Departmental and Faculty Level.....	37
7.2	Student Academic Representatives	37
7.3	Representation via the Students' Union	38
7.4	Student Representation on UCL Academic Standing and Sub-Committees	38
7.5	Student Representation on UCL Non-Academic and Statutory Committees.....	39
8	ACADEMIC COMMITTEE REVIEW PANEL	40
8.1	Policy.....	40
8.2	Procedure.....	40
9	CORE PROGRAMME INFORMATION.....	42

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 external agencies such as the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) and the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) about standards and quality.

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 Annual Student Experience Review (ASER)

2.1 Purpose of ASER

1. UCL's Annual Student Experience Review (ASER) draws together monitoring activities (data review, External Examiner Reports, student surveys, NSS Action Planning) that are extended throughout the year into an annual 'health check' exercise for undergraduate (UG) and postgraduate taught (PGT) provision. ASERs provide an opportunity to:
 - Monitor each Department's scrutiny of student datasets and subsequent action plans;
 - Reflect annually on risks and weaknesses, identifying action to be taken forward where necessary;
 - Review processes and engagement with University quality assurance and quality enhancement policies;
 - Discussing departmental and faculty engagement with key strategic education priorities;
 - Providing a formal opportunity for Education Committee to discuss student experience matters including the programme portfolio and the effectiveness of the response to student feedback;
 - Review academic partnership activity (including student exchanges/study abroad);
 - Review common themes emerging from External Examiner reports;
 - Providing an opportunity to identify good practice worthy of wider dissemination.
2. UCL recognises that the process of reviewing taught degree provision is iterative, and that much of this business takes place at different times and through a variety of mechanisms during the monitoring year. Responsibility for reviewing such provision is devolved to Departments and Faculties and, for this procedure to work, it is important that Departments and Faculties are able to identify concerns:
 - a) That apply to a particular programme;
 - b) That are common to a number of its programmes or disciplines and to take timely and appropriate action.

2.2 Publication and Circulation of ASER Data

1. Each year, Academic Services' Student Data Services Department will prepare datasets for each UCL Department containing information on:
 - Student Profile (Male, Female, Home, EU, Overseas, Ethnicity, WP)
 - Admissions
 - Progression
 - Average Student Achievement
 - Final Classification
 - Submission
 - Referral
 - Completion
2. These datasets will then be analysed by Student Data Services. Each year, the data will be additionally analysed in accordance with an agreed theme, such as the achievement of Black or Minority Ethnic (BME) students or those from non-traditional academic backgrounds.
3. These measures will be used in conjunction with data from a number of other sources: Additional sources will include:
 - External Examiners' Reports
 - External survey results (NSS, PTES)
 - Feedback from internal surveys (e.g. SEQs)
 - Employability statistics (DHLE)*

4. Consideration of the analysed datasets will be the task of a Quality Review Sub-Committee of Education Committee. Once these have been considered, reports will be sent to Heads of Department, copied to Faculty Deans and Faculty Tutors. They will be expected to respond to and explain performance in any area highlighted by the analysis conducted by QRSC in an evaluative report and to write a Development and Enhancement Plan [see [Annex 6.1.3 ASER Template](#) for reporting templates].
5. There will be two issues of data per academic session and two ASER Development and Enhancement Plans:
 - Undergraduate data sets will be available for information at the end of July (no action need be taken by modules, programmes or Departments at this point) and reports and Development and Enhancement Plan templates circulated to Departments and Faculties by early September.
 - Postgraduate data sets will be available at the end of November and reports and Development and Enhancement Plan templates circulated to Departments and Faculties by the end of January.
6. See [Annex 6.1.1 ASER Main Steps Undergraduate](#) and [Annex 6.1.2 ASER Main Steps Taught Postgraduate](#) for more details.

DHLE* Data

7. UCL acknowledges that time lapses in the production of each cohort of DLHE data means that cohorts will not correlate and cannot be compared (i.e. there will be no direct relationship between the DLHE data produced for evaluation in 2017 and the graduating cohort but Departments are expected nonetheless to evaluate their own performance in the DHLE survey and will have to work with the most recent complete dataset available.

2.3 The Role of the Quality Review Sub-Committee

1. As noted in [Section 2.2 Publication and Circulation of ASER Data](#), consideration of the datasets produced and analysed by Student Data Services will be undertaken by a Quality Review Sub-Committee (QRSC) of Education Committee (EdCom). The QRSC will be responsible for setting themes and identifying institutional risk areas for Departments to consider and respond to. These Reports and Development and Enhancement Plans produced by Departments and approved by Faculties will also be discussed by DTCs and SSCCs before being submitted to the Secretary of the QRSC for discussion by QRSC once completed. This discussion will focus on the Development and Enhancement Plans and the QRSC will be charged with approving them and with checking with Faculties that all actions have been appropriately followed up. It will operate in a similar way to the IQR Panel, with faculty representatives invited to these meetings to discuss the Development and Enhancement Plans.

2.4 ASER Evaluative Reports and Development & Enhancement Plans

1. The QRSC will send the QRSC digest of the ASER dataset to each Department, accompanied by templates for an Evaluative Report and Development and Enhancement Plan (see [Annex 6.1.3 ASER Template](#)). This will be copied to Faculties, and will highlight issues raised (i.e. areas where performance has raised concerns or where there is good practice which could be useful for wider dissemination). This must be completed by each Department, discussed by the Departmental Teaching Committee (DTC) and Departmental Staff Student Consultative Committee (SSCC) and scrutinised and signed off by the Faculty Teaching Committee before being submitted to the Secretary of the Quality Review Sub-Committee of EdCom. See [Annex 6.1.1 ASER Main Steps Undergraduate](#) and [Annex 6.1.2 ASER Main Steps Taught Postgraduate](#) for timelines.

2. Actions detailed in the Development and Enhancement Plan should be precisely stated, ensuring that they are measurable and achievable. Where more than one person is listed against an action it should be clear who is the lead and is responsible for completion. The Development and Enhancement Plan should include the date on which it was subject to Faculty scrutiny (i.e. at which FTC meeting). The Development and Enhancement Plans will form the basis of discussion at the Quality Review Sub-Panel meeting. FTC minutes must clearly record discussion of the ASERs and any outcomes or actions resulting from this.

2.5 ASER and Dissemination of Good Practice

1. An important aim of ASER should be to promote enhancement and to disseminate good practice, not only within the Faculty, but also across UCL. It is therefore important that good practice is considered and recorded for all provision. This will then be referred to the Arena Centre for further development and dissemination.

2.6 Publication of ASER Reports

1. ASERs and their associated Development and Enhancement Plans, once approved by the QSRC, should be published on either departmental or faculty intranet sites, for viewing by UCL staff and students. They should also be made available to External Examiners.
2. Before publication, it is requested that colleagues exclude anything from their DEPs that could identify individuals. They are therefore asked not to name course tutors or individual students.

2.7 ASER and the National Student Survey

1. The NSS data (for UG students only) is available on or around 12 August each year. It is analysed by the Office of the Vice-Provost (Education & Student Affairs) and a digest of the data for each Department, will be sent to each Department (only those with UG students) as part of the ASER package of data and information. The NSS Digest will comprise:
 - Subject Overview of students satisfied (%)
 - Longitudinal Data
 - Main NSS Data
 - Competitor Institutions' Data
 - Student Comments

2.8 ASER and Student Evaluation Questionnaires

1. The proforma for Departments to summarise the information arising from consideration of SEQs has been designed to provide a clear overview of the main matters of interest arising from the analyses of the SEQs and any action taken. It can be found at [Annex 6.1.4 ASER Departmental SEQ Summary](#). The SEQ summary should inform the Department's Report and Development and Enhancement Plan.
2. The following points should be considered in completion of the proformas for departmental and faculty consideration of the SEQ data:
 - i. It is advisable that analysis of the SEQs is conducted by Departments and academic units in time for the beginning of the following academic session;
 - ii. The departmental proformas should be submitted, as part of the ASER Development and Enhancement Plan to the DTC and the SSCC and FTC.

3 Internal Quality Review (IQR)

3.1 Introduction

1. Internal Quality Review is UCL's central academic quality management and enhancement process. IQR is a rolling programme of peer review, in which all academic units of UCL¹ (as well as a small number of interdepartmental degree programmes) are reviewed on a six-yearly cycle.
2. An important purpose of IQR is to review the effectiveness of a Department's mechanisms for the management of its programmes, ensuring that UCL's policies and procedures are operating as intended to safeguard academic standards and to provide a high-quality learning experience for students.
3. IQR is also concerned with reviewing the academic content of a Department's programmes, including the continuing currency and validity of programmes in light of developments in research, professional and industry practice and pedagogy (including the use of technology in learning and teaching), changes in the external environment such as the requirements of professional, statutory and regulatory bodies (PSRBs) and continued alignment with UCL's strategy and mission.
4. IQR also aspires to be a genuinely developmental process which provides an opportunity for Departments to review and, in partnership with the review team, identify ways of enhancing their existing QME structures and systems.

