University of Reading

PERIODIC REVIEW: PRE-EXPERIENCE POSTGRADUATE PROGRAMMES IN THE HENLEY BUSINESS SCHOOL

Introduction

1. An internal review of Postgraduate Pre-experience programmes in Henley Business School was held on 28 and 29 March. The members of the Panel were:
   - Dr Alan Howard *(Chair: School of Archaeology, Geography and Environmental Science)*
   - Professor Daniella Acker *(External Panellists: University of Bristol)*
   - Professor David Boughey *(External Panellists: University of Essex)*
   - Dr Karen Sieracki *(Industrial Panellists: KASPAR Associated)*
   - Dr Karen Ayres *(Internal Panellist: School of Mathematical, Physical and Computational Sciences)*
   - Dr Chiara Cirillo *(Internal Panellist: International Study and Language Institute)*
   - Mr Jack Gillum *(Student Panellist: School of Politics, Economics and International Relations)*

2. The Panel met the following:
   - Prof Ginny Gibson *(Deputy Dean)*
   - Dr Martin Bicknell *(School Director of Teaching and Learning)*
   - Professor Peter Miskell *(Head of Postgraduate Programmes (Pre-Experience))*
   - Dr Lucy Newton *(Director of Studies: International Business and Strategy)*
   - Prof Adrian Bell *(Head of Section: ICMA Centre)*
   - Prof Yelena Kalyuzhnova *(Director of Studies: Leadership, Organisations and Behaviour)*
   - Prof Keiichi Nakata *(Head of Section: Business Informatics, Systems and Accounting)*
   - Prof Nada Kakabadse *(Head of Section: Marketing and Reputation)*
   - Mr Eamonn D'arcy *(Programme Area Director: Real Estate and Planning)*
   - Dr Renata Stenka *(Programme Area Director: Accounting)*
   - Dr Yin Leng Tan *(Programme Area Director: Informatics)*
   - Prof Andrew Godley *(Head of Section: Leadership, Organisation and Behaviour)*
   - Dr Angelique Chettiparambil *(Director of Studies: Real Estate and Planning)*
   - Dr Marrisa Joseph *(Senior Tutor: Business and Management)*
   - Dr Jong Min Lee *(Lecturer: International Business and Strategy)*
   - Dr Jorn van de Wetering *(Lecturer: Real Estate and Planning)*
   - Dr Weizi Li *(Lecturer: Business Finance)*
   - Miss Naeema Pasha *(Head of Careers Services)*
   - Mrs Imogen Watson *(Programme Area Manager: Pre-Experience Postgraduate Programmes)*
   - Mrs Laura Johnstone *(Programme Co-ordinator: ICMA Centre)*
   - Mrs Hayley Son *(Postgraduate Programme Administrator: Business Management and Accounting)*
   - Miss Katie Brincat *(Postgraduate Programme Manager: Real Estate and Planning)*
   - Miss Meena Gurung *(Programme Administrator: Business Informatics, Systems and Accounting)*

3. The Panel met students who represented the following degree programmes:
   - MSc Financial Risk Management

- MSc in International Securities, Investment and Banking
- MSc in Real Estate
- MSc in Real Estate Finance
- MSc Business Technology Consulting
- MSc Information Management (Big Data in Business)
- MSc Accounting and International Management
- MSc in International Management

4. The Panel also met recent graduates who had graduated from the following degree programmes between 2014 and 2016:
    - MSc in Development Planning
    - MSc in International Shipping and Finance
    - MSc Information Management and Systems
    - MSc in Real Estate

General observations

5. The Review Panel held face-to-face meetings with a diverse range of staff from across the School over the course of the Review. Staff were fully engaged with the review process and provided the Panel with a welcoming environment within which to work. The Review Panel benefitted from a detailed and well-organised Blackboard organisation, which was invaluable in reviewing the School's activities. Any requests for additional materials or information during the course of the Review were met with alacrity. The Panel extends its thanks to all staff involved in the Review and in the development (and maintenance) of the Blackboard organisation.

