

Discussion

In summary the University's RAG ratings of progress against the SU Student Experience 2016 recommendations can be seen below.

2016 SU Recommendations with RAG ratings – the SU initial RAG rating and an updated UEA RAG rating – October 2017																				
Ref.	A1	A2	A3	B1	B2	B3	B4	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	D1	D2	D3	D4	E1	E2	F1	F2
SU																				
UEA																				n/a

The table below is taken from the 2017/18 UEA SU Student Experience report and below each SU recommendation is detailed the current situation as regards progress.

2016 SU Recommendation	2016 UEA Response	UEA SU commentary 2017	UEA SU recommendation 2017																																				
A: Organisation and Management																																							
A1. A consistency and standards review should be carried out across hubs, to include an audit of the training and support for staff in all 3 hubs. The review should include work across Student Support Services, uea su and the hubs themselves to ensure that there is consistency and shared information when signposting students.	Agreed - The work of Hubs is regularly reviewed and co-ordinated to ensure consistency. During 2015/16 there was a problem of high staff turnover among LTS staff which risked compromising the quality of the service to students. The Job Descriptions for front desk staff have been reviewed and regraded and some extra staff appointments have been made, and staff turnover has reduced as a result. It would be helpful to establish a more formalised approach to sharing information on processes to ensure consistency of advice across Students Services, LTS and the Students' Union	We haven't yet had any invitation to work with the Hubs or LTS on information-sharing. It also seems that user satisfaction is not being systematically gathered, shared or acted on and thus a true picture of student experience of using hubs has not been fully established RAG rating: Amber	UEA should carry out a systematic review of user satisfaction of hubs to establish more specific areas of (dis)satisfaction.																																				
Staff turnover has decreased. Improved induction processes are also now in place to ensure consistency in the advice given.																																							
UEA does undertake a systematic review of satisfaction with Hubs which is presented annually to SEC. Actual dissatisfaction with things entirely within Hub control is very low. Following on from the 2016/17 report we are seeking to enhance new student website, the student handbook and information about coursework submission this year.																																							
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4">Non Academic survey 2016/17</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Question</th> <th>% agree and strongly agree</th> <th>Improvement from 2015/16?</th> <th>% disagree/strongly disagree</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Arrivals</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>I was satisfied with the procedures for face-to-face registration</td> <td>88%</td> <td>Up from 84%</td> <td>4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>I was satisfied with the breadth and depth of material covered in the General student handbook</td> <td>68%</td> <td>Down from 73%</td> <td>5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>I was satisfied with the breadth and depth of material covered in the New student website</td> <td>67%</td> <td>Down from 70%</td> <td>8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hubs – customer service</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>I have found the staff in my Hub friendly and approachable</td> <td>89%</td> <td>Up from 85%</td> <td>2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>I have found the staff in my Hub helpful</td> <td>88%</td> <td>Up from 84%</td> <td>3%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Non Academic survey 2016/17				Question	% agree and strongly agree	Improvement from 2015/16?	% disagree/strongly disagree	Arrivals				I was satisfied with the procedures for face-to-face registration	88%	Up from 84%	4%	I was satisfied with the breadth and depth of material covered in the General student handbook	68%	Down from 73%	5%	I was satisfied with the breadth and depth of material covered in the New student website	67%	Down from 70%	8%	Hubs – customer service				I have found the staff in my Hub friendly and approachable	89%	Up from 85%	2%	I have found the staff in my Hub helpful	88%	Up from 84%	3%
Non Academic survey 2016/17																																							
Question	% agree and strongly agree	Improvement from 2015/16?	% disagree/strongly disagree																																				
Arrivals																																							
I was satisfied with the procedures for face-to-face registration	88%	Up from 84%	4%																																				
I was satisfied with the breadth and depth of material covered in the General student handbook	68%	Down from 73%	5%																																				
I was satisfied with the breadth and depth of material covered in the New student website	67%	Down from 70%	8%																																				
Hubs – customer service																																							
I have found the staff in my Hub friendly and approachable	89%	Up from 85%	2%																																				
I have found the staff in my Hub helpful	88%	Up from 84%	3%																																				

