



UCL Academic Manual 2021-22

Chapter 9: Quality Review Framework

Chapter 9 is UCL's regulatory framework for monitoring standards, the student experience and strategic quality enhancement activities across UCL. It includes the regulations for 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.

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 Commentaries	8
2.6	Publication of ASER Reports	8
2.7	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	11
3.5	Preliminary Briefing	12
3.6	The Self-Evaluative Statement and supporting material.....	12
3.7	The IQR Visit.....	13
3.8	The Summary of Findings	13
3.9	The IQR Report.....	14
3.10	Follow-up.....	15
3.11	IQR Panel/Academic Committee.....	16
3.12	Dissemination of Findings of IQR Report	16
4	EXTERNAL EXAMINING	18
4.1	Criteria for Appointment	18
4.2	Responsibilities of UCL	19
4.3	Responsibilities of the External Examiner	20
4.4	Nomination and Appointment	21
4.5	Student Contact with External Examiners	24
4.6	Entitlements of External Examiners.....	24
4.7	External Examiner Reports	24
5	PEER DIALOGUE SCHEME.....	26
5.1	What is the Peer Dialogue Scheme?.....	26
5.2	What do I need to do?	26
5.3	Option A: Collaborative enhancement of a specific area of practice	26
5.4	Option B: Pair-based Teaching Observation	27
5.5	Option C: Reflection and dialogue with Student Reviewers	27
5.6	Peer Dialogue follow up (Options A, B and C)	27
6	STUDENT ACADEMIC REPRESENTATION.....	29
6.1	Introduction	29
6.2	Committee Structure and Process.....	29
6.3	Appointment of Representatives	29
6.4	Staff Student Consultative Committee Meetings	30
6.5	SSCC Terms of Reference.....	31
6.6	Lead Department Representatives.....	32
6.7	Faculty Representatives.....	32
6.8	Faculty Academic Representative Forums.....	32

6.9	Interdepartmental Degree Programmes	33
7	STUDENT REPRESENTATION ON UCL ACADEMIC STANDING COMMITTEES AND SUB-COMMITTEES	34
7.1	Representation at Departmental and Faculty Level.....	34
7.2	Student Academic Representatives	35
7.3	Representation via the Students' Union	35
7.4	Student Representation on UCL Academic Standing and Sub-Committees	35
7.5	Student Representation on UCL Non-Academic and Statutory Committees	36
8	ACADEMIC COMMITTEE REVIEW PANEL	37
8.1	Policy.....	37
8.2	Procedure.....	37
9	CORE PROGRAMME INFORMATION	39
10	MODULE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRES	40
10.1	Introduction	40
10.2	Module Evaluation Questionnaire Policy	40

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 Office for Students (OfS) 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 in partnership with students, identifying action to be taken forward where necessary;
 - Review processes and engagement with University quality assurance and quality enhancement policies;
 - Discuss departmental and faculty engagement with key strategic education priorities;
 - Provide 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;
 - 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 (UG)
 - Average Student Achievement
 - Final Classification
 - Submission
 - Referral
 - Completion
2. These datasets will then be analysed by Student Data Services.
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 (Graduate Outcomes Survey, formerly DLHE)
 - New to UCL and Student Experience Survey (SES) results
 - Other (e.g Town hall meetings, Unitu etc).
4. Consideration of the analysed datasets will be the task of the Staff Student Consultative Committees (SSCC) and Departmental Teaching Committees (DTC).

5. There will be one main issue and one update of datasets per academic session, to enable continual update of the Development and Enhancement Plan.
6. See [Annex 9.2.1 ASER Main Steps](#) for more details.