6. The Panel was very impressed by the quality and level of engagement of the students and alumni who they met over the course of the Review. The Panel thanks the students they met, and those who contributed to the Student Submission, for their valuable input into the Review. The Panel felt that the students and alumni were a credit to the School and to the University as a whole.

7. The Panel recognised the wide breadth of the School's provision at the postgraduate level. The School is separated into six academic areas (ie departments): Business Informatics, Systems and Accounting (BISA), International Business and Strategy (IBS), ICMA Centre, Leadership, Organisations and Behaviour (LOB), Marketing and Reputation (M&R), and Real Estate and Planning (REP). The School delivers programmes in five programme areas, which can cut across these 'departmental' structures: Accounting, Business and Management, Finance, Informatics, and Real Estate and Planning. Responsibility for the quality assurance of module design and delivery (QME level 1) resides with the 'departmental units', whereas the responsibility for quality assurance of programme design and delivery (QME level 2) resides with the programme areas.

8. The Panel noted the rigorous exercises the School undertakes in maintaining its triple accredited statues with the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), EFMD Quality Improvement System (EQUIS), and the Association of MBAs (AMBA)[1]. Working with these accreditation bodies informs the Schools activities and demonstrates an ongoing commitment to enhancement.

9. The Panel noted previous recommendations from the Sub-Committee on the Delivery and Enhancement of Learning and Teaching that consideration be given to the management of 'larger' Periodic Reviews. Whilst recognising that this review fell into that category (given the spread of academic activities) the Panel felt that there would be no additional benefit in splitting future

---

[1] Additionally, a number of programmes within the School are also accredited by the Chartered Institute of Management Accountants (CIMA, Chartered Institute for Securities and Investment (CISI), Institute of Chartered Shipbrokers (ICS) Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS), Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI), and the Institute of Historic Building Conservation.

reviews into smaller reviews of academic areas (or groupings of academic areas). The Panel felt that there was ample evidence that the School is well-managed and that the academic standards and quality of provision were of a high standard. The Panel noted that the review was not an audit of individual programmes, but rather a health check of the quality and enhancement mechanisms and processes surrounding the those activities. Additionally, the Panel noted that individual programmes received significant scrutiny through the School's interplay with a number of accrediting bodies.

10. The Panel noted that the School had recently undertaken work to rationalise and restructure its portfolio of programmes. These changes had been greeted positively by students and alumni, who had identified that the names of the programmes that they were taking/had taken was important to them and prospective employers.

Academic standards of the programmes

Committee structures

11. Overall the Panel was satisfied that the committee structures within the School were appropriate and in line with University expectations, providing an effective mechanism for the quality management and enhancement of programmes.

12. The Panel considered whether there was a potential risk of the 'Business' and 'Teaching and Learning' stream committees working in silos. The Panel were satisfied that any risks were mitigated against through a shared committee membership (ie key staff operating on both committees) and by the fact that the SDTL Chairs the Programme Portfolio Strategy Sub-Committee.

13. The Panel noted that the Diversity and Inclusion Committee had not yet met, but commends the School on convening the committee and the clear statement that this makes.

14. The Panel found that the minutes of the meetings provided evidence that the committees were satisfactorily fulfilling their responsibilities with regards quality management and enhancement. The Panel noted that the committees give appropriate consideration to eternal examiner reports, NSS and PTES results, annual programme reports, accreditation reports and other management information materials.

Programme design

15. The Panel received and considered programme specifications, module descriptions, programme handbooks, External Examiner reports, and samples of student work and feedback. Additionally, the Panel had the opportunity to speak with staff and students from across the School. On the basis of the Panel's deliberations on this evidence the Panel was able to confirm that the academic standards of the programmes under review were appropriate and that they compared favourably to programmes on offer at other universities

16. The Panel considered that, overall, the degree programmes offered were coherent and of appropriate scope, the Panel found evidence that the School had given significant consideration to the QAA Subject Benchmarks[2] in the design of their curriculum.

17. The Panel felt that the programme design is informed by the School's four broad 'learning goals' (Academic business knowledge and analytical skills; International perspective; Personal development; Awareness of business practice) which neatly align with the 'graduate attributes' developed as part of the University's Curriculum Framework.

