



Internal Audit Recommendation Tracker

Outcome requested	Audit and Risk Committee is asked to note progress with the internal audit recommendations.
Executive Summary	<p>Updates from lead officers have been provided for all of the actions. The full list of actions has been included for review.</p> <p>4 items have been progressed to completion. 16 items remain open and are being progressed.</p> <p>The report is presented with the areas due for report at the June ARC meeting listed first. The following items are now overdue and outstanding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SMDP06 (12/13) - Partner payments for placement students (amber) • SMDP07 (12/13) - Partner payments for placement students' use of facilities (amber) • ROR01 (14/15) – Research strategy (amber) <p>It was noted however, at the last meeting that the progress of the SMD actions has been delayed by staffing issues within Barts Health Trust.</p> <p>All items prioritised as 'red' by the Internal Auditors have now been completed.</p> <p>The last column details the revised deadlines for items proposed by the responsible officers. Newly proposed deadlines have been highlighted in red. The Executive will provide any further updates at the meeting.</p> <p>Column D: items in red = not completed, items in green = completed.</p>
QMUL Strategy:	Internal audit supports all areas of the strategic plan.
Strategic Risks:	Internal audit considers all risk areas.
Subject to prior and onward consideration by:	QMSE 10 May 2016
Confidential paper under FOIA/DPA:	No
Equality Impact Assessment:	Not required
Timing:	Regular report to Audit and Risk Committee
Author:	Eleanor Crossan, Governance Administrator
Date:	04 May 2016

**Senior
Management/External
Sponsor**

Emma Bull, Interim Chief Operating Officer

Audit Plan Year	Audit Title Code	Auditor Priority	Agreed due by date Red = not complete Green = complete	ARC meeting to report progress to	Finding / Risk / Recommendation	Management Response in Audit	Responsible Officer	Management Notes on progress	Status	Revised deadline proposed by Management Red = high priority
1516	SMD01	Amber	Implemented	June 2016 ARC	<p>SMD and Institute risk registers</p> <p>We obtained the School Risk Register and the individual Institute Risk Registers and sampled nine risks to ensure control activities were operating as stated and were documented in a way that is SMART.</p> <p>Whilst we confirmed the SMD Risk Register was prepared in-line with guidelines, only 2/6 Institute Risk Register items sampled were fully complete, with KPI's, strategic aims, owners and lead officers missing. In one case the mitigating controls were missing. We also confirmed that while control activities are being performed in line with the School Risk Register, the actions identified were not all considered to be SMART, meaning that risks can not be appropriately tracked and staff held to account.</p> <p>Institute risk registers should be updated to ensure that all required fields are complete. In addition the documentation of control activities should be updated to ensure they are SMART. Controls should be allocated timelines for completion and metrics for measurement. We also noted two areas for improvement regarding specific items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The William Harvey Research Institute had a risk documented with no mitigating control, risk registers should be reviewed and updated regularly to ensure all identified risks are managed through mitigation; - The Institute of Health Science risk register contained an obsolete risk. We recommend ensuring that risks are regularly reviewed and removed when no longer relevant. 	Accepted	Nick Smith, Executive Officer	<p>Update Dec 2015: The requirements have been communicated to Institutes. This will be checked when they prepare their Risk Register for the PAR submissions in the new year.</p> <p>It was noted that in some cases the recommendations were being used by Institutes but, because they were not "snapshotting" in the application properly these were not recorded properly.</p>	Overdue	Complete
1516	PART02	Green	Implemented	October 2016 ARC	<p>Legal Counsel</p> <p>While the College does currently have legal counsel on retainer, there is not consistent awareness of this arrangement amongst key stakeholders in the process. In addition, there is no internal policy which sets out when contracts should be escalated to legal review.</p> <p>The College should develop a consistent internal approach to the use of legal counsel relating to partnerships. Partnership opportunities can often arise at short notice and the College does not have a standard contract template to fulfil all of the different types of partnerships it pursues. Therefore the College may benefit from being able to obtain legal advice at short notice. The College should also ensure that all individuals</p>	Accepted	Deputy Academic Registrar	<p>Update April 2016: This has been done and approved by QMSE.</p>	Not yet due	Complete

					involved with partnership agreements are aware of this arrangement and are utilising legal counsel when appropriate.	contracts on for specialist legal advice will be the responsibility of either the Chief Operating Officer or the Deputy Academic Registrar.				