Graduate Outcomes Survey, (formerly DHLE) Data

7. UCL acknowledges that time lapses in the production of each cohort of the Graduate Outcomes Survey data means that cohorts will not correlate and cannot be compared (i.e. there will be no direct relationship between the survey data produced for evaluation in 2020 and the graduating cohort but Departments are expected nonetheless to evaluate their own performance in the Graduate Outcomes 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 Staff Student Consultative Committees and Departmental Teaching Committees. The QRSC will be responsible for ensuring compliance with the minimum QA elements of the ASER process and an annual review of the Department's Development and Enhancement Plans to identify themes and identifying institutional risk areas for consideration and response by Departments. These Development and Enhancement Plans produced by Departments will also be discussed by DTCs and SSCCs before being submitted to and approved by Faculties then to the Secretary of the QRSC. This annual review by QRSC will focus on the Development and Enhancement Plans and the QRSC will be charged with approving planned actions 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 where the QRSC deems this necessary.

2.4 ASER Evaluative Reports and Development & Enhancement Plans

1. The QRSC will release the ASER dataset to each Faculty, accompanied by the template for an Evaluative Report and Development and Enhancement Plan. 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 the annual snapshot is taken by the Secretary of the Quality Review Sub-Committee of EdCom. See [Annex 9.2.1 ASER Main Steps](#) 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.
3. Following the annual snapshot the Departments will continually update the Development and Enhancement Plan in response to Staff Student Consultative Committees (SSCC) and Departmental Teaching Committees (DTC).

2.5 ASER Commentaries

1. In the Commentary section of each department's ASER, there is a section for the staff departmental author to provide a commentary on "What contextual issues have shaped the progress against last year's development plan and this year's plan? How does the department ensure a culture of continuous quality improvement?" The commentary has a limit of 500 words and enables departments to provide additional information on the design and implementation of their development plans. The staff commentary should be completed before the QRSC snapshot of ASER in Term 2.
2. In the same section, there are sections in which the student co-authors at undergraduate and taught postgraduate levels should provide their commentaries on "How have students been involved in ensuring progress against last year's plan and identifying priorities for the coming year? How does the department work in partnership with students to ensure a culture of continuous quality improvement?" These commentary sections also have a limit of 500 words. The student co-authors are typically the Lead Department Reps at undergraduate and taught postgraduate levels. The student commentaries should be completed before the QRSC snapshot of ASER in Term 2.

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 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 9.2.2 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. A data-informed approach to agenda preparation for the visit day also ensures that review teams focus on priority strategic areas for each department, as well as on quality and standards. In advance of each review an institutional IQR Panel will advise on themes for exploration.
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.

3.2 Summary of IQR

Each IQR comprises seven main stages:

1. The IQR Panel, chaired by the Vice-Provost (Education and Student Experience), supported by UCL's Pro-Vice-Provosts sets Review Teams specific issues and themes for follow-up, based on:
 - Annual Student Experience Review (ASER) plans.
 - Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) metrics.
 - Data on student achievement and employability.
 - National Student Survey (NSS).
 - Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES).
 - Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES).
 - New to UCL Survey.
 - Student Experience Surveys.
 - An annual report from UCL Estates in respect of each of the departments scheduled for review.
2. 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 or Moodle).
3. Scrutiny of the SES and supporting evidence by the review team.
4. 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. **See Annex 9.3.2 IQR Sample Timetable.**
5. Production of an IQR Report.

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.

6. Preparation by the Department of a preliminary plan of action to be taken in response to the recommendations contained in the IQR Report.
7. Subsequent consideration by the Internal Quality Review Panel of (i) the IQR Report and (ii) the Department's action plan.

