

Meeting of the Educational Character Committee,
at 4pm* on Wednesday 12 February 2014,
in room 1B27, Technopark, London Road, SE1

* Tour of the Faculty of Business for committee members at 3pm

A G E N D A

<i>Item</i>	<i>Paper</i>	<i>Presenter</i>
1. Welcome & Apologies		Chair
2. Minutes of the meeting of 4 December 2013 (for publication)	EC.01(14)	Chair
3. Matters Arising <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Notes from AHS Faculty visit 4 December 2013		Chair
4. Update on consultation: Developing Our Structures (to discuss)	EC.02(14)	VC
5. Recruitment of DVC – update (to note)	EC.03(14)	Chair
6. Undergraduate faculty monitoring reports (to note)	EC.04(14)	PVC(A)
7. Annual report on external examiners (to note)	EC.05(14)	PVC(A)
8. Report on UG Student Progression (to note)	EC.06(14)	PVC(A)
9. Report on student complaints and the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (to note)	EC.07(14)	Sec
10. Educational Character Committee and Academic Board – good governance (to discuss)	EC.08(14)	Chair
11. Any other business		Chair
12. Date of next meeting – 4pm on Wednesday 4 June 2014		Chair

Members: Douglas Denham St Pinnock (Chair), Barbara Ahland, Steve Balmont, Hilary McCallion and Mee Ling Ng.

With: Vice Chancellor, Pro Vice Chancellor (Academic), Executive Dean – Faculty of Arts and Human Sciences, University Secretary and Governance Assistant.

Educational Character Committee
Faculty Briefing Document: Faculty of Business

Faculty Management team:

Acting Executive Dean: Professor Mike Molan

Pro Deans: Professor Geoff Elliott (Academic) & Professor Dilip Patel (External)

Head of Operations and Resources: Mr Jonathan Tanner

Heads of Departments: Professor Jim Snaith (Business Studies), Mr Milo Crummie (Management), Dr Kevin Grant (Informatics), Mr Iain Boatman (Accounting and Finance).

Academic Departments

Department	Head of Department	Key disciplines
Management (BMAN)	Mr Milo Crummie	PG in area of Management, Civil Society, Marketing & HR, Not for Profit UG Marketing
Business Studies (BBS)	Professor Jim Snaith	PG International Business UG Business Studies, Business Administration
Accounting & Finance (BAF)	Mr. Iain Boatman	PG Accounting, Finance & Corporate Governance UG Accounting and Finance
Informatics (BINF)	Dr Kevin Grant	PG Information Systems UG Business information Technology, Computing studies

The Course portfolio by Department

Department	Link to portfolio
Management	http://prospectus.lsbu.ac.uk/courses/course_level_list.php?DepartmentID=35&FacultyID=1
Business Studies	http://prospectus.lsbu.ac.uk/courses/course_level_list.php?DepartmentID=2&FacultyID=1
Accounting & Finance	http://prospectus.lsbu.ac.uk/courses/course_level_list.php?DepartmentID=1&FacultyID=1
Informatics	http://prospectus.lsbu.ac.uk/courses/course_level_list.php?DepartmentID=36&FacultyID=1

NSS

National Student Satisfaction Survey 2013

	Overall Teaching Quality by JACS3		Overall Assessment and Feedback by JACS3	
	Faculty	Sector	Faculty	Sector
Marketing	83	81	68	69
Business Studies	73	80	68	69
Accounting & Finance	90	85	76	74
Computer Science	77	81	67	71

	Overall Satisfaction	
	Faculty	Sector Score JACS 3
Marketing	91	84
Business Studies	80	84
Accounting & Finance	93	90
Computer Science	78	82

Employability – Destination of Leavers from Higher Education ('DLHE') 2011/12

Department	Total Responses	Unavailable /Refusals Etc.	%	Unemployed	%	Active	%	Active as % of those declaring (the EPI)
Management	170	3	2	14	8	153	90	80%
Business	228	4	2	38	17	186	81	79%
Accounting & Finance	262	3	1	48	18	211	81	84%
Informatics	112	2	2	23	21	87	77	78%
Total	772	12	2	123	16	637	82	80%

Level 4 Progression 2012/13*

Progression from L4 to L5 (3 years).

			2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
Accounting & Finance	UG	FT	73%	82%	70%
Business Studies	UG	FT	52%	59%	58%
Informatics	UG	FT	44%	49%	53%
Management	UG	FT	73%	61%	75%

Faculty SWOT Analysis: Faculty of Business

<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professionally focused and badged business education • Innovative curriculum delivery models (i.e. distance and blended e-learning) • Innovative and pro-active course development to meet market needs • Close geographic association with London as a world financial capital • Amongst some of the best NSS scores in the University 	<p>Opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enterprise income from professional courses and associations • Niche provision of products and services to specific markets • Provision of named awards to meet market needs and provide market differentiation • Focus on International curriculum • Employability embedded where relevant in the curriculum to meet market needs and in extra curricula activity
<p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Declining student numbers in Postgraduate areas • Retention rates below the average in some areas pulling down overall Faculty average • Low research and scholarship base in the business areas • No differentiated Business School brand or accreditation • UG provision not sufficiently differentiated 	<p>Threats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many public and private competitors in London offering business education at lower fee levels • National removal of caps on student no's 15/16 • Decline of part-time students • Instability resulting from realignment of staff costs with declining income • Changes to recruitment patterns for overseas numbers

2013/14 Bus Deliverables (to be delivered in 2013/14) and how success will be measured

Deliverable and link to 2011-14 LSBU corporate plan	What it requires	KPI measurement	Likelihood of success
1. Recruit to target September 2014	1. To continue to develop the Faculty integrated marketing plan in collaboration with the UK/EU and International recruitment offices and the Marketing Team. To deliver postgraduate and International recruitment at least to stated target and to maintain undergraduate recruitment in line with SNC target.	1. To meet agreed conservative student recruitment targets.	1. UCAS applications have increased for three of the four departments but overall the outlook is the SNC target will be achieved. Applications from the EU are looking very promising. Postgraduate applications are challenging but the Faculty will be increasing and improving its PG keep warm processes and working closely with the Recruitment team. International recruitment is also challenging with the impact of UKBA regulations possibly having a negative impact. The Faculty is actively building external collaborations with reputable academic institutions in the Far East (India and beyond) and also in the EU.
2. Improved student satisfaction scores (NSS)	2. To maintain year-on-year engagement with students to contribute to the National Student Survey. To increase sample size and to continue to make academic staff aware of the critical factors affecting student satisfaction e.g. feedback, teaching quality, learning experience and academic support.	2.NSS – achieve minimum of 90% of benchmark in all 7 compulsory categories across all BUS JACS code areas by September 2014	2. Academic Department Heads to lead on staff engagement and outlining successes and identifying areas for improvement. Deanery to provide guidance and encouragement through implementation of communication plan and highlighting cross Faculty good practice.
3. Improved retention and progression	3. Continued provision of reliable and timely PAT data – ownership by HODs and course teams; effective	3. All courses achieving a minimum L4 progression rate	3. Been a challenge for Informatics & Business

Deliverable and link to 2011-14 LSBU corporate plan	What it requires	KPI measurement	Likelihood of success
	intervention and change; review of student support, teaching quality, curriculum and assessment as appropriate ;	of 65% for the 2014/15 intake	
4. Deliver on budget targets	4. Accurate budget planning with contribution targets identified for income streams (especially research and enterprise); recruitment and retention targets achieved; research activity levels maintained; continued enterprise activity tight control of costs; effective delegation of authority and accountability; regular monitoring of progress.	4. Set Prudent budget all income streams and expenditure to be monitored on a monthly basis. International activities to be closely monitored and kept in line with International strategy and strategy of the International Office.	4. Prudent monitoring of income and expenditure. Realistic contribution to the Centre.
5. Improve academic profile and scholarship	5. Heads to set aside a budget to encourage staff to publish in professional and academic journals and at conferences and engage in professional activities.	5. 40% of staff to engage in scholarship activity.	5. Starting from low base hence the minimum 30% of activity.
6. Improve Student Employability.	6. All undergraduate offering should have professional accreditation or recognition. Provide an environment to allow students to engage with professional bodies e.g. IOD initiative, CMI, CIM etc.	6. Monitoring of DLHE survey specifically: Aim to improve response rate to 800 graduating students (majority of students).	6. Working with the Employability Team to improve student employability profile e.g. CVs, working with academic departments, working with external companies, widening internship.
7. Improved retention and progression.	7. Staff to provide timely feedback to students. To ensure that there is professional provision which engages students and meets the needs of professional bodies. Academic Heads to monitor feedback, attendance and progression. To create and implement action plans as necessary and to feedback to Faculty Executive.	7. Minimum 60% retention across the faculty.	7. Through the Faculty Student Liaison Team, to actively monitor student attendance. To work in conjunction with Academic teams and the Student Life Centre teams on putting in place interventions to support students. To provide regular reports on retention activity and to take appropriate action.

Bus Key risks 2013/14

Risk Title	Cause & Effect	Inherent Risk Priority	Existing Controls	Residual Risk Priority	Action Required
<p>BUS-01-01 Failure to innovate curriculum portfolio</p>	<p>Cause & Effect: Cause: Lack of oversight of curriculum</p> <p>Failure of course teams to develop innovative courses and modules in response to external demand leading to poor recruitment of students</p> <p>Failure to decommission courses that are no longer in demand leading to out of date course portfolio and poor recruitment</p> <p>Effect: Curriculum will not be current for the jobs market, students will not be employable and difficult to recruit student, failure to gain professional accreditation</p>	<p>2 1 Low</p>	<p>Regular reviews of course portfolio by FMT.</p> <p>Working with industry partners and professional bodies to keep content relevant.</p>	<p>2 1 Low</p>	<p>Major faculty priority is the move to 20 credits - now achieved.</p> <p>Faculty Scrutiny and Monitoring Committee panel to monitor fairness of subject provision.</p> <p>All new course development to be closely monitored through Faculty Academic Standards Committee (FASC) and Pro Dean (Academic) role.</p> <p>Person Responsible: Geoff Elliott</p> <p>To be implemented by: 31/01/2014</p> <p>Academic Heads and Pro Dean (Academic) to review current course portfolio and work with the Marketing team and industry partners and professional bodies on the development</p>

						of new demand led courses and modules. Person Responsible: Geoff Elliott To be implemented by: 29/08/2014
BUS-04-07 Failure to recruit to Home and Overseas recruitment targets and agreed course recruitment criteria Risk Owner: Mike Molan Last Updated: 13/01/2014	Cause & Effect: Changing patterns of student demand, UKBA rules, increased competitive landscape, funding source changes leading to reduced income, and courses and units with low/unsustainable student numbers. No clear strategy for overseas recruitment in University leading to ineffective resource allocation. Ineffective liaison with International Office team leading to lack of clear direction for marketing to international applicants and poor recruitment	3 High	3	(- BART System is in place and now embedded in Faculty and - - Admissions recruitment practice (ensuring appropriate processing). - The BART System is monitored regularly and reports are reviewed by FMT.) Carry out a review of the BART system and implement university recruitment strategy. - Director of Recruitment and Director of Home Collaborations, Access Accords and UG Admissions organize clearing processes and operations in conjunction with	3 High	3 Review recruitment on low recruiting courses by end of semester one with semester two to close courses that have not recruited. Through development of Faculty strategy build a differentiated "Business School" to build an aggressive recruitment campaign for post graduate and undergraduate courses. Faculty to develop coherent overseas recruitment strategy in conjunction with International Office. Strategy to focus on key recruitment markets.Hold

			Admissions team.		<p>regular meetinging with International office staff to develop strategy. Agree strategy for managing Agents with International Office.</p> <p>Person Responsible: Jane Houzer</p> <p>To be implemented by: 31/01/2014</p>
--	--	--	------------------	--	---

**Agenda for Educational Character Committee Business Faculty
visit on 12 February 2014 to be held at London South Bank
University Keyworth Building K309**

Focus on Employability Initiatives in the Faculty of Business

- 15:00 Welcome by Mike Molan
- 15:10 Faculty Video (6 minutes): brief introduction to Business courses with a
focus on employability (Prof Geoff Elliott)
- Alan Hovell, Course Director – MBA Chinese Business Practice
 - Dr Bing Shi, Link Tutor – MBA Chinese Business Practice
 - Anita Peleg, Senior Lecturer MSc International Marketing
 - Chrissie Oldfield, Course Director MPA and Exec MPA
 - Adam Isle, MSc Human Resources Practice – ex-student
- 15.20 Institute of Directors (IOD) - (Prof Geoff Elliott)
- 15.35 Summer Internship - (Prof Dilip Patel)
- 15:45 Winter Internship - (Iain Boatman)
- 15:50 Network of International Business Schools Case Competition - (Prof Dilip
Patel)
- 16:00 Close

	PAPER NO: EC.01(14)	
Board/Committee:	Educational Character Committee	
Date:	12 February 2014	
Paper title:	Minutes of the meeting of 4 December 2014	
Author:	James Stevenson, University Secretary and Clerk to the Board of Governors	
Board sponsor:	Steve Balmont, erstwhile Chairman of the Educational Character Committee	
Recommendation:	That the committee approves the minutes of its last meeting and approves publication subject to the proposed redactions.	
Matter previously considered by:	N/A	N/A
Further approval required?	N/A	N/A
Communications – who should be made aware of the decision?	Published on the University's website	

Executive Summary

The Committee is asked to approve the minutes of its meeting of 4 December 2013. No redactions are suggested.

Minutes of a Meeting of the Educational Character Committee
held at 4pm on Wednesday, 4 December 2013
in Room T209, Student Centre, Borough Road, London SE1

Present

Steve Balmont	Chair
Barbara Ahland	SU President
Douglas Denham St Pinnock	
Hilary McCallion	
Mee Ling Ng	
Andrew Owen	

In attendance

Prof Martin Earwicker	Vice Chancellor and Chief Executive
Dr Phil Cardew	Pro Vice Chancellor (Academic)
Stephen Hackett	Director of Student Services
Prof Mike Molan	Executive Dean, Arts and Human Sciences
Kirsty Palmer	Head of Employability Service
James Stevenson	University Secretary and Clerk to the Board of Governors
Ruth Sutton	Governance Assistant

Welcome and Apologies

1. The committee welcomed Mee Ling Ng to her first meeting of the committee.
2. No apologies had been received.
3. Barbara Ahland joined the meeting.

Minutes of the last meeting

4. The minutes of the meeting of 9 May 2013 were approved for publication with no redactions.

Matters Arising

5. The Chairman circulated notes from the previous pre-meeting of the last meeting, which had been with the Students' Union.
6. The Chairman reported that the committee members had just had a productive pre-meeting with the Faculty of Arts and Human Sciences and that brief notes would be circulated to members via email.

Membership of the Committee

7. The Committee noted that the original plan for the Committee was to rotate its membership. Accordingly, Steve Balmont and Andrew Owen would step down from the Committee (see minute 8). It was noted that the Board had agreed for Douglas Denham St Pinnock to take the Chair and for Mee Ling join the Committee.
8. The Committee discussed the length of membership, as detailed in the Terms of Reference. It was resolved that the two year term would be increased to three years and that Steve Balmont would remain on the Committee as a member to give continuity.

Terms of Reference

9. The Committee resolved to amend paragraph 2.4 in the Terms of Reference to extend membership of the Committee from 2 years to 3 years.
10. The committee recommended its amended terms of reference to the Board for approval (paper **EC.23(13)**).

Equality Act

11. The Committee noted the Equality Act assurance update (paper **EC.15(13)**), which had previously been discussed by the Board. The purpose of the paper coming to this committee was to focus on how the Equality Act related to LSBU's students. The Committee requested a further breakdown of the data on students' ethnicity.
12. The Committee noted the actions being taken to meet the public sector equality duty in relation to students. LSBU's equality and diversity action plan for 2012/13 as reported to HEFCE was also noted. The Committee agreed to monitor progress against the action plan.

Academic Key Performance Indicators

13. The committee noted and discussed the academic key performance indicators (KPI's) (paper **EC.16(13)**) which had been approved by the Board on 21 November 2013 (paper **BG.71(13)**) and reviewed at the Executive meeting on 3 December 2013.