---

[2] http://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/Publications/Documents/SBS-Business-and%20Management-15.pdf

18. The Programmes have been designed to meet the requirements of the relevant Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs). For example, the content of Accounting programmes is carefully mapped against the CIMA professional qualification.

19. There are two bodies accrediting programmes across the entirety of the pre-experience postgraduate portfolio: the AACSB and EQUIS. Reviews of provision are conducted by these bodies on a five year cycle, with AACSB visiting in 2015 and EQUIS in 2013. The School submitted a follow-up report to AACSB in 2017 to highlight how they were implementing, and progressing with, the 'Assurance of Learning' system.

20. As well as informing the design of programmes, the 'learning goals' are also tangible measures against which success in the implementation of the Assurance of Learning are assessed. The 'learning goals' are identified with specific 'learning objectives' against which every students progress is measured. This gives a measure of the number of students in each cohort who are attaining the learning objectives.

21. The Panel felt that the accreditation requirements of the various professional bodies, and in particular the 'Assurance of Learning' exercise, make a significant contribution to the quality assurance processes within the School. **[Good practice a]**

22. Overall the Panel was satisfied that the aims and learning outcomes of the programmes under review are aligned with the University's key strategies. This has been achieved through ensuring that programme design is aligned with the Schools own six core ambitions: Being a truly international business school; Excellence of the learning experience; World-class research and thinking; Sense of community and responsibility; Strength of networks; Breadth and depth of relationships with industry.

23. The Panel noted that changes at a modular level are brought to the relevant Programme Area Committees and that broader programme-level changes are brought to the Programme Portfolio Committee. This helps ensure that they align with the Schools strategic objectives before they are submitted the formal approval route.

24. The Panel found evidence that teaching and assessment methods had been designed with care and attention in order to cater to different students' approaches to learning. However, the Panel noted that more effort could be directed towards assessing the suitability, design and management of group work. There are examples of excellent practice in this area, but there are examples of an over reliance on group work in some areas in order to manage expanding student numbers. The Panel felt that there should be better oversight of the use of group work (see also paragraph 33 below).

25. The prevalence of group work as a mode of assessment might be viewed as an example of student expansion driving programme changes. Whilst this does not seem to be the case across the board, the School should be mindful continuing expansion will put increased pressure on resources. The Panel would counsel the School to be mindful of the need to ensure that resources grow at a commensurate rate with student numbers.

26. The Panel was pleased to see evidence through the programmes of an emphasis on global issues. In part, this had been achieved through a globally diverse student body and faculty.

27. The Panel noted the School's concerns about the risks posed by recruiting a high proportion of overseas students from one area (including the challenges around creating a sense of shared culture and issues around differing academic practices and expectations). The Panel felt that some of the issues could be ameliorated through an increase in the pre-sessional training of students from different educational backgrounds in order to induct them into UK academic norms.
[Desirable recommendation f]

28. Whilst noting that the matrix structure nominally affords opportunities for interdisciplinary activities, the Panel wondered if these were being exploited to their full potential. The School's Self Evaluation Document notes that programmes in Business and Management are the only ones to cut across the departments with regards their content. The Panel felt that there could be greater opportunities to exploit the synergies between the disciplines which the School was neglecting. The exploration of these potentially fertile interdisciplinary links could help enhance in the design of the portfolio and provide opportunities for professional development for staff and students. **[Desirable recommendation g]**

Assessment and feedback

29. The Panel was satisfied that the External Examiner's reports verified that the standards achieved by students met the minimum expectations for awards, as measured against the relevant Subject Benchmark Statements and the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications. The Panel noted that the School reflects on the feedback received from External Examiners and welcomes the critical feedback which they offer (whilst also noting that the feedback has been broadly positive). Feedback has helped highlight issues and also reinforce feedback from other students.

30. The Panel noted that there was some variance in practice with regards managing examinations processes, and for liaising with External Examiners, across the Programme Areas. Whilst some Programme Areas have a dedicated Examinations Officer for the postgraduate programmes others rely on a senior academic (with no formal 'examinations' designation) running these processes, with support from individual Programme Area Directors who manage responses to External Examiner reports and associated activities.