1516	SMD02	Green	Implemented	June 2016 ARC	<p>Key Committee Terms of Reference We obtained and reviewed terms of reference for the nine key committees at SMD (including the Institute committees) and compared them to good practice. Only one committee (School Space Coordinating Committee) has a terms of reference which address all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purpose of the committee; • The membership of the committee; • If applicable, the committee quorum; • The minimum frequency of meetings; • If applicable, the committee's responsibility for oversight of other groups or committees; and • Any other College or groups or committees to which the committee is required to report and at what frequency. <p>The other eight committees of SMD should consider whether their terms of reference are updated to include the above areas. We also noted three areas for improvement for specific committees as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Blizzard Institute was not able to provide up-to-date ToR. This should be included as an action point at the next committee meeting. • The VP Team meeting has terms of reference and is minuted. The minutes should include details of member attendance and absences. • Barts Cancer Centre and Health Science Institute terms of reference should be updated to include the correct frequency of meetings (meetings occur bi-monthly but the terms of reference refer to monthly meetings). 	Accepted	Nick Smith, Executive Officer	<p>Update Dec 2015: The Blizzard Institute has now provided an up to date TOR.</p> <p>Since the audit recommendations were prepared the Institutes have been made aware of the necessary changes to TOR. In many cases they have not met to ratify these changes. As such I would ask for an extension to Feb 2016 to ensure these take place.</p>	Due	Complete
1415	CFS02	Green	Implemented	October 2016 ARC	<p>Payroll starters, leavers and amendments form completion Our review of payroll starters, leavers and amendments forms identified that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Three new starter form were not signed by payroll; and - Two leaver forms were not signed by either HR or Payroll. <p>Not fully completing payroll change forms increases the risk that incorrect or unauthorised changes are made to the payroll.</p> <p>We understand that the College is looking to implement a new system next year that will make the process entirely electronic and no longer require paper sign offs. Until the new system is implemented, staff processing new starter, leavers and change of details should be reminded that they should only approve the changes when forms have been properly completed. The College should also consider undertaking quality checks to review</p>	Accepted This should be eliminated once our new system providing workflows with electronic storage and view of documents is in place. However, in the meantime I have emailed all HR staff informing them of the need to either physically sign or electronically sign (depending upon the document and the way it is submitted to HR) going forward.	Tony Pettit - Head of Payroll and Pensions	<p>Update April 2016: This action is complete and the item can be closed. The project to implement WebView is finished and now allows work to flow electronically from HR Operations to Payroll without the need for paper appointment/leavers/change forms.</p> <p>Additional enhancements are planned to further automate the workflow of HR processes and improve reporting</p>	Not yet due	Closed

					starter, leavers and amendments to ensure staff are only processing completed forms.					
1213	SMDP06	Amber	01/08/2013	June 2016 ARC	<p>Partner payments for placement students</p> <p>Whilst we confirmed that the College was prepared to withdraw funding from the Health Service Bodies (including BHT) in the event that standards fell, we could not identify a specific framework against which providers were assessed.</p> <p>There is a risk that if student numbers were withdrawn from a provider, the deemed lack of transparency over the process could lead to tensions in the partnerships. A formalised framework for assessing suppliers could also reduce the risks of conflicts of interest arising in decisions on partner placement numbers arising from the number of staff that hold joint roles within the SMD and BHT.</p> <p>It is recommended that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The SMD define standards expected of the Health Service Bodies in receipt of funding for supporting placement students under the Service Increment For Teaching (SIFT) arrangement and benchmark the performance of the difference partners against these criteria. - The SMD inform partners on a timely basis where they are under-performing against the criteria and ultimately use performance as a determinant for allocations 	<p>Accepted</p> <p>Action is already in place, to be augmented by agreed quality metrics and backed up with clear accountability for resources disbursed for the support of Education in partner Trusts. This will be managed by the SMD's Dean for Education</p>	Dean for Education	<p>Update March 2016: The planned pilot is underway. A meeting is scheduled for May 2016 to include a full review of the document and discussion of any challenges, with a view to agreeing any required amendments. This will allow implementation of the SLAs for the 2016/17 academic year.