National Student Survey

14. The committee noted the overview of the National Student Survey results (paper **EC.17(13)**). LSBU's overall satisfaction rate was 82% for 2013 (19% up on 2012; sector 86%). The Committee requested the Pro Vice Chancellor (Academic) to circulate the related action plan to all members of the Committee.

Destination of Leavers from Higher Education Survey Results

15. The committee noted the report on Destination of Leavers from Higher Education (DLHE) survey 2011/12 results (paper **EC.18(13)**). LSBU's employment performance indicator was 77.45% (78.1% in 2010/11) and the bottom of the table. The Director of Student Services and the Head of Employability Services took the Committee through the results.
16. The committee noted the extensive programme in place to improve the University's DLHE survey results including the work of the Employability team in the Student Centre and plans to conduct the survey in-house. This included an extensive Winter internship programme.

The Director of Student Services and the Head of Employability left the meeting

Validations Report

17. The committee noted the validations report for 2012/13 (paper **EC.19(13)**).

Internal Audit Report

18. The committee discussed in detail and noted PwC's report of October 2013 on extenuating circumstances and academic appeals that could result in an

OIA case (paper **EC.20(13)**). The VC explained that there was a need to simplify processes and communicate better to students. Some cases were very complex. The actions in the report were being addressed.

OIA Annual Letter

19. The committee noted the annual letter of September 2013 from the OIA (paper **EC.21(13)**) and a letter of November 2013 that explained how fees would be related to volume that accompanied it.

Committee Annual Plan

20. The committee approved its annual business plan (paper **EC.22(13)**), which was intended to cover the constituent topics in the annual report of the Academic Board during the year.

Next Meeting

21. The date of the next meeting was confirmed as Wednesday 12 February 2014 at 4pm, preceded by a visit to the Faculty of Business.

Confirmed as a correct record

.....
Chair

London South Bank University
Educational Character Committee (the “Committee”)
Notes of a pre-meeting of the Committee with officers and members of the Arts and Human Sciences Faculty (the “AHS Faculty”)
4 December 2013

Attendees:

Steve Balmont
Douglas Denham St Pinnock
Andrew Owen
Hilary McCallion
Mee Ling Ng

Hazel Willis – Pro Dean – AHS Faculty

The Committee was invited to attend an early rehearsal for a production of Macbeth:

- The production to be performed in the Edric Hall in the Borough Road building in January 2014
- An external director works with the student actors, in conjunction with student directors and AHS Faculty staff
- The play is put on as a professional production
- The students involved also market and sell tickets to the production, giving exposure to all elements

The Governors will be invited to attend.

The Committee then visited the Digital Gallery in the Borough Road building:

- Four AHS Digital Photography students described the current piece of work #GETYOURGRINON
- The students discussed the research they had done into the project, and that the project had taught them about group work and the different elements of curating and arranging a gallery viewing, all of which were important skills for their careers
- The students commented on the resources that were available to them for the project, including mac computers and iPads, and how these had been an integral part of the project

	PAPER NO: EC 02(14)	
Board/Committee:	Educational Character Committee	
Date:	12 th February 2014	
Paper title:	Update on Consultation: Developing Our Structures	
Author:	Vice Chancellor	
Executive sponsor:	Vice Chancellor	
Recommendation by the Executive:	That the committee discuss the paper	
Aspect of the Corporate Plan to which this will help deliver?	Enhancing the reputation of LSBU	
Matter previously considered by:	N / A	N / A
Further approval required?	N / A	N / A
Communications – who should be made aware of the decision?	Ongoing consultation of stakeholders during February 2014.	

The University, in line with Board approval, is moving to a school-based structure. The Vice-Chancellor and the Executive have been engaged in an extensive consultation exercise to enable staff to help shape the proposals. Attached is the latest document.

The paper:

- provides feedback to staff and describes the final School structure
- outlines proposals for the service structure based on comments received from staff
- Shares the vision statement and key outcomes discussed at the October Board Strategy day for comment.

Whilst the over-arching operational and service structure remains Executive responsibility, the paper is presented to the Educational Character Committee to enable the ideas to be tested and so further strengthen final proposals.

In addition, the document starts to lay down the foundation of a 2015-2020 Strategy in line with discussions held at the October Board Strategy day. The 2015-2020 Strategy will shape the University's ambitions and will require both input from the

London South Bank

University

Board and sign-off by the Board. It is suggested that the Educational Character Committee could provide a vehicle to help shape this work and could suggest ways in which the Board can be engaged.

As part of the vision statement the Vice Chancellor is seeking to build on LSBU's history, its links to the community and its applied focus. To this end the term 'Civic' is used and this will need testing with internal and external stakeholders to see whether or not it is felt to be relevance in terms of the London context. A short paper setting the scene regarding civics is also attached.

Distinguishing LSBU as A Civic University

A “Civic university” is usually an institution that was initially formed in the 19th century as a higher education college to serve one of the then expanding major industrial cities. Sheffield University in describing its history as “a truly civic university” references the “penny donations given a century ago by factory workers to establish a university which would benefit their economy, health and children”. This resonates with the foundation of the Borough Polytechnic Institute, formed in part from funds collected in buckets on London Bridge for “the promotion of industrial skills, general knowledge, health and well-being of young men and women belonging to the poorer classes”.

There is a connection to the US land grant universities of the 19th century which Sternberg (Defining a Great University, 2010) contrasts with more elite institutions where there is a “kind of curious disconnection between the university and society. In a land grant institution traditional scholarly endeavour still matters, but work that gives back to society receives special plaudits. It thus becomes easier for state legislatures and the people of the state to see why research is important to them...”

The Kellogg Commission report on the future of these institutions is entitled “Returning to our roots: The Engaged Institution” (National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges 1999). The Commission argues that the engaged institution must accomplish at least three things:

- It must be organised to respond to the needs of today’s students and tomorrows, not yesterdays.
- It must enrich student’s experiences by bringing research and engagement into the curriculum and offering practical opportunities for students to prepare for the world they will enter.
- It must put its critical resources (knowledge and expertise) to work on the problems the communities it serves face.”

Newcastle University refers to itself as a “World-Class Civic University” and describes a primary feature of a Civic University as being “an understanding of not just what it is good at, but what it is good for” – a distinction between private benefit and public good. It defines other key components as:

- Responding to real world challenges
- Positive impact on society
- Contributing to the economy

Newcastle University references a paper “The Civic University and the leadership of place” which is drawn on here. (<http://www.talloires2011.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/06/Civic-University-and-Leadership-of-Place-John-Goddard.pdf>)

A distinction between a Civic university and a Community University (or College) is in the area of research. “Community University” implies widening access – serving individuals in an area. “Civic” retains this implication of serving individuals but emphasises the university’s contribution to the region (not just to the individuals in the region) in terms of academic and economic contribution, which is largely around research.

This engagement is not solely about economic development but in shaping other areas such as sustainability, social welfare or culture. This might be through research, professional training, and intellectual contributions

The authors “The Civic University and the leadership of place” suggest that what it should mean today is:

- Provide opportunities for the society of which it is part (individual learners, businesses, public institutions).
- Engage as a whole not piecemeal with its surroundings.
- Partner with other local universities and colleges.
- Be managed in a way that facilitates institutional wide engagement with the city and region of which it forms part.
- Operate on a global scale but use its location to form its identity.”

Lastly, the paper usefully summarises what the authors regard as the obstacles and challenges faced by universities in working with external bodies:

- Universities’ stretched resources place limits on the degree to which they can get involved in a range of external projects.
- ‘Civic partnership’ is not itself part of their core business, but only a means to other ends, and hence there are few people within universities whose main role and responsibilities are to support these relationships. Many of the activities that fall underneath the label civic partnerships are cross-subsidised from other funding sources, and therefore may not be financially sustainable in times of reduced resources.
- The multitude of organisations that are involved in the political and economic governance of cities and regions in the UK creates challenges of understanding the “local political-organisational map” and knowing who are the most important partners with which universities need to work. The way this varies across geographic and administrative boundaries can be a source of further complexity.
- Universities are not institutions located directly within the local political sphere, and are therefore unable to exert significant influence here.
- Instability and changes in the leadership of local politics can make it hard for university leaders to build strong relationships with city councils.
- External organisations in the private and third (voluntary) sectors may have a poor perception of universities as being unreliable, inefficient, or overly self-interested, and are therefore discouraged from working with them. Alternatively, many external bodies may still perceive universities as solely inward-focused teaching and research organisations, and therefore are not aware of the opportunities working with them offers.
- It is sometimes difficult for universities to know whether their civic engagement activities are having an impact, particularly in the long-term.
- A lack of demand or absorptive capacity for the knowledge that universities could supply. For instance, only a small proportion of SMEs would actually benefit from academic research outputs.

Source: Goddard J “Reinventing the Civic University”. London NESTA

MS 29/1/24

DEVELOPING OUR STRUCTURES: Response to consultation feedback and next steps

1.0 Preface

At the end of 2013 I asked staff for their views on the implementation of a School based structure. I was especially interested in:

- How we define Schools, including the number and discipline content of the Schools;
- Potential implications of the proposals on the structure of professional services and the support arrangements for academic activity, students and staff.

Given the varied and complex nature of the University, I was clear that whilst our organisational arrangements would have to be flexible to meet the needs of stakeholders we should reduce variation between Schools as much as possible.

I also indicated that the Schools would become the key drivers of academic delivery and be the focus of academic engagement between staff and students. The creation of such an identity and sense of belonging can help aid student retention and support progression. In building that identity Schools can consider the balance of teaching, research and enterprise that best builds their academic reputation externally but all Schools will be expected to engage in all three activities.

It is also intended that Schools, and any related changes to Services, would help clarify responsibilities. There would of course have to be clear accountability for delivering agreed strategies and achieving agreed targets but decision making will be taken closer to the point of delivery. Devolution and accountability will both be strengthened.

I would like to thank all those staff that took the time to email their thoughts or attend one of the Executive led workshops. I have sought to reply to each individual submission and in this document I summarise the outcomes of the consultation.

The document serves two functions.

- First it outlines the School structure we will now implement and describes the next steps.
- Secondly it builds on views expressed during the consultation regarding professional services and makes proposals moving forward. Staff are asked to provide their views on the service proposals by Friday 7th March 2014 and information on how to do this is provided at the end of the document.

I would again emphasise to colleagues that this proposal and discussion about organisational structures is not driven by a need to reduce costs nor is it a disguised staff reduction exercise. It is about ensuring that we have the right structures and processes that best serve our students and which will deliver the University's strategy for the medium and long term.

2.0 University Strategy

As part of the consultation process a number of staff suggested the need to revisit the University strategy – not to signal a change of direction – but to help clarify priorities and focus. I will prepare an outline of the proposed strategy for 2015-2020 and will consult staff during April 2014 so we can have the strategy in place during summer. This will then provide the context within which the new Schools and service areas will develop their vision and their local delivery plans during next academic year 2014/15.

I want to ensure that by 2020 LSBU is externally and internally recognised as:

An enterprising civic university that is addressing real world challenges.

I hope it is clear from the above that we need to build on our reputation for courses relevant to the professions, our applied research, and our business engagement to make the ***real world impact*** come alive.

To develop in an increasingly competitive environment we need to be ***creative and entrepreneurial*** in all that we do – from our academic activity through to our business processes.

A key element of the vision is being a ***civic university***. A Civic University is usually an institution that was initially formed in the 19th century as a Higher Education College to serve one of the then expanding major industrial cities, and this resonates with the foundation of the Borough Polytechnic Institute, formed in part from funds collected in buckets on London Bridge for “the promotion of industrial skills, general knowledge, health and well-being of young men and women belonging to the poorer classes”.

To be a civic institution engaged with its community it has been argued that a University:

- Must be organised to respond to the needs of today’s students and tomorrow’s, not yesterday’s.
- Must enrich students’ experiences by bringing research and engagement into the curriculum and offering practical opportunities for students to prepare for the world they will enter.
- Must put its critical resources (knowledge and expertise) to work on the problems which the communities it serves face.

As I indicated in the previous consultation, the focus of this 2020 plan will be around increasing our reputation. In line with the vision for an enterprising civic university with real world impact I would propose to focus on three key outcomes:

- a. **Student Success:** Ensuring we are externally recognized for providing a personalised, high calibre education which equips graduates for employment and prepares them to make a positive contribution to society.
- b. **Real World Impact:** Ensuring we provide dynamic evidence based education which is underpinned by research and enterprise activity with real world impact.
- c. **Chosen Partner for Change:** Ensuring we are actively engaged with our communities and seen as a partner of choice by organisations seeking to

address societal challenges and support social health and well-being in London and internationally.

In addition I will be considering what I would term 'enablers' – human resources, estates, finance and data management, for example, to ensure staff are equipped to deliver on this agenda.

I believe the three outcomes I have listed will enable us to excel and provide a platform through which we will develop a distinctive focus. A short paper has been produced with further back ground information on civic universities (available through the gateway) for those interested.

In undertaking the structural changes outlined in this paper we are putting in place teams that will be able to deliver the strategy and achieve continued success for LSBU and its students.

3.0 Schools

There was no significant disagreement regarding the number of Schools or the focus of the Schools proposed but there were questions from some departments as to whether we had the correct distribution of subjects. I have provided feedback to those making suggestions for change. After discussion with staff the following modifications have been agreed:

- a. *Psychology*: The department requested a review of their proposed location in social sciences. Given future developments around Forensic Psychology and the potential for shared use of resource around human performance labs with sports science they proposed a move to Applied Science which was accepted.
- b. *Urban Engineering*: The department felt that whilst there was overlap with engineering their focus on built environment and civil engineering provided a better fit with architecture and the built environment. This has traditionally been a significant strength at LSBU and there is clear overlap between the industries with which the built environment and urban engineering interface hence this change was agreed.
- c. *Product Design*: The majority of the teaching team raised concerns about a move to the School of Creative Industries given the current focus of the curriculum on engineering. The level of shared resource between Product Design and Engineering Product Design raised concerns about splitting these areas. It has therefore been agreed this will remain as one area based within Engineering. It will be important that this team works with the School of Creative Industries to support joint developments and the effectiveness of these interactions can be reviewed in 18-24 months time.
- d. *UELS*: The department felt that their research and discipline focus meant they would be better served remaining as a unit within social sciences and highlighted potential for tourism to interact not only with business but for example with Creative Industries and Health. It has been agreed that the team may remain as a single unit with Social Sciences with a view to considering the effectiveness of the cross School engagement in 18-24 months as the structures develop.

- e. Finally there were two proposed name changes which have been reviewed by marketing to test likely stakeholder interest. Based on this analysis the School of Social Sciences will be titled the School of Law and Social Sciences and the School of Creative Industries will be titled the School of Arts and Creative Industries.

The School structure to be adopted is shown below. Research Centres will be aligned with their cognate areas.

School	Composition
Applied Science	Applied Science Department excluding Chemical and Petroleum Engineering Psychology National Bakery School
Arts and Creative industries	Arts and Media Culture, Writing and Performance
Built Environment and Architecture	Built Environment (which currently includes Architecture) Urban Engineering
Business	Accounting and Finance Business Studies Informatics Management
Engineering	Engineering and Design Chemical and Petroleum Engineering (from Applied Science)
Health and Social Care	Adult and Midwifery Allied Health Sciences Childrens' Nursing Institute of Vocational Learning Mental Health and Learning Disabilities Primary and Social Care
Law and Social Sciences	Law Social Sciences Urban Environment and Leisure Studies Education

3.2 School Leadership

During the consultation, staff feedback was clear on the need to support cross School working. I therefore intend to appoint a Deputy Vice Chancellor who will be responsible for line management of the Deans of School. This team will be expected to work together to support each other as they consider the future portfolio and internal processes moving forward.

The consultation also fed back concerns regarding the need to recognise the importance of the NHS commissions in terms of the University's core business. The lead for the School of Health and Social Care will therefore be Dean/Pro-Vice Chancellor. Whilst line management will be via the Deputy Vice Chancellor in terms

of academic delivery, a reporting line to the Vice Chancellor will be maintained with respect to the Health Contract.