3.3 The Review Team

1. The review team will normally comprise five reviewers, a Review Manager and an Administrative Secretary. Three reviewers will be members of staff of UCL, one will be a student reviewer and one will be external reviewers. The members of review teams will be appointed by the Internal Quality Review Panel as follows:
 - i) A Senior Academic Member of staff i.e.: a Vice-Dean Education or Faculty Tutor (from a different Faculty to the Department under review), who will act as Chair.
 - ii) Academic or other senior practitioner. Teaching Fellow or Research Fellow (at least Grade 9).
 - iii) One Head of Department (from a different Faculty to the Department under review).
 - iv) 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.
 - v) One student reviewer who will be put forward by UCL's Arena Centre from a pool of volunteers for Student Quality Review activity.
2. The role of the team leader.
 - i) To chair the review team's planning meeting, which will begin the Review Visit. In the planning meeting, the team leader will confirm the areas being explored by each member of 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 interviews on the review visit; these are all shared responsibilities of all members of the review team.
 - ii) 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.
 - iii) At the end of the review visit, to develop, in conjunction with the other members, a summary of the review team's main findings and conclusions.
 - iv) 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.
3. The role of the External Reviewer.

External Subject Expert

 - The 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. S/he will produce a structured report of maximum 1.5 sides of A4. It will set out any lines of enquiry required by the External Subject Expert.

The External Reviewer plays 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. They are able to identify excellence in provision and 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. The External Subject Expert will be invited to comment on the Report of the Review and the department's response to the Report. The External Subject Expert will, prior to the visit, conduct a desk-based review of programme documentation in order to establish (and, when established, to make a statement to this effect) 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. **See Annex 9.3.3 External Subject Expert proforma for report.**

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. **See Annex 9.3.4 External Subject Expert nomination form.**

4. All internal members of the review team, including the administrative secretary and the Review Manager, will have received formal briefing in advance of undertaking an IQR.
5. All reviewers will undertake:
 - i) To read all supporting documentation and, in the case of the External Subject Expert, to conduct a desk-based review;
 - ii) To participate fully in interviewing staff and students during the review visit;
 - iii) To make an appropriate contribution to the preparation of the IQR Report.
6. The Review Manager
The role of the Review Manager is to:
 - provide high level advice and support to the Team and Chair on UCL's education strategy;
 - To advise the team on educational strategy (how the department are meeting it well and how else they could be implementing it to strengthen their student experience);
 - Suggest areas the team may wish to investigate further;
 - Work with the secretary and Team Leader to empower the review team.
7. The Administrative Secretary.
 - 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.
 - Commission the External Subject Expert's Report. This will be a structured report of maximum 1.5 sides of A4 and will set out any lines of enquiry required by the External Subject Expert.

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 and the Office of the Vice-Provost (Education and Student Experience) 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.
 - Review Managers.

3.6 The Self-Evaluative Statement and supporting material

1. The SES should be completed by the Department according to the format set out at Annex 9.3.5 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 three working weeks before the date of the review team's visit to the Department. **See Annex 9.3.5 Guidance on the Composition of the SES.**
2. 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.
3. 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 SES to: the Dean of Faculty concerned; the Faculty Tutor concerned; the Faculty Graduate Tutor concerned, inviting them, if they wish, to send comments on the SES to the IQR team, via the administrative secretary.
4. The review team will read the SES and all supporting documentation in conjunction with the External Subject Expert's desk-based report.
5. The SES will 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.
6. The SES will comprise two sections (in addition to supporting statistical data and other briefing material). These two sections are expected to comprise a total of around 5 pages. **[See Annex 9.3.5]**
7. Student Data
Departments will be supplied with the ASER data for the previous session through Tableau. A list of this data is at Annex 9.3.6 IQR Data Set. **See Annex 9.3.6 IQR Data Set.**
8. Programme Handbooks and Programme Summaries
The External Subject 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 and Programme Summaries. 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..
9. 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. Any academic partnership should automatically be included in any sample of programmes.
 10. 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 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 9.3.7 IQR Core Documentation. **See Annex IQR 9.3.7 Core Documentation.**

3.7 The IQR Visit

1. 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.
2. 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 12.30-5.30pm
Day 2 9am-3.30pm

3. Please see Annex 9.3.2 IQR Sample Timetable for an example. This also provides an indication of the types of meetings that the IQR team will wish to hold during the course of the IQR visit.
4. Interviewees should always include:
 - The Dean of Faculty concerned.
 - The Faculty Tutor concerned.
 - The Vice-Dean Education 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.
 - A range of academic staff including senior education leads and professional services staff.
 - Key Education Staff including programme leads.
5. 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.
6. 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.