I have found the staff in my Hub knowledgeable	82%	Up from 77%	5%
My queries were dealt with in a timely manner	88%	Up from 81%	8%
Hubs – coursework submission			
I found the process of coursework submission clear and easy to follow	79%	Down from 84%	8%
I have a good understanding of how I can expect my marked work to be returned	69%	Down from 85%	16%
I have a good understanding of when I can expect my marked work to be returned	64%	Down from 71%	20%

Student and Academic Services works closely with the Student Union Advice Centre. Managers in both LTS and SSS have established relationships with key Advice Centre staff and a collaborative approach is taken to addressing the range of issues that students raise with the Advice Centre from Appeals and Complaints to matters regarding accommodation or disability support. Both LTS and SSS meet regularly with Advice Centre staff to ensure that up to date advice can be provided to students by the Advice Centre.

SU: It remains the case that we are not aware of specific or systematic work across Student Support Services, uea|su and the hubs themselves to ensure that there is consistency and shared information when signposting students.

<p>A2. Schools with satisfaction levels below 80% satisfaction for communication should be caused to investigate this and report back on their findings and actions.</p>	<p>Agreed - We will look at responses to NSS Questions 17 and 25 in the summer and require the relevant Schools to put in place improvement plans where satisfaction levels do not meet our benchmarks. We will also disseminate the good practice used by Schools with high satisfaction levels and explore developing a system of School student communication plans.</p>	<p>We cannot find evidence that good practice used by schools on communication has been gathered or disseminated. Now that the NSS 2017 results have been released we would like to see an urgent plan for action for those schools with under 80% satisfaction for communication (AMA, BIO, CMP, EDU, ENV, HSC, LDC, MED, MTH, NAT, PHA, SWK). RAG: Amber</p>	<p>Improvement plans for schools with below 80% satisfaction for communication (AMA, BIO, CMP, EDU, ENV, HSC, LDC, MED, MTH, NAT, PHA, SWK) should be established and these schools mandated to report on progress at each Learning and Teaching Committee.</p>
--	--	--	---

This was covered in the TEF preparedness meetings – reported to June LTC (LTC16D125) and October 2017 LTC (LTC17D004)

SU: The LTC papers referred to do not mention the issue of communication of changes to the course or teaching (which was the focus of the SER recommendation), nor do they outline any dissemination of good practice, nor are we aware of any exploration of school student communication plans.

<p>A3. UEA should commit to working towards a student centred timetabling system which allows for students to more easily plan ahead and balance commitments. Examples of action within such an approach could include timetables being released at least 2 weeks prior to the start of each semester and/or to have the dates and times of modules confirmed when students make their module choices.</p>	<p>Agreed in part - The University's approach to timetabling is under continual review. Our aspiration is to release timetables as early as possible, although providing a guarantee of two weeks ahead of the start of each semester is not possible, because of pressure on rooming.</p>	<p>There has been some work done on this, particularly with zoning of timetables. However we are some distance from identifying factors which help or hinder student success here. This would involve an in-depth look at student centredness in timetabling, establishing needs beyond zoning. RAG:Amber</p>	<p>Investigatory work should be undertaken to explore what, beyond zoning, students want from their timetabling experience and factors which can help or hinder success- particularly for groups with poorer success rates- with an action plan put in place.</p>
--	---	--	---

Timetabling involves working with the teaching pattern as defined by the Module Organiser, and then matching up the availability of students, rooms and teaching staff. The concept of zoning the campus was introduced in preparing the 2017/18 timetables with the objective of reducing travel times between teaching events. In addition, much work to date has been

undertaken to ensure student choice can be delivered by using course profile ranges and the slotting system. The timetable slotting (anti-clash) system is the current focus of activity and this informs students of what does and does not clash and an idea of when it might be scheduled in the timetable. By making the slotting system easier to work with and improving its comprehensibility we will improve students' understanding of when events might take place and also the reliability of being able to deliver this by timetabling events within the advertised slot.

Timetables for 2017/18 were released on 14th August 2017.

The NSS has a particular question – my timetable works well for me – overall satisfaction 79.4% (2017).