See Annex 6.2.1:
Internal Quality
Review Schedule
2013-14 to 2018-
2019.

3.2 Summary of IQR

1. Each IQR comprises seven main stages:
 - i. Submission by the Department to the review team of a self-evaluative statement, with a list of supporting documentary evidence (which should, in order to minimise any burden on the Department, be made available electronically e.g. on the Department's website, Moodle or on a memory stick.).
 - ii. Scrutiny of the SES and supporting evidence by the review team.
 - iii. A visit by the review team to the Department, normally lasting 1.5 working days when interviews with relevant staff and students of the Department take place.
 - iv. Production of an IQR Report.
 - v. Preparation by the Department of a preliminary plan of action to be taken in response to the recommendations contained in the IQR Report.
 - vi. A meeting between the review team and the Department at an agreed point after the review (and after the IQR Report has been finalised). The main purpose of the meeting is to discuss the Department's preliminary plan of action in response to the findings of the review team as set out in their Report.

See Annex 6.2.5
IQR Sample
Timetable

¹ Except where otherwise indicated, 'Department', in the context of these guidelines, means 'the unit of activity being reviewed'; this will in most cases mean an academic department of UCL or an interdepartmental degree programme, although 'Department' in these guidelines also subsumes relevant academic units which are not formally academic Departments established by Council.

- vii. Subsequent consideration by the Internal Quality Review Panel of (i) the IQR Report and (ii) the Department's action plan.
2. Approximately one year after the IQR visit to the Department has taken place, the Head or a nominated representative of the Department will attend the meeting of the IQR Panel which considers the Report and action plan; the Head or other representative of the Department will be invited to discuss with the Panel at that meeting the Report and the progress which the Department has made in implementing the recommendations. The Head or representative will then be invited to comment on the IQR process itself.
 3. Approximately two years after the original IQR visit, the Department will be asked to submit to the Panel a written update on its continued progress in implementing its action plan.

3.3 The Review Team

1. The review team will normally comprise six reviewers and an administrative secretary. Three reviewers will be members of staff of UCL, one will be a student reviewer and two will be external reviewers. The members of review teams will be appointed by the Quality Review Sub-Committee (QRSC) of Education Committee as follows:
 - i. A Senior Academic Member of staff ie: a Vice -Provost, Dean or Head of Department from another Faculty, who will act as Chair
 - ii. One member of staff with expertise in teaching practice²
 - iii. One academic member of staff with expertise in supervision practice.
 - iv. One external reviewer who is a senior member of staff, either academic or administrative, of another institution of higher education with expertise in quality management and enhancement.
 - v. One external reviewer who is an external subject specialist, with appropriate expertise, nominated by the Head of Department to be reviewed. This must NOT be the current or recent former External Examiner.
 - vi. One student reviewer who will be nominated by the UCL Union.

2. The role of the team leader

The role of the team leader is:

- i. In advance of the review visit, to provide a first point of contact and advice for the administrative secretary and a point of contact and advice, via the secretary, for other members of the team (including the external reviewers).
- ii. To chair the review team's planning meeting. In the planning meeting, the team leader will also propose that particular members of the review team take responsibility for shaping the team's agenda in particular areas being explored by the team. The team leader is not, however, expected to be solely responsible for, e.g., reading the SES or other briefing material or asking questions during

² These Team members will be drawn from a pool of eligible colleagues, some of whom will be nominated by the Chair of the Connected Curriculum Steering Group from among its membership, which includes Faculty Tutors.

- interviews on the review visit; these are all shared responsibilities of all members of the review team.
- iii. During the review visit, to introduce other members of the team and explain briefly the purpose of the visit at the start of each interview with staff or students.
 - iv. At the end of the review visit, to make an oral report to the Head of Department³ summarising the review team's main findings and conclusions.
 - v. After the review visit, formally to approve the IQR Report once a draft of this has been agreed by all other members of the review team and by the Department reviewed.
 - vi. To chair a meeting between the review team and the Department at an agreed point after the review (and after the IQR Report has been finalised). The main purpose of the meeting is to discuss the Department's preliminary plan of action in response to the findings of the review team as set out in their Report.

3. The role of the External Reviewers

External QME expert

- i. One External Reviewer will be a senior member of staff, either academic or administrative, of another institution of higher education. S/he will be able to demonstrate expertise in and experience of QME structures and systems and to comment impartially on these aspects of the Department's provision.

External Subject Expert

- ii. The other External Reviewer will normally be a senior academic of another institution of higher education. S/he should have knowledge of the discipline concerned and, where possible, should have experience of Periodic Review in his/her own institution or external review by the QAA or relevant professional body. S/he should not have had any formal links with the Department under review within the previous 5 years.
- iii. Both External Reviewers play a vital role in assisting the Team to identify key issues to be explored during the visit to the department and play a full part in the Team's meetings with staff and students. In particular, External subject reviewers are able to identify excellence in provision and in the case of the External Subject expert, they are able to make comparisons with similar provision at other institutions and comment on the currency of a department's programmes in the context of developments in the discipline. They can also offer feedback on the appropriateness of aims and learning outcomes to future career development. External Reviewers will be invited to comment on the Report of the Review and the department's response to the Report.
- iv. Each External Reviewer will be provided with an outline of their role as a member of an IQR team and receives a fee from UCL.

³ Except where otherwise indicated, Head of Department should be understood as meaning the Head of the academic unit or, where the subject of the IQR is an interdepartmental degree programme, the Programme Co-ordinator

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>v. The External Subject Expert will, prior to the planning meeting, conduct a desk-based review of programme documentation in order to establish that any incremental programme/course changes made since the last review have not detracted from the aims of the programmes, affected their standing in relation to the National Qualifications Framework or where appropriate the Subject Benchmark Statement. The report of this desk-based review will then be considered at the Planning meeting where it will form an appendix to the Secretary's Report.</p> | <p>See Annex 6.2.7- External Subject Expert proforma for report</p> |
| <p>vi. The External Subject Expert will be nominated by the Department to be reviewed. Academic Services will then take responsibility for his/her appointment and remuneration. S/he will be paid £300 for a one off duty. If a department wishes to appoint more than one External Subject Expert to the Review, it will be expected to pay for any additional reviewer/s. The External Subject Expert cannot be the current or recent former External Examiner</p> | <p>See Annex 6.2.6 External Subject Expert nomination form</p> |
4. All internal members of the review team, including the administrative secretary, will have received formal briefing in advance of undertaking an IQR.
 5. All reviewers will undertake:
 - i. To read the SES and supporting documentation and, in the case of the External Subject Expert, to conduct a desk-based review;
 - ii. To attend the planning meeting of the review team prior to the review visit. However, External Team members from institutions outside London be permitted to join the Planning Meeting using an online conferencing platform wherever practicable
 - iii. To participate fully in interviewing staff and students during the review visit;
 - iv. To make an appropriate contribution to the preparation of the IQR Report;
 - v. To attend, if practicable, the follow-up meeting with the Department.
 6. Internal members of the review team should not be members of staff from the same Faculty as that of the Department being reviewed.

The Administrative Secretary

7. The administrative secretary will normally be a member of staff of Academic Services, Student and Registry Services. The administrative secretary will:
 - Liaise with the Department concerned on behalf of the review team in advance of the visit.
 - In consultation with the Department and reviewers agree a date for the review team's visit to the Department and then devise the overall timetable for the conduct of the IQR, including deadlines for, or dates of, the key stages in the process.
 - Receive from the Department its SES in electronic form, (e.g. on the departmental website, Moodle or a memory stick) which will either (i) contain within the text of the document links to supporting material which is available on the Department's website or (ii) contain a separate index of links to supporting material.
 - Ensure that for authorised users this electronic departmental information is saved and electronically

archived so that handbooks and other items from previous years are still accessible for the IQR team. The websites for each Department must be archived or a Sharepoint site used to store all documentation reviewed for the purposes of maintaining an audit trail.

- Discuss and confirm during the departmental briefing, the most efficient means of providing the SES and supporting material with the Department concerned.
- Discuss and confirm with the Department in advance how access to any departmental intranet sites for (i) UCL staff and (ii) external reviewers will be obtained.
- Confirm with individual team members the format in which they wish to receive the SES and supporting material; i.e. in hard or soft copy.
- Provide the review team with a copy of the previous IQR report on the Department and the associated action plan (where these are available). Teams will wish to assure themselves that all actions from the previous review have been implemented. Issues which have resulted in a previous recommendation of any strength, but in particular those which have been graded as 'necessary' and which have not been implemented should be fully re-explored in the current IQR and, if these have not been not fully addressed, automatically given an 'essential' recommendation.
- Take notes of interviews during the visit and ask questions during interviews.
- Read the SES and supporting material and prepare a report for the review team in advance of its planning meeting.