3.8 The Summary of Findings

1. The Secretary will draft a summary of key findings (good practice, commendations and recommendations) on the day following the final visit day. This will be circulated to the Team Leader and Team for approval and sent to the Department with a note that the fuller draft IQR Report, which will contextualise all recommendations, will follow in 15 working days.

3.9 The IQR Report

1. The administrative secretary will normally have main responsibility for drafting the Report in consultation with the Review Manager, Chair 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 list of good practice 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', '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. An 'advisable' action point will be where the Department is not actually contravening UCL policy but the Team feels strongly that practice should be improved. 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.
 - 'Affirmations' may be used when the Team would like to make a recommendation for improvement but believes that the department has already acknowledged the issue and that action is in train to address it.
 - A statement from the External Subject Expert concerning whether the learning outcomes etc. of any sampled programmes are valid and current, whether academic standards are measured appropriately, and student achievement is equally appropriate and whether the academic staffing profile is diverse and able to cover the current programme requirements. 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. There is no notion within IQR of any programme being approved (or not approved) to continue as a result of the IQR process.
4. 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. Any recommendations in the 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'.

6. The Review Team would not normally make explicit recommendations for additional resources such as space. However, this may sometimes be necessary. Briefing will emphasise to Review Teams that they must scrutinise departments closely and they should be challenged to provide evidence that the root cause of an issue affecting the student experience is not within its control. Teams will insist on triangulation between what the Head of Department, the students and active academics are telling them. If the issue is genuinely outside departmental control but impacts on students, the IQR Panel will be able to advocate on the department's behalf. However, the criteria for intervention will be strict and the issue must be one which is both persistent (i.e., not a 'one-off') and particular to the department and/or discipline specific.
7. 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 Quality Assurance Manager.
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. 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.

3.10 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 administrative secretary will provide 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:
 - 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 an action plan, using the template provided, for discussion by the IQR Panel.
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 may be undertaken.
4. 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.
5. 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 plan to the relevant DTC for discussion.
6. The 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.

3.11 IQR Panel/Academic Committee

1. 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, 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.
6. The Pro-Vice-Provost of the Doctoral School, as a member of the IQR Panel will be expected to refer PGR issues to Research Degrees Committee and the Vice-Provost (Education and Student Experience) will refer taught student issues (UG and UGT) to Education Committee. A report on outcomes of the session's IQRs will be made to Academic Committee.
7. Longer term follow-up of IQR actions in respect of taught provision (UG and PGT) will be undertaken via ASER plans and tracked and monitored by the Quality Review Sub-Committee (QRSC). Any longer-term actions should then be rolled up into continuing ASER development and enhancement plans. Follow up of PGR-related actions will be undertaken through the Doctoral Planning Process.

3.12 Dissemination of Findings of IQR Report

1. Following the Panel's approval of responses to all the IQR Reports the Quality Assurance Manager will prepare an annual report on that year's IQR programme for submission to and formal approval by Academic 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.
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 Academic 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, or be involved in collaborative activity with the staff or students of that programme, for five years before their term of office and during their term of office. This includes Honorary staff members.
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 and former UCL students must not be appointed as External Examiners before a lapse of at least five years. It must also be ensured that all students taught by that former member of staff have left the programme being examined.
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. 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.
11. An External Examiner will not be appointed from a department/division in which a member of UCL staff is serving as an External Examiner. Boards of Examiners must check these details with staff in their Department and with the nominee prior to submitting the nominee's details.
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 or staff on the programme for which they are acting as External Examiner whether that interest or connection is personal or professional. If such an interest or connection exists, the External Examiner in question should not be appointed. The Chair of the Board of Examiners is responsible for managing this process and should notify any cases to 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 External Examiner is not eligible for re-appointment for a period of five years. The period of service is defined as the period of service as an External Examiner at UCL and not as the period of service as External Examiner to a particular Board of Examiners.