</p> <p>Update Dec 2015: Working with Sara Davenport, who is covering for Lesley Elias, we have worked hard to reinvigorate the process of implementation of the SLA. Further work has been undertaken within SMD to develop a template for reporting on KPIs. It has also been agreed to expand the pilot of the SLA to all Trusts with whom we work, including BHT. The pilot should complete by March 2016, and then any further adjustments may be incorporated with the intention that the SLAs will be formally in place for the 2016/17 academic year.</p> <p>Update May 2015: The Service Level Agreement items now all been agreed and Barts Health NHS Trust staff are ready to implement them. Lesley Elias is progressing this within the Trust. Once it has been formally signed off, we will reproduce this with our other partner Trusts. This action is likely to require a further two months for implementation in BHT (due to ongoing internal problems) and six months for full completion.</p>	Overdue	Proposed revised deadline: Sept 2017
1213	SMDP07	Amber	01/08/2013	June 2016 ARC	<p>Partner payments for placement students' use of facilities</p> <p>We identified that certain partners are being paid significantly more for use of facilities by placement students than other partners, which creates a risk that the College is not getting value for money in its medical placements. Two areas merit special attention.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PCTs (Tower Hamlets and City & Hackney) together provide only three medical student placements and yet have a combined facilities charge of £509k (the equivalent charge for three placements from the other partners combined would be just £138k). - The BHT facilities charge is £31.8m, which represents £78k per placement compared to an average of £15k for the other non-PCT partners who combined provide 51% of the total placement numbers. <p>It is recommended that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Facilities payments to SIFT partners are monitored in the context of placement numbers and where these are significantly higher for certain institutions, the College should consider re-negotiating the fees and the allocation of any students to these partners. 	<p>Accepted</p> <p>New tariffs from the DoH deal with this issue which is a legacy issue that has been out of the SMD's hands.</p>	Dean for Education	<p>Update March 2016: A letter has gone from the IHSE Institute Manager to BHT with the proposed plan to reduce the tariff funding (which replaced separate placement and facilities funding) over a number of years. We await a formal response. The proposed budget for 2016/17 includes a reduction in tariff funding in line with the letter.</p> <p>Update Dec 2015: Discussions have been held with Sara Davenport at BHT who is covering for Lesley Elias about the increased level of funding that they receive. An initial discussion with the aim of reducing the amount of placement income BHT receives has taken place. Proposal is that we do so over a period of 5-6 years so that they gradually come into line with other Trusts. This is in very early stages but there is a mutual understanding that the current position is unsustainable long term.</p> <p>PCTs: we no longer allocate any medical students to PCTs.</p> <p>Update Sept 2015: Most frustratingly, this has stalled within Barts Health NHS Trust. Lesley Elias, the Administrative Officer who was piloting this through their internal structures, has now gone on long-term sick leave and, as yet, no one in the Trust has been able to find her notes. It is therefore possible that we may see a significant delay in progressing this risk.</p>	Overdue	Proposed revised deadline: Sept 2017

1415	ROR01	Amber	31/12/2015	June 2016 ARC	<p>Research Strategy During our review we identified that the Research Strategy 2012-15 does not include reference to how overheads will be maximised on individual projects and by the overall approach to the types of research the College focuses on.</p> <p>The approach at the highest level is to increase activity, be in a better position to support large multi-discipline applications and liaise better with industry. However this is not articulated in any document that includes practical steps on how this vision is going to be realised, so that the College targets resources to undertake the most strategically beneficial and profitable research. We recommend that the College develops a plan for maximising overhead recovery that takes into account the overhead recovery of different types of research and seeks to develop the areas that have the best overhead recovery rates, while balancing this with academic requirements to maintain a high quality of research. This should be documented within the 2016 update to the Research Strategy.</p>	<p>Accepted The College has accepted that it needs to develop a strategy to maximise the overhead recovery rate to the organisation to ensure continued growth.