31. The Panel was very impressed with the School's use of the 'Assessment of Learning' framework to measure student progression towards the achievement of programme learning outcomes. The 'Assessment of Learning' process gives the School highly detailed information on the proportion of a cohort who are meetings, exceeding or not meeting expected standards. Not only does this provide a measure of student performance on individual modules, but also an early indicator as to the 'health' of specific programmes.

32. The Panel was satisfied that External Examiners' reports confirm that academic and professionally accredited standards achieved by learners meet set expectations. It saw evidence of reflection on, and implementation of, External Examiners' recommendations in Programme Area Committees and Boards of Studies meetings.

33. The Panel noted the proliferation of group work as a mode of assessment. It was not able to fully determine the extent to which group work is used as an assessment method within programme areas, the extent to which its implementation varies in different modules (i.e. including marks derived from peer assessment or not), nor identify that there were always good pedagogic reasons for its use, rather than logistical ones. However, it was pleased to note that there had been staff development opportunities focused on this method of assessment. The Panel recommends that the School formulates and disseminates specific guidance to all staff on the advantages and disadvantages of the different pedagogic principles and approaches to group work, including advice about aligning assessable learning outcomes in module descriptions to elements involving summative peer assessment. **[Advisable recommendation a]**

34. The Panel heard that the School had recently rationalised its delivery of study skills, and this includes advice on effective group work. However, the Panel was concerned as to whether some groups of students may be disadvantaged by assessments which required them to identify their own groups, and whether all students had an equal opportunity to demonstrate their individual learning. The Panel recommends that the School develops an approach to ensure that group assessments are always designed with issues of diversity and inclusion in mind. **[Advisable recommendation b]**

35. The Panel noted that Real Estate and Planning had been at the forefront of the move to electronic marking, and that all coursework is now submitted and marked electronically in that Department. The transition to electronic marking is ongoing on the School, with many staff reporting favourably on their experiences of the move.

36. The School had experienced some technical inconvenience with using anonymous e-marking tools, which had meant anonymous marking was not always implemented. The Panel felt that these difficulties were not insurmountable, and further noted that enhanced moderation procedures had not been put in place to mitigate any issues arising from lack of anonymous marking. The Panel felt that the School should either identify solutions to the difficulties faced, drawing on good practice from around the University (or more widely), or identify an enhanced moderation procedure to improve its alignment with University policy. **[Advisable recommendation c]**

37. The Panel noted that the data from 2015/16 (covering both undergraduate and postgraduate programmes) showed underperformance in some areas regarding meeting the University's 15 day turnaround of feedback requirement. It heard from students that there were still problems with late return of feedback in at least one programme area. The Panel asks that the School continue working on enhancing its compliance with this policy. **[Advisable recommendation d]**

38. Students and staff highlighted the fact that a diverse and sometimes innovative range of assessment types enhanced student engagement. Of particular note, which the Panel would like to identify as good practice, were 'Business Games' and role playing activities. **[Good practice b]**

39. The Panel found that there was a perception amongst students that there was variable practice regarding provision of feedback on examinations and class tests. The Panel would encourage the School to consider giving greater feedback to students on these types of assessments, noting that feedback on Multiple Choice Quizzes can include detailed information on why each answer is correct or incorrect.

40. The Panel noted the convenience afforded to the School by having the Examinations Office provide the administrative support (ie scheduling) of examinations for Finance programmes in January. This helps support the School in its aims of avoiding bunching in the Summer term examination period. The Panel noted this involvement of the Examinations Office as an area of good practice. **[Good practice c]**

41. The Panel noted that the Schools structural differences (ie their employment of the 'matrix' structure) has led to some slight deviation from standard University practice when dealing with cases of academic misconduct. In the first stage of such cases the matter is given consideration by the Director of Studies (instead of a School/Departmental Director of Teaching and Learning), in line with their responsibility for QME level 1. More serious cases are escalated up to the School Director for Teaching and Learning (or other senior parties) as per standard University practice. The Panel was satisfied that this was a deviation necessitated by structural difference rather than anything else.