4.2 Responsibilities of UCL

1. At the time of nomination 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 of fees and expenses, visa requirements and details of UCL's academic regulations. This appointment email acts as a contract letter for the External Examiner.
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. The fee will be paid on receipt of the External Examiner's report, provided that it is submitted via Portico within one month of the Board of Examiners meeting. NB: Postgraduate External Examiners are registered at UCL as self-employed and are therefore required to declare their income and payment of any sums owed to the Inland Revenue directly.
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 and continuing External Examiners with the following information by the start of the academic year:
 - i. The name of departmental/divisional board contact (e.g. Examinations Liaison Officer, or Board Administrator).
 - ii. The date(s) of meetings of Board of Examiners to which the External Examiner is invited (when known).
 - iii. The Terms of Reference, Constitution and Membership of the Board (e.g. number of Internal Examiners and any interdepartmental/ interdivisional involvement).
 - iv. The number and subject area of other External Examiners appointed to the Board.
 - v. The Student Handbook or equivalent, Programme Summary and/ or syllabus information.
 - vi. The programme regulations to be used in determining student Progression, Awarding and Classification.
 - vii. The marking criteria for individual papers (when known).
 - 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 13: Boards of Examiners](#), noting in particular:
 - [13.2 Boards of Examiners](#)
 - [13.3.4 Candidate Anonymity](#)
 - [Annex 4.3.6 Covid 19 Boards of Examiners Emergency Procedures](#)
2. The primary responsibilities of a Taught Programme External Examiner are to approve summative assessment tasks prior to students being assessed and to submit an annual report via Portico, based on their professional judgement, about the following aspects of the programme(s) they examine:
 - i) Whether the academic standards set for the programme qualifications are appropriate.
 - ii) The extent to which the assessment processes are rigorous, ensure equity of treatment for students and have been fairly conducted within UCL's regulations and guidance.
 - iii) The standards of student performance in the programme, or parts of programmes, which they have been appointed to examine.
 - iv) To formally delegate authority to Sub Boards to make decisions on their behalf.
 - v) Where appropriate, the comparability of the standards and student achievements with those in some other higher education institutions in the UK.
 - vi) Identify comparable practice.
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 9.4.1 Main Steps: Response to External Examiners' Reports](#). Payment of the External Examiner's fee is authorised when the report is received via Portico by Student & Registry Services and within the one month timeframe.
5. External Examiners should consider the totality of the degree in respect of both the syllabus and examination². The major part of their role should be devoted to modules and the assessment elements 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. The Chair may make arrangements for External Examiners to review a sample when they visit UCL for a Board of Examiners meeting.
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.

² In some cases this will not be possible as External Examiners are appointed to examine specific module(s) and not a full programme.

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.
14. When reviewing students' assessments External Examiners should comply with data protection regulations, maintaining confidentiality of the content of students' work.
15. 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. New External Examiners must be appointed before the start of the first academic session so that they can approve assessment tasks in good time. Nominees must not be asked to undertake any duties until their appointment is confirmed.
3. 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.
4. As part of the nomination process on Portico, the Chair will ensure that the External Examiner's Right to Work documentation is checked before approving the nomination (see further guidance below).

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 providing all of the information listed below via the pre-nomination form which can be found below:

External Examiner Details for Nomination Form

Please note that you should no longer send the below details via email. Prospective External Examiners data should be collected, stored and processed in compliance with general data protection regulations (GDPR). For further information please see [UCL General Data Protection Regulation \(GDPR\)](#).

Required information:

- Nominee's Title
- Nominee's Forename
- Nominee's Surname

- Nominee's Email address
- Board Title
- Board Code
- Faculty
- Board Chair
- Board Administrator
- Name of outgoing External Examiner
- Academic Year duties of nominee will begin in

Please note that if any of the required information is missing you will be asked to provide it before the nomination can proceed as this data is used to generate the External Examiner Unique Personal Identifier.