</p> <p>A review will look at the current research portfolio, agree the strengths and ambitions of the organisation and the financial contributions required to ensure that the infrastructure is sufficient to enable growth. This will be articulated and disseminated throughout the organisation and used as a model and process when applying for externally funded research.</p>	<p>Bill Spence, VP Research</p>	<p>Update April 2016: A second update regarding implementation of the overhead recovery policy was provided to QMSE in March 2016, containing data for grant applications submitted between January and mid-March 2016; out of 350 applications, 23 (6.5%) had been re-costed to meet overhead recovery requirements and three cases (<1%) had been referred to VPs. The projected growth in overhead income for 2015-16 - up 2.3% from 14/15 (based on current budget forecasts) - suggests that these measures are already having a positive influence. Overhead recovery rates are expected to further increase as the new policies become fully embedded and grants applied for under the new policy are awarded.</p> <p>An analysis of the distribution of grant awards by size, and changes over time has been undertaken and demonstrates an increasing concentration of income on a few top institutions as a result of success in winning larger grants. This analysis will be circulated to Faculties with a recommendation to re-focus applications towards larger bids, where possible and relevant. These results will also be presented at the QMSE-staff engagement events scheduled for June; staff will be asked their opinions on potential challenges to applying for large grants and possible support mechanisms to facilitate applications.</p> <p>A Research Support 'match-funding' scheme is currently under consideration and, if approved, will be piloted in S&E in 16/17. This initiative is intended to stimulate additional overhead growth by providing supporting resource (e.g. PhD studentships, equipment funding) to attract longer and larger RCUK grants; an area where QMUL lag behind competitor institutions. The scheme is expected to attract an additional ~£1.2M in net overhead income in S&E per annum and, if successful, will be rolled out across other Faculties.</p> <p>A business case has been submitted via the PAR process for a £50k Research Initiatives Fund that will be used to support new research initiatives, particularly those that might leverage large grant funding or, facilitate the exploration of the £15bn Global Challenges funding (as announced by George Osborne in the Autumn Statement). An analysis of the costs and value of research activity has been undertaken, utilising data from the HECFE TRAC reporting process and will be submitted for consideration by QMSE by the end of April 2016.</p> <p>The Annual Research and Innovation Reviews are being held in April/May 2016. These meetings are an important mechanism for identifying and sharing good research grant-related practice between Schools and Institutes, as well as identifying particular needs.</p> <p>A Strategic Grant Monitoring Group has been established to act as a coordinating body for large strategic bids, identifying relevant funding opportunities, establishing appropriate teams to develop applications, and monitoring the progress of those applications; a UK Research Partnership Investment Fund (RPIF) bid is currently under preparation that, if successful, will generate an additional £6M in research income.</p> <p>A Clinical Academic Group has been established between QMUL and Barts Health Trust to help facilitate and galvanise interdisciplinary research collaborations as part of the Life Sciences Initiative. The emerging research projects and themes will be used to strategically target relevant funding calls.</p>	Overdue	Proposed revised deadline: Sept 2017
------	-------	-------	------------	------------------	--	--	---------------------------------	--	---------	--------------------------------------

1415	SDS01	Amber	01/09/2015	June 2016 ARC	<p>Co-ordination of staff development activities</p> <p>From the survey results, discussion with staff and analysis of spend there is diverse practice in provision of courses and the amounts being spent. This may not be achieving best value for money as many courses are procured locally by professional services and faculties. We recommend that staff development activities are co-ordinated through the CAPD to provide courses and activities to staff in order to ensure value for money is achieved.</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p>This appears to be a rational suggestion which will significantly contribute to the success of strategic aim 1 of the QMUL2015 strategy. It will be difficult to achieve, given current custom and practise across the university and will require a significant change in culture. The successful implementation of this will be absolutely contingent on the purchase and use of a learning management system. CAPD will develop a strategy to deliver staff development, starting with central Professional Services, outlining key interventions over a five year period, leaving only the specialised areas for directorates to purchase their own training. We will aim to roll this approach out to faculties. It will be necessary to have high-level agreement that PS departments will not simply continue to purchase generic courses.