We will advertise for the DVC and six Deans during February 2014 with a view to having staff in post before the next academic year. Once in post I will expect this team to work with staff to develop a vision and delivery plan for each School early next academic year.

3.3 Faculty Offices

Now the Schools are defined it will be necessary to look at coding of financial, HR and academic information to enable them to operate for September 2014.

Once the Support structure is agreed in March (see below) we can begin looking at functions carried out in Academic Departments, Faculty Offices and Services and decide where they are best located in the future. Given this will take some time, in the interim we will maintain Faculty Offices as they are, but I will move them under a single line manager. By doing this, staff within these areas will be able to work together and with the Schools and professional services to identify the most effective ways of working in the future. As part of this review I am keen that we ensure that Schools are freed up as much as possible to ensure they can deliver on the academic agenda.

4.0 Development of Professional Services Groups

During the consultation a number of staff commented on the need to align Services with key areas of delivery. There were also a number of comments on the need to minimise duplication and ensure there was clarity in terms of responsibility. The goal is therefore to create a number of agile professional service groups, which, like the new Schools, can develop to reflect the specific requirements of their customer base. It is envisaged that each group will be led by a member of the Executive who will have the authority to work with the group's senior team to deliver on agreed strategies. Each group will need to define its own internal arrangements and, as with the Schools, each group will need to forge a new identity and create a coherent customer service. As described above, they will also need to work effectively with the Schools to deliver effective cross-University processes. The following groups are proposed and the views of all staff are sought on their focus and also on the suggested composition.

a. Teaching Quality and Enhancement

Purpose: To protect the academic integrity of all the University accredited programmes and to ensure courses consistently deliver a range of LSBU graduate attributes (to be developed). To lead on the technology enhanced learning agenda helping drive the 'digital shift' in delivery and feedback within a research informed setting.

Composition: Academic Quality & Development Office, Academic Regulations (Taught and Research).

Primary output measures: Relevant student satisfaction measures, QAA and professional body review outcomes, contract quality measures (NHS).

Secondary output measures: Retention

b. Student Support and Employment

Purpose: To deliver consistent information, support and services to LSBU students from enrolment to graduation and work to ensure graduates obtain employment. To deliver a quality, proactive customer service through expert

knowledge and innovative business solutions, enabling the University to function effectively and deliver student success. To oversee and support the relationship with the SU.

Composition: Orientation for new students, Accommodation, Student Support including the Student Life Centre, Learning Resources Centre (advice and guidance services), Academy of Sport, Employability (including intern support and work to develop an employment-agency-type offer), Graduations, any Student facing services transferred from the Faculties, Examinations & Conferments, Appeals & Academic misconduct. Research Student Office.

Primary output measures: relevant student satisfaction measures, retention, graduate employment

c. **Research & Enterprise**

Purpose: To support the engagement of staff and students in Research and Enterprise activity. To support Schools in providing an interface with the wider public sector, business world and potential funders and enable the diversification of the University's income streams.

Composition: Central Research Office, Enterprise Unit (incl SBUEL).

Primary output measures: Income for research and enterprise per staff FTE

Secondary output measures: REF outputs (next cycle), KTPs, graduate start ups, research council income, peer reviewed output, other publications in academic, trade and other media, academic case studies, patents, CPD activity, leads for work placement and internship opportunities; employer-sponsored programmes / students, number and quality of partnerships with external stakeholders.

d. **Recruitment, Marketing & Partnerships**

Purpose: To enable sustainable recruitment of new students to LSBU programmes, or related activities with LSBU partners, nationally or internationally. To manage the process of recruitment from application to full enrolment, for all students, in all locations. To engage in, or support, activities which will enhance the reputation of LSBU and/or prepare students for successful progression to LSBU. To facilitate wider engagement of the University internationally

Composition: All of Marketing and UK Recruitment; Admissions and Enrolment, International Office, Confucius Institute; Plus a new commercially oriented partnerships capability

Primary output measures: Student enrolments (by category)

Secondary output measures: Applications per place, brand awareness in target group

e. **Organisation and People**

Purpose: Leading on culture shift; senior team effectiveness; core process improvement, talent management strategies and employee development (eg PGCHE/CLTHE, development of early career researchers etc). The service would provide the key interface with staff to deliver consistent information, support and services.

Composition: Human Resources, Organisational & Staff Development,

Primary output measures: Good employer score

Secondary output measures: Appraisals complete by 1st October, progress against staff development targets, diversity data etc

f. **Academic and Business Support**

Purpose: To deliver a quality proactive customer service through expert knowledge and innovative business solutions enabling the University to

function effectively and deliver academic success. To ensure the creation of an environment, both physical and digital, that can meet the demands of the current and future cohort of staff and students

Composition: Corporate Services (excluding HR/OSDT), Estates, ICT, Residences, Refectories, Catering, Library and learning resources. Business support, safety, compliance and Business continuity. This group will look to develop a central technical support team capability

Primary output measures: Student and staff satisfaction levels

Secondary output measures: value for money, relevant efficiency measures (eg carbon usage, space utilisation, network down time), health and safety measures

g. **Finance and Management Information**

Purpose: To facilitate the University's business planning and performance review processes through the provision of budget and planning guidance alongside consistent financial and non-financial information. To maintain oversight of finance and other key data returns and to oversee the integrity and consistency of those returns. To manage the internal and external audit functions.

Composition: Finance (as present, including financial planning and financial control). Fees and Bursaries team (to remain co-located with Student Support), Procurement, Payroll (to be co-located with HR), Registry (Student records and student returns), Staff returns (from HR), Corporate and business planning manager (from Executive)

Primary output measures: Financial performance, fit for purpose external data returns

h. **Business Intelligence and Strategic Stakeholder Development**

(i) Business Intelligence

Purpose: To ensure that the planning process is informed upfront by market demand information and benchmark data; to ensure that the internal KPIs within finance and management information are aligned to the strategy, and to the external measures which will impact on reputation. To be responsible for providing independent assurance on the provision of information to external stakeholders and advising on the interplay between returns to ensure they appropriately reflect the University performance.

(ii) Strategic Stakeholder Development:

Purpose: To provide the Executive with timely horizon scanning insights to inform University strategy and policy influencing; To prepare policy position papers for consideration by the Executive as required; To provide support to the Executive and Senior Leadership to develop key stakeholders effectively and coherently; To provide an excellent support programme for alumni – and facilitate alumni engagement in University programmes; To identify and lead projects for philanthropic fundraising

Composition: (i) New. (ii) Development and Alumni Relations.

Primary output measures: League table position; philanthropic fundraising, alumni satisfaction and engagement

Secondary output measures: LSBU proactivity in influencing the political environment, executive well informed when formulating strategy.

i. **Governance and Legal Services**

Purpose: To set the highest standards of governance and legal compliance for the university and its people. To uphold the university's legal rights and fulfil its obligations. To effectively manage OIA cases and student complaints. Engagement with external legal bodies, such as the Office of the Independent

Adjudicator.

Composition: Governance and Legal Team and Academic Board

Primary output measures: the board of Governors is working effectively and making decisions at a strategic level. The risks of litigation and/or regulatory action against the university are mitigated.

5.0 Project Management

A range of respondents to the consultation asked for feedback on how the overall change process would be managed.

First it is important to note that at the outset we will simply group existing areas, be they into the new Schools or Professional Service Groups. We will need to look at financial systems and core data to reflect the new structure but other than those changes I would see work continuing as currently until new systems have been developed and put in place.

To oversee the new developments we will be seeking to appoint, on a fixed term basis, a programme director with experience of cross institutional change programmes such as these. The overall change programme will be overseen by the Executive but a project team will be created to support this appointment by freeing up a number of existing staff with specialist knowledge of how LSBU operates. As part of this process I would be supporting those staff to visit other institutions with different mixtures of central and local activity, so we can develop the arrangements that best meet our needs going forward.

6.0 Next steps

The aim is to engage in a process of open consultation with all staff commencing on Monday 3rd February 2014 and closing on Friday 7th March 2014 regarding the proposals for Professional service groups as outlined above. I encourage all staff to contribute during this consultation period. There will be an opportunity to provide views at a series of consultation meetings in February or via email at Consultation@lsbu.ac.uk

I would be particularly interested in staff views on:

1. The vision I propose for an enterprising civic university that is addressing real world challenges.
2. The three key outcomes I have proposed for the 2015-2020 strategy.
3. The concept of Professional Service Groups as described
4. The composition and purpose of these Groups as currently described
5. Thoughts as to any challenges and opportunities caused by the creation of the professional services groups.

The outcomes of this consultation will help inform the strategy for moving forward and a response to the consultation will be circulated in April 2014.

I look forward to meeting you and to hearing your views.

sincerely,

David Phoenix
Vice Chancellor

London South Bank
University

	PAPER NO: EC.03(14)	
Board/Committee:	Educational Character Committee	
Date:	12 th February 2014	
Paper title:	Recruitment of DVC and Deans	
Author:	Professor David Phoenix	
Board sponsor:	David Longbottom, Chairman	
Recommendation:		
Aspect of the Corporate Plan to which this will help deliver?		
Matter previously considered by:		
Further approval required?		
Communications – who should be made aware of the decision?		

Please find below the Job Description for the role of Deputy Vice Chancellor.

Deputy Vice Chancellor.

Role:

The role of Deputy Vice Chancellor is part of the senior management team reporting directly to the Vice Chancellor. The DVC will be responsible for the line management of Schools and will take a leading role in helping the university move forward with an ambitious agenda for strategic change. The DVC will take the lead role in ensuring the academic function is developed coherently as well as working closely with the VC and senior colleagues to help achieve LSBUs overall strategic aims. The DVC acts as the deputy to the VC in all regards and acts on his behalf in his absence.

Core functions of Executive

Members of the Executive derive their authority from the Vice Chancellor. They are expected, under the leadership of the Vice Chancellor and Chief Executive, to work as a team providing collective leadership, strategic direction and overall management of the University. Core functions common to all members of the Executive include;

1. To assist the Vice Chancellor in the leadership, direction and management of the University.
2. To assist the Vice Chancellor in developing policies for the strategic direction and leadership of the University, ensuring policies are complied with and corporate objectives met
3. To advocate and role model the principles set out in the LSBU behavioral framework and to comply with the standards of public behavior set out in the Nolan Principles
4. To ensure the University's financial objectives, as set out in the annual budget and associated papers, are met and showing due regard for the University's financial regulations and the need to evidence proper and appropriate use of public funds.
5. To ensure the diversification of income sources and support increased efficiency and effectiveness in all aspects of operations giving due regard to our accountability to stakeholders for institutional performance.
6. To support the mission and foster an educational environment that is defined by high quality teaching, research and enterprise and high quality services which support the core business as outlined in the medium term strategy
7. To develop and strengthen external partnerships, the University's regional, national and international profile and in particular through the ambassadorial role which each member of the Executive has, to ensure greater visibility of the University
8. To ensure rules of corporate governance are complied with, in particular that their actions, and those of the staff reporting to them, comply with the Articles of Governance, the hefce financial memorandum, contract agreements and where appropriate articles of association for university companies
9. To achieve the performance objectives and targets which have been set by the University Board and/or the Vice Chancellor and to ensure that objectives as set out in the medium term strategy and annual corporate plan are achieved

Main duties and Responsibilities:

1. Line management of the Deans of School to ensure the effective and efficient development and delivery of School plans to budget.
2. Leading the development of the academic core by ensuring Schools deliver a research informed curriculum of relevance to public services, business, and the professions.
3. To ensure Schools attain top quartile student satisfaction and meet or exceed benchmarks for retention.
4. Ensuring Schools recruit to target, reviewing and strengthening the academic portfolio and developing new student markets , including the further development of PT and PG provision.
5. Working with senior colleagues to encourage and develop educational, business and enterprise partnerships and to ensure the Schools' academic environment supports both staff and student enterprise activity so enabling financial contribution targets to be met
6. To work with senior colleagues to develop and implement a university research strategy with particular focus on highly applied, REF related activities which enhance the university's reputation and increase external research income
7. To work with senior colleagues to ensure the active participation of Schools in UK and international collaborative activity in line with the university's strategic ambitions.
8. Deputising for the Vice Chancellor as appropriate

Selection Criteria:

- A. Strong academic credibility and intellectual stature as evidenced by previous achievements, for example Professorial status and a relevant publications record and/or roles at a national or international level.
- B. An experienced senior leader, able to demonstrate proven delivery of successful change management across large and complex organisations.
- C. Evidence of leading policy developments and turning plans into action.
- D. Confident line manager with the ability to motivate staff and effectively performance manage.
- E. Strategic insight as demonstrated by engagement in cross-institutional leadership and strategy setting and implementation.
- F. A comprehensive understanding of current and future developments in the sector and the key drivers behind them.
- G. Experience in academic portfolio review, management planning & budget setting
- H. Evidence of expertise in an international higher education context.
- I. Ability to inspire staff and drive a culture of commitment, innovation and engagement that leads to delivery of successful outcomes.
- J. Excellent communication skills
- K.** A thorough understanding of Equality, Diversity and Inclusion and demonstrable ability to lead on this within the School

	PAPER NO: EC.04(14)	
Board/Committee:	Educational Character Committee	
Date:	12 th February 2014	
Paper title:	Undergraduate Faculty Monitoring Report	
Author:	Margaret Hollins, Deputy Head of Department, Urban, Environment and Leisure Studies, AHS; Jon Warwick, Professor: Educational Development, BUS; Philip Lockett, Pro Dean (Academic), ESBE; Mary Saunders, Head of Department, Primary and Social Care, HSC.	
Executive sponsor:	Phil Cardew, Pro Vice Chancellor (Academic)	
Recommendation by the Executive:	To note	
Aspect of the Corporate Plan to which this will help deliver?	Academic success, employment and student satisfaction. Ensuring that our underpinning business processes, systems, policies and investments create an environment that enables success.	
Matter previously considered by:	Quality and Standards Committee FASCs	On: 5 th February 2014 On: Various
Further approval required?	N/A	
Communications – who should be made aware of the decision?	N/A	

Executive summary

Faculty Annual Monitoring Reports represent a significant stage in the University's annual monitoring process, which begins with reports compiled at department and course level, which are scrutinised by Faculty Academic Standards Committees.

These reports focus upon:

- External examining – including the report(s) covering the courses within scope and the responses to those reports.
- Student satisfaction – both within the National Student Survey and Module Evaluation Questionnaires. The reports also highlight any issues raised through Course Boards.

- Progression and Achievement – noting any particular concerns at course and module level.
- Employability – through analysis of responses to the Destinations of Leavers in Higher Education survey.
- Action Planning – including analysis of the previous year's action plan, and inclusion of an action plan for the coming year.

These annual monitoring reports are shared with external examiners, students (through Course Committees and on the Virtual Learning Environment) and within the faculties. They inform the faculty-level reports, which are attached here, which draw out particular areas of interest, and concern, and concentrate on any further action needed at faculty (or University) level. All reports work to a standard set of information and data.

The Educational Character Committee receives annual monitoring reports from each of the Faculties so that it can be made aware of any issues that are impacting on the University's educational provision. These are then reiterated in the Annual Report from Academic Board to the Board of Governors, which marks the culmination of the monitoring process each year (and includes a summary of all reports considered at Educational Character Committee).

In addition to receiving the Faculty reports, Quality and Standards Committee undertakes an audit of reports at departmental and course level, selecting a variety from each faculty, each year, and scrutinising the report (and the material informing it) and the monitoring process undertaken by the faculties. This auditing process has led to significant developments of the overall process, particularly in terms of the streamlining of the reports themselves (but also in terms of 'closing the loops' of monitoring within faculty scrutiny processes).

Executive Summaries

Faculty of Arts and Human Sciences

This report from the Faculty of Arts and Human Sciences provides an overview of the quality assurance in the Faculty for the 2012/13 academic year in terms of undergraduate student progression and awards together with student experience and satisfaction survey results. The focus is on Faculty developments from last year's action plan and the context and rationale for the current plan.

The response rate for the National Student Survey (NSS) increased and met the University benchmark. Results show that for the Faculty overall, student satisfaction has increased. Progression for full-time students has improved at Year 1 and the benchmark is met at Year 2 though not at Year 3 (final year). Part-time students' progression meets benchmarks, save for Year 2. The current Action Plan seeks to address these issues.