RAG rating – Green

SU: We remain of the view that whilst some progress has been made we are some distance from identifying factors which help or hinder student success here. This would involve an in-depth look at student centredness in timetabling, establishing needs beyond zoning.

B Resources

<p>B1. Courses, particularly those highlighted in graph 5, should do further investigation into specific specialised equipment, facilities of rooms and circulate responses to relevant students. Training for staff on tech and room equipment should be available and encouraged</p>	<p>Agreed - The relatively low satisfaction scores are a due to a mix of factors. Some of these subject areas do not use specialist facilities. With others (e.g. Nursing) we do have specialist facilities, but there may be relatively low satisfaction due to either how they are used, or with the facilities themselves (e.g. Clinical Skills Training Rooms). This issue will be pursued during detailed discussions with those Schools during 2016/17. On Nursing, the problem is known and the issue under consideration is how any refurbishment and redesign might be prioritised and resourced. HSC have invested in a project to fully understand the requirements of skills facilities through detailed scoping activity. An additional related project of work in collaboration with practice partners commenced last year to maximising opportunities for students to have exposure to timely, high quality skills preparation. [It would be useful to have more specific information from the SU about which facilities are seen as problematic].</p>	<p>The Learning and Teaching Spaces Group (LTSWG) has focussed on equipment, rooms and facilities closely and actioned estates to do an audit of rooms. This has taken place but it is imperative that a robust plan of ensuring that resources are in line with the requirements of the ever-growing student body is developed. With this, provision for staff training to use these resources must be a priority.</p> <p>RAG: Amber</p>	<p>Plans for staff training on using technology and new resources must be established. This should be as part of systematic training to achieve a basic standard, rather than adhoc/ optional improvement opportunities.</p>
--	--	---	--

This should be RAG rated green as complete.

The LTSWG is aware of specialist facilities required and also worked to secure additional teaching rooms to accommodate the growth in student numbers. Staff training events have been run on the use of the learning technologies in the new spaces.

The LTSWG will continue to focus on both specialist facilities and overall teaching room capacity during 2017/8.

SU: Students are still regularly feeding back that staff are not able to use the technology in rooms

<p>B2. UEA Estates should develop a system for students and staff to quickly and easily report issues with inappropriate teaching and learning spaces and satisfaction monitoring</p>	<p>Agreed – this is being developed through the Learning & Teaching Spaces Group. In addition, the BIU are already running the Non-Academic Experience survey with students and an Estates customer</p>	<p>This system is in place but we have not had a robust update on how the system works and how UEA plan to communicate it to students and staff, including information on what happens to the information once the text is sent.</p>	<p>Estates must create a clear communication plan for this to ensure that it is not only known among the student and staff population but used effectively. Awareness of the system should be tested during term one. This should include developing a system for ensuing data gathered is acted on and fed back to students</p>
---	--	--	--