</p>	<p>Professor Joy Hinson, Director of CAPD</p>	<p>Update April 2016: Finance have now supplied detailed information to CAPD on training spend across all QMUL schools and departments. HOLPD and Director CAPD to commence work on interrogating the report and identifying key areas of overlap, duplication and inefficiencies and will then discuss with the relevant heads of school/service. A Staff Development Policy Statement has been written by HOLPD which proposes implementing a preferred supplier list (maintained by CAPD), and giving CAPD a greater degree of involvement in sourcing training suppliers in conjunction with business areas. Consultation on the policy statement will begin on 27th April, when it is presented to the Staff Development Advisory Group for discussion.</p> <p>Update Dec 2015: Confirm timescale of June 2016 to confirm a plan to address this issue. Benchmarking of spend per capita, development of a preferred suppliers list, implementation of a learning management system and implementation of a learning and development strategy and policy are all enablers which will need to be completed in order to accurately judge the magnitude of the changes required. Additional note – a PAR bid for a learning management system will be submitted in January 2016, and which is supported by all professional services functions.</p>	Due	Proposed revised deadline: Dec 2016
1415	SDS02	Amber	01/09/2015	June 2016 ARC	<p>Suite of development courses to match staff needs</p> <p>From the survey results we identified a number of courses which were consistently being procured from organisations outside the College. The most common courses were First Aid, Lean Six Sigma, Social Media and Fair Selection and Interview Skills. We recommend the College develops a suite of courses to match the common needs of the academic departments and professional services. This should be refreshed and updated at least annually.</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p>CAPD will conduct a thorough needs analysis to determine the range of courses needed and the appropriate level of provision. This analysis will include faculties as well as Central PS. We will carry out a value for money analysis and determine whether an external or internal provider present best value. Where internal providers are used, CAPD will run a number of train the trainer sessions to allow colleagues at QMUL to deliver this training. For external providers CAPD will establish and maintain a list of preferred suppliers.</p>	<p>Professor Joy Hinson, Director of CAPD</p>	<p>Update April 2016: Work on analysing common training needs and reviewing/updating the existing professional development portfolio is now underway, and is being incorporated into planning activities for the 2016/2017 academic year. This includes the topics listed in the 'recommendations' column. Fair selection training has been revised and will be relaunched in May 2016, and is now owned by CAPD rather than HR. Lean six sigma training is being addressed via the process improvement work coordinated via the COOs office. Other training needs identified focus on leadership and management development topics and proposals for new programmes addressing these will be reviewed by SDAG on 27th April.</p> <p>Update July 2015: A vetted list of providers is underway (CAPD done, rest of PS in progress). Will be progressed by HOLPD.</p> <p>The plan for 2015-16 is to send reports out in October, January and April.</p>	Due	Proposed revised deadline: Dec 2016
1415	SDS05	Green	01/06/2015	June 2016 ARC	<p>Preferred suppliers of courses</p> <p>Once the portfolio of courses has been developed, the trainers and providers of the courses need to be identified. We recommend that for each subject matter trainers are either developed internally or external providers of the courses and activities are identified. A cost benefit analysis should be undertaken to identify who, or which organisation, is best placed to provide the course or activity. This must consider the costs, the quality of the service provider and the qualifications needed to provide that course.</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p>We will carry out a cost benefit analysis and develop a list of preferred suppliers, starting with the top five courses by spend.</p>	<p>Professor Joy Hinson, Director of CAPD</p>	<p>Update April 2016: Finance have now supplied detailed information to CAPD on training spend across all QMUL schools and departments. The suppliers listed on this report will be used as the basis for developing a preferred supplier list. HOLPD will commence a series of stakeholder meetings with Heads of School/Service to review and evaluate cost and quality of existing suppliers, as well as to identify any gaps in provision, during May 2016.</p> <p>Update Dec 2015: This activity will also enable implementation of SDS01. However development of a preferred supplier list will be dependent on developing a detailed understanding of what training is sourced and funded locally from within department budgets across the rest of the University (i.e. SDS02 is also a prerequisite for this</p>	Due	Proposed revised deadline: Dec 2016

							work). As such a revised timescales of Apr 2016 may be more appropriate.			