Faculty of Business

The Educational Character Committee receives annual monitoring reports from each of the Faculties so that it can be made aware of any issues that are impacting on the University's educational provision. This report from the Faculty of Business confirms the academic standard of the awards made within the Faculty and highlights any issues requiring action by the Faculty. There are no specific issues that the Committee needs to give particular attention to other than to note the uncertainties over part-time student recruitment and the need to improve student progression on sub-degree courses both of which represent a risk for the Faculty and therefore to the institution as a whole.

Faculty of Engineering, Science and the Built Environment

This paper is the annual report of the quality management processes for Undergraduate courses in the Faculty of Engineering, Science and the Built Environment. The paper provides an overview of the faculty and its operations.

The committee may wish to note the improve recruitment to the Faculty, issues with BTEC progression on first year full-time degrees and the action plan regarding the National Student Survey.

Faculty of Health and Social Care

This paper highlights key aspects of the monitoring of quality in the undergraduate provision of the Faculty of Health and Social Care. Nineteen undergraduate Programme Monitoring Reports were received and reviewed.

There are no particular issues the Committee needs to give its attention.

There are no risks identified in the report to the University. The action plan reflects issues identified from the reports and actions to address or strengthen the quality of the student experience or the monitoring of the quality process.

Attachments:

- 1) Arts and Human Sciences*
- 2) Business*
- 3) Engineering, Science and the Built Environment*
- 4) Health and Social Care*

Appendix 1 – Faculty of Arts and Human Sciences

Faculty Annual Overview

1. The Faculty of Arts and Human Sciences assures the Quality and Standards Committee that it has fulfilled all functions required of it with respect to the annual monitoring of academic standards and quality at undergraduate course level during the academic year 2012/2013. All courses in the Faculty have engaged appropriately with external examiners and reference is made in this report to external examiner comments of particular significance and to the responses to these comments.
2. Where courses have been reviewed, and new courses validated, the Faculty Academic Standards Committee has retained appropriate oversight of the responses to the conditions imposed and recommendations made during these processes and has ensured that they have been addressed to the satisfaction of review and validation panels. The FASC has maintained oversight of proposals for collaboration with partner institutions, both in the UK and overseas, and has ensured that all conditions imposed by approval panels have been met, and approved Memoranda of Cooperation are in place, before the commencement of courses to be delivered collaboratively.
3. The Faculty of Arts and Human Sciences comprises seven Departments: Arts and Media, Culture, Writing and Performance, Education, Law, Psychology, Social Sciences, and Urban, Environment and Leisure Studies.
4. The Faculty's Action Plan for 2012/13 focused upon raising the profile of the NSS to final year undergraduates and increasing NSS scores, ensuring alignment of Departmental Plans and Programme (now Course) Monitoring Reports (PMRs), implementing PMR action plans to meet progression benchmarks and raising the profile of the Destination of Leavers in Higher Education (DLHE) survey to final year undergraduates. Section 2 of the report provides an overview of the Action Plan's implementation.

Quality Assurance at Faculty Level

5. All Departments in the Faculty **met or exceeded** the University's benchmark **NSS response rate** of 70%.
6. AHS saw a general improvement in **NSS scores**. Student satisfaction in AHS has increased overall. This Action is carried over to the 2013/14 AHS Action Plan.
7. **Alignment of Departmental Plans and PMRS (now CMRs)** is addressed by the established practices of (1) the Faculty's Senior Management Team conducting annual meetings with all Departments to discuss and provide feedback on Departmental Action Plans (2) Deanery scrutiny of Course Monitoring Reports (3)

Faculty SMT meetings with individual Departments to feedback and advise on NSS scores. The NSS Action and Enhancement Plan supports these practices, supports Departments in the preparation and production of their plans and supports CMR authors.

8. **Meeting course progression benchmarks** through implementation of PMR (now CMR) Action Plans has been partially met as indicated in the commentary below on student progression and awards (paragraphs 3.1 and 3.2 below).
9. **Raising the profile of DLHE survey to final year undergraduates** has resulted in high response rates and rates of employment for graduates reported in some of the Course Monitoring Reports. This action point is carried forward into the 2013/14 Faculty Action Plan for a consistent all-course application.
10. The Faculty has been active in supporting the roll-out of the **Student Union's own student representatives' training programme** as a successor initiative to the training delivered jointly by the Faculty and the SU in previous years. This is a natural 'next step' towards embedding greater ownership by the SU of the training process so as to support the student voice and ensure confident and meaningful **student representation** on Course Boards and Faculty Committees.
11. The Faculty's **two-weekly Student Voice meetings** are chaired by the Pro-dean and attended by the Faculty Managers, the Chair of FASC and the LSBU Student Union Vice President (Student Experience). Several members of the Student Voice group use Twitter accounts as an additional way to keep in touch.
12. The Faculty's **electronic log-in and tracking of coursework submissions**, (launched September 2012) has embedded standard practice throughout the Faculty and established Faculty-wide promulgation of agreed submission deadlines and timescales for the return of student work. The system has prompted Departments to develop standardised feedback sheets in support of detailed and structured feedback to students (a point in the Faculty's 2011/12 Faculty Action Plan).
13. The use of **external invigilators** for Faculty examinations continues, with the benefits that brings (shorter turnaround time for marking and feedback to students, consistent and rigorous application of examination regulations).
14. The **AHS Moodle Group** continues to meet on a bi-monthly basis in anticipation of the transition from Blackboard to Moodle in September 2014. Training for Faculty staff incorporates refresher sessions for those members of staff who completed the standard training in the previous year in readiness for a start in 2013. A number of Moodle pilots are running this year in the Faculty, providing additional Faculty 'champions' to assist and advise colleagues on implementation and best practice for the formal changeover.

15. The Faculty's overall findings from its **annual undergraduate course monitoring and scrutiny process** are that the majority of courses (14 out of 19 reports) now merit a finding of broad confidence. To ensure consistency of scrutiny findings, the Faculty continues its practice of convening a Deanery scrutiny after submission of the scrutiny reports. Where course monitoring reports (CMRs) have scrutiny conditions or have not otherwise been signed off, the Faculty Academic Standards Committee (FASC) continues its monitoring.
16. The **range of conditions** imposed following CMR scrutiny included requiring the addition of evaluative commentary; reflecting upon lessons learned; making explicit links to comments, findings and issues arising from eg external examiners reports, course board minutes, module evaluation questionnaires, NSS and DLHE survey results; identifying desired outcomes and developing action plans that are SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-limited). The Faculty's approach to delivery of CMR author training is under review for the next round of undergraduate course monitoring reporting, with the intention of supporting the Faculty general training session with one-to-one sessions with authors and is taken forward as an action point in the 2013/14 Faculty Action Plan.
17. For all CMRs, **external examiners' reports, responses thereto and course board minutes were available** and had generally been used constructively to feed into action plans. For some authors, the amount of DLHE data upon which to comment was limited. The 2013/14 Faculty Action Plan includes two specific actions in relation to improving amount and quality of DLHE data. Nevertheless, the importance of employability initiatives for graduates and the importance of career destination data from the survey to inform and support those initiatives was acknowledged in several reports and in some cases both the response rate to the DLHE survey and the employment rates were encouraging. All CMRs confirmed that **current programme specifications were available online**.

Recruitment, Retention and Progression

18. There has been an improvement in progression at Level 4 (Year 1) for **full-time** students, while Level 5 (Year 2) full time progression has remained steady and exceeds benchmark, and Level 6 (Year 3), awards to full time students, has dropped slightly and does not meet the benchmark, as indicated by the table below (2011 – 2012 figures in brackets).

FT	Benchmark	Average progress rate
L4	70%	68% (61%)
L5	75%	81% (81%)
L6 (awards)	90%	84% (86%)

19. The table below indicates overall attainment of the small number of AHS **part-time** students against university benchmarks, where progression at Level 4 Year

1 is up significantly and exceeds benchmark, Progression in Year 2 is down significantly, Year 3 is up slightly from the previous year and awards at Level 6 are down but exceed the benchmark.

PT	Benchmark	Average progress rate
Year 1 L4	70%	73% (53%)
Year 2 L4 and L5	75%	47% (71%)
Year 3 L5 and L6	75%	86% (85%)
Year 4 L6 (awards)	90%	91% (96%)

20. Progression for students with qualifications other than 'A' Levels, in particular BTEC, remains an issue for most, but not all, Departments. All Departments need to address progression by specific ethnic groups but particular ethnicities vary between Departments. In terms of age and gender, progression trends and profiles remain varied for the Departments. No single progression profile is common to all. Progression data regarding students with disabilities, and EU, overseas and home students present particular Departments with issues to reflect upon and take action as appropriate. The Deanery's meetings with Departments individually to discuss Departmental Plans and NSS scores enable specific examination of key issues, tailored to individual course provision and delivery. Progression and retention remains a key element of the 2013/14 Faculty Action Plan.

Actions for the coming year (2013/14)

21. Faculty actions are based on the undergraduate Course Monitoring Reports (CMRs) and scrutiny thereof, on the Faculty and University priority areas of progression and awards and National Student Survey (NSS) results. They are set out in the table below.

AHS Action Plan 2013/14

	Action	Desired Outcome	To be actioned by	Target Date	Update
1	Implement CMR action plans to meet progression benchmarks.	Progression rates in line with University benchmarks.	HoDs / CDs / Course teams	October 2014	
2	Implement CMR Action Plan/ NSS Action and Enhancement Plan to extend NSS profile raising to current final year students and extend	At least a 70% NSS response rate from final year students on all courses.	Pro-Deans, HoDs/ CDs/ Course teams	April 2014	

	awareness-raising to second-year students.	All subject (JACS Code) areas achieving at least 90% of NSS sector benchmarks in all 7 compulsory categories.			
3	Extend DLHE survey profile-raising to current final year students.	At least a 70% DLHE response rate for all courses.	Pro-Deans/ HoDs/ CDs/ Course Teams	April 2014	
4	Implement CMR / Employability Action Plans to increase DLHE scores.	Increased rates of graduate employment to achieve 70% positive responses.	Pro-Deans/ HoDs/ CDs/ Course Teams	September 2014	
5	One-to-one sessions with CMR authors to produce consistently robust CMR action planning and implementation on first submission of CMR report.	All CMRs with finding of 'broad confidence' without referral to authors for amendment after initial Deanery scrutiny.	Pro-Deans/ FASC Chair/ HoDs/ CDs	January 2015	

Margaret Hollins
Chair of AHS FASC
January 2014

Appendix 2 – Faculty of Business

Annual Overview

1. With the completion of the curriculum modernization process (CMP) the emphasis this year has been on reviewing the operation of the programmes and modules to ensure as smooth a transition to the new curriculum for students as possible. In addition there was further curriculum development work undertaken with revalidation of the BA (Hons) Accounting & Finance and associated PRSB accreditation of the BA (Hons) Accounting & Finance (2008 version); the revalidation of the BSc (Hons) Baking Technology Management and FdSc Baking Technology Management under CMP; and a full end-of-cycle review of courses in the Department of Informatics and an associated accreditation visit from the BCS - The Chartered Institute for IT. All reviews and validations had successful outcomes.
2. Across the undergraduate programmes we are pleased to report that external examiners confirm that appropriate standards are established for courses and modules at all levels in the Faculty, and that the appropriate external benchmark standards are in evidence. The Department of Accounting and Finance has made good progress in implementing the actions arising from the review of 2012-13 and actions that were identified at Faculty level in relation to that review have also been completed.

Quality Assurance at Faculty Level

3. No significant issues were raised by external examiners relating to the operation of Faculty wide processes. The Faculty's Academic Standards Committee met according to its agreed schedule and FASC maintains a record of all programme and course level protocols which detail any specific variations to LSBU Academic Regulations for example as a result of PSRB accreditation. Protocols are reviewed annually and any amendments to the protocols must be agreed by FASC. As a result of CMP2 and the availability of a central record of all validated courses and modules, FASC is undertaking a review of module guides and Course Specifications to check consistency with recorded information.
4. Now that the results of CMP are largely in operation across the Faculty issues relating to quality and standards of the new curriculum have been under review and we are pleased to report that no serious issues have been raised in relation to either the full-time or part-time curriculum. Some changes at the module level have been requested by course teams as the new curriculum has rolled out but these have been dealt with under normal FASC operating processes.

Quality Assurance at Programme Level

5. The Faculty is pleased to note that no major issues were identified by external examiners given the significant changes introduced through the implementation

of the new 20 credit curriculum. Some issues were raised in relation to individual courses and subject groupings and these have been responded to.

6. From a Faculty perspective there were two areas where concern was expressed across more than one programme. The first was in relation to some discrepancy between average coursework marks and average exam marks within the same module – with the former being considerably higher than the latter in a small number of modules. While it is clear that students find some forms of assessment, particularly unseen written exams, more challenging, we must be sure that we are able to discriminate clearly between the good and not so good students in coursework submissions, that groupwork (which features in a number of modules) routinely includes assessment of individual student contributions, and that we are doing all that we can to minimise the risks of contract cheating. The second relates to the organization of our collaborative provision and the amount of time that members of staff have to undertake moderation and other processes. While there is no threat to quality of our assessment outcomes it is felt that we could look again at the timing of assessments and marking to reduce the pressure on administrative and assessment processes.
7. It is also pleasing to see examples of excellent practice identified by External Examiners. For example courses in the Department of Informatics were commended for the excellence of feedback provided to students and “... it is clear that academic colleagues care about their students and enabling their students to learn from assessment” (Dept. of Informatics). There was further positive comment regarding the quality of assessment tasks and their use to promote skills to enhance employability.

Recruitment, Retention and Progression

8. Student recruitment for 2012-13 for undergraduate full-time courses remained relatively stable and was in line with expectations although recruitment to part-time courses remains challenging. The Faculty is taking steps to try and improve recruitment to part-time courses for example with the introduction of flexible delivery modes in BA Business Studies and BA Business Administration. The changing age profile of students noted in last year's report has continued with now 55% of our new full-time undergraduate students being 21 or under. More than 90% of these are Home or EU students and the number of overseas students is reducing year on year and now stands at just 8%. In addition, the entry qualifications of the full-time cohort are now showing a marked trend of declining numbers of 'A' level entrants (34% to 28% over three years) and a commensurate increase in BTEC/SCOTVEC qualifications from 21% to 31%.
9. Analysis of undergraduate progression data gives the cross-Faculty progression statistics shown below.

Progression/ Award Rates: Undergraduate Full-time Students

All F/T Hons Degree	10-11 (%)	11-12 (%)	12-13 (%)	Average (%)
Level 4 (Year 1)	55	62	61	59
Level 5 (Year 2)	70	76	73	73
Level 6 (award) (Years 3 and 4)	86	85	82	84

These figures are abstracted directly from the University system and so should be regarded as indicative only since no account has been taken of the subtleties of student progression between and within courses. The data shows that further improvements in progression have not been made at Levels 4 and 5 and in fact this year we have seen a slight drop. At level 6 we have seen a continuation of a downward trend in awards made with larger numbers of students having to repeat modules. This is a matter of some concern to the Faculty and will be the subject of investigation to try and establish causes. On sub-degree courses there have been some disappointing progression results. The Department of Informatics reports progression from level 4 having slipped back considerably from last year (albeit on small cohort sizes) and is taking action to review this. The HND Business Studies also reports progression as below 50% and again this needs to be looked at. Other courses have been more consistent with the FdA Accounting at 64% (60% the previous year).

10. A number of new collaborations were validated during 2012-13 reflecting the Faculty's desire to collaborate with partners both within the UK and abroad. All Course Monitoring Reports reflect on existing collaborations and do not indicate any serious causes for concern either in their operation or the standard of the work examined or awards made. External Examiners have mentioned the need for some developmental work with partners (e.g. Business Studies) which has been completed and there is a need to look at timing of assessments as mentioned in paragraph 6. There are some operational difficulties being experienced with overseas students attending semester 2 start courses. These stem from the lack of a gap between semesters and the consequently tight schedule for transfer of accommodation, course induction etc. Course teams have managed to operate with local arrangements and we wish to commend the support provided by Library and Learning Resources and in particular the Faculty of Business Information Advisor who has supported both the Faculty and our overseas students admirably.
11. All courses and programmes held board meetings as required. A variety of issues were raised by students in relation to specific modules but in general there seemed to be only two issues that were raised with any consistency. The first is the standard of behaviour of students in the classroom and in particular disruptive talking among students and late arrival of students. The second related to assessment and the bunching of assessment deadlines at certain

specific points of the year. Both of these issues will be addressed as FASC actions for this year.