should be carried out amongst academics	satisfaction survey with staff in this academic year which will provide insight on this issue.	RAG: Amber	and staff. In addition a programme of proactive auditing should be developed and run rather than just waiting for an issue to be reported.
The new texting system was formally launched via staff and student e-bulletins at the start of 2017/18.			
SU: At the time of writing the SER the texting system had not been launched and there is almost no awareness amongst the student body of its existence. We are not aware of any satisfaction monitoring carried out amongst academics.			
B3. UEA Estates should review all room capacities and ensure enough suitable seating matches those capacities and review all spaces marked for lectures to ensure suitability for that purpose.	Agreed – This is part of routine work by Estates	The Learning and Teaching Spaces Group (LTSG) has focussed on equipment, rooms and facilities closely and actioned estates to do an audit of rooms. This has taken place but it would be good to see a robust plan of ensuring that resources are in line with the requirements of the ever-growing student body. RAG: Amber	UEA should commit to physical, observational auditing of spaces during busy daytime periods. This would be to establish a better lived reality of space rather than one based on people per square metre.
The 2016 recommendation should be RAG rated green as it happens routinely.			
The suitability of rooms is a function of the Module Organiser being asked about, and specifying, the type of room they need for the activity they are planning and that this detail feeds through to the timetabling process. The size of room booked is determined by the numbers of students enrolled on the module/event. We are aware that some events are scheduled for inappropriate rooms and the new text reporting line will provide us with another mechanism for helping us in identifying these, establishing at which stage of the process the error was made and in allocating more suitable rooms for future such events.			
SU: Feedback from students suggests there is still an overcrowding issue.			
B4. In the context of changing student needs and a growing student population, the University should identify short, medium and long term needs in conjunction with students, quantify them and develop clear plans to meet expectations - with particular reference to identified "pinch points". A facilities and services plan should then be published which addresses pressure on facilities, services and space.	Agreed - Facilities and services are being reviewed in the context of student numbers. There are several component covering: academic services; welfare services; learning & teaching spaces; library and IT services; Student Union services; accommodation (on and off-campus); campus and catering; transport.	This is obviously an ongoing issue and there is no 'quick fix' solution, so we need regular updates and a development of a more medium-term management assessment and planning. RAG: Amber	UEA should develop a clear medium-length (2-3 year) expansion management plan, with resourced solutions to issues to do with space, resources and facilities that have been identified among the student body.
The University planned and made investments in spaces and staff for 2017/18, The plans were presented to SEC in February 2017 (SEC16D23). The University will continue to work in partnership with the SU in relation to changing student needs and a growing student population.			
SU: We do not accept that the paper to SEC Feb 2017 represents evidence of the University "identifying short, medium and long term needs in conjunction with students, quantify them and develop clear plans to meet expectations - with particular reference to identified "pinch points". A facilities and services plan should then be published which addresses pressure on facilities, services and space"			
C: Teaching and Assessment			
C1. The University should identify specific work to promote diversity and inclusivity in	Agreed - We are now much more systematically monitoring student academic performance by student	We haven't had any update about this since the appointment of the WP manager. Now that the WP	The University should cause specific work, school by school, to engender diversity and inclusivity in teaching curriculums in higher education with appropriate training. Any new courses, revised courses or module revisions

teaching curriculums in higher education.	characteristics. The appointment of a new Widening Participation Manager and Academic Director for WP will give greater momentum to this work. (It would be useful to know what sort of specific work the SU have in mind on curriculum content. The WP manager would be happy to meet with the SU to discuss further).	Manager has been in post for a comfortable amount of time it would be good to establish further conversations on embedding diversity within teaching curriculums. RAG: Red	should trigger E&D content review.
A Widening Participation Manager has been appointed and the Academic Director for Widening Participation met with the Welfare, Community and Diversity Officer on 19.9.17 to discuss the development of an inclusion policy which aims to improve the diversity embedded in the curriculum. A Working Group is being established to take this forward.			
SU: At the time of the SER being written the meeting mentioned had not taken place. As of now it is hard to agree that the University has identified specific work to promote diversity and inclusivity in teaching curriculums in higher education other than the creation of a working group that may do so in the future.			
C2. UEA should carry out research on the satisfaction levels of international BME students and home BME students, in order to investigate why the achievement gap is such a stark issue.	Agreed - The achievement gap has narrowed by over a third over the last five years (from 29 percentage points in 2011/12 to 17.7 percentage points in 2015/16). The nature of the problem and the effectiveness of the actions are well understood. We would anticipate the achievement gap, which is common in HEIs across the sector, will continue to narrow at UEA. Additional analysis could be carried out on some existing surveys where data are available and robust base sizes exist.	This was agreed but we have not seen demonstrable research taken place. If the "nature of the problem and the effectiveness of the actions are well understood" then this is not detailed in the access agreement. RAG:Red	We expect to see the access agreement properly devolved (not merely disseminated); a school by school action plan on any issue where an achievement or success gap has been identified should be collected via LTC.
School and Faculty level reports on success, retention and progression across the range of WP characteristics including BME is now available and is being discussed at Faculty and School Teaching committees, where student representatives are present. For example the PG Education Officer was present at SCI FTLQC where such reports were discussed on 20.9.17). There is an important distinction to make here is between home BME students and International students. WP reporting does not cover the latter.			
SU: As at the time of development of the SER whilst statistics were available, we are now aware that demonstrable research on why satisfaction levels were lower had taken place. It remains the case that if the "nature of the problem and the effectiveness of the actions are well understood" then this is not detailed in the access agreement.			
C3. UEA should work to implement and monitor take up of standardized online marking to ensure that feedback on assessment in of consistent quality and easily accessed by students.	Agreed – uptake on online marking is being carefully monitored and is being encouraged through management meetings with Schools.	Student comments from this year's NSS indicate that this has not been established. This should be taken forward again, and it would be good to have regular updates from schools on their online marking statistics. RAG: Red	UEA should work to implement and monitor take up of standardized online marking to ensure that feedback on assessment in of consistent quality and easily accessed by students.
LTC receives a report on assessment and feedback at every meeting. The May 2017 report to LTC reported on the take up of online marking via Blackboard and Evision for 2016/17. (LTC16D109). The June 2017 report (LTC16D130) contained an assessment enhancement report. The TEF preparedness meetings also discussed e-marking with every School and the School responses have been presented to the June 2017 and October 2017 LTCs (LTC 16D125 and LTC 17D004).			
SU: We believe insufficient progress was made hence Amber			
C4. All schools should be required to have a teaching practice development strategy, working	??? - This is an interesting proposal and will be considered alongside the outcomes of the discussions with each School about student satisfaction and TEF	Now that TEF preparedness strategies have started moving forward, it would be interesting to have an update and we would like to see this move from	All schools should put in place have a teaching practice development strategy, working in conjunction with UEA's teaching awards and uea(su)'s Transforming Teaching Awards.