The Administrative Secretary's Report

8. The administrative secretary's report will not be a précis of the SES, but an analysis of the SES and supporting material. This analysis will provide the reviewers with an initial indication of the following:
 - Those areas where the Department's policies and procedures appear to be fully in accordance with UCL policy and/or good practice as set out in the UCL Academic Manual and which therefore might not be priority areas for discussion with the Department during the review visit (although the review team might still wish to ask questions in these areas when meeting the Department's staff and students in order that the Department might be allowed to demonstrate the quality of its approach. Also, these areas might contain elements of good practice for wider dissemination).
 - Those issues which the review team might wish to explore in further detail, either because it is not clear from the SES and supporting material whether departmental policy and/or procedure accords with UCL policy and/or good practice or because the Department itself has raised significant issues which it wishes to discuss with the review team; such issues should be regarded as constituting the 'core' areas to be examined during the IQR.

The External Subject Expert's Report

- This will be a structured report of maximum 1.5 sides of A4 and form an appendix to the Secretary's report. It will set

out any lines of enquiry required by the External Subject Expert. This report will then be considered at the Planning meeting.

3.4 Departmental Contact

1. The Head of Department/Programme Co-ordinator may nominate a colleague (either academic or administrative) as a Departmental Contact. The Contact's essential role will then be to co-ordinate preparations within the Department for the review visit on behalf of the Head of Department. This will include practical arrangements for the visit, such as the provision of documentation, the drawing up of the visit timetable etc. The Departmental Contact can also help to ensure that the review team has an adequate understanding of the particular nature of the Department in advance of the visit to the Department.

3.5 Preliminary Briefing

1. At the start of the IQR process each year, Academic Services officers will make arrangements to brief each of the following groups:
 - Heads of Department and/or Departmental Contacts, etc., in the academic units to be reviewed during the coming academic year.
 - New IQR reviewers, including new external reviewers, student reviewers and reviewers acting as Team Leaders for the first time.
 - Administrative secretaries to IQR teams.

3.6 The Self-Evaluative Statement and supporting material

1. The SES offers an important opportunity for the Department to shape the agenda of the review team. The SES should discuss both strengths and weaknesses in the Department's provision.
2. The SES should be completed by the Department according to the format set out at Annex 6.2.2 Guidance on the Composition of the SES. It should be submitted electronically e.g. via a departmental website or on a memory stick to the administrative secretary to the review team, for receipt at least six working weeks before the date of the review team's visit to the Department. Before finalising the SES, the Department may, if it wishes, invite preliminary comments from the team leader on a draft version of the document (to be submitted to the team leader via the administrative secretary).
3. Departments should issue the draft SES to the Departmental Teaching Committee for approval, before the document is submitted to the review team. Departments should also consult staff and students more widely in the process of developing the SES. Departments should ensure that the final version of the SES is received by the DTC and the Departmental Staff-Student Consultative Committee before the review team's visit to the Department and is made available to all staff and students in the Department.
4. The Administrative Secretary should also send a copy of the SES once received, to the Quality Assurance Manager. On receipt of the SES the Quality Assurance Manager will copy the

See Annex 6.2.2
Guidance on the
Composition of the
SES

SES to: the Dean of Faculty concerned; the Faculty Tutor concerned; the Faculty Graduate Tutor concerned, inviting them to send comments on the SES to the IQR team, via the administrative secretary.

5. The review team will read the SES and all supporting documentation in conjunction with the administrative secretary's report and the External Subject Expert's desk-based report in advance of its planning meeting. At its planning meeting, the review team will agree the core areas that it will wish to explore during the review visit and how the team will organise its scrutiny of the relevant supporting material. The supporting material made available through its web pages by the Department should provide most of the briefing documentation required by the review team. The team may subsequently request from the Department additional briefing material in advance of their visit to the Department but the amount of any additional material requested should be kept to a minimum. (The Department should submit such additional material in the agreed format to the administrative secretary, who will forward it to the other members of the review team).
6. In conducting the IQR, the review team will test the rigour of the SES and the extent to which it presents an accurate picture of the Department's QME processes and programmes. The SES will not necessarily dictate the full scope of the review team's enquiries. The team may develop independent lines of enquiry in the light of, e.g., issues raised in the administrative secretary's report or from the reviewers' own scrutiny of documentation made available by the Department.
7. It is an important principle of the SES that it should include a candid and, where appropriate, self-critical account of the Department's mechanisms for assuring, managing and enhancing quality. If the review team finds the SES to be lacking in self-evaluative content, it should record this judgment in the IQR Report. It should also be borne in mind, however, that the SES will form an appendix to the resulting IQR Report. The SES will thus be seen by UCL colleagues other than members of the review team and will form part of a documentary record which may also be seen by external reviewers in the context of Higher Education Review or other external review such as accreditations by PSRBs. Departments who, with this in mind, feel they need advice on the inclusion in the SES of potentially sensitive material are encouraged to contact the Quality Assurance Manager.
8. The SES is an evidence-based document. The text of the document should therefore substantiate the statements made therein by cross-reference to the supporting evidence contained in documents listed for submission with the SES.
9. The SES will normally consist of four sections (in addition to supporting statistical data and other briefing material). These four sections are expected to comprise a total of around 12 pages, although there is no formal prescription of page length. [See Annex 6.2.2]

PSRBs

10. A Section of the SES will be devoted to a summary by the Department of the outcomes of its most recent PSRB accreditation visit.

Connected Curriculum

11. The Arena Centre Teaching Fellow or Senior Teaching Fellow appointed to each Faculty will take responsibility for helping IQR departments in advance to develop their SES with an additional chapter on the department's progress in implementing the Connected Curriculum.
The Arena Centre Teaching Fellow or Senior Teaching Fellow appointed to each Faculty will also be invited to supply briefing for the External Subject Expert on the aims of the Connected Curriculum, if required.

12. E-Learning Baseline

The outcomes of the e-learning baseline review, and a description of any significant gaps or areas of difficulty, should form part of the self-evaluative statement for the IQR. Departments are asked to comment on the extent to which their modules and programmes meet the baseline, and on their approach to the use of e-learning. They should describe their aspirations for the use of technology to enhance their teaching, and any related support requirements.

13. Student Data

The Student Data Services Section of Student and Registry Services will supply Departments with certain categories of statistical data relating to students and applicants by the start of the academic year in which the IQR is to take place (normally by 30 September). A list of this data is at Annex 6.2.3 IQR Data Set. Departments are expected to analyse this data and provide a commentary on any trends or themes which emerge.

See Annex 6.2.3
IQR Data Set.

14. Programme Handbooks

The external Subject/Discipline Expert on the IQR review team will need to consider special documentation in addition to the Self-evaluative statement (SES). This will normally be the programme handbooks. Programmes will be asked to provide External Subject Experts, via the Administrative Secretary to IQR with the same programme-related documentation they give their External Examiners.

15. Sampling of Programmes

For large/complex provision there will be sampling of programmes.

The amount will be the subject of negotiation between the review team and the Department. These should be chosen by the Department. A statement will be required in the SES about why these programmes have been chosen.

16. Partnerships

Part of the responsibility of the IQR process is to provide an assessment of risk. Therefore any academic partnership will automatically be included in any sample of programmes. Details of these partnerships will be pre-populated from the UCL Partnerships Register when the IQR information is sent to the department by Academic Services.

17. The other supporting material made available to the review team by the Department through its web pages or via the other methods listed [see above] should consist of documentation which the Department believes provides relevant evidence of its

See Annex 6.2.4
IQR Core
Documentation.

QME processes and its programmes. A list of the core documentation which IQR teams normally expect Departments to submit, together with the SES, in advance of their IQR visit is at Annex 6.2.4 IQR Core Documentation.

3.7 The IQR Agenda and Visit to the Department

1. The review team is expected to survey a Department's QME operations and the quality of its programmes generally. Within that brief, however, the team (i) should explore issues highlighted by the Department in its SES and (ii) may devise and pursue particular 'trails'.
2. The areas explored by the review team should normally be those areas of operation which are listed at Annex 6.2.2 and issues identified by the departmental SES. IQR is not intended as a vehicle for exploring research performance, although it may explore ways in which the research environment impacts on the PGR student experience. Neither will IQR review teams make explicit recommendations for resources in respect of UCL's teaching estate.
3. The IQR team's visit to the Department should normally last 1.5 working days. However, in the case of particularly small numbers of students and/or a limited number of programmes the visit may take one working day. This will still be conducted by a full Review Team.
4. Decisions on the duration of a review will be made on a case-by-case basis and departments will be informed in plenty of time prior to their review.
5. It is helpful to build into the timetable for the visit one or more sessions in which the team can reflect on interviews which have already taken place and identify matters which need to be pursued or explored in remaining interviews. Any tour of the Department to be reviewed may be undertaken on a separate occasion, for example, immediately after the planning meeting, if this is thought necessary.

3.8 The Interview Programme

1. The review team will agree with the Department in advance of the visit a detailed timetable of interviews to be conducted on the visit. It is suggested that this be:

Day 1 12.30-5pm
Day 2 9am-2pm

2. Please see Annex 6.2.5 IQR Sample Timetable for an example. This also provides an indication of the types of meetings that the IQR team may wish to hold during the course of the IQR visit.
3. Interviewees should always include (in time order on the visit day):
 - The Dean of Faculty concerned.
 - The Faculty Tutor concerned
 - The Faculty Graduate Tutor concerned.
 - Students (including both undergraduate and taught graduate students, wherever the Department teaches at both levels, as well as graduate research students).
 - The Head of Department.