Academic Services will request the information below from the External Examiner:

- Nominee's Date of Birth (*required to set up on UCL Services System*)
 - Nominee's City/Town of residence, including country (*so we can advise on travel implications, see paragraphs 12 and 15 below*)
3. Student & Registry Services will then set up the nominee on UCL's Services System.
 4. Student & Registry Services will send the nominee a single sign on link to Portico with information about accessing Portico to enter details of their relevant teaching and examining experience. NB: External Examiners will not be asked to login using a username as an automatic link to their Portico in-tray is sent to them. If External Examiners are asked for these details they should contact examiners@ucl.ac.uk.
 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, including the External Examiner's Right to Work evidence (see Point 16 below) and being content to proceed with the nomination, the form will be sent to the Faculty approver via the Portico 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 approver 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 point 6 above.
 10. The Chair of QRSC (or their nominee) 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 9.4.2, External Examiner Fee Payment and Expenses Claim Form](#).
 13. Departments/divisions should book and pay for External Examiners' travel arrangements well in advance (at least one month) of the Board meeting to ensure the best rates are achieved. They should also book and pay for any hotel accommodation, submit an interdepartmental transfer with supporting documentation (invoices, receipts) to Academic Services and also retain receipts locally. See [Annex 9.4.2 External Examiner Fee Payment and Expenses Claim Form](#) for more information.
 14. External Examiners should claim expenses using [Annex 9.4.2 External Examiner Fee Payment and Expenses Claim Form](#). A link to this form is sent to them upon their

appointment, but departments/divisions should also ensure that External Examiners make use of this form.

15. The appointment of overseas External Examiners should be limited.
16. At the nomination stage, a scanned copy of the Right to Work evidence will suffice and this will need to be verified by the Board team when the External Examiner next visits UCL. This should be securely stored and retained by the Department.

4.4.2 Period of Appointment

1. In exceptional circumstances, External Examiners may have their four-year term extended for one further academic session only, subject to the approval of the Quality Review Sub-Committee. Chairs of Boards of Examiners are responsible for requesting extensions for their External Examiners via examiners@ucl.ac.uk with a brief statement of reason.
2. If it is decided that 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 examiners@ucl.ac.uk with a brief statement of reason.

4.4.3 Continuation of Appointment

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

Further Guidance

1. When prompted by the Student & Registry Services, Chairs or their nominated administrators should only confirm those taught programme External Examiners who are not continuing in their role for another academic session.
2. This task is carried out via the Chair's or nominee's Portico staff homepage by a cut-off date (to be decided by Student and Registry Services and communicated to Chairs and administrators).
3. Chair's should ensure they have discussed with the External Examiner concerned in advance of completing this task and that the External Examiner is aware their appointment has come to an end (particularly for cases where it is not a natural end to their term).
4. By the end of September each year all External Examiners will be confirmed unless Student and Registry Services has been informed to the contrary (via the above steps 1-2).
5. 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 9.4.3](#) for UG programmes and [Annex 9.4.4](#) 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 6, Section 10: Student Complaints Procedure](#). External Examiners should inform examiners@ucl.ac.uk should a student contact them.
3. External Examiners may be given an opportunity to meet students to ascertain their thoughts about the strengths and weaknesses of their educational experience at UCL. This is not something that is routinely offered to External Examiners but can be arranged by the programme / board administrators should the External Examiner wish to meet students.

4.6 Entitlements of External Examiners

1. External Examiners are entitled to withhold their approval 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 Experience). When all institutional avenues have been exhausted, External Examiners may contact QAA through its Concerns scheme route.

4.7 External Examiner Reports

4.7.1 Distribution of Reports and Response to Reports

1. The process for considering External Examiners' reports is set out in the External Examiners' Reporting Process (see [Annex 9.4.1 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 9.4.5](#).