<p>in conjunction with UEA's teaching awards and uea su's Transforming Teaching Awards</p>	<p>preparedness during 2016/17. The University's Learning & Teaching Strategy commits to the development of communities of practice in learning & teaching, but a teaching practice development strategy may be a more systematic and planned approach. We need to consider how the peer observation of teaching might inform such an approach.</p>	<p>interesting to agreed</p> <p>RAG: Red</p>	
<p>LTC has and will be considering the School responses to the TEF preparedness meeting at the June 2017 and October 2017 meeting (LTC16D125 and LTC17D004). As responded to above this will need consideration as part of this wider discussion about TEF preparedness and is being considered. RAG rating: Amber</p>			
<p>SU: We are not aware that the TEF preparedness days examined teaching practice development strategies, nor that there has been discussion on working in conjunction with UEA's teaching awards and uea su's Transforming Teaching Awards</p>			
<p>C5. Whilst the timeliness of assessment and feedback has improved, there is no discernible work going on to systematically identify improvements that could be made to quality of assessment and feedback and perceptions of assessment fairness. Utilising the NUS Assessment and Feedback benchmarking tool, work should be developed school by school to ensure that this is done.</p>	<p>Agreed - There is work underway to improve the aspects of satisfaction with feedback other than timeliness with all Schools, on a School- by-School basis through meetings between the PVC-ACAD, Ac Directors TP & LTE and key role holders in Schools. Each School is required to hold an Annual Review of Assessment & Feedback, which examines issues in the round and not just timeliness of feedback return.</p>	<p>We have yet to see any concrete feedback on this, and looking at this year's NSS results there have been significantly more decreases than increases in satisfaction.</p> <p>RAG:Red</p>	<p>Utilising the NUS Assessment and Feedback benchmarking tool, an action plan should be agreed and monitored at University level in every school to ensure that there are improvements.</p>
<p>The NUS Assessment and Feedback benchmarking tool was incorporated as a fundamental aspect of the University Guidance on Assessment and Feedback. https://portal.uea.ac.uk/documents/6207125/8551351/senate-guidance-on-assessment-feedback.pdf/6685239d-75c3-4ee7-99c0-d9adda98abf3</p> <p>Schools review and take action on assessment and feedback every year via the annual School meeting on Assessment and Moderation which form part of our internal quality assurance processes. The outcomes of these meetings are documented in the QAR 3 forms which are reported to LTC.</p> <p>This topic was covered in the TEF preparedness meetings with every School and is being reported to the October 2017 LTC. (LTC17D004)</p>			
<p>SU: We do not believe that the evidence that was available to us in the TEF preparedness report earlier in 2017 represented systematic identification of improvements that could be made to quality of assessment and feedback and perceptions of assessment fairness. The NUS Assessment and Feedback benchmarking tool was partially incorporated as part of a policy but there is not evidence of its usage in looking at the issue.</p>			
<p>D. Welfare and Support</p>			
<p>D1. UEA should review its system for training academic advisors and ensure that none can begin to practice as advisors until they have had correct, up-to-date training</p>	<p>Agreed - All new advisers will be expected to work through the new Blackboard support module before they undertake advising duties.</p>	<p>Statistics indicate that this has not been achieved: only 200 out of 1000 advisors have been trained currently.</p> <p>RAG: Amber</p>	<p>UEA should review its system for training academic advisors and ensure that none can begin to practice as advisors until they have had correct, up-to-date training.</p>