1415	SDS07	Green	31/07/2015	June 2016 ARC	Per capita budget for staff development At present professional services and faculties can allocate their own budgets to staff development activities. We recommend that the College considers moving towards a per capita budget for staff development activities to ensure an equitable split of activities for staff. These should be flexed locally where necessary by professional services and departments.	Accepted We will establish a per capita spend for central PS departments in the first instance and discuss with faculties whether this would be appropriate for their staff.	Professor Joy Hinson, Director of CAPD	Update April 2016: Information supplied by finance shows that QMUL spent a total of £1.04m against the 'training' code in departmental budgets in the last financial year. However the data is not robust enough to be used for per capita analysis and this would also not reflect the significant differences in cost of training for different audiences. It will also not reflect the cost of providing training and development internally via CAPD. HOLPD will carry out a benchmarking activity to identify L&D suitable measures and QMUL's performance against them relative to other HEIs. Update Dec 2015: Benchmarking will be carried out within the HE sector and across other organisations in general. Spend per head is a simple measure which may not reflect accurately the complexity of most faculty activities so extrapolating the activity beyond professional services functions is likely to make the data unrepresentative. Decisions regarding how development budgets are then allocated by finance will need to be taken at QMSE level.	Due	Proposed revised deadline: Dec 2016
1213	PRO05	Green	31/07/2013	October 2016 ARC	Stakeholder Engagement Our discussion with stakeholders around the College found that there was a desire to be more informed when key tenders which affect all departments are taking place. There is currently no formal route in place for the Schools or Professional Service departments to provide feedback on suppliers. We recommend that: - The Schools and Professional Service departments are consulted when considering suppliers to be part of a framework or when a re-tender is in progress. This could involve holding an annual survey to engage stakeholders or developing voting tools to allow stakeholders to have a say in who the key suppliers are for activities undertaken by the Schools; such as travel companies or furniture suppliers. - As part of a performance review of suppliers, the Procurement Team should request feedback from the users every six months on key suppliers.	Accepted We will 1 - Ensure there is appropriate stakeholder representation on tender exercises designed for common use of goods or services across QM 2 - Design a suitable user feedback mechanism that will complement the actions to be carried out in recommendation no	Head of Procurement	Updated April 2016: Point 1 – Completed Point 2 – We will design and carry out an annual user survey for feedback prior to July 2016. Update January 2015: Point 2 – An e-contract tool has been purchased and implemented to manage material contracts. This incorporates a feedback mechanism. We have loaded all known accessible contracts and will continue to populate the tool with new contracts as they are entered into. IT are now using the e-contract tool, as a pilot, for the operational contract management (this will include the feedback mechanism). Following a successful pilot other areas will be given access.	Not yet due	End of July 2016
1213	BFM05	Amber	01/08/2013	October 2016 ARC	Budget holder training There is scope for improving the training for budget holders with 43% of budget holders perceiving not to have received sufficient training to perform their role. This is supported by 40% of budget holders who do not view their budgets as realistic. There is also no training for Finance Managers on how to explain accounting matters. It is recommended that: - Mandatory training is introduced for budget holders on budget setting and monitoring. - Staff should not be allowed to take on the responsibilities of being a budget manager until they have completed basic training in budget setting and budget monitoring. - Training is introduced for Finance Managers on how to explain accounting matters to non-finance professionals. - The College should consider the potential for using e-Learning software to track attendance and achieve efficiencies in recurring training programmes.	Accepted Budget holder training will be re-introduced and a programme developed. The Finance Director approval will be required before a new budget holder is appointed Training needs will be assessed as an integral part of the staff appraisal process. With regards to e-Learning, this should be considered in the wider context of the HR strategy on staff development, rather than in isolation in the finance department.	Deputy Director of Financial Management	Update Apr 2016: Part 1 of the pilot has been completed, part 2 is scheduled for May 2016. Plan to rollout training through CAPD booking site from 2016-17 academic year. Update Aug 2015: This project has been delayed further by the necessity to prioritise the 5 Year Plan and as a consequence the agency resource identified to progress this project has left QMUL. New resource has been identified and a further session to review the material has been booked for August 2015. It is intended to conduct a pilot in Autumn 2015.	Not yet due	Proposed revised deadline: End of Dec 2016

1516	PART01	Amber	31/07/2016	October 2016 ARC	<p>Partnership Board Visibility We noted that partnerships at the College are often initiated at the grassroots level. Therefore, it is important for College professors and staff to be aware of the process for implementing a new partnership and the resources that are available to them via ARCS. We noted that this information is available online; however, it could be better highlighted to key stakeholders. This lack of awareness results in inefficiencies and reduced timeframes for appropriate review.</p> <p>We recommend that the College undertake marketing or training activities to increase the visibility of the Partnerships Board across the College. This will ensure that facilities/schools are utilising resources available to them and better involve the partnership team in potential projects earlier in the process.