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.
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 9.4.1 Main Steps: Response to External Examiners' Reports and a flow chart for the External Examiner Reporting process is available at Annex 9.4.5). In order to help faculty and departmental internal processes, an optional template to record departmental Chair of Board responses to External Examiners' recommendations is at Annex 9.4.6.
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 report must make clear whether or not there are, in the Examiners' opinion, any risks to academic standards. If External Examiners are satisfied that no recommendations are required, they should clearly state this in the relevant sections of the report. They are asked not to leave sections blank or to enter 'not applicable'. 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 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.
7. 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:
 - a) Agree on their approaches to enhancement.
 - b) 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 observation of online 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 [UCL Arena Peer Dialogue](#) 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 12.1 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 regularly in each academic year to enable joint working between staff and students, through discussion and agreement of priorities for improving students’ educational experience.”
2. The purpose of student academic representation is to enable partnership working between students and staff throughout UCL. Through their representatives, the Student Voice should shape and influence the work of their departments, their faculties, and UCL.
3. Arrangements for academic representation are overseen by the Quality Review Sub-Committee (QRSC), with membership from UCL departments, faculties, professional services, and the Students’ Union. The QRSC reports to 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 6.9). Departments should avoid complex SSCC structures that disperse the Student Voice.
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 QRSC 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 that 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 Students' Union .
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. Some or all members may participate in the meeting through a UCL supported online platform such as Moodle, Blackboard Collaborate or MS Teams, where they cannot physically be in attendance.
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.
9. A template for the SSCC agenda and minutes is available at Annex 9.6.1.

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 every meeting, focusing on:
 - a) Any areas of concern raised by the Student Representatives or other SSCC members, not otherwise covered by the below
 - b) The Annual Student Experience Review (ASER) Development and Enhancement Plan:
 - i. Teaching and Curriculum
 - ii. Assessment and Feedback
 - iii. Academic Support – including personal tutoring
 - iv. Organisation and Management - including timetabling and Departmental processes
 - v. Learning Resources - including library, IT and other teaching/learning resources
 - vi. Learning Community
 - vii. Student Voice
 - viii. Continuation and Outcomes
 - ix. Inclusivity
 - x. Careers and Employability
 - xi. Other

Note: the ASER themes and data may be separated for discussion at different SSCC meetings.

 - c) UCL ChangeMakers Projects including discussion of project proposals and tracking of progress of the projects throughout the year
4. To ensure joint student and staff discussion at least once during every Academic Session of:
 - a) Information relating to internal and external systems of accountability, to include Professional, statutory and regulatory body reports and Department responses to recommendations
 - b) New and revised programme developments
 - c) As part of the ASER discussions, to ensure the SSCC reviews and discusses the following key information and data at least once during the session:
 - i. Results and actions arising from relevant student surveys e.g. Module surveys, New to UCL, National Student Survey (NSS), Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES), Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES)
 - ii. External examiners' reports and Department responses to recommendations
 - iii. Careers data
 - d) Other student-led projects or events, such as those led by student societies
 - e) The effectiveness of the SSCC and the actions of the Students' Union and Departments in response to it

- f) The priorities and actions of the Department Teaching Committee (and/or research-education equivalent)
 - g) Opportunity for the Lead Department Representative to report on meetings they have attended at the Faculty level
 - h) The development of strategies to support research students' experiences
5. To facilitate greater communication between students and staff, and report key actions, discussions and recommendations to the wider student body.
 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 ASER (see Term of Reference 3 above).