<p>The University recognises that Adviser training requires improved co-ordination and record keeping. Training currently takes place for all new academic staff via the MA Higher Education Practice, 298 staff are currently enrolled on this course, plus there are CSED sessions for other academic staff, two this October 2017 and one in January 2018, a new on-line support/training module which 180 staff have accessed in the last 2 years, and a range of more tailored courses on offer, for example on careers. RAG Rating: Amber</p>			
<p>D2. UEA should fulfil its pledge to develop a mental health plan, outlining specific support services for UEA students.</p>	<p>Agreed – a mental health plan is in the final stages of preparation, which incorporates but goes beyond our commitments under the Time to Change pledge.</p>	<p>This plan is now in place which is excellent to see, but moving forward the focus needs to be on developing its implementation and communicating the aims to students and staff institutionally. RAG: Amber</p>	<p>A robust communication plan for the Mental Health Strategy must be established to ensure that all students and staff members are not only aware of it but have clear expectations for UEA’s mental health provisions.</p>
<p>The Mental Health strategy was developed with SU involvement and was approved by LTC 21 June 2017. The recommendation has been completed and should be RAG rated green.</p>			
<p>SU: Whilst the plan exists there is little evidence that it has been communicated to students</p>			
<p>D3. UEA should acknowledge the crisis of student cost of living by: i. Establishing a previously promised student financial support group and widening its terms of reference Student Cost of Living group ii. Following up on the recommendations of uea su’s ‘Real Cost of Study’ report to look at wider average costs of participation rather than mere “charges” iii. Conduct an investigation on different types of students with different financial circumstances, providing information as to their avenues for support and their ability to participate</p>	<p>A Student Financial Support Group is being established by SSS.</p>	<p>It is 18 months since a Student Financial Support Group was promised- if it has met, we’ve not attended. Given that UEA has reviewed its own finances, it seems only fair that a comprehensive review of student finances takes place. RAG: Red</p>	<p>UEA should acknowledge the crisis of student cost of living by: i. Following up on the recommendations of uea(su)’s ‘Real Cost of Study’ report to look at wider average costs of participation rather than mere “charges” ii. Conduct an investigation on different types of students with different financial circumstances, providing information as to their avenues for support and their ability to participate iii. A strategic review of the student financial picture at UEA should be developed to inform decision making iv. A single committee that includes student representation should oversee all charges/fees levied on students</p>
<p>A Student Financial Support Group was established with a meeting arranged but SU members did not attend. The Head of Student Services has met with the SU to discuss membership and Terms of Reference for a re-launched group, the first meeting of which is expected to take place early in January 2018</p>			
<p>SU: A single meeting took place in March 2017. No progress has been made on looking at student cost of living nor investigating student type and the relationship between this group and the WP finance group is not clear.</p>			
<p>D4. UEA should work with the SU to ensure that off campus accommodation is sustainable</p>	<p>What, specifically, would this joint working involve? SSS does work closely with community representatives and with</p>	<p>It remains the case that these does not appear to be a plan about where students will live as the University expands.</p>	<p>UEA should work with the SU and NCC to develop a plan that ensures that on and off campus accommodation is sustainable and appropriate, in terms of quality and price and</p>