12. Student satisfaction as measured by the NSS showed some considerable variation between departments. The results are shown below for the overall quality of teaching in each Department. Due to the inclusion of undergraduate provision within the Department of Management for the first time no figures for previous years are recorded.

Overall Quality of Teaching

	2010	2011	2012	2013
Business Studies	80	80	72	76
Accounting/Finance	80	86	88	90
Informatics	74	74	81	74
Management				85
Bakery School	74	76	88	91
University Average	81	79	81	82

The results for 2012-13 are generally good with the Department of Accounting and Finance maintaining a record of improvement for the last four years and similarly the National Bakery School. The Department of Business Studies has recovered some ground after a disappointing set of results in 2012 but the Department of Informatics has shown a downturn in results which have undone the gains of last year. Both Departments are currently below the University average.

13. Looking at the range of other questions asked, the Faculty has scored below 70% in Assessment and Feedback (Depts. of Business Studies, Informatics and Management), Academic Support (Depts. of Business Studies and Informatics), and Organisation and Management (National Bakery School). Each Department will be addressing these particular weaknesses in the responses to the NSS.

Actions for the Next Academic Year

14. All actions from last year have been completed and for the current year the identified actions are:

	Action (and report reference)	Desired Outcome	To be Actioned by	Target Date
1	Review of coursework assessment in	All assessment processes clearly differentiate	SGLs	27 th June 2014

	modules where there is a large discrepancy in average marks with formal examinations (para 6).	between strong and weak students with the full range of marks used.		
2	Assessment processes in relation to collaborative provision (para 6).	Adequate provision of time for moderation of marks and administrative processes.	SGL, Link Tutors.	27th June 2014
3	Review progression on sub-degree courses and the decline in Awards made (para 9).	Increasing trend in progression towards KPI.	HoDs, PM.	27th June 2014
4	Classroom behavior of students (para 11).	Improved and prompt attendance at classes and no disruption to classes.	HoDs, PM.	27th June 2014
5	Bunching of coursework assessments (para 11).	Assessment deadlines set to equalise the assessment load on students as far as possible.	PM, SGL.	27th June 2014

Key: HoD – Head of Department; PM – Programme Manager; SGL – Subject Group Leader.

Jon Warwick
Chair of BUS FASC
January 2014

Appendix 3 – Faculty of Engineering, Science and the Built Environment

Faculty Annual Overview

1. The Faculty of Engineering Science and the Built Environment assures the Quality and Standards Committee that it has fulfilled all functions required of it with respect to the annual monitoring of academic standards and quality at undergraduate programme level during the academic year 2012/2013 for all programmes. All programmes in the Faculty have engaged appropriately with external examiners and reference is made in this report to external examiner comments of particular significance and to the responses to these comments.

Quality Assurance at Faculty Level

2. The Faculty set up a partnership with the British University in Egypt to validate BEng (Hons) Petroleum Engineering and Gas Technology and BEng (Hons) Chemical Engineering. These awards already lead to Egyptian degrees and the request was to make a dual award of an LSBU degree for the same curricula.
3. The Faculty has placed Programme Specifications and Module Pro-Formas along with other QA documentation on SharePoint which is accessible to all ESBE staff. We will be working with the University to make this available to students, applicants and external bodies as appropriate.
4. The Faculty was able to implement personalised timetables in September 2013. This was well received by students and staff.
5. There were no other significant faculty wide issues raised in the annual cycle of review at undergraduate level.

Quality Assurance at Programme Level

6. The Faculty has monitored its courses and programmes in a number of ways. These include End of Cycle reviews, validations, professional body visits and the Programme Monitoring Review process (PMR).
7. During 2012-13 there was one End of Cycle review scheduled. However this had to be deferred until the autumn term because an External panel member became unavailable at short notice.
8. Also during 2012-13 there were seven external accreditation visits and all were successful.

National Student Survey - ESBE overall satisfaction

	2013	2012	2011
	Overall I am satisfied with the quality of	Overall I am satisfied with the quality of	Overall I am satisfied with the quality of

	the course	the course	the course
EAS (n = 169) (r = 75)	80 ▲	79 ▼	82 ▼
EBE (n = 122) (r = 81)	69 ▲	68 ▼	73 ▼
EED (n = 160) (r = 76)	81 ▲	79 ▲	68 ▼
EUE (n = 162) (r = 74)	72 ▲	69 ▼	72 ▼

9. A summary of the NSS for ESBE is given above. These figures show only a small improvement when they are compared with the 2012 figures. A more detailed analysis shows that our degree level NSS scores are comparable with our competitors. However for many, but not all, of our HNC, HND and Foundation Degree programmes the student satisfaction scores are low, in some cases very low. The Faculty's Departments has put in place detail plans to improve the student satisfaction. These plans have been developed and implemented with support from the Student Centre and also other faculties. We anticipate our scores will be substantially higher this year.

Recruitment, Retention and Progression

10. The Faculty has increased recruitment by 300 students when compared to last year's recruitment. It was able to do this in all categories other than postgraduate fulltime international students where there was a small decrease.

ESBE recruitment summary 2013/2014

Course Level and Mode	Actual recruitment 2012/2013	Target recruitment 2013/2014	Actual recruitment 2013/2014
UG FT Home	718	844	848
PG FT Home	153	227	193
UG (Home & OS) PT	276	315	343
PG (Home & OS) PT	145	178	200
UG OS FT	80	100	111
PG OS FT	69	69	60

11. The Faculty identified progression had improved for levels 5 and 6 and for PT level 4 students. However progression for FT level 4 students had dropped from 65% (2011-12) to 61% (2012-13).

1st Year Undergraduate Progression

		09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13
Applied Sciences	FT	58%	61%	67%	67%
	PT	50%	100%	100%	n/a
	Total	58%	62%	68%	67%
Built Environment	FT	53%	60%	66%	54%
	PT	64%	92%	68%	84%
	Total	56%	64%	67%	58%
Engineering and Design	FT	43%	52%	65%	58%
	PT	61%	79%	72%	82%
	Total	45%	54%	66%	60%
Urban Engineering	FT	63%	68%	66%	73%
	PT	87%	72%	80%	79%
	Total	69%	69%	71%	74%
ESBE Faculty Total		55%	59%	66%	63%

11. The FT level 4 progression is still much higher than at any time in the last 5 years other than last year. It is also still at a similar level to other Faculties. When progression figures were analysed it became apparent that progression of students who enter with BTEC qualifications is typically 20% to 30% lower than for any other qualification. BTEC students make up about 25% of the intake. The faculty has reviewed the performance of BTEC students and put in place a number of actions. These include being more selective over which particular Units students must attempt on their BTEC; reviewing our level 4 curriculum to identify in which modules these student underperform and offering additional support; and raising out UCAS points requirement for BTEC students so that more are likely to join HND or Extended degree courses. It is worth noting that on PT level 4 students who entered with BTEC qualifications do as well as students whom entered with other qualifications.

Actions for the Next Academic Year

	Action <i>(include paragraph reference(s) in report</i>	Desired Outcome	To be actioned by	Target Date	Update
1	Review performance of students who enter with BTEC level 3 qualifications during	Modify curriculum/admissions criteria to ensure all	Academic Directors	April 2014	

	their first year of study (Paragraph 3.5)	programmes are fully accessible by BTEC students			
2	To develop NSS action plans at departmental level (Paragraph 3.7)	Improve NSS outcomes (80%+ overall satisfaction)	Heads of Department	November 2013	Completed
3	To increase student representation on Faculty committees – (Paragraph 5 F3)	All appropriate Faculty Committees and Course Boards should have at least 1 student attending	PD (A), FAQSSO, HoDs, SGLs and CDs	September 2014	

Philip Lockett
Chair of ESBE FASC
January 2014

Appendix 4 – Faculty of Health and Social Care

Quality Guarantee

1. The Faculty of Health and Social Care assure the Quality and Standards Committee that it has fulfilled all functions required of it with respect to the annual monitoring of academic standards and quality at undergraduate programme level during the academic year 2012-13. All programmes in the Faculty have engaged appropriately with external examiners and responses to the comments of individual examiners have been included in the annual monitoring reports.

Progress on Action Plan for 2012-13

2. Early warning system of external examiners developed and is now a standing item on FASC agenda to ensure recruitment is timely for new appointments.
3. We have developed a more robust system for tracking and scrutiny reporting of course monitoring reports and the appointment of a new Faculty Quality Assurance and Enhancement Officer (FQAE0) has assisted in this process.
4. The unexpected departure of the FQAE0 in August 2013 has hindered the transfer of revised course specifications to sharepoint and this is ongoing as course directors check the revised templates.
5. A sample audit of blended learning in modules across the department showed an improvement in articulation of blended learning and some excellent examples of innovation.
6. PAT data review for BA Social Work: This continues to be a major issue as all placements have to be sourced individually. The current economic climate with cuts in many social services has also had a negative impact on sourcing placements alongside changes in the practice educator standards by the professional body that have meant some placements are no longer eligible to be used. This issue is under constant review and on the Faculty risk register.

Quality and Standards at Programme and Faculty Level

7. All reports are scrutinised by FASC members using the same form. All the reports achieved broad confidence and a new system of scrutineer feedback to authors prior to FASC has improved the process with all reports achieving broad confidence with the exception of two that are still outstanding due to sick leave of authors or other unavoidable issues. Please note that an extraordinary meeting of FASC was held to receive the reports but it has not been possible to present the FMR to FASC so this is currently in draft form. The vast majority of external examiner reports are very positive and where any issues have been raised by external examiners these are addressed in the template response to the external examiner. There have been some very positive comments for example:

- ...what has continued to stand out and still does is the quality of the feedback that each student gets. It is highly constructive and encouraging for the student in developing their study skills as it has always included a feed forward approach. (David Marshall, External Examiner for Pre – Registration Learning Disability Nursing and Social Work.)
 - Overall the assessment strategies are appropriate, innovative, creative and fit for purpose that enables the student to meet their intended learning outcomes. (Dr Mary Braine, External Examiner Adult Nursing CPPD).
 - The quality of all the 13 modules under review was very good indeed. (Prof. Karen Harrison, External Examiner BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy)
 - The staff members are courteous, open and will respond to advice and questions readily without seeing this as an imposition on, or implied criticism of their professional practice. (Eric Charlton, External Examiner Foundation Degrees)
8. However there was one issue of concern raised by the external examiner for Specialist Community Public Health Nursing who cited in her report that she had seen some student's assignments for one module that focused on students writing about a critical incident observed in practice and she had concerns that some of the practice observed was "unsafe or dangerous". This issue was not raised during scrutiny of scripts or at the examination board but was in the external examiner's report. The Faculty has treated this as a critical incident and this is being investigated internally and also followed up with examiner who has completed her term of office.
 9. LSBU was selected as one of 16 HEIs to be reviewed by the Nursing and Midwifery Council during 2012-13. The Nursing and Midwifery Council Programme Review took place on 9-10 January 2013 and confirmed that programmes of Nursing and Midwifery continue to be delivered in accordance with NMC standards. It examined the systems in place to ensure that NMC Key Risks are controlled and that quality assurance processes are effective in maintaining and enhancing programme delivery in both theory and practice. A judgement of good was received for all areas. The review covered all pre-registration nursing programmes but particularly focused on adult nursing and midwifery.
 10. Progression is normally good in the programmes and meets or exceeds the university benchmarks. As this is a key monitoring criteria for NHS London (now shared services on behalf of the three Local Education and Training Boards LETBs), much effort has been made in reducing attrition and improving progression. PAT data continues to be complex and our own Faculty monitoring processes necessary for the Quality Contract Performance Monitoring process required by the LETB shared services give much more information about the

reasons for withdrawal or interruption. Our programmes, particularly post qualifying programmes attract a large number of students who have senior roles and often need to undertake the programmes in a slower route or need to interrupt. This can be difficult to track in the PAT data with results appearing to show poor progression and attrition. Another issue of concern to students and course directors is the relative inflexibility of our systems that are unable to take account of situations where student's circumstances may change and they need to slow their studies but this is difficult to implement in practice and can have the effect of students withdrawing from the programme.

11. There were some very pleasing results from the NSS with BSc Learning Disability Nursing and Social Work scoring 100% overall satisfaction.

Key points from action plan for 2013-14

12. Continue to embed service user involvement in all aspects of courses regulated by the NMC or HCPC.
13. Improve quality and consistency of student feedback and organise Interprofessional Faculty wide workshops to support consistency in approach. Exemplars of good practice to be available on sharepoint.
14. Review of CPPD Open system and better information for students holding academic credit.
15. Reduce attrition and improve progression in pre –registration nursing programmes. Enhance personal tutor support and utilise student services more effectively.

Mary Saunders
Chair of HSC FASC
January 2014

	PAPER NO: EC.05(14)	
Board/Committee:	Educational Character Committee	
Date:		
Paper title:	External Examiner Summary Report – 2012/13	
Author:	Catherine Moss – Deputy Director, Academic Quality Development	
Executive sponsor:	Phil Cardew, PVC (Academic)	
Recommendation by the Executive:	This report is for information	
Aspect of the Corporate Plan to which this will help deliver?	3. Student Choice 4. Student Success	
Matter to be considered by:	Quality and Standards Committee	On: 5 th February 2014
Further approval required?	Academic Board	On: 19 th February 2014
Communications – who should be made aware of the decision?	Not applicable	

Executive summary

The purposes of the annual External Examiner Summary Report are to:

- confirm to Academic Board, and thus the Board of Governors that the external examining process, which is a key mechanism for assuring the standards of LSBU awards, has been carried out effectively;
- advise Academic Board of any emerging quality and standards issues that need to be addressed;
- assist Academic Board in quality enhancement by identifying areas of good practice.

The Committee is requested to note the External Examiner Summary report for 2012/13.

1. Scope of External Examiners Summary Report

- 1.1 Each year Academic Board and the Quality and Standards Committee receive a report which includes:
- an analysis of the, (approximately 200), external examiner reports received over the course of the year,;
 - identification of any emerging issues relating to any aspect of the University's external examining processes;
 - external examiners' comments on what LSBU does well and suggestions for how processes can be further improved.
- 1.2 External examiner reports are divided into two sections; Part A which is a questionnaire requiring Yes/No answers to each aspect of the external examining process and Part B which asks for written comments. The annual summary report for Academic Board & QSC includes a detailed statistical breakdown of the collated answers for each of the questions in Part A and an analysis of the key issues raised in Part B.
- 1.3 The report also summarises any changes to the external examining process during the preceding year.

2. The external examining process

- 2.1 The external examining system, whereby subject experts from the University sector scrutinise the standards of the awards of their peers, is critical to the degree awarding processes of UK HEIs. The Quality Assurance Agency sets out its expectations for the operation of the system in Chapter B7 of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education. The way in which LSBU manages this process is, therefore, closely linked to the 18 indicators described in Chapter B7.
- 2.2 Although external examiners are appointed to look at both modules and programmes, the detailed part of their work is at the module level. Each external examiner is allocated approximately 15 modules within their subject area and is expected to:
- make an overall judgement on the standards required to pass modules;
 - comment on the appropriateness of the coursework briefs and exam questions to ensure that they challenge the student appropriately in terms of subject knowledge and the level of the award;
 - scrutinise student work to ensure that it is marked fairly and accurately;
 - comment on whether students are receiving appropriate feedback on their assessments.

- 2.3 The other key aspect of the external examiner role is to participate in exam boards and to confirm that the students' marks are appropriate, (at Subject Area Boards) and that the overall award or progression decision is fair and accurate for each student, (at Award and Progression Boards).
- 2.4 After the exam board, the external examiner completes their report, (as described above). Reports are submitted to the Academic Quality Development Office, (AQDO), where they are read and distributed to the relevant Faculty. The external examiner receives a formal response to their report from the Faculty, using a standard template, so as to ensure that responses are complete and consistent.
- 2.5 If an external examiner raises a serious concern, particularly with regard to standards, the report is sent to the PVC (Academic), who will require that specific action is taken.