6.6 Lead Department Representatives

1. The Department will be responsible for the appointment of the Lead Department Representative through a process specified by the Students' Union.
2. The Lead Department Representative(s) will be responsible for leadership of the 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 Faculty Academic Representative Forums

1. Each faculty should operate a forum which brings together faculty staff, Faculty representatives, and the Lead Department Representatives (or their nominee) from each SSCC in the faculty.
2. The purpose of this forum will be to identify shared priorities within the faculty and any action required to address such priorities, and to involve students with faculty decision-making. The Faculty Teaching Committee, Faculty Research Degrees Committee and/or the Faculty Representatives may additionally wish to utilise the forum as a sounding board where they identify a need for greater student involvement with particular matters.
3. A staff lead for the forum should be established, who should be a member of the Faculty Teaching Committee and/or the Faculty Research Degrees Committee. The staff lead and the Faculty Representatives will be responsible for agreeing the agenda and format of each meeting.

4. This forum should meet at least twice each year.
5. Faculties may wish to operate more than one forum to cover different levels of study.
6. The format of this forum is not required to be a committee meeting, and creative approaches to considering business are encouraged, i.e. workshop-style items.
7. A record of each meeting should be taken and circulated to attendees. This may be in the form of summary notes rather than formal minutes.

6.9 Interdepartmental Degree Programmes

1. 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 12.2 and 12.3 provide as follows:
 - 12.2 Subject to the provisions of Regulation 12.3 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 regularly in each academic year.
 - 12.3 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 12.1, 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 6.7) 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 Faculty Academic Representative Forums

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

7.1.6 Further Information

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

7.2 Student Academic Representatives

1. Student Academic Representatives are elected to represent students' views to UCL. Student Academic Representatives sit on various committees at a programme (such as 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 at least once:
 - To consider the relevant documentation
 - To interview appropriate persons
 - To prepare its report.

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

9 Core Programme Information

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

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

10 Module Evaluation Questionnaires

10.1 Introduction

1. Module Evaluation Questionnaires are an important part of UCL Student Engagement practice, providing valuable student feedback to departments and faculties on their programmes. The feedback helps programmes to maintain academic standards as well as facilitate meaningful discussions with students on their delivery and on ways to improve and enhance provision (see the [Quality Code Advice and Guidance: Student Engagement](#)). The following regulations set out UCL's policy for Student Module Evaluation Questionnaires and are applicable to all taught programmes, including undergraduate, postgraduate taught (and MRes) and Initial Teacher Education programmes.

10.2 Module Evaluation Questionnaire Policy

1. Module Evaluation Questionnaires (MEQs) must be distributed at least once a year for each module (or equivalent for non-modular programmes).
2. The MEQs should concentrate on the effectiveness of the teaching, learning, assessment and student support on the modules as perceived by the student.
3. Departments must inform students of the purpose of taking the MEQs, how their anonymity will be protected and how a summary of the results will be made available.
4. While the final responsibility for implementing an appropriate module evaluation and mechanisms for the subsequent analysis of data rests with the individual department and/or faculty, departments should follow the [guidance for online student questionnaires](#) and include the UCL core questions.
5. Where appropriate, the student's programme should be captured alongside their feedback to allow the results to be analysed by different programmes, subjects and department groups.
6. Analysis of data must be conducted by departments and a summary of the departmental level results produced as part of the Annual Student Experience Review (ASER) process, using the [ASER Departmental MEQ Summary](#) proforma. The MEQ summary will then inform the Department's ASER Report and Development and Enhancement Plan.
7. The ASER Departmental MEQ Summary proforma should be attached to the ASER Development and Enhancement Plan and forwarded to the Departmental Teaching Committee (DTC), the Staff-Student Consultative Committee (SSCC) and the Faculty Teaching Committee (FTC).
8. Each department must have adequate mechanisms for identifying action required arising from the MEQs and ensuring that appropriate action is taken where necessary. It is recommended that anonymised MEQ data and student comments are retained for a period of ten years by departments and/or faculties, as stipulated in the UCL [Records Retention Schedule](#) to allow individual staff to consult as and when appropriate.
9. Each department must have in place mechanisms for closing the feedback loop, whereby students are informed of any actions which have been taken in response to student feedback – either in the current year or in response to feedback from previous cohorts - and the impact this has had on the learning experience within and across modules.