See Annex 6.2.5
IQR Sample
Timetable

- A range of academic staff including established staff and those more recently appointed.
 - Key administrative and support staff, including the Departmental Equal Opportunities Liaison Officer (DEOLO); Departmental Tutor and Departmental Careers Advisor.
4. Where the subject of a review is an interdepartmental degree programme, those interviewed should normally include the Programme Co-ordinator and the Chair of the relevant Board of Examiners.
 5. Attendance at each interview session should normally be restricted to those being interviewed within that particular session. Departments should bear in mind the need to provide, as far as possible, a fully representative and balanced sample of staff and students for interview. Please note that it is also considered good practice to meet students in the morning, usually immediately after the meeting with the Head of Department, as this ensures that student views help to set the agenda for the day's enquiries.

3.9 Oral Feedback to the Department

1. At the end of the interview programme, the team leader will, on behalf of the review team, make an oral report to the Head of Department concerned, summarising the reviewers' main findings, in terms of both good practice identified and areas which the team feels need to be addressed, either by the Department or by another body or other bodies within UCL. The purpose of this feedback is to ensure that the Department is immediately informed of the main findings of the review. The Head of Department is not expected to comment on the team's findings at this stage.

3.10 The IQR Report

1. The administrative secretary will normally have main responsibility for drafting the Report in consultation with the team leader and other members of the team as appropriate.
2. The IQR Report should normally include (in the following order):
 - The composition of the review team for the current IQR.
 - A commentary on the Department's follow-up from the previous IQR.
 - A list of good practice in QME in the Department. **Review teams should seek out and record good practice where there is clear evidence that it has contributed to outstanding achievement in one or more areas of recruitment, progression, student satisfaction, student achievement and employability.**
 - A list of recommendations for improvement in the Department's operations - the list should clearly distinguish improvements as either 'essential' or 'advisable' or 'desirable'. An 'essential' action point will be either (i) dictated by policy as defined in the UCL Academic Manual or (ii) concern an issue which the review team considers to represent a significant risk to the vision or direction of travel of the department, sufficient to warrant immediate action by the Department. A 'desirable' action point reflects a suggestion for improvement based on the personal views of

the review team but which is not (at present) prescribed in the Academic Manual. In the case of 'essential' recommendations, it is expected that explicit timescales should be set for their implementation. These should be appropriate and achievable.

- A statement from the External Subject Expert to the effect that the learning outcomes etc. of any sampled programmes are valid and current. Any major/minor programme amendment needed as a consequence of the External Subject Expert's statement will be dealt with via the existing programme amendment process.
 - Before the draft IQR Report is referred to the Department concerned, the administrative secretary to the IQR team should submit the list of recommendations included in the team's draft Report to the Quality Assurance Manager for confirmation that the proposed grading of recommendations as 'essential' or 'advisable' or 'desirable' is appropriate.
3. External Subject Experts' statements may raise issues concerning the currency and validity of programmes reviewed. It should be noted, however, that IQR is not intended to be a procedure for approval or non-approval of programmes; indeed, there is no notion within IQR of any programme being approved (or not approved) to continue as a result of the IQR process.
 4. The Report is a vehicle for the contextualisation of the recommendations and good practice, which also provides a 'snapshot' of the review team's findings on the day. The Report should not go into the fine detail of, or attempt to 'sum up', the activity of the provision reviewed in its entirety, which is rightly the job of the SES. Where necessary the Report should refer to the SES (which forms an Appendix to the Report) rather than attempting to replicate its contents.
 5. When contextualising the recommendations, a Report should detail specifically why the recommendation is being advised, and how this would, in the team's view, improve departmental performance. A responsible officer must be assigned by role to each recommendation in order to ensure a direct link between the recommendation and the action proposed and to promote accountability to ensure that it is performed. Recommendations should therefore not be made to 'the Faculty' or 'the Department' but to the specific role of a member (or members) of staff. However, this will be done by the Department as part of its action planning, as it is best placed to know who would be most suitable to implement a particular recommendation. A template will be provided for this purpose by the Administrative Secretary to the review.
 5. Where such matters arise in the course of a review, a recommendation to the appropriate faculty or institution-level committee to consider an aspect of UCL's institutional-level or faculty-level QME processes.
 6. The IQR Report may refer to resource issues and the concluding lists of good practice and needs for improvement identified by the review team may, e.g. commend the Department's efforts to improve its learning resources or invite the Department to consider the need for such improvement. Resource-related issues may thus be addressed for attention to the Director of the relevant Professional Service, Senior Officer or Chair of the relevant committee. However, IQR will not include explicit recommendations, either to the Department or to any other body or bodies within UCL, for additional resources.

7. Any recommendations in IQR Report which are to be addressed by the Faculty, another Department or bodies within UCL, rather than by the Department which is the subject of the review, should be clearly indicated as such in the concluding list of recommendations under the heading 'Matters for attention outside the Department'.
8. Where a sensitive or potentially confidential issue has arisen, the review team should, through the team leader and/or administrative secretary, seek guidance on how to address the issue in the IQR Report from the Director of Academic Services.
9. The IQR Report should normally include as appendices:
 - The Department's SES (with a list of the items of supporting documentation)
 - A list of the individuals or groups interviewed on the visit
 - A list of items of additional briefing material requested and received.
10. The full draft IQR Report should be agreed by all members of the review team and should normally be forwarded to the Head of Department, for receipt within fifteen working days of the end of the review visit, with an invitation to notify any factual corrections needed to the Report.
11. The draft Report should be circulated to the DTC before corrections are notified to the administrative secretary to the review team. If the Report is received by the DTC, the Department's response to the draft Report should be received by the administrative secretary no later than 10 days after the date of the DTC meeting. In any event, the Department's response to the draft Report should be received by the IQR secretary not more than four weeks after the date on which the draft Report is sent to the Department⁴.
12. The review team will consider the Department's comments on the factual accuracy of the draft Report and will then decide what changes, if any, to make to the report in the light of these comments. The final version of the report will be submitted by the administrative secretary to the review team to: (i) the Head of Department; (ii) the Quality Assurance Manager.
13. Academic Services will provide new review team secretaries with an IQR Report template.

3.11 Follow-up

1. Once the final version of the IQR Report has been submitted to (i) the Head of Department or Programme Co-ordinator and (ii) the Quality Assurance Manager by the administrative secretary to the review team, the team will, as soon as possible thereafter, arrange a follow-up meeting with the Department. The purpose of this meeting will be to assist the Department in the development of its response to the recommendations of the IQR Report. To aid this process, the administrative secretary will have provided the Department with a template for preparing its action plan setting out how it intends to respond to the recommendations contained in the IQR Report. The template comprises juxtaposed lists of:

⁴ Note that if timing of the DTC meeting makes this timeframe impossible, all members of the DTC, including student representatives, should be sent a copy of the draft report by email and their comments invited.

- i. Recommendations in the IQR Report
 - ii. Action taken or planned in respect of each of these recommendations
 - iii. Timescale for implementation of the recommendation
 - iv. The officer responsible.
2. The Department will be requested to produce a preliminary action plan, using the template provided, for discussion at the follow-up meeting with the review team.
3. The Arena Centre Teaching Fellow or Senior Teaching Fellow appointed to each Faculty will assist the IQR department in the formulation of its action plan in response to any recommendations made by the Review Team. A specific engagement with the Arena Centre to this effect should be undertaken.
4. During the follow-up meeting, the administrative secretary will take a note of any modifications to the draft action plan suggested by the review team. After the follow-up meeting, the secretary will write to the Head of Department, with a copy to the Quality Assurance Manager, to confirm the review team's comments on the draft action plan. Once the follow-up meeting has taken place, the review team will have completed its work.
5. Recommendations outside the Department
Where the IQR Report makes recommendations concerning the Faculty, another Department, Professional Services or other bodies within UCL, the Quality Assurance Manager will write to the other Head(s) of Department(s) concerned, asking them to submit, by a specified deadline, a similar summary of action taken or planned.
6. Departments must:
 - i. Ensure that they make the final IQR Report and action plans accessible to students in the Department, e.g. by making these public on departmental intranets
 - ii. Submit the IQR Report and action plans to the relevant DTC for discussion.
7. IQR Report will be sent by the Quality Assurance Manager to the officers of the Faculty concerned, with a note which makes clear the Faculty's particular responsibilities to:
 - i. Submit the IQR Report and action plans to the FTC for discussion
 - ii. Note and disseminate within the Faculty good practice and/or recommendations for improvement identified in the IQR Report.