Quality of learning opportunities offered by the programmes

Teaching and learning

42. The Panel was pleased with the diversity of approaches to, and the quality of, teaching and learning in the School. The Panel felt that data from the Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey, and comments from the students and alumni who they met, confirmed that students found teaching engaging and intellectually stimulating. There were also favourable comments from External Examiners reports about the quality of teaching.

43. The Panel felt that the programmes were current and up to date, owing to the fact that staff research and scholarship were embedded in the teaching and learning. The knowledge and expertise of faculty was supplemented by the School's impressive links with alumni and industry. The School's willingness to exploit these links to ensure that knowledge and experience, both directly and indirectly, informed the programmes and student learning. **[Good practice d]**

44. The Panel was particularly impressed by the variety of learning activities employed by the School and their alignment with programme-level outcomes. The Panel found that the School employed a series of business-oriented and experiential-learning activities across their programmes (eg 'mock trials', role playing activities). The Panel considered that these activities developed student engagement with research and enquiry skills in a manner relevant to the discipline and future professional career paths (especially through the use of case studies and business simulations).

45. The Panel commends the School's efforts to integrate and enhance classroom activities with other learning opportunities (including co-curricular events). The use of visits, guest speakers, and engagement with consultants from business and industry in the augmentation of the curricula was particularly striking. **[Good practice e]**

46. The Panel noted the international focus of the programmes – informed by diverse faculty and students. The Panel found examples of learning experiences aimed at embedding an international dimension within programmes (such as the project-based module over the Summer in Australia developed for the MSc International Business). These activities were commendable and their implementation could profitably be explored across the entire range of programmes, mindful of the constraints that such activities entail for postgraduate programmes.

47. The Panel was satisfied that the programmes align with the academic and pedagogic principles of the curriculum framework (as noted in paragraph 17 above). Additionally, the School's commitment to develop outstanding leaders and great professionals means that activities are informed by what they refer to as 'the five 'c's model': Enhancing curiosity, understanding the context, choices from multiple perspectives, developing confidence in acting legitimately, and participating and creating communities.

48. The Panel was impressed with the formal systems in place to ensure the quality of teaching and learning is maintained and enhanced. The application of processes for mentoring of new staff and peer review of teaching were felt to be robust and well adhered to. These activities were supplemented by ad hoc teaching and learning events and feedback from students.

Student admission, retention, progression and attainment

49. The Panel was satisfied that admissions are undertaken in accordance with the University of Reading Admissions Policy. The Panel noted that for the Accounting, Informatics and Business & Management programme areas most admissions decisions are made by the University's central Admissions Office, with just borderline cases being referred to Programme Directors. Real Estate & Planning and the ICMA Centre make most admissions decisions themselves.

50. The Panel noted that most programmes under review recruit a high number and high proportion of international students, the exceptions being programmes in Real Estate and Planning where the majority are home/EU. While international students normally must pass the IELTS test at the required level for the programme, some 'transnational students' (ie international students who have completed the final year of undergraduate study in the UK) are able to gain admission to a programme without undertaking an IELTS test. The School is currently working with the University Admissions Office to address this apparent loophole (and consequently address School concerns around language proficiency of some students raised elsewhere in the report).

51. The Panel found that much of the dedicated additional student support provided at School level is targeted at those students unfamiliar with studying in a UK context. This targeted support helps to

ensure that the vast majority of students are able to achieve the learning outcomes of their modules and programmes.

52. The Panel was content that Welcome Week events (especially for those devolved to a Programme Area level) were appropriate for new students and helped ensure a smooth induction to University life. Programme Area activities include business games (in Accounting and Informatics), business case workshops (Business and Management), and field trips and visits to key employers (Real Estate and Planning); these are complemented by School sessions from the Henley Careers service on personal development.