The procedures for external examining and for exam boards are set out in the LSBU Quality Code and the Academic Regulations for Taught Programmes respectively. To ensure that the external examining role remains 'external' and thus independent, there are strict criteria governing their appointment and the length of time that they can fulfil the role at one University.

External examiners are provided with written guidance on these procedures and, for newly appointed examiners particularly, invited to attend induction events.

3 Key outcomes of the external examining process in 2012/13

3.1 *External examiners reports – Part A:*

A compilation of all of the responses to Part A of the report is attached as Appendix A. Clearly the University is aiming for a 'Yes' answer to each question and Appendix A shows generally positive responses with over 90% answering 'Yes' to most of the questions. This paints a similar picture to previous years. Although forming only a small percentage of the total, the 'No' and 'For some modules' responses are always of concern to QSC and Academic Board and, therefore, form the focus of a Faculty's response to an external examiner.

3.2 *External examiners reports – Part B:*

For 2012/13, the key issues raised by external examiners in the written comments section of their reports were:

- the standard of referencing in assessments
- the clarity and consistency of internal moderation procedures (the process for checking that marking is fair and consistent across a group of assignments) and the way in which group work is marked;

- inconsistencies in the quality and clarity of the feedback given to students on their assessments;
- the amount of time that externals are given to scrutinise student work;
- issues around external examiners' contracts relating to the inaccuracies in the lists of modules that have been assigned to them.

3.3 **Features of good practice:**

External examiners also identify and comment on areas of good practice. For the 2012/13 reports these included: high quality feedback given to students and innovative and varied assessments. External examiners also identified a number of course specific examples of good practice.

4 **Issues relating to the external examining process in 2012/13**

4.1 In order to ensure compliance with the UK Quality Code for HE and to improve current practices, the following actions were taken in 2011/13:

- Academic Board now receives regular reports on the number of outstanding external examiner appointments for each Faculty. This has resulted in some reduction in the number of late or outstanding appointments.
- In order meet the requirement in the UK Quality Code for Higher Education', module guides now include the names, positions and institutions of the external examiners for their course.
- New external examiners are now being offered a mentor to as part of their induction into the role.
- QSC now conducts an annual audit of the responses to external examiner reports.

APPENDIX A

Subject Area Boards: all Faculties (n =200)

	Yes	No	For some modules	n/a
For newly appointed examiners (n =62)				
Were you satisfied with the information received from the AQDO on your appointment?	47	4	-	-
Were you invited to an induction session held by the Faculty or Department?	55	19	-	-
If so, did you attend?	15	27	-	-
Did you find it useful?	15	-	-	30
Did you feel adequately prepared for your role as an external examiner at LSBU?	54	2	-	-
The character of the assessment				

Did you receive Modules Guides for the modules you examine?	171	7	17	
On the basis of the evidence you saw, were the assessments generally:				
appropriate for the outcomes of the modules?	190	1	7	-
sufficiently discriminating between strong and weak candidates?	184	1	2	-
up-to-date?	188	0	8	-
appropriately varied?	193	0	3	-
Have staff of the Department or Faculty responded to comments you made in previous years?	141	9	14	33
Are you satisfied with these responses?	137	0	-	3
Standards				
Was the standard of student work required to pass the modules comparable with that at the same level in other institutions with which you are familiar?	194	2		
<u>IF NOT</u> , do you consider the standard required to pass modules is generally:				
higher than elsewhere?	4	-	-	-
lower than elsewhere?	2	-	-	-
The quality of student work presented for assessment				
Do you consider the overall performance of students comparable with that of their peers on similar courses elsewhere in the UK?	191	6	-	1

The assessment process				
Do some or all of your modules have written examinations?	135	56	-	1
<u>IF YES</u> , did you see draft examination papers for comment:				
for all your modules which have written examinations?	98	-	-	-
for some of your modules which have written examinations?	24	-	-	-
for none of your modules which have written examinations?	9	-	-	-
Did you receive draft papers in reasonable time?	118	11	-	-
Were your comments acted on in the papers given to students?	116	10	1	-
Did you have the opportunity to comment on new coursework briefs for modules wholly or largely assessed by coursework?	114	48	29	
Did you receive other coursework briefs for information?	147	20	24	
Did you have the opportunity to see sample marked coursework:				
for all your modules?	172	-	-	-
for some of your modules?	10	-	-	-
for none of your modules?	3	-	-	-
Did you receive marking schemes or clear statements of assessment criteria?	160	5	27	
Did you have the opportunity to see sample marked examination scripts:				
for all your modules which have written examinations?	114	-	-	-
for some of your modules which have written examinations?	8	-	-	-
for none of your modules which have written examinations?	4	-	-	-
On the basis of the evidence you saw, was there a satisfactory system of internal moderation or verification?	174	2	13	
On the basis of the evidence you saw, was marking:				
fair?	186	1	5	-
consistent?	183	5	6	-
too generous?	1	160	21	-
too harsh?	1	165	14	-

From examples you saw, was feedback given to students: sufficient?	155		38	
helpful to students in improving their performance?	151	1	30	1
consistent?	150		22	-
Practice-based courses				
Were you involved in the assessment of a practice-based course e.g. Nursing?	53	131	-	-
Do any of your modules involve assessments carried out in practice e.g. clinical practice?	40	14	-	-
If Yes, did you see the details of the assessments to be carried out by students?	41	7	-	-
Did you see the documentation used by students?	44	4	2	-
Did you see the details of the outcomes of these assessments?	46	3	-	-
Where students were required to produce portfolios of evidence based on practice, did you have the opportunity to sample these?	45	13	4	-
Assessment of students from partner organisations				
Were you involved in assessing the work of students based at one of LSBU's partners, either in the UK or abroad?	33	160	-	-
Did you see draft examination papers different from those taken by students at LSBU?	13	14	-	5
If the assessments for students at partner institutions were different from those at LSBU, are you satisfied that the standard set was equivalent?	25	1	-	-
Were any examination papers or assignment briefs in a language than English?	1	30	-	-
Did you receive any student work in a language than English?	1	30	-	-
If so, were you able to comment on them in the same way as for papers in English?	4	7	-	-

Appendix B

Award and Progression Boards: all Faculties (n = 84)

	Yes	No	n/a
1. Are you satisfied that decisions were made consistently within the University's regulations?	83	1	-
2. Are you satisfied that decisions were fair to individual students?	83	-	-
3. Was the meeting of the Examination Board efficiently conducted?	78	3	2
4. Did the Board have sufficient information to make fair decisions about:			
5. extenuating circumstances?	66	0	17
6. cases of cheating or plagiarism?	51	1	32
7. provision for students who had failed some of their modules?	76	0	5
8. application of protocols?	70	0	10
9. Was your role at the Board:			
10. clear to you?	81	0	-
11. as far as you could tell, understood by the other members of the Board?	83	0	-
12. Did the information which came before the Board enable you to judge whether the decisions made on awards and progression were comparable with those in other institutions known to you?	80	0	1
13. If so, do you believe that they were comparable?	80	1	1

London South Bank University

PMR Course(s) Progression Analysis Report

AHS (First Degree, Full Time) progression

		10/11		11/12		12/13		Total Students	Average	Data shows progression of students for last three academic years with the average of the three years. Highlighted are the areas that have not reached the average of the Faculty progression over the past 3 years, shown in the key below. For courses that are longer than 3 years, the L3(L6) benchmarks are used. Key: Year 1 <70% Year 2 <75% Year 3 <90%
		Students	Percent	Students	Percent	Students	Percent			
Year 1	Award	104	6%	169	14%	151	15%	424	11%	
	Progress	1,037	64%	748	61%	688	66%	2,473	64%	
	RYA/Continuing	175	11%	115	9%	67	6%	357	9%	
	Interrupt	28	2%	21	2%	23	2%	72	2%	
	Fail	115	7%	71	6%	36	3%	222	6%	
	Withdrawn	160	10%	100	8%	73	7%	333	9%	
	Missing	1	0%					1	0%	
	Total Students	1,620		1,224		1,038		3,882		
Year 2	Award	69	8%	75	6%	72	8%	216	7%	
	Progress	690	77%	938	81%	710	81%	2,338	80%	
	RYA/Continuing	92	10%	96	8%	55	6%	243	8%	
	Interrupt	18	2%	15	1%	12	1%	45	2%	
	Fail	8	1%	1	0%			9	0%	
	Withdrawn	22	2%	29	3%	26	3%	77	3%	
	Missing	1	0%	1	0%			2	0%	
	Total Students	900		1,155		875		2,930		
Year 3	Award	604	87%	625	86%	857	88%	2,086	87%	
	Progress									
	RYA/Continuing	67	10%	74	10%	94	10%	235	10%	
	Interrupt	17	2%	16	2%	16	2%	49	2%	
	Fail									
	Withdrawn	5	1%	5	1%	9	1%	19	1%	
	Missing			6	1%	2	0%	8	0%	
	Total Students	693		726		978		2,397		
Year 4	Award	51	86%	50	78%	41	82%	142	82%	
	Progress									
	RYA/Continuing	5	8%	11	17%	7	14%	23	14%	
	Interrupt	1	2%	3	5%			4	2%	
	Fail	1	2%					1	1%	
	Withdrawn	1	2%			2	4%	3	2%	
	Missing									
	Total Students	59		64		50		173		

	10/11		11/12		12/13		Students	Percent	Award Classification Key: (Faculty average over 3 years) 1st < 10% 2:1 < 45% 2:2 < 40% 3rd > 5%
	Students	Percent	Students	Percent	Students	Percent			
First	45	5%	60	7%	86	8%	191	7%	
Upper Second	244	29%	255	28%	347	31%	846	29%	
Lower Second	281	34%	274	30%	363	32%	918	32%	
Third	48	6%	37	4%	59	5%	144	5%	
Unclassified	24	3%	29	3%	41	4%	94	3%	
Not known/Other Award	186	22%	264	29%	225	20%	675	24%	
Total	828		919		1,121		2,868		

London South Bank University

PMR Course(s) Progression Analysis Report

BUS (First Degree Full Time) progression

		10/11		11/12		12/13		Total Students	Average
		Students	Percent	Students	Percent	Students	Percent		
Year 1	Award	122	11%	124	18%	75	11%	321	13%
	Progress	590	55%	422	62%	408	61%	1,420	59%
	RYA/Continuing	102	10%	58	9%	60	9%	220	9%
	Interrupt	21	2%	14	2%	10	1%	45	2%
	Fail	92	9%	12	2%	28	4%	132	5%
	Withdrawn	140	13%	50	7%	85	13%	275	11%
	Missing	2	0%			1	0%	3	0%
	Total Students	1,069		680		667		2,416	
Year 2	Award	65	10%	73	9%	62	10%	200	10%
	Progress	471	70%	592	76%	447	73%	1,510	73%
	RYA/Continuing	92	14%	82	10%	55	9%	229	11%
	Interrupt	5	1%	9	1%	7	1%	21	1%
	Fail	14	2%	2	0%	16	3%	32	2%
	Withdrawn	22	3%	26	3%	28	5%	76	4%
	Missing	1	0%					1	0%
	Total Students	670		784		615		2,069	
Year 3	Award	460	86%	469	85%	558	82%	1,487	84%
	Progress	2	0%					2	0%
	RYA/Continuing	61	11%	72	13%	103	15%	236	13%
	Interrupt	6	1%	6	1%	4	1%	16	1%
	Fail	1	0%	2	0%	2	0%	5	0%
	Withdrawn	3	1%	4	1%	4	1%	11	1%
	Missing	1	0%	1	0%	7	1%	9	1%
	Total Students	534		554		678		1,766	
Year 4	Award	92	84%	94	87%	94	78%	280	84%
	Progress								
	RYA/Continuing	11	10%	11	10%	19	16%	41	12%
	Interrupt	3	3%	3	3%	5	4%	11	3%
	Fail	2	2%					2	1%
	Withdrawn	2	2%			2	2%	4	1%
	Missing					1	1%	1	0%
	Total Students	110		108		121		339	

Data shows progression of students for last three academic years with the average of the three years. Highlighted are the areas that have not reached the average of the Faculty progression over the past 3 years, shown in the key below. For courses that are longer than 3 years, the L3(L6) benchmarks are used.

Key:
 Year 1 <70%
 Year 2 <75%
 Year 3 <90%

	10/11		11/12		12/13		Students	Percent
	Students	Percent	Students	Percent	Students	Percent		
First	86	12%	107	14%	132	17%	325	14%
Upper Second	247	33%	260	34%	288	37%	795	35%
Lower Second	258	35%	212	28%	211	27%	681	30%
Third	49	7%	40	5%	33	4%	122	5%
Unclassified	25	3%	25	3%	29	4%	79	3%
Not known/Other Award	74	10%	116	15%	96	12%	286	13%
Total	739		760		789		2,288	

Award Classification Key:
 (Faculty average over 3 years)
 1st < 10%
 2:1 < 45%
 2:2 < 40%
 3rd > 5%

London South Bank University

PMR Course(s) Progression Analysis Report

ESBE (First Degree, Full Time) progression

		10/11		11/12		12/13		Total Students	Average	Data shows progression of students for last three academic years with the average of the three years. Highlighted are the areas that have not reached the average of the Faculty progression over the past 3 years, shown in the key below. For courses that are longer than 3 years, the L3(L6) benchmarks are used. Key: Year 1 <70% Year 2 <75% Year 3 <90%
		Students	Percent	Students	Percent	Students	Percent			
Year 1	Award	41	4%	85	9%	75	9%	201	7%	
	Progress	568	57%	623	65%	536	61%	1,727	61%	
	RYA/Continuing	166	17%	128	13%	130	15%	424	15%	
	Interrupt	32	3%	24	2%	20	2%	76	3%	
	Fail	107	11%	43	4%	47	5%	197	7%	
	Withdrawn	76	8%	59	6%	65	7%	200	7%	
	Missing	1	0%	1	0%	3	0%	5	0%	
	Total Students	991		963		876		2,830		
Year 2	Award	33	5%	64	8%	82	10%	179	8%	
	Progress	432	69%	574	76%	622	74%	1,628	74%	
	RYA/Continuing	110	18%	83	11%	93	11%	286	13%	
	Interrupt	8	1%	15	2%	11	1%	34	2%	
	Fail	17	3%	3	0%	5	1%	25	1%	
	Withdrawn	22	4%	15	2%	23	3%	60	3%	
	Missing			1	0%	1	0%	2	0%	
	Total Students	622		755		837		2,214		
Year 3	Award	101	84%	104	80%	107	36%	312	57%	
	Progress					149	50%	149	27%	
	RYA/Continuing	15	13%	21	16%	26	9%	62	16%	
	Interrupt	4	3%	4	3%	6	2%	14	3%	
	Fail					1	0%	1	0%	
	Withdrawn			1	1%	5	2%	6	2%	
	Missing					2	1%	2	0%	
	Total Students	120		130		296		546		
Year 4	Award	367	86%	346	84%	554	91%	1,267	87%	
	Progress	1	0%	3	1%	6	1%	10	1%	
	RYA/Continuing	43	10%	51	12%	37	6%	131	9%	
	Interrupt	10	2%	5	1%	10	2%	25	2%	
	Fail	2	0%			1	0%	3	0%	
	Withdrawn	6	1%	6	1%	2	0%	14	1%	
	Missing									
	Total Students	429		411		610		1,450		
Year 5	Award	1	100%			4	100%	5	100%	
	Progress									
	RYA/Continuing									
	Interrupt									
	Fail									
	Withdrawn									
	Missing									
	Total Students	1				4		5		

	10/11		11/12		12/13		Students	Percent	Award Classification Key: (Faculty average over 3 years) 1st < 10% 2:1 < 45% 2:2 < 40% 3rd > 5%
	Students	Percent	Students	Percent	Students	Percent			
First	86	16%	94	16%	132	16%	312	16%	
Upper Second	190	35%	160	27%	278	34%	628	32%	
Lower Second	167	31%	147	25%	199	24%	513	26%	
Third	45	8%	41	7%	52	6%	138	7%	
Unclassified	20	4%	17	3%	17	2%	54	3%	
Not known/Other Award	35	6%	140	23%	144	18%	319	16%	
Total	543		599		822		1,964		