3.12 IQR Panel/QRSC

1. Immediately after the follow-up meeting, the Quality Assurance Manager will write to the Heads of Departments concerned, asking them to submit the final summary of action taken or planned by the Department in response to the recommendations of the IQR Report for submission to the IQR Panel.
2. On receipt of the action plans, responses and comments requested, the Quality Assurance Manager will refer these for consideration by the IQR Panel, in conjunction with the IQR Reports to which they refer.
3. Sustained dialogue between the Department which has been reviewed and those responsible for oversight of the review process is an essential element of IQR. Consequently,

- approximately one year after the review visit has taken place, the Head or a nominated representative of the Department will attend the meeting of the IQR Panel which considers the IQR Report and action plan. The Head or other representative of the Department will be invited to discuss with the Panel at that meeting the perceived usefulness of the IQR process, the Report and recommendations, and the progress made by the Department in implementing the action plan.
4. If, having reviewed the Report and action plan and interviewed the Head of Department, the Panel judges that the Department has not made satisfactory progress in implementing the recommendations, the Quality Assurance Manager (as Secretary to the IQR Panel) may request further information or clarification. Only when the Panel is satisfied that the Department has implemented the recommendations will the Panel recommend that the IQR Report, the Department's action plan and any other responses to the Report be formally approved.
 5. Following the Panel's approval of responses to an IQR Report, the Quality Assurance Manager will confirm approval in writing to the Departments concerned.

3.13 Dissemination of Findings of IQR Report

1. Following the Panel's approval of responses to all the IQR Report produced in the previous academic year, the Quality Assurance Manager will prepare an annual report on that year's IQR programme for submission to and formal approval by Quality Review Sub-Committee.
2. The Quality Assurance Manager will prepare a Summary of Good Practice arising from IQR in the previous session. The IQR Panel will, in the course of its annual discussion of this Summary, refer these to the Arena Centre for wider dissemination and implementation. The Quality Assurance Manager will also circulate the Summary to Vice-Deans Education, Faculty Tutors, Faculty Graduate Tutors with the suggested that they promulgate this more widely by (for example) sharing it with Heads of Department/Division and Departmental Teaching Committees with an invitation to consider whether there are items which could be of wider relevance or application to their own disciplines. The Summary is also copied to the Arena Centre who will publish it on the Teaching and Learning Portal along with a web link to where all previous years' Summaries are published on the Academic Services website. This web link can also be found here: <http://www.ucl.ac.uk/srs/governance-and-committees/qme/qmea-z/igrqgoodpractice> and requires a UCL userid and password.
3. Recommendations concerning research student issues arising from IQR during the previous session are noted in a separate section and these recommendations and any progress noted are then discussed at the autumn meeting of the Research Degrees Committee.
A summary of all other recommendations arising from IQR will also be reported to the Education Committee.

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 from outside UCL and must not be involved in teaching on the programme during their term of office.
3. 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.
4. External Examiners appointed to programmes must meet any specified qualification requirements of the relevant Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies.
5. External Examiners are not expected to hold more than the equivalent of two substantive External Examinerships at the same time; this includes their appointment for UCL.
6. Boards of Examiners should avoid appointing an External Examiner to examine a single module without good reason for doing so.
7. 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.
8. Former members of UCL staff must not be appointed as External Examiners before a lapse of at least five years and provided that all students taught by that member of staff have left the programme being examined.
9. External Examiners for taught postgraduate Boards of Examiners who are not eligible to work in the UK must obtain a Tier 5 visa or a Permitted Paid Engagement letter to enter the UK. It is the responsibility of the Chair of the Board of Examiners to verify eligibility of External Examiners to work in the UK or arrange the provision of a Tier 5 visa or a Permitted Paid Engagement letter to enter the UK. The guidance set out on the [UCL Human Resources - Immigration](#) website ('Sponsored Researchers and Visiting Academics' section of the 'UCL Right to Work and Immigration Guidance' document) should be followed.
10. External Examiners for undergraduate programmes must be eligible to work in the UK. It is the responsibility of the Chair of the Board of Examiners to verify eligibility to work in the UK.
11. An External Examiner will not be appointed from a department/division in which a member of UCL staff is serving as an Examiner.
12. Only one External Examiner from the same department/division and Faculty of an institution will be appointed to examine the same programme at any one time.
13. An External Examiner may be appointed from the same department/division of an institution only after at least two years have elapsed since the termination of the previous appointment from that department/division.
14. Boards of Examiners should avoid appointing excessive numbers of External Examiners.
15. 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 Chair of Education Committee or their nominee.
16. External Examiners will be asked at the time of appointment, or continuation in appointment, to declare any interest in or connection with any student on the

programme for which they are acting as Examiner whether that interest or connection is personal or professional. If such an interest or connection exists, the Examiner in question should not be appointed. The Chair of the Board of Examiners is responsible for managing this process and should notify the Chair of Quality Review Sub-Committee (QRSC) of Education Committee.

17. After serving for a period of four consecutive years, (or five years if an extension to service was approved by the Chair of Quality Review Sub-Committee (QRSC)), an Examiner is not eligible for re-appointment for a period of two further 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 UCL 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, visa requirements and details of UCL's academic regulations.
3. UCL 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 and the fee on receipt of the External Examiner's report.
5. Where resources permit, Departments should take the opportunity to invite new External Examiners to UCL 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.
6. As a minimum, Departments must provide new External Examiners with the following information by the start of the first session of their appointment:
 - i. The name of departmental/divisional board contact (e.g. Examinations Liaison Officer).
 - ii. The date(s) of meetings of Board of Examiners to which the External Examiner is invited (when known).
 - iii. An outline of UCL's examination policies and procedures for Board of Examiners (e.g., point of contact for External Examiner, time allowed for marking, procedures for setting and scrutinising papers).
 - iv. Relevant departmental/divisional booklets such as a Student Handbook or syllabus information, or links to these if they are online.
 - v. Programme specification(s).
 - vi. Module descriptions.
 - vii. The Scheme for the Award and marking scheme for individual modules and components of assessment.
 - viii. The previous External Examiner's final report and the departmental response.

4.3 Responsibilities of the External Examiner

1. External Examiners should refer to the UCL regulations in Chapter 4, Section 10: Boards of Examiners, noting in particular:
 - 11.2 Programme Boards of Examiners
 - 11.2.4 Candidate Anonymity
 - Annex 4.3.8 Procedures When Marks Are Missing
 - Annex 4.3.9 Procedure When an External Examiner is Unable to Attend
 - Annex 4.3.10 Procedures to Follow in the Event of An Emergency
2. The primary responsibilities of a Taught Programme External Examiner are to review summative assessment methods prior to students being assessed and to submit an annual report, 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) Where appropriate, the comparability of the standards and student achievements with those in some other higher education institutions in the UK.
 - v) Identify comparable practice.
3. 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.
 4. The form must be completed on Portico (UCL's student and assessment record system) **within one month** of the final meeting of the Board of Examiners so that External Examiner's comments can be taken into account for the next academic session. The External Examiners Reporting procedures are set out in [Annex 6.3.1 Main Steps: Response to External Examiners' Reports](#). Payment of the Examiner's fee is authorised when the report is received via Portico by Student & Registry Services.
 5. Examiners should consider the totality of the degree in respect of both the syllabus and examination⁵. The major part of their role should be devoted to modules and examinations which are the main determinants of the degree classification.
 6. Departments and Divisions should invite External Examiners to comment on the appropriateness of new or amended methods of assessment.
 7. All forms of assessment and dissertations must be comprehensively moderated internally before being sent to the External Examiner. **An External Examiner must never be asked to mark or moderate any form of assessment or dissertation.**
 8. External Examiners must have sight of 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. Departments/Divisions should make suitable practical arrangements for this task either by sending a sample by post/email or by arranging a suitable time and location in advance of the Board for the External Examiner to review a sample.
 9. For oral examinations, External Examiners should receive a representative sample of the recorded oral examinations or all of the recorded assessed work in the case of a minority language. In this context a minority foreign language refers to a language where there is only one qualified member of staff who could teach that language in a given academic session.
 10. External Examiners may be invited to attend oral examinations as observers and must not directly examine students.
 11. External Examiners must also see the mark sheets for all students for the assessment from which the samples are taken. Final projects and dissertations from programmes should be treated in the same way as other forms of assessment. The Chair may make arrangements for External Examiners to review final projects and dissertations when they visit UCL for a Board of Examiners meeting.
 12. External Examiners should also receive the assessments of borderline students where the External Examiner is examining a whole programme (not just a component).
 13. An External Examiner 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 the External Examiner it is essential for them to see all the assessments for that component of the assessment.

⁵ In some cases this will not be possible as External Examiners are appointed to examine specific module(s) and not a full programme.

14. At least one External Examiner present at the final Board of Examiners is required to sign a statement that the examination has been conducted according to the general UCL regulations and the specific programme regulations to the best of their knowledge, and that they have agreed to the results.

4.4 Nomination and Appointment

4.4.1 Process of Nomination

1. The Chair of a Board of Examiners will nominate a new External Examiner for all or part of a taught programme.
2. Nominations for new External Examiners must be conducted before the start of the first academic session so that they can review assessment tasks in good time.
1. In making a nomination, the Chair will take account of the appointment criteria specified in Section 4.1 Criteria for Appointment, including confirmation of approval of the nomination from the relevant Chair of the Faculty Board of Examiners and the Quality Review Sub-Committee.