and appropriate, in terms of quality and price and availability.	HomeRun, but it would not be feasible or appropriate for the University to control any and all private developments off campus that might house students. Where there is a willingness on the part of Landlords/ development companies to engage we will do so and would encourage such developments to be sustainable and affordable	RAG:Red	availability.
The University worked with the SU during 2016/17 to meet the 2016 recommendation as best it can i.e. in evaluating the private sector capacity and in developing a Home Stay option and collaborating on Homerun.			
SU: We are some distance from a plan that demonstrates that UEA is taking systematic action to ensure that off campus accommodation is sustainable and appropriate, in terms of quality and price and availability			
E PG Students			
E1. All schools should be required to review their PGT programmes in light of findings on skills development and career focus, highlighting and enhancing skills content where appropriate.	Agreed – the University will review its PGT offering across all Schools	We have not seen a demonstrable update on this and how it is being embedded. RAG:Red	All schools should be required to review their PGT programmes in light of findings on skills development and career focus, highlighting and enhancing skills content where appropriate.
The University has a five yearly Course Review process and an annual update. In addition the whole PGT course offer is under review with a focus on what action is most appropriate to take in relation to small unpopular courses.			
SU: We cannot find evidence that schools were directed to carry out updates/reviews in light of findings on skills development and career focus, highlighting and enhancing skills content where appropriate.			
E2. As space is a key component of PGR community, PGR research space should be at the heart of schools- with strategies in place both for existing buildings in the short/medium term and built into new building plans.	Agree in principle. PGR space is at the heart of the campus redevelopment plan (for the long term). In the short/medium term the Ac Dir RDP is working with the Space Manager to encourage Faculties, where possible and within the constraints of their current space envelopes, to provide improved PGR work space and this have brought benefits in EDU and LAW, for example.	PGR space being “at the heart of campus redevelopment” is a statement we would like to see evidence of now that more concrete development plans are in place. We would also like to see a plan in both medium and long term. RAG:Amber	UEA should provide clear short (1 year), medium (2-3 years) and long (3+ years) plans for the provision of PGR space, both academic and non, with demonstrable evidence.
PGR needs are well known and will be taken into consideration in any new academic building. The detail will be discussed with students as stakeholders, through agreed student representation channels, as plans for new buildings are developed. There has been no such development reach this stage during 2016/17. The short term improvements are in progress as outlined above, now including Annual Fund financial support for development of space in Constable Terrace during 2017/18 secured by the Academic Director for Research Degree Programmes and UEA SU Postgraduate Education Officer. The PGR Executive on 12 December has an item scheduled to cover PRES 2017 action plans and specific time will be given to discussion of feedback on space during this item, to ensure that student feedback is taken into account and principles agreed and/or issues fed on to Student Experience Committee or Space Planning and Management Group as needed. The intent is to include an update on PGR space provision plans (short, medium, long-term) alongside the UEA PRES 2017 response and action plan, which will be reported to Student Experience Committee in early 2018.			
SU: We cannot identify clear or coherent strategies in place both for PGR space in existing buildings in the short/medium term nor in place for new building plans			
F General			

F1. To review the Student Charter in light of findings from the uea su/TSEP work carried out over the summer.	Agreed - This will be reviewed during the summer 2017 / and AY 17/18	As far as uea(su) is aware, nothing has been done to review this to date. If it is to be reviewed during AY 17/18, as the response states, we would like to see a plan of action going forward. RAG: Red	To develop a task and finish group to oversee the review the Student Charter in light of findings from the uea(su)/TSEP work carried out over summer 2016
This work was planned to take place during academic year 2017/18 and remains on course to do so.			
SU: If this work is planned we are not aware of the nature, scope or timing.			
F2. To identify dedicated staff capacity for student representation in similar and competitor institutions with a view to identifying appropriate investment.	NO - The University has responded to recommendations from the SU on this matter in previous years. We would like the operation of the new system of student representation, and Student Partnership Officers to be given a chance, and do not see a need for further additional University investment at this stage.	Although UEA responded to this with 'no', the findings outlined in chapter 2 ('Student Voice and Representation') of this report indicate that a change such as this must take place if UEA's representation should be bought into line with other HE institutions RAG: Red	To identify dedicated staff capacity for student representation in similar and competitor institutions with a view to identifying appropriate investment.
The University did not accept this recommendation. The identified staff capacity is in the role of Student Partnership Officers.			