53. The Panel noted the School's concerns with regards to international students for whom English is a second language, and supports their commitment to provide additional support through a dedicated provision within the ISLI Pre-sessional and Academic English programmes. As noted above (paragraph 27), the School is encouraged to explore ways in which pre-sessional advice and training can help induct students into UK Higher Education learning and equip them with the necessary academic skills (especially around good academic practice).

54. The Panel also encourages the School to give further consideration to the diverse nature of student body, recognising the wider spectrum of diversity (including gender, age, disability, sexual orientation, religion and belief, socio-economic and educational background). Such consideration should give rise to the development of inclusive pedagogies that take into account such a wider concept of diversity. In part, this will be achieved through the work of the recently convened Diversity and Inclusion Committee.

55. The Panel noted that failure rates on programmes are below 5% in all cases, and that the majority of students are able to achieve degree classifications in the Merit category or higher. However, the Panel noted that University data indicates that some groups of students achieve lower numbers of merit or distinction classifications relative to the cohort as a whole. This requires further analysis and consideration and the Panel recommends that the School works with the Planning and Strategy Office to explore the apparent attainment gap for some students through the analysis of relevant programme-level performance data. **[Advisable recommendation e]**

Learning environment and student support

56. The Panel found that the School has a healthy cross-section of staff at a variety of different career stages. The breadth of collective staff expertise is such that the curricula are effectively delivered and learning outcomes are readily achievable.

57. The programmes benefit from administrative support from a committed team of staff. Administrative staff and academics work together effectively and help provide a supportive environment for all students. The Panel was particularly impressed by the way in which the professional support teams actively engage with the students, providing an additional layer of pastoral support. **[Good practice f]**

58. The Panel was impressed by the Academic Resource Centre, including the materials housed there, the dedicated staff resource assigned to it, and its use by the student body. The Panel heard that the Henley Business School has site licences for a number of subject-specific pieces of software.

59. The Panel noted that the Finance programme benefit from facilities in the ICMA Centre, including 'dealing rooms' (with 100 state of the art trading simulation terminals), dedicated research area, café, and access to ICTrader trading simulation software.

60. The Panel noted that the teaching spaces within the Henley Business School buildings were of high quality. However, there were indications that the student body would like to have better access to the spaces and more for sessions timetabled within the building.

61. The Panel heard that the original specifications for the new Henley Business School building had been based on projections of student numbers which had been surpassed in subsequent years. This growth in student numbers has meant that many of the spaces are no longer suitable for the larger cohorts enrolled on the programmes.

62. The Panel noted that the School is working with the University to extend the current premises and that this should go some way to help alleviate the issues around the availability of the spaces to their students.

63. The Panel noted that several spaces within the Henley Business School building were given priority booking for School activities and that some spaces were available to be booked by students.

64. The Panel felt that some students were unaware of the full range of learning resources and study spaces that are available to them. A greater awareness of the spaces (and how to book them) would go some way to addressing perceptions (and complaints) about the lack of space in the Henley Business School building. **[Desirable recommendation h]**

65. However, the Panel noted that the School should continue to monitor the impacts of growing student numbers. This growth not only impacts upon resources (including, but not limited to, teaching spaces), but could also affect academic standards and effective delivery of programmes. **[Desirable recommendation i]**

Employability

66. The Panel noted that data on employability rates of graduates was scant owing to the large number of international students on the programmes. The Destinations of Leavers from Higher Education (DLHE) survey traditionally has low response rate from international students (owing to the fact that such students normally return home after their course has finished). Additionally, reporting of DLHE results makes no attempt to differentiate between undergraduate and postgraduate students.

67. Areas that do include a high proportion of UK students and where there are larger postgraduate cohorts (eg Real Estate and Planning) have had pleasing results in the latest DLHE survey: Real Estate and Planning scored 94.4% of working graduates in professional roles. The Financial Times Master's in Finance rankings place Henley Finance programmes 26th in the world for careers (with 95% of graduates who responded employed within three months of graduation, with an average salary of $48,643). The FT Master's in Management ranking finds 78% of respondents in work within three months of graduation, with an average salary of $48,456).