Further Guidance

1. In order for External Examiners to complete the nomination form on-line External Examiners need access to a restricted area of Portico (UCL's student records system). NB - This is particularly important because External Examiners will submit their annual reports to UCL also using an on-line tool constructed for this purpose.
2. Access is gained by sending brief details to examiners@ucl.ac.uk providing the following information: Title / Forename / Surname / Date of Birth / Email address / Title and code of Board / Faculty / Board Administrator / Name of outgoing External Examiner / Academic Year duties will relate to.
3. Student & Registry Services will then set up the nominee on UCL's Services System.
4. Student & Registry Services will send the nominee a link to Portico with information about accessing Portico to enter details of their relevant teaching and examining experience.
5. Upon completion of the on-line form, the nominee will then submit the form to the Chair of the Board by confirming that they wish to proceed (using a radio button on the on-line form).
6. The form will then appear in the Chair's (and/or their nominee's) 'In-tray' on their home page on Portico. They will also receive an email letting them know that the form has been submitted.
7. Upon checking the details and being content to proceed with the nomination, the form is sent to the Faculty via the in-tray and email process set out in paragraph 6 above.
8. The Faculty approver can accept or reject the nomination or send queries back to the Chair of the Board.
9. If content with the nomination, the Faculty can proceed by sending the form to the Chair of QRSC, via the Student & Registry Services, via the in-tray and email process set out in iv above.
10. The Chair of QRSC can accept or reject the nomination or send queries back to the Chair of the Board.
11. If the nomination is accepted the External Examiner is appointed by UCL for a period of 4 years (or less if requested), to be confirmed on an annual basis.
12. 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 Annex 6.3.4, External Examiner Fee Payment and Expenses Claim Form.
13. Departments/divisions should book and pay for External Examiners travel arrangements well in advance to ensure the best rates are achieved. They should also book and pay for any hotel accommodation, submit an interdepartmental transfer to

with supporting documentation (invoices, receipts) to Academic Services and also retain receipts locally.

14. External Examiners should claim expenses using Annex 6.3.4 External Examiner Fee Payment and Expenses Claim Form. A link to this form is sent to them upon their appointment.
15. The appointment of overseas External Examiners should be limited.

4.4.2 Period of Appointment

1. External Examiners may have their four-year term extended for one further academic session only, subject to the approval of the Quality Review Sub-Committee. Chairs of Boards of Examiners are responsible for requesting extensions for their External Examiners via Student & Registry Services.
2. If an External Examiner will not be nominated for reappointment within the four year appointment period, the Chair of the Board must formally notify the External Examiner concerned and inform the Chair of Quality Review Sub-Committee of the decision via Student & Registry Services with a brief statement of reason.

4.4.3 Continuation of Appointment

1. Chairs of Boards of Examiners will confirm that External Examiners are continuing in appointment annually.
2. An Examiner has the right not to seek continuation in appointment at any time during the period in which they are eligible to serve.

Further Guidance

1. When prompted by the Student & Registry Services, Chairs or their nominated administrators should confirm that a taught programme External Examiner is continuing for another academic session.
2. This task is carried out via the Chair's or nominee's Portico staff homepage.
3. When confirmed, the External Examiner will receive an email, issued by the Student & Registry Services, appointing them for another year.

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. For a list of current External Examiners, see Annex 6.3.5 for UG programmes and Annex 6.3.6 for PGT programmes.
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 1, Section 12: Student Complaints Procedure. External Examiners should inform Student & Registry Services 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 by signature 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 Review Sub-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 Review Sub-Committee or Vice-Provost (Education & Student Affairs). 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 (see [Annex 6.3.1 Main Steps: Response to External Examiners' Reports](#)).
2. Access to these documents will be provided to students via UCL's student records system, Portico, and should also be discussed at Departmental Staff-Student Consultative Committees.
3. A flow chart for the External Examiner Reporting process is available at [Annex 6.3.2](#).

4.7.2 Annual Student Experience Review (ASER)

1. The Annual Student Experience Review process (see [Section 2](#)) is intended to provide an increased level of central data analysis which will flag up statistically significant issues and highlight particularly strong or weak data from a variety of sources. Each Department will respond directly to the issues identified by its own data which will allow for the collation and comparison of meaningful data and reflects a genuinely risk-based approach. The central analysis will also help to identify cross-institutional trends and variances, particularly in key areas such as WP and BME attainment.
2. External Examiners' Reports will be used in conjunction with quantitative data and additional sources, such as external survey results, feedback from internal surveys and employability statistics, to compile the central datasets that will be considered by Quality Review Sub-Committee. Please refer to [Section 2: Annual Student Experience Review](#) for further information.

4.7.3 Monitoring of Reports and Responses

1. Academic Services will monitor responses to all reports. A step by step process for monitoring External Examiners' reports and responses to the reports is set out in [Annex 6.3.1 Main Steps: Response to External Examiners' Reports](#) and a flow chart for the External Examiner Reporting process is available at [Annex 6.3.2](#).
2. External Examiners will be asked to make recommendations within their report and grade these as Essential, Advisable or Desirable, which would require timely responses. The definitions for the three categories are as follows:
 - i) **Essential:** 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. Academic Services will prepare annual reports on matters of general interest and concern for inclusion in the ASER process, for the Boards of Faculty to consider and for wider dissemination to Quality Review Sub-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

5.1 What is the Peer Dialogue Scheme?

1. The Peer Dialogue scheme is open to all staff who teach and/or support students' learning at UCL. Its aim is to inspire you to develop your teaching and your students' learning, by working closely with colleagues. It enables you to focus on developing a range of dimensions of your practice, such as classroom teaching, feedback on assessment or development of resources. You are invited to engage in a constructive discussion about enhancing student learning and/or the wider student experience in your subject.
2. Peer Dialogue is not a judgmental process, but an opportunity for creative thinking about developing your educational practice. Departments will keep a brief record of engagement with the scheme, to demonstrate commitment to ongoing, collegial enhancement of academic practice. This should record the participants in the engagement, the option followed and the date(s) the activity took place. All UCL staff who teach must participate and Departmental records are to be forwarded to Faculty Teaching Committees.

5.2 What do I need to do?

1. You have three options, and can choose which to undertake in each academic year. We recommend using the range of the options over time. Staff on probation should take advice from their subject leader on which option would be the most helpful.

5.3 Option A: Collaborative enhancement of a specific area of practice

Colleagues work in twos, threes or small groups (same subject OR interdisciplinary clusters).

1. Identify with your Peer Dialogue partner(s) one or more aspects of your educational practice which you would like feedback on, for example: assessment methods; feedback to students; e-learning materials and resources; flipped lectures; inclusive teaching for diverse groups; research-based education. See the [UCL Teaching and Learning Portal](#) for more examples.
2. Plan times to observe each other's educational practice in the area of interest.
3. Spend time on preparation before the session. It will be very helpful if you understand the context of each other's practice and the aim and content of particular activities and/or assessments.
4. When observing, make notes on what you will feed back to your colleague and on what you can apply to your own practice.
5. Engage in a constructive follow-up discussion, exploring how your practice can be mutually enhanced.
6. Write a very brief account (50-150 words) summarising any changes you plan following the Peer Dialogue, focusing particularly on suggestions of benefit to others in the department.

If the colleagues agree that it would be mutually beneficial, they may wish to extend this option, so that following the discussion and prior to writing the report, they:

7. Agree on their approaches to enhancement.
8. Try out the new approaches and then get together to review them.

5.4 Option B: Pair-based Teaching Observation

1. Identify with a colleague one or more aspects of your face-to-face teaching which you would like feedback on. You are encouraged to select a new partner for the Peer Dialogue each academic year, so that you can draw on and contribute to the expertise of diverse colleagues.
2. Plan times to visit each other's teaching sessions.
3. Spend time on preparation before the session. It will be very helpful if you understand the context of each other's teaching and the aim and content of particular session.
4. When observing, make notes on what you will feed back to your colleague and on what you can apply to your own teaching/course design.
5. Engage in a constructive follow-up discussion, exploring how your practice can be mutually enhanced.
6. Write a brief joint report (50-150 words) summarising any changes you plan following the Peer Dialogue, focusing particularly on suggestions of benefit to others in the department.