London South Bank University

PMR Course(s) Progression Analysis Report

HSC (First Degree, Full Time) progression

		10/11		11/12		12/13		Total Students	Average	Data shows progression of students for last three academic years with the average of the three years. Highlighted are the areas that have not reached the average of the Faculty progression over the past 3 years, shown in the key below. For courses that are longer than 3 years, the L3(L6) benchmarks are used. Key: Year 1 <70% Year 2 <75% Year 3 <90%
		Students	Percent	Students	Percent	Students	Percent			
Year 1	Award	85	19%	79	8%	85	9%	249	11%	
	Progress	286	63%	712	71%	615	68%	1,613	68%	
	RYA/Continuing	15	3%	37	4%	11	1%	63	3%	
	Interrupt	12	3%	46	5%	22	2%	80	3%	
	Fail	27	6%	74	7%	66	7%	167	7%	
	Withdrawn	22	5%	52	5%	56	6%	130	6%	
	Missing	8	2%	1	0%	51	6%	60	3%	
	Total Students	455		1,001		906		2,362		
Year 2	Award	40	14%	28	9%	32	4%	100	8%	
	Progress	196	70%	226	75%	479	64%	901	76%	
	RYA/Continuing	5	2%	16	5%	18	2%	39	3%	
	Interrupt	15	5%	11	4%	25	3%	51	4%	
	Fail	17	6%	15	5%	25	3%	57	5%	
	Withdrawn	6	2%	5	2%	22	3%	33	3%	
	Missing					143	19%	143	11%	
	Total Students	279		301		744		1,324		
Year 3	Award	247	80%	292	80%	316	73%	855	83%	
	Progress	7	2%	6	2%	6	1%	19	2%	
	RYA/Continuing	43	14%	52	14%	28	6%	123	12%	
	Interrupt	4	1%	11	3%	11	3%	26	3%	
	Fail	3	1%	4	1%	6	1%	13	1%	
	Withdrawn					3	1%	3	0%	
	Missing	4	1%			65	15%	69	6%	
	Total Students	308		365		435		1,108		
Year 4	Award					4	40%	4	40%	
	Progress			6	100%			6	100%	
	RYA/Continuing					5	50%	5	50%	
	Interrupt									
	Fail									
	Withdrawn									
	Missing					1	10%	1	10%	
	Total Students			6		10		16		

	10/11		11/12		12/13		Students	Percent	Award Classification Key: (Faculty average over 3 years) 1st < 10% 2:1 < 45% 2:2 < 40% 3rd > 5%
	Students	Percent	Students	Percent	Students	Percent			
First	61	16%	75	19%	64	15%	200	17%	
Upper Second	128	34%	165	41%	199	46%	492	41%	
Lower Second	124	33%	101	25%	128	29%	353	29%	
Third	19	5%	26	7%	18	4%	63	5%	
Unclassified	6	2%	9	2%	14	3%	29	2%	
Not known/Other Award	34	9%	23	6%	14	3%	71	6%	
Total	372		399		437		1,208		

	PAPER NO: EC.06(14)	
Board/Committee:	Educational Character Committee	
Date:	12 th February 2014	
Paper title:	Report on Undergraduate Student Progression	
Author:	Registry/Phil Cardew	
Executive sponsor:	Phil Cardew	
Recommendation by the Executive:	To note the report – action on points raised through progression (at course and department level) is carried through Annual Monitoring and Quarterly meeting processes.	
Aspect of the Corporate Plan to which this will help deliver?	Student Success	
Matter previously considered by:	Annual Monitoring and Quarterly Meeting processes	On: September-November 2013
Further approval required?	N/A	On:
Communications – who should be made aware of the decision?	N/A – the information is widely shared amongst academic staff (and with students via Course Committees)	

Executive Summary

1. Context:

Key measures of success for the University are progression and achievement.

Progression signifies the successful completion of a level of an academic course in order to qualify for the next (this may or may not be after re-take of individual elements of assessment). We do not count within 'progression' those students who are required to re-take a higher proportion of their course again (who classify as 'repeat year with attendance' (RYA) – though this may not signify the need to re-take all elements).

Thus, if the accompanying overview tables are examined, there are four main categories of result:

1. **Award/Progress;** which indicates successful progression or completion, with nothing more required of the student.
2. **RYA/Continuing;** which indicates that the student may progress after completing additional work.
3. **Interrupt:** the student has either interrupted studies themselves (or been interrupted by the University) - usually as a result of serious personal difficulties or illness (increasingly, visa issues are playing a part here) – which means that

they are counselled to take some time out, rather than fall further behind in their studies.

4. **Fail/Withdrawn/Missing:** the student has either failed irrevocably (usually due to the level of failure and the number of attempts at a module, which preclude re-sit), withdrawn, or has missing elements of the profile which make an examination board decision impossible (applies to only a handful of students each year).

Thus, in terms of students actually, finally, leaving the University, it is the 'fail' and 'withdraw' categories that give an absolute figure, each year. However, we concentrate on 'award/progress' as the key measure, as experience and analysis suggests that high levels of referral often lead to further problems (they are increasingly indicative of a student with severe personal difficulties who finds these insurmountable, despite support) and that students who are 'repeat year attend' have a higher propensity to fail at a later stage.

For this reason, the University concentrates on 'award' and 'progress' as the key monitoring measures, with progression particularly focused upon full-time undergraduate progression at the end of their first year of study (level 4 to level 5, in terms of the *Framework for Higher Education Qualifications*), where we have the most significant issues. Whilst achievement is monitored (particularly in respect of first class and upper-second-class awards, which are counted within league tables as 'good degrees') we are wary of setting targets in this area, lest they present an inherent threat to the standards of our awards.

2. Monitoring progression and achievement:

Marks are confirmed by examination boards, which are held at different times of the year, depending on the duration and mode of the course (for example courses within Health and Social Care, some of which have January starts, do not feature within the tables attached to this report, as their examination boards are only just being held, similarly, there are 'calendar year' postgraduate programmes which have examination boards later in the cycle).

For most full-time undergraduate courses, the main examination board 'season' will take place during the summer, with main boards in early July, and re-sits boards in early September. There are two levels of board:

1. **Subject Area Boards:** which confirm the marks awarded within each module, taking into account both internal moderation and the advice of external examiners.
2. **Award and Progression Boards:** which process the outputs from Subject Area Boards, and ensure appropriate application of the University's regulations (around maximum numbers of attempts, up-grade at boundary, or the application of extenuation, for example) and any professional requirements that may need to be taken into consideration (the Joint Academic Stage Board, for Law – for

example – will only permit a maximum of three attempts at assessment, whilst the University regulations permit four [assessment, re-assessment and repeat of the module, with a further opportunity for re-assessment]).

There is also a (limited) opportunity for actions by the Chair of the examination board (Chairs' Actions) following either stage, to include missing marks or deal with issues that emerge during a board. These are monitored at University level, through reports submitted to the Academic Registrar by faculties.

Once results are confirmed, they are included within our 'Cognos' data warehouse, which enables a series of standard reports (summaries of which are attached to this report) to be utilised within the Annual Monitoring process at departmental level (within which course directors are asked to comment on progression and achievement and note any issues which may be addressed through action planning). The standard reports from 'Cognos' are also utilised within the first 'quarterly meeting' of the year, chaired by the Vice Chancellor, which discusses progression and achievement (as well as student satisfaction, through the National Student Survey and Module Evaluation Questionnaire reports) at departmental level. In all cases, progression and achievement are not considered as 'stand alone' measures, but alongside other aspects of student satisfaction.

3. Actions taken at University level as a result of monitoring:

Each year, Academic Regulations Committee considers systemic issues within the Regulations which either hamper success, or provide areas of difficulty within progression (which are not simply as a result of failure). In recent years, this has led to a standardisation of 'upgrade' regulations (the point at which a student is considered for upgrade between award boundaries) and a clear limit on the number of attempts at assessment (even where extenuating circumstances represent chronic difficulty). The regulations have also been amended to allow the University to interrupt a student, where we consider that to be in the student's best interests (as a result of repeated extenuation, for example) where, hitherto, interruption was only at the request of the student.

As a part of the 'Full and Successful Transition' strand of the Student Transition and Retention programme of work, we have a project which is looking at the worst-performing (and the best-performing) 10 modules in each faculty, in terms of progression, analysing module satisfaction, external examiner comment, module guides and learning materials, reading lists and virtual learning environment materials, to understand whether there are clear links between the students' learning experiences and their success.

It is clear, from work across the sector, that one of the most significant factors impacting upon successful progression is the engagement of the student with their course (or module). Thus, the imperative, from a University perspective, remains to increase student engagement (the main focus of our Academic Strategy) and to identify

weakness at an early stage, to provide effective support soon enough to have a positive impact.

4. Progression and Achievement Statistics 2012/13

Comments on UG progression

Year 1 (L4) and Year 2 (L5) progression for full time first degree courses all faculties

	10/11	11/12	12/13
Year 1 (L4) progression	60%	65%	64%
Year 2 (L5) progression	72%	78%	74%

Source: Cognos PAT reports

(N.B. overall statistics not complete due to HSC January start courses)

Overall, Level 4 progression has dropped by one percent this year, though this may still be positively-impacted by the inclusion of January-start courses within the Faculty of Health and Social Care (which are always better than in other faculties). This makes year-on-year comparison difficult as for 10/11 and 11/12 we are including the complete HSC results. First-year progression results in the faculties of Business and Engineering, Science and the Built Environment have been disappointing this year, perhaps reflecting a difficult recruitment year in 2012.

The progression targets at Level 4 and 5 remain 75% and 80%, respectively, though 65% at Level 4 remains the measure included at the end of the current 5-year forecast to HEFCE (so in terms of budget planning, we remain ahead of schedule).

(N.B.: In all cases, progression and award statistics at year 3 and above, for the current year, are misleading, at this stage, as they will not include students who are completing work in the first semester of the following year).

5. Arts and Human Sciences

5.1 Overall in AHS the percentage of students awarded a first class honours degree has increased from 10/11 to 12/13 from 5% to 8%, the percentage being awarded a 2:1 or 2:2 has remained fairly constant.

5.2 Overall there was an increase in 1st year progression from 64% in 10/11 to 66% in 12/13.

Areas for concern

- 5.3 In 12/13 no women were awarded a first class honours degree, there was an increase in the percentage of women being awarded 2:2 and 3rd class honours degrees.
- 5.4 In 10/11, 11/12 and 12/13 no minority ethnic students were awarded a first class honours degree.
- 5.5 No students who are disabled (i.e. Disabled Students Allowance (DSA) Not Known, no DSA or in receipt of DSA) were awarded first class honours degrees, however, these students are a very small percentage of overall student numbers in AHS.

Positives

- 5.6 100% of students in the 21 and under category were awarded a 2:1 or a first class honours degree. This is an improvement from 11/12 when they were being awarded 2:1, 2:2 and third class honours degrees.
- 5.7 There was an increase in 12/13 in the percentage of 1st year progression for both men and women and all minority ethnic groups.
- 5.8 There was also an increase in the percentage of 2nd year progression for women.

6. Business

- 6.1 Overall in BUS the percentage of students awarded a first class honours degree and a 2:1 has increased.
- 6.2 Whilst the percentage of year 1 student progression has remained fairly constant and there has been a slight increase in the percentage of 2nd year progression, year 1 progression continues to be a challenge in the Business Faculty.

Areas for concern

- 6.3 There has been a decrease from 11/12 to 12/13 in the 1st year progression percentage for disabled students (i.e. Disabled Students Allowance (DSA) Not Known, no DSA or in receipt of DSA), however, these students are a very small percentage of overall student numbers in BUS.

Positives

6.4 There has been an increase in the percentage of 1st year progression for those in the age group 21 or under, however there has been a decrease for all other age groups.

6.5 The percentage of 1st year progression for minority ethnic and gender groups has remained fairly constant.

7. Engineering, Science and the Built Environment

7.1 Overall in ESBE the percentage of students awarded first class honours degrees has remained fairly constant. There has been a slight increase in students being awarded a 2:1 from 27% in 11/12 to 34% in 12/13.

7.2 Progression at the end of the first year has dropped back from the marked improvement in 2011/12, but still remains above 2010/11 figures.

7.3 There are no other statistically significant elements upon which to comment.

8. Health and Social Care

8.1 The data for HSC for 12/13 is not yet complete as students are still being awarded on non-standard year courses, therefore there are no comments on progression are provided for this faculty.

	PAPER NO: EC.07(14)	
Board/Committee:	Educational Character Committee	
Date:	12 th February 2014	
Paper title:	Report to Educational Character Committee: Student complaints and the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (the OIA), February 2014	
Author:	Dr Keely Fisher, Student Complaints Officer (interim)	
Executive sponsor:	Phil Cardew, Pro Vice Chancellor (Academic) James Stevenson, University Secretary and Clerk to the Board	
Recommendation by the Executive:	That the Committee notes the report	
Aspect of the Corporate Plan to which this will help deliver?	Improved student satisfaction and enhanced reputation of LSBU	
Matter previously considered by:	Circulated to key faculty stakeholders	January 2014
Further approval required?	N/A	N/A
Communications – who should be made aware of the decision?	Key faculty stakeholders	

Executive Summary

The attached report will form a chapter of the Academic Board's Annual Report, to be considered by the Board in July 2014.

The key matters that the Committee should note are:

- for 2012-13 there were 118 internal complaints (120 in 2011-12); and 124 OIA cases (81 in 2011-12).
- The University is scheduled to visit the Deputy Adjudicator at the OIA's office in Reading in February 2014 to discuss all current issues and best practice.
- From January 2014 the OIA have introduced a new points-based funding model to supplement their annual, core subscription rate; with each point worth £200.
- This academic year 2013-14, the University will take advantage of the OIA's concession of allowing us to offset compensation against a student's outstanding debts.