68. The Panel heard that the Henley Careers service was set up in 2014 as a dedicated resource to help all HBS students with their careers planning. The Panel heard that there is a focus on helping postgraduate students take an active and self-reliant approach to their career development. To this end they are encouraged to participate in intensive and hands-on workshops to help them build the foundations for successful job searches. The Panel noted that the service has taken an innovative approach to these workshops, including scheduling a stand-up comedy night to help students develop their confidence and self-belief.

69. The Panel noted that the Henley Careers services runs and hosts events with employers (the Monday Night Employer Panels offer Q&A sessions followed by the opportunity for networking) and a 'Bite-size Programme' of lunch time events to help build careers skills. The service has a small team of careers coaches who are aligned with programme areas. These coaches come from professional backgrounds and are trained in careers consulting. The service also benefits from a Chinese language speaking consultant who is able to communicate more directly with the large cohort of Chinese students and speak about the careers market in China.

70. The Panel noted that 69% of appointments were taken by students in Real Estate and Planning. The Panel heard that the services is addressing this by targeting students from certain areas (Finance and ICMA) and introducing a module on 'Careers Skills' into the curriculum (which should raise awareness of the services). Additionally, the service has invested in software to help raise awareness of their work pre-arrival, this will help students engage with value-added activities immediately upon their arrival.

71. The Panel found the Henley Careers service, and it's Director, to be hugely impressive. The provision was thought to be of an incredibly high standard and clearly populated with knowledgeable and enthusiastic staff. The Panel commends the School on its foresight in investing and embedding careers support, especially as it clearly make provision for the postgraduate students. **[Good practice g]**

72. The Panel noted that future business models are changing, with ever increasing inter-connectivity between disciplines. A continuing focus on programme design, aligning programme aims with real-world applications (as noted in paragraph 28 above), should help ensure the continuing employability of Henley scholars.

Enhancement of quality and academic provision

73. The Panel considered that the School makes appropriate and effective use of a range of datasets. The data is fully considered on a regular basis as the foundation for responses to accreditation bodies and in the development of practices within the School. However, the panel noted that the data on attainment currently provided by the Planning and Strategy Office is not programme-specific and therefore is not effective for identifying specific programme areas with low attainment for some groups of students (see also paragraph 55 above). The Panel felt that the School responds appropriately to constructive feedback form the External Examiners.

74. The Panel was impressed by the Schools links and engagement with industry and how these inform the curriculum (see also paragraph 43 above).

75. The Panel heard that good practice in teaching and learning was largely disseminated at departmental (ie Programme Area) staff meetings. These are supplemented by ad hoc events held at the School level, which tend to be in reaction to specific issues that need addressing (eg assessment and feedback). The School events do not appear to be for the purpose of developing strategy or proactively disseminating best practice across the School. The Panel recommends that the School creates more opportunities for cross-fertilization of ideas in relation to teaching and learning and for the development of a teaching and learning strategy. **[Desirable recommendation j]**

76. The Panel noted that students felt that they had adequate opportunities for their voice to be heard, even though the Boards and Committees with student membership with large (both in terms of membership and business).

77. However, students indicated that it was not always clear how the comments made in module evaluation surveys were acted upon. The Panel noted the recent introduction of a module convenor's report, and would like to encourage the School to make these reports available to current as well as future cohorts of students as soon as is practicable, as well as thinking about other mechanisms for closing the evaluation 'feedback' loop. **[Desirable recommendation k]**

78. The Panel was pleased to note that early career academic staff, and Graduate Teaching Assistants, felt well supported in their roles, and received excellent advice from mentors or the module convenor. These staff are given significant responsibilities, but also the supportive framework needed in order to enable them to succeed and thrive. **[Good practice h]**

Main characteristics of the programmes under review

79. The Henley Business School is world-renowned and rightly proud of its triple-accredited status. The School benefits from enthusiastic students and alumni, who clearly identify themselves with Henley and its ethos. The School's pre-experience postgraduate programmes have undergone a prolonged period of significant growth, and the School recognises the challenges that this poses.