5.5 Option C: Reflection and dialogue with Student Reviewers

Staff work in partnership with one or two students, who are not taking the course under consideration, to reflect on their educational practice through dialogue as follows:

1. The staff and student(s) meet to introduce themselves and their motivation for working with each other. They should agree the focus for their joint investigation into the staff member's educational practice and the format of this.
2. The student(s) spends a minimum of 3 hours observing educational practice (such as a combination of classroom/laboratory teaching, a Moodle site/other VLE and/or assignment brief/ other course documentation).
3. Prior to each observation the staff and student(s) discuss the context, aim and content of the observation.
4. When observing, the student(s) should make some notes to aid their memory of it. They should spend some time following the observation reflecting on it from their perspective.
5. Following each observation the staff and student(s) should engage in constructive dialogue about their different perspectives on the observation. This will focus on how the teaching practice can be enhanced; what the student has learnt about how to learn effectively and whether this learning can also be shared with course participants to enhance their learning.
6. The student may additionally, with the agreement of the member of staff, discuss the experience of taking the course with course participants, to inform their reflections and feed these insights into the discussion with the member of staff teaching the course. In this case, the focus of the dialogue with course participants should be discussed with the staff member in advance and the outcomes discussed afterwards.
7. The staff and student(s) should collaboratively write a short report (50-150 words) summarizing any changes that are planned following the dialogue, focusing particularly on suggestions of benefit to others (staff and students) in the department.
8. Participants may also wish to add an invitation to present the outcomes of the Peer Dialogue to Staff Student Consultative Committees.

5.6 Peer Dialogue follow up (Options A, B and C)

You are invited to:

- Present and discuss your account of Peer Dialogue at your appraisal
- Present your enhancement work to your Departmental Teaching Committee

- Share with your Departmental Teaching Committee any generic issues arising, for example suggestions for changes to the use of space or of technology
- Present the outcomes of the Peer Dialogue to Staff Student Consultative Committees
- Develop a case study for the UCL Teaching and Learning Portal: email ConnectedCurriculum@ucl.ac.uk to discuss possibilities
- Lead a UCL Arena exchange seminar, to share your developments with colleagues beyond your Faculty: see <http://www.ucl.ac.uk/arena/events/seminar-proposal-form> or contact arena@ucl.ac.uk.

For further information or guidance on how to engage with the UCL Peer Dialogue scheme, please contact arena@ucl.ac.uk.

6 Student Academic Representation

6.1 Introduction

1. UCL Regulation for Management 11.1 provides as follows: *“In each academic Department [1] there shall be at least one departmental Staff-Student Consultative Committee (SSCC). Each Staff-Student Consultative Committee shall meet at least twice in each academic year. The Head of Department shall ensure that the constitution and the procedures of this Committee are acceptable to the staff and the students of the Department or Faculty. The minutes of each meeting of each such Consultative Committee shall be forwarded to Academic Services.”*
2. The purpose of student academic representation is to enable partnership working between students and staff throughout UCL. Through their representatives, all students’ voices should shape and influence the work of their departments, their faculties, and UCL.
3. Arrangements for academic representation are overseen by the Student Academic Representation Steering Group, with membership from UCL departments, faculties, professional services, and the Students’ Union. The Student Academic Representation Steering Group reports to Research Degrees Committee and 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) To 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 SSCC. A Department may wish to establish a separate SSCC for postgraduate or research students where the membership of the Departmental SSCC would otherwise be too large.
2. Meetings with representatives at a programme level, though encouraged, do not constitute SSCC meetings, except in the case of inter-departmental programmes (see 6.8). Departments should avoid complex SSCC structures that disperse students’ voices.
3. The minutes of SSCC 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 SSCCs.

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 should be members of an SSCC; the role should not be split between multiple students, nor should different representatives be invited to attend different meetings of the same SSCC.
4. All representatives should normally be appointed by process of election, except where this is not possible or there is insufficient interest in the role. Elections should include a 'Re-Open 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 Student Academic Representation Steering Group 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 SSCC Co-Chairs.
7. The SSCC may choose to co-opt additional representatives to ensure a diverse membership which can effectively reflect students' views and perspectives.
8. Any co-opted or 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.
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 should be re-elected.
11. Any representative appointed at a later date through replacement or co-option will also end their term of office in October. SSCC meetings in advance of the October appointment of representatives may utilise the returning membership of the SSCC.

6.4 Staff Student Consultative Committee Meetings

1. SSCC 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 taught Masters students*
 - iv) At least one member of staff responsible for research students*
 - v) All student academic representatives in the department
 - vi) Where relevant, a committee member of an academic society based in the department

** May not be required where there is a separate committee graduate or research-student SSCC.*

2. Each SSCC 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 Student Academic Representation Steering Group.
3. Departments will nominate a member of professional service staff responsible for each SSCC, who will act as secretary. SSCC minutes should clearly indicate who has attended, and their role in relation to the Committee.
4. Staff membership of the SSCC should not form a majority.
5. An SSCC should meet a minimum of at least three times in each academic year (typically once per term). The Co-Chairs will be responsible for assessing whether further meetings would be useful.

6. The agenda shall be circulated to all SSCC members normally at least one week before the date of a meeting of a Committee. The agenda should also be made available to all students via a Department webpage, Moodle or any other appropriate method.
7. Where the Co-Chairs agree, the agenda points in 6.5 can be adapted to suit any SSCCs that have more specific needs, particularly postgraduate SSCCs.
8. The unconfirmed minutes of an SSCC meeting, as approved by the Co-Chairs, should be displayed to all students via a Department webpage, Moodle or any other appropriate method within ten working days of the meeting. These minutes should also be emailed to sscc@ucl.ac.uk within this timeframe.

6.5 SSCC 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 Teaching Committee (and/or doctoral-education equivalent), and to make recommendations where appropriate.
3. To ensure joint student and staff discussion at least once during every Academic Session of:
 - i) Information relating to internal and external systems of accountability, to include:
 - a) Professional, statutory and regulatory body reports and Department responses to recommendations
 - b) External examiners' reports and Department responses to recommendations
 - ii) Teaching (including dissemination of good practice and programme/module evaluation)
 - iii) Outcomes of student evaluations e.g. Module surveys, NSS, and action plans arising from these
 - iv) New and revised programme developments
 - v) Assessment and feedback
 - vi) Organisation and management (including timetabling and Departmental processes)
 - vii) Learning resources (including library, IT and other teaching/learning resources)
 - viii) Employment, employability and personal development
 - ix) Personal tutoring
 - x) Student-led projects or events, including UCL ChangeMaker projects
 - xi) The effectiveness of the SSCC and the actions of the Students' Union and Departments in response to it
 - xii) The priorities and actions of the Department Teaching Committee (and/or research-education equivalent)
 - xiii) Opportunity for the Department Representative to report on meetings they have attended at the Faculty level
4. To facilitate greater communication between students and staff, and report key actions, discussions and recommendations to the wider student body.
5. To identify and address areas of concern to students and staff.
6. To identify and disseminate examples of good practice.
7. To enable the engagement of students through their representatives with processes to enhance students' experiences, such as the Annual Student Experience Review, and the development of strategies to support research students' experiences.

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 Student Academic Representation Steering Group.
2. The Lead Department Representative(s) will be responsible for leadership of the SSCC, ensuring the effectiveness of students' voices 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 SSCC. They can also take chair's action to approve changes to policies and documents that require action before an SSCC can be convened. Where such action is taken, the Lead Department Representative must be allowed time to consult with the SSCC to gain wider student feedback and the chair should provide a full report to the next formal SSCC 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) should be invited to join their Faculty Teaching Committee (or doctoral-education equivalent). Other student representatives may also be invited where appropriate.

6.8 Interdepartmental Degree Programmes

1. Degree programmes that are inter-departmental (with contributions from more than two Departments) are required to have a separate, programme-based, SSCC. UCL's Regulations for Management 11.2 and 11.3 provide as follows:
 - 11.2 *Subject to the provisions of Regulation 11.3 below, there shall be, for each combined studies degree programme operating within UCL and involving more than two Departments of UCL, an SSCC, which shall meet at least twice in each academic year. The academic staff responsible for the co-ordination of such a degree programme shall ensure that the constitution and procedures of this committee are acceptable to the staff and students involved in the degree programme. The minutes of each meeting of each such committee shall be forwarded to Academic Services.*
 - 11.3 *Where the academic staff responsible for the co-ordination of a combined studies degree programme operating within UCL and involving more than two Departments of UCL consider that it will not be appropriate for a separate Staff-Student Consultative Committee to operate for the degree programme in question, those staff shall ensure that the views of students following the programme can be expressed instead either through (i) the Staff-Student Consultative Committees of the Departments concerned, as prescribed in Regulation 11.1, or through (ii) an annual meeting which all students following the programme shall be invited to attend, or through both (i) and (ii).*

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

7.1.1 Staff-Student Consultative Committee (SSCC)

1. Every Department should have at least one Staff-Student Consultative Committee (SSCC) (see Section 6) which meets at least three times each academic session (typically once each term). SSCCs 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 minutes of the SSCC meetings are considered by the UCL Student Experience Committee (see Section 7.4).

7.1.2 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.

7.1.3 Faculty Teaching Committee (FTC)

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 Teaching Committee (FTC) which meets termly. All FTCs should invite the student Faculty Representative to membership of the Committee (see Section 6.6) and consider inviting other student representatives where appropriate.

7.1.4 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.