Report to Educational Character Committee: Student complaints and the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (the OIA), February 2014

Contents

1. Internal Complaints: 2012-13 and 2011-12
2. OIA Complaints: 2012-13 and 2011-12
3. Trends in complaints and OIA cases 2012-13 and 2011-12
4. This year, 2013-14
5. 2013-14: the OIA's Recommendations – next steps

1. Internal Complaints: 2012-13 and 2011-12

Internal Complaints and their outcomes 2012-13

2012-13	LSBU	HSC	AHS	ESBE	BUS
Total volume of Complaints	118	30	40	34	14
No decision required	11	5	4	2	0
Upheld	24	2	12	9	1
Reject	45	12	12	13	80
Internal Referral	21	6	7	5	3
Partly Upheld	17	5	5	5	2

Internal Complaints and their outcomes 2011-12

2011-12	LSBU	HSC	AHS	ESBE	BUS
Total volume of Complaints	120	18	35	45	22
No decision required	19	3	6	6	4
Upheld	18	2	6	6	4
Reject	44	8	15	15	6
Internal Referral	27	2	8	10	7
Partly Upheld	12	3	0	8	1

Internal Complaints by subject matter 2012-13

2012-13	LSBU	HSC	AHS	ESBE	BUS
Total volume of Complaints	118	30	40	34	14
Academic	55	14	22	13	6
Administration	14	5	2	6	1
Member of Staff	4	1	1	2	0
Other	6	2	3	1	0
Finance	11	1	5	0	5
Fees	13	3	2	7	1
Accommodation	1	1	0	0	0
Access	1	0	0	0	1
Appeal	4	0	2	2	0
Suspension	2	0	2	0	0
Disabilities	6	3	1	2	0

Internal Complaints by subject matter 2011-12

2011-12	LSBU	HSC	AHS	ESBE	BUS
Total volume of Complaints	120	18	35	34	22
Academic	56	8	19	13	9
Finance	21	3	4	6	4
Outside remit	3	1	1	2	0
Member of Staff	9	4	1	1	2
Exam Board	2	1	1	0	0
Fees	12	0	4	7	2
Administration	11	0	3	0	4
Accommodation	1	0	0	0	0
Other	3	0	2	2	0
Visa	1	0	0	0	1

2. OIA Complaints: 2012-13 and 2011-12

OIA Complaints 2012-13

OIA 2012-13	LSBU	HSC	AHS	ESBE	BUS
Total volume of Complaints	124	59	28	23	14
Justified	12	3	5	3	1
Partly Justified	12	7	3	2	0
Not Justified	70	38	13	9	10
No Case	16	5	4	6	1
Suspended/ Settled	5	0	2	1	2
Ongoing	9	6	1	2	0

OIA Complaints 2011-12

OIA 2011-12	LSBU	HSC	AHS	ESBE	BUS
Total volume of Complaints	81	38	18	13	12
Justified	10	6	4	0	0
Partly Justified	11	4	4	1	2
Not Justified	52	24	8	10	10
No case	8	4	2	2	0

OIA Complaints compared 2012-13 and 2011-12

	2012-13	2011-12
LSBU	124 (100%)	81 (100%)
HSC	59 (48%)	38 (47%)
AHS	23 (23%)	18 (22%)
ESBE	23 (18%)	13 (16%)
BUS	14 (11%)	12 (15%)

OIA Complaint Outcomes for LSBU 2012-13 and 2011-12

	2012-13	2011-12
Total volume	124 (100%)	81 (100 %)
Justified	12 (10%)	10 (12 %)
Partly Justified	12 (10%)	11 (14 %)
Not Justified	70 (56%)	52 (64 %)
No Case	16 (13%)	8 (10 %)
Suspended/ Settled	5 (4%)	0
Ongoing	9 (4%)	0

OIA Complaints per Faculty

OIA Complaint Outcomes for HSC 2012-13 and 2011-12

HSC	2012-13	2011-12
Complaint volume	59 (100%)	38 (100%)
Justified	3 (5%)	6 (16%)
Partly Justified	7 (12%)	4 (10.5%)
Not Justified	38 (64%)	24 (63%)
Suspended/ Settled	0	0
No Case	5 (9%)	4 (10.5%)
Ongoing	6 (10%)	0

OIA Complaint Outcomes for AHS 2012-13 and 2011-12

AHS	2012-13	2011-12
Complaint volume	28 (100%)	18 (100%)
Justified	5 (18%)	4 (22%)
Partly Justified	3 (11%)	4 (22%)
Not Justified	13 (46%)	8 (45%)
Suspended/ Settled	2 (7%)	0
No Case	4 (14%)	2 (11%)
Ongoing	1 (4%)	0

OIA Complaint Outcomes for ESBE 2012-13 and 2011-12

ESBE	2012-13	2011-12
Complaint volume	23 (100%)	13 (100%)
Justified	3 (13%)	0
Partly Justified	2 (9%)	1 (8%)
Not Justified	9 (39%)	10 (77%)
Suspended/ Settled	1 (4%)	0
No Case	6 (26%)	2 (15%)
Ongoing	2 (9%)	0

OIA Complaint Outcomes for BUS 2012-13 and 2011-12

BUS	2012-13	2011-12
Complaint volume	14 (100%)	12 (100%)
Justified	1 (7%)	0
Partly Justified	0	2 (17%)
Not Justified	10 (71%)	10 (83%)
Suspended/ Settled	2 (14%)	0
No Case	1 (4%)	0
Ongoing	0	0

3. Trends in complaints and OIA cases 2012-13 and 2011-12

3.1 OIA complaints over the past academic years 2011-12 and 2012-13

If a student wishes to take a complaint to the OIA, they must first demonstrate that they have exhausted the complaints and appeals procedures at local, university level. The issue of a Completion of Procedures letter to a student is proof that university-level resolution has come to an end. The OIA therefore stipulate that a student must produce a Completion of Procedures letter from their university before the OIA can begin any investigation of a student complaint. Student complaints that reach the OIA are not only the formal student complaints that are submitted and investigated internally by the University: the majority relate to formal student appeals that have reached the end of the LSBU's internal process.

For the academic year 2012-13 (1 August 2012 to 31 July 2013), LSBU issued 506 Completion of Procedures letters (501 by the Academic Registry, 5 by the Legal Team); for 2011-12, LSBU issued 397 (389 by the Academic Registry, 8 by the Legal Team).

Comparing complaints from 2011-12 with 2012-13: the OIA's case turnover for LSBU went up 53% from 81 to 124. Faculty-specific: the volume of complaints about HSC is up 55% (from 38 to 59); AHS is up 55% (from 18 to 28); BUS is up 16% (from 12 to 14); and ESBE up 56.5%, from (13 to 23).¹

The proportional spread of complaints across the 4 faculties has remained stable – HSC continues to have the highest volume of complaints (48% in 2012-13; 47% in 2011-12);² and the proportions for each type of complaint finding remain (more or less) stable too. In 2012-13, the OIA found 10% 'Justified' and 56% 'Not Justified' LSBU complaint investigations; in 2011-12, they found 12% 'Justified' and 64% 'Not Justified'.

A new development during 2012-13 is the OIA's increasing use of intervention at the assessment stage of their complaint handling in order to 'settle' cases. This is a mediatory role, and seeks to resolve complaints between universities and students from the start, if possible.³ This is an emerging and positive trend for the OIA in their resolution processes; the benefit being that if OIA mediation provides a successful outcome, the OIA can suspend their investigation, mark their case as successfully settled, and the need to write up a costly, time-consuming complaint report is obviated. In 2012-13, 4% of the OIA's cases on LSBU were settled in this way; there were no such settlement interventions the previous year.

4. This year, 2013-14

The majority of OIA complaints about LSBU over the past two years are 'Not Justified' – implications

The majority outcome for OIA's cases about LSBU does remain 'Not Justified': 56% of complaints were 'Not Justified' in 2012-13; and 64% in 2011-12. However, we cannot rest on our laurels. There must be continuous improvement in how the University manages student complaints at all levels. During 2014-15, in order to encourage continuous improvement, the Student Complaints Officer will provide guidance and training to all Faculty and University staff involved in the student complaints and appeals processes to follow best practice guidelines.

¹ ESBE: from nil 'Justified' findings in 2011-12, to 13% 'Justified' findings about ESBE complaints in 2012-13. And in the other direction: in 2011-12 the OIA found 'Not Justified' in 77% of ESBE cases; yet only 39% 'Not Justified' findings for the 2012-13 ESBE caseload. ESBE also generates the highest volume of ineligible complaints to the OIA: there was 'no case' found in 26% of the ESBE caseload in 2012-13, and 15% 'no case' submissions in 2011-12.

² The majority of OIA complaints about HSC are, however, found to be 'Not Justified': 64% in 2012-13; 63% in 2011-12.

³ Changes in the OIA's approach to early resolution are discussed in the OIA's *Annual Report 2012*, pp. 4 and 7-8.

4.1 OIA costs will increase

We must keep in mind the OIA's new points-based funding model, which took effect at the beginning of calendar-year 2014.⁴ From 1 January 2014, not only will we be charged for the core annual subscription rate of £44,001 for the OIA's service, but also pay for each point we accrue above the 59 points we're awarded each year (59 is the amount allowed for each university in Sector F of the OIA's scheme).

The points system works as follows: for any student complaint submitted to the OIA that they decline as ineligible for further investigation, we are charged one point. For any case that is seen through to their issue of an investigative report, which the OIA call their 'Complaint Outcome', we are charged three points – no matter whether the complaint about us be 'Justified', 'Partly Justified', or 'Not Justified'. Once we have reached our limit of 59 points, the OIA will charge us for each further point we accrue during that year, at the current price of £200 a point.

Judging on our current performances over the last two years, the OIA's new pricing system would have cost LSBU, beyond the core subscription charge, a further £33,600 in 2011-12;⁵ and £55,200 in 2012-3.⁶ So in applying the 16.4% increase evident between these two calculations, we may expect a bill in the region of £64,252 for 2013-14 (beyond the core subscription of £44,001; thus a bill for c. £108,253). Bear in mind too that the price of each point has already gone up – from £200 (for 2014) to £210 (for 2015) – since the OIA's new charging scheme was originally announced.⁷ Therefore, it is crucially important this year to identify and action how we might **reasonably militate against** any complaint being sent to the OIA, be it justified, partly justified or not justified in the least. Because regardless of any sense of moral high ground in that the majority of complaints about us are 'Not Justified', financially, we are 'hanged for a sheep as a lamb' – each complaint to reach the report-writing stage has a going rate of £600 (£630 in 2015).

4.2 'Justified' and 'Partly Justified' Complaint Outcomes – areas for improvement

The majority of 'Justified' and 'Partly Justified' decisions require us to give students a second chance – for an appeal hearing, to submit an application to an Extenuating Circumstances panel (in cases of ill health or personal catastrophes), or to retake assessments or resit examinations. Hence the majority of recommendations in these two outcome categories advise that a fresh panel be reconvened – 9 of the 12 'Justified' cases; 6 of the 12 'Partly

⁴ Fully discussed in 'Question 5: OIA funding model' of the OIA's report *Pathway 3 – Towards early resolution and more effective complaints handling* (October, 2012), pp. 35-42; and announced in the OIA's *Annual Report 2012*: 'From 2014 a small case-related element will be included in the subscription system. The amount universities will pay will depend partly on the number of complaints referred to the OIA in 2013. This is part of the OIA's work to encourage and incentivise universities to deal with complaints internally' (p. 10).

⁵ 73 cases to report stage (therefore 3 points each), 8 'no case' (1 point each). Thus: $(219 + 8 - 59) \times £200 = £33,600$.

⁶ 103 cases to report stage (including those ongoing, at 3 points each), 5 suspended/settled (2 points each), 16 'no case' (1 point each). Thus: $(309 + 10 + 16 - 59) \times £200 = £55,200$.

⁷ The increase per point from £200 to £210 was published in an OIA letter to Prof. Martin Earwicker from Ben Elger, Chief Operating Officer, of 18 December 2013.

Justified’– albeit that the outcome of the newly convened panel for a complainant is never prescribed by the OIA.⁸

‘Justified’ and ‘Partly Justified’ outcomes also come with recommendations for compensation; and as in former years, HSC still pays out the most (£95,750 for 2012-13 – one case alone cost HSC £80,000 in compensation). Overall, in 2012-13, 12 ‘Justified’ OIA complaints about LSBU recommended compensation payments totalling £102,940; and 17 ‘Partly Justified’ cases recommended compensation totalling £12,900; so the total amount of compensation paid out by LSBU for 2012-13 was £115,840. Interestingly, the greater proportion of cases recommending compensation payments are the ‘Partly Justified’ variety – and often to compensate for ‘distress and inconvenience’ the student has suffered on account of our administrative errors and poor communication (3 ‘Justified’; 5 ‘Partly Justified’ instances for 2012-13).⁹ AHS paid more money in compensation for ‘Partly Justified’ complaints (£7,850) than it did for ‘Justified’ cases (£5,690).

5. 2013-14: the OIA’s Recommendations – next steps

5.1 Best practice and the PwC report

The OIA’s Deputy Adjudicator, Felicity Mitchell, identified three major issues in her Promotion of Good Practice letter to LSBU of 13 June 2013. The OIA’s letter drew attention to areas of our administrative handling of complaints and appeals that were not up to the standards of best practice. The first: that minute-taking of panel meetings was handwritten and limited in scope; where best practice would have panel minutes word-processed and specifically record those present at the panel, along with their roles and all decisions taken and documents submitted. The second was about extenuating circumstances claims and the need for clearer communications from Faculty to student during that process. The third point concerned the lack of evidence that the University provides any guidance or update information to students during the processes of extenuating circumstances or appeals; where best practice would have the University keep the students informed on their progress and provided with guidance in relation to outcomes.

These three areas of practice were therefore the focus of the PwC internal audit report 2013-14 in relation to ‘Extenuating Circumstances, Academic Appeals & other processes that could result in a student complaint to the OIA’ and the operating effectiveness of our complaint handling. A full report on the actions recommended by PwC in their internal audit report will come to the Audit Committee of 12 June 2014.

5.2 Work on complaints has continued

During November-December 2013, the Student Complaints Officer had meetings with each Faculty to discuss all the issues raised by the OIA Good Practice letter and the PwC internal report. The Pro Deans, Heads of Department, Faculty Managers and administrative support staff of each Faculty now understand that the University aims to resolve all internal

⁸ These actions are addressed in response to the PwC report with regard to Appeals and Extenuating Circumstances submissions.

⁹ ‘Distress and inconvenience’ compensation totalled £2,250 in the 3 ‘Justified’ cases; and £2,750 in the 5 ‘Partly Justified’.

complaints informally at Stage 1; and that a sufficiently senior member of staff is to lead on these resolutions. In the light of the restructuring of Faculties into Schools scheduled for 2014, it was agreed that Pro Deans, Heads of Department and Faculty Managers designated by the Pro Deans were all suitable for this role.

Each Faculty was enthusiastic about the variety of refresher courses planned for 2014. These courses will address best practice in complaint handling, related issues raised under the Equality Act 2010, and advise on procedures to be followed in the complaints process (disciplinary versus fitness to practise procedures, for example). The resources identified for these courses are PowerPoint presentations and guidance publications that are readily available on the OIA and Quality Assurance Agency websites (the OIA use the Quality Assurance Agency's *The UK Quality Code for Higher Education* as the standard in determining the outcomes of their investigations).¹⁰ Further, the Academic Registrars' Council's Student Complaints and Appeals Practitioner Group has published guidance on best practice in managing academic appeals and extenuating circumstances.¹¹ The OIA do not have a best practice framework of their own, so the Faculty presentations will be augmented by best practice frameworks published by the Office of the Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman, which will cover the principles of good administration, of complaint handling, and of remedying upheld complaints.¹²

None of the Faculty points of contact considers the current deadlines for the internal complaints system to be unworkable; the 20-working-day turnaround for Stage 1 complaints is considered more than adequate, and within this system provision is already in place to allow for extra time during busy exam periods or holidays.

To improve communications to students, as regards keeping students informed of the progress of their complaints and appeals, it has been agreed that Faculties will feed back on progress to the Student Complaints Officer and to students individually; and that the role of the Student Complaints Officer will become more involved in communications with students and in proactive liaison with Student Services.

5.3 Payment of compensation – set-off of debt

Beyond the promotion of best practice, future collaboration and improved communication between staff and students, LSBU is also to take advantage of a concession offered by the OIA that we have not tried before. In the OIA's publication *The OIA's approach to remedies and redress* (March, 2013), the OIA states that it will allow universities to offset compensation payments they recommend against a student's outstanding fees:

'If the student has accepted that tuition fees are owing, or if the OIA has determined that they are, then it may well be reasonable for the university to deduct the outstanding fees from any compensation recommended by the OIA ... The university

¹⁰ See the OIA: www.oiahe.org.uk/guidance-good-practice-and-events.aspx; and the QAA: www.qaa.ac.uk/assuringstandardsandquality/quality-code/Pages/default.aspx.

¹¹ ARC, *A Reference Document on Academic Appeals and Extenuating Circumstances for University Practitioners (Primarily for Taught Students)* (April, 2011), downloadable at: www.arc.ac.uk/uploadedfiles/documents/ARCAppealsExtCircs.pdf.

¹² See www.ombudsman.org.uk/improving-public-service/ombudsmansprinciples.

will have an opportunity to ask whether it can set off a debt against recommended compensation when it comments on the practicalities of the Recommendations made in the Draft Formal Decision or Preliminary Decision. If appropriate, the OIA can then ask the student whether or not there is a dispute about the debt.¹³

LSBU's first request to the OIA for us to offset compensation against a student's outstanding debt is still pending. In future, we hope that this service might discourage students from submitting ill-founded complaints to the OIA too.

There is a scheduled visit to the OIA offices in Reading for 13 February 2014, where all relevant and current issues will be discussed.

The complaints team, where possible, has face-to-face time with aggrieved students (either by inviting them in to meetings or arranging skype video conferences), to help them classify their complaints properly in the first instance. This, too, will facilitate early resolution in the internal complaints process, in line with the requirements of internal audit and the wishes of the Executive.

Dr Keely Fisher
Student Complaints Officer (interim)
February 2014

¹³ OIA, *The OIA's approach to remedies and redress* (March, 2013), p. 16.

Agenda item EC.08(14)

Papers to follow