80. The School offers a wide and varied selection of programmes at the postgraduate pre-experience level, which the Panel found to be coherent, current and of appropriate breadth and scope. The programmes are informed by world-class research, an emphasis on real-world applications and the influence of industry.

Conclusions on innovation and good practice

81. The Panel identified the following as representing particularly good practice:
    a. Engagement with 'assurance of learning' and its use in identifying areas for enhancement
    b. Engaging students through the use of a range of alternative assessment modes like 'Business Games' and roleplaying activities
    c. Engagement with the Examinations Office for the delivery and administration of January exams in ICMA
    d. The impressive links with industry and alumni and the integration of these links into programmes and student learning
    e. Inspiring and engaging variety of learning opportunities including visits, guest speakers etc
    f. Professional support team's active engagement with students and collaborative approach to work
    g. Investment and success of the embedded careers support for PGT students
    h. Early career academics and Graduate Teaching Assistants are well supported in their development

Conclusions on quality and standards

82. The Panel concluded that the quality and standards of the programmes reviewed are appropriate.

Conclusions on new degree programme proposals

83. The Panel received no submissions with regards to new programme proposals.

Recommendations

84. The Panel **recommends** to the University Programmes Board that the following degree programmes taught by the Henley Business School are re-approved to run for a further six years or, in the case of joint programmes, until the Periodic Review of the other discipline:

Accounting
- MSc Accounting and Financial Management
- MSc Accounting and International Management

Business and Management
- MSc International Management
- MSc International Business
- MSc International Business and Finance
- MSc Entrepreneurship and Management
- MSc Entrepreneurship and Financing
- MSc Marketing

- MSc International Human Resource Management

Finance
- MSc Behavioural Finance
- MSc Capital Markets, Regulation and Compliance
- MSc Corporate Finance
- MSc Economics and Finance???
- MSc Financial Engineering
- MSc Financial Regulation (FCA) (Part-time)
- MSc Financial Risk Management
- MSc International Securities, Investment and Banking
- MSc International Shipping and Finance
- MSc Investment Management

Informatics
- MSc Business Technology Consulting
- MSc Information Management
- MSc Informatics (BIT)
- MSc Management Information Systems (Ghana)

Real Estate and Planning
- MSc Real Estate
- MSc Real Estate (Flexible)
- MSc Real Estate Finance
- MSc Real Estate Investment and Finance (Flexible)
- MSc Rural Land and Business Management
- MSc Spatial Planning and Development
- MSc Urban Planning and Development
- MSc Conservation of the Historic Environment

85. The report will categorise any issues as follows, in order of priority:
    - Those areas where the Review Panel believes it is **necessary** for action to be taken urgently to safeguard the standard of provision;
    - Those areas where it is **advisable** that the issues be addressed as soon as possible.
    - Those areas where it is **desirable** that the issue be addressed over a longer time span.

86. The Panel makes the following recommendations to the School:

Necessary
There are no necessary recommendations.

Advisable
  a. Ensure that group project designs are inclusive and provide every student with an equal opportunity to demonstrate their achievement
  b. Develop clear advice and guidance on the use of group work and the award of individual credit
  c. Work towards delivering anonymous marking across programmes or ensure enhanced moderation procedures where this is not possible
  d. Take steps to improve consistent compliance with the University policy that feedback be returned to students within 15 days across the School
  e. Work with the Planning and Strategy Office to explore the apparent attainment gap for some students through the analysis of relevant programme-level performance data

Desirable
  f. Increase pre-sessional advice and training available to students to confirm that they understand and can demonstrate good academic practice

g. Ensure that synergies across disciplines are exploited to aid portfolio design and professional development

h. Ensure that students are knowledgeable about the range of learning resources and study spaces available to them

i. Continue to monitor the impact of growing student numbers and the possible impacts on academic standards and effective delivery

j. Create more opportunities for regular T&L events at a School level for the dissemination of best practice and the development of T&L enhancement strategy

k. Build on emerging practice to find more explicit and visible ways to close the loop and communicate changes made in response to evaluation activities

87. The Panel does not have a recommendation to the University Programmes Board as to whether any proposals for new degree programmes should be approved, as this was not applicable.