7.1.5 Further Information

1. For more information on your SSCC, DTC, FTC or FRDC, 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 SSCCs), 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 Experience Committee (StEC) deals with issues relating directly to students. It reviews university-wide issues raised at SSCCs and also looks at the data received from student surveys. Many of the agenda items are raised by students via the Students' Union. StEC 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 StEC, then please contact Simon To, Representation & Campaigns 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)
- Welfare & International Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)

Education Committee

- Education Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)
- Welfare & International 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 Experience Committee

- Education Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)
- Welfare & International Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)
- Postgraduate Students' Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)
- Eleven student members with one from each faculty nominated by the Students' Union

Student Recruitment, Admissions and Funding Committee

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

7.5 Student Representation on UCL Non-Academic and Statutory Committees

Council

- Education Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)
- Democracy, Operations & Community Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)

Finance Committee

- Democracy, Operations & Community Officer, Students' Union (Student Observer)

Health and Safety Committee

- Two Student Observers, nominated by the Students' Union

Honorary Degrees and Fellowships Committee

- Education Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)

Research Governance Committee

- Postgraduate Students' Officer, 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.

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 Academic Services staff nominated by the Director of Academic Services, 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

For Current UCL Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate Students, including MRes programmes

- 1) The following information should be included in a single location, available to current students, via handbooks, Moodle pages or online websites/intranets.
- 2) Where a section title or other text is marked **(Centrally Provided)** this text is available in Annex 6.6.1 Standard UCL Text for Core Programme Information. It should be copied and pasted without any amendments. However departments might like to add additional, local information as appropriate.
- 3) Where a section title is unmarked the department/faculty/school is invited to include the relevant information in a manner of their choosing.
- 4) Information can be provided in any order but the policy below is numbered for ease of reference.

9.1.1 Welcome to UCL

To include:

- 1) Provost's Welcome

9.1.2 Introduction to the department and parent faculty

To include:

- 1) Introduction to the department and its history
- 2) Explanation of the relationship between department and faculty
- 3) Key staff members within the department and faculty

9.1.3 Departmental staff related to the programme

To include:

- 1) Explanation to students of the roles of the module and programme leaders and other key staff involved in programme delivery

9.1.4 Key dates

To include:

- 1) Term dates, exam/assessment periods, core activities **(Centrally Provided)**
- 2) Department- and faculty-level events and key dates
- 3) How UCL and the department will communicate with students **(Centrally Provided)**

9.1.5 Programme structure

To include:

- 1) The structure of the programme, duration, credits, award(s)

9.1.6 Advice on choosing module options and electives

To include:

- 1) Choosing modules (**Centrally Provided**)
- 2) Contact details for staff who can give advice
- 3) Deadlines for choosing modules, and how a student will know if they have secured a place
- 4) The above information should also cater to Affiliate students

9.1.7 Progression and award requirements

To include:

- 1) Information on how a student progresses through the programme – what does a student need to complete and pass to be awarded a degree; what are the consequences of unsatisfactory progress
- 2) Modern Foreign Language requirement (**Centrally Provided**)

9.1.8 Tutorials and supervision

To include:

- 1) What students can expect in terms of academic and personal tutoring (**Centrally Provided**)
- 2) Department pastoral tutoring
- 3) How dissertation supervision operates and the expectations of both the supervisor and student
- 4) Transition Mentors (**Centrally Provided**)

9.1.9 Projects, placements and study abroad (if applicable)

To include:

- 1) Finding projects
- 2) Information on placements
- 3) Information on study abroad options
- 4) Information about regulations concerning the year abroad (academic requirements if they exist)
- 5) Information on summer internships

9.1.10 Professional accreditation (if applicable)

To include:

- 1) Details of any professional accreditation and associated requirements integrated into the programme and requirements for students

9.1.11 Academic partnerships (if applicable)

To include:

- 1) Who the partner is, what is involved in the partnership and how it impacts the student

9.1.12 Learning resources and key facilities

To include:

- 1) Information on university-wide learning resources and key contacts for support **(Centrally Provided)**
- 2) Information on department/faculty library spaces/resources, IT provision/support, social spaces etc.
- 3) How to access Moodle and support contacts **(Centrally Provided)**
- 4) Portico – what it is, why it is important and who to contact for support **(Centrally Provided)**
- 5) Research Student Log **(Centrally Provided)**

9.1.13 Student representation

To include:

- 1) Information on the Students' Union, how to run for election and how to find a representative **(Centrally Provided)**
- 2) Student societies **(Centrally Provided)**
- 3) Information on Student Academic Representatives **(Centrally Provided)**
- 4) Role of the Staff-Student Consultative Committee **(Centrally Provided)**
- 5) Other ways (specific to the department/programme) that students can give feedback, including local processes and key contacts
- 6) Students' Union Advice Service **(Centrally Provided)**
- 7) Informal and Formal Student Complaints **(Centrally Provided)**

9.1.14 Student support and wellbeing

To include:

- 1) Information regarding central wellbeing and support services, including what services are offered, locations and contact information **(Centrally Provided)**
- 2) Information about registering with a doctor and out-of-hours support services **(Centrally Provided)**
- 3) Information on how students can access support/information related to Equality and Diversity **(Centrally Provided)**
- 4) Information about UCL's Zero Tolerance policy on harassment and bullying **(Centrally Provided)**

9.1.15 Student feedback

To include:

- 1) The importance of feedback and how UCL uses the results **(Centrally Provided)**
- 2) Student surveys and how UCL uses the results, including information about the NSS, PTES and Student Barometer **(Centrally Provided)**
- 3) Student Evaluation Questionnaires – when they occur and why they are important **(Centrally Provided)**
- 4) The ASER process and how student representatives are involved **(Centrally Provided)**

9.1.16 ChangeMakers

To include:

- 1) About the project, who they are and how a student can find out more or become involved **(Centrally Provided)**

9.1.17 Employability and careers

To include:

- 1) Opportunities available, where and how to get advice, career planning tips
- 2) Information on UCL Careers **(Centrally Provided)**
- 3) Internships that are not part of the programme (i.e., faculty opportunities) (if applicable)
- 4) Entrepreneurship at UCL **(Centrally Provided)**

9.1.18 Global Citizenship

To include:

- 1) What it is, who a student can contact or where they can go to find out more, or become involved **(Centrally Provided)**

9.1.19 Information on assessment

To include:

- 1) How will students be assessed?
- 2) What are the marking criteria and learning outcomes?
- 3) What marking scale is in use on the programme?
- 4) How will marks be combined to reach a classification?
- 5) What is feedback, and how will students recognise it (questions in lectures, emails etc.) How and when will students receive feedback on their work and what will it look like?
- 6) UCL standard turnaround time for feedback **(Centrally Provided)**
- 7) For written examinations, a link to the *UCL Examination Guide for Candidates* on the Examinations and Awards website **(Centrally Provided)**
- 8) For coursework submissions, clear information about where and how to submit work, including details of any electronic submission methods and the technical support available
- 9) Information about penalties for late submissions **(Centrally Provided)**
- 10) Information about absence from assessment **(Centrally Provided)**
- 11) Information about word counts and penalties **(Centrally Provided)**
- 12) Information about the consequences of failure **(Centrally Provided - except where derogations are in place)**
- 13) Information about accepted referencing methods on the programme
- 14) Information about academic integrity (plagiarism) in the discipline
- 15) Information about UCL's examination irregularities and plagiarism procedures **(Centrally Provided)**
- 16) Information about research ethics, approvals process, code of conduct etc. on the programme (where applicable)
- 17) Information about Marking, Second-Marking and Moderation **(Centrally Provided)**
- 18) Information about the External Examiner process and how to access reports via Portico **(Centrally Provided)**

9.1.20 Extenuating Circumstances and Reasonable Adjustments

To include:

- 1) Information about Reasonable Adjustments **(Centrally Provided)**
- 2) Information about Special Examination Arrangements **(Centrally Provided)**
- 3) Information about when, where and how to submit a claim for Extenuating Circumstances **(Centrally Provided)**
- 4) Information on fitness to study **(Centrally Provided)**
- 5) Information on local fitness to study or practise policies

- 6) Key contacts in the department for assistance with any of the above

9.1.21 Changes to registration status

To include:

- 1) Information on how to change, interrupt or withdraw from a programme (**Centrally Provided**)
- 2) Key contacts in the department for assistance with any of the above

9.1.22 Our Expectation of Students

To include:

- 1) Hours of study (Centrally Provided)
- 2) Personal study time
- 3) Attendance requirements and penalties for poor attendance (Centrally Provided)
- 4) UCL disciplinary policies and expected behaviour (Centrally Provided)

9.1.23 Data protection

To include:

- 1) How UCL uses student information, for what purposes, and the steps taken to safeguard this information; Where to find information security, intellectual property and email policies; Information on how to enquire or make a related complaint (**Centrally Provided**)

9.1.24 Health, safety and security

To include:

- 1) UCL Health, Safety and Security information (**Centrally Provided**)
- 2) Health and Safety information concerning the department

9.1.25 After study

To include:

- 1) Information on transcripts and how to access replacements (**Centrally Provided**)
- 2) Information about the HEAR (**Centrally Provided**)
- 3) Information on UCL Alumni activities and key contacts (**Centrally Provided**)