</p>	<p>Accepted We will address this by introducing drop-in International Partnerships Surgeries across all three campuses on a regular basis. We will also improve signposting on the website by introducing details on the work of Partnerships Board to those pages maintained by the Office of the VP International. Any such training/marketing activities will align with our framework for collaborative provision and our regulations and policy for the management of academic standards and the quality of provision. We are also in the process of refining our collaborative framework to make it more accessible. We intend to highlight more clearly what activity can be undertaken and what is prohibited –this will need to be approved by Senate in June 2016.</p>	Deputy Academic Registrar; Vice-Principal (International)	<p>Update April 2016: With regard to the collaborative framework, we have developed a single-side of guidance that provides a summary of the process for approving a collaborative venture, together with details of activities that are prohibited under our current policies.</p> <p>The VP International office are considering how best to organise the drop-in surgeries. A new Head of International Partnerships has recently been appointed and the team are working together with colleagues in ARCS to have these in place for the new academic year. This will align with the creation of a new International Partnerships Strategy which will need to be rolled out across QMUL.</p> <p>Improved signposting on the website is expected to be live by mid-May 2016.</p> <p>Alignment of training / marketing activities is in progress.</p>	Not yet due	July 2016
1516	PART03	Amber	31/07/2016	October 2016 ARC	<p>Monitoring and reporting of partnerships There are arrangements in place to oversee the management of existing international and domestic joint programmes. However there is no overarching framework that clearly sets what monitoring should take place, when and by which group or committee. Our sample testing therefore found variation in the scrutiny, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Partnerships Board received the Annual Programme Review on the Joint Programme with BUPT eight months after the year end; According to the 23 June 2015 Partnerships Board minutes, the Board noted that a Joint Programme Annual Report for Nanchang, BUPT, and the Global Shakespeare programmes for 2014-15 had not been presented <p>We recommend that the College map or document the required annual reporting for partnerships to include the forum and expected timing. This will mitigate against the risks of duplication of effort should committees being scrutinising the same information or of other arrangements not being adequately scrutinised.</p>	<p>Accepted The monitoring and reporting requirements for partnerships are outlined in our collaborative framework. We need to take account of the different types of partnership, role of annual programme review, periodic review and possible templates as part of the revisions and updates to that framework. It is fair to say that what has been happening has probably deviated from the existing guidance in order to tailor requirements in the context of different partnerships –we will streamline and map for final approval by Senate in June 2016.</p>	Deputy Academic Registrar	<p>Update April 2016: The Partnerships Board has been reviewing the monitoring and reporting requirements for partnerships throughout 2015-16. The collaborative framework will be updated with requirements in tabular form for approval by Senate in June 2016.</p>	Not yet due	July 2016
1213	BFM12	Green	01/04/2014	October 2016 ARC	<p>Surplus by course Information provided by finance does not help budget holders identify courses that are in surplus or deficit as income and costs are reported in total for all courses in a cost centre. It is recommended that the College designs reports to show budget holders the surplus position by course. If deficits exist, strategic reasons for continuing the course should be documented.</p>	<p>Accepted The costing of all courses is an aspirational position for all Universities, particularly with the development of TRAC information. However developing this is a very time and resource intensive exercise, for longer term consideration. Where there are indicators that a course is likely to be operating at</p>	Deputy Director of Financial Management	<p>Update April 2016: No further update.</p> <p>Update July 2014: No further update. The setting up of an Activity Costing Group has been approved by QMSE which will start to address some of these issues and there is an agreed objective within Finance and the COO to move to a target based budget setting process which will ultimately need to be underpinned by an understanding of course surpluses, however this understanding requires better data which will be dependent on achieving activities such as implementation of a new chart of accounts, SWARM and BI.</p>	Not yet due	2016/17

						a deficit, such as the number of students on a course, the finance team will prepared targeted higher level costings to facilitate management decision making.		These are planned for 2014-15, meaning that significant progress on course costing is only likely to be achieved from 2015-16.		
1415	SDS06	Green	01/09/2015	October 2016 ARC	Provision of further education Some staff receive substantial funding for additional qualifications such as masters and bachelors degrees. There is no defined policy for when it is appropriate for professional services to provide funding for these qualifications. We recommend that the College develops a policy for provision of such qualifications which are funded wholly, or in part, by the College.	Accepted We are presently working on an overarching staff development policy which will include reference to these qualifications. We will consult depts. Across the university in the development of this policy. One option may be to allow staff to take degrees offered by QMUL but not other providers.	Professor Joy Hinson, Director of CAPD	Update April 2016: No progress has yet been made however the topic of a centrally coordinated fund for qualifications was discussed at PSLT on 12 th April. Should a proposal be requested by PSLT for how such a fund will work, HOLPD will lead on this. Budget from across PS functions will need to be sourced to support this activity. Update Dec 2015: Overarching staff development strategy and policy will be developed by CAPD for Jun 16 deadline. The document will include guidance on how QM staff can be funded for additional qualifications, and SDAG will act as the approving body for this work.	Not yet due	Jun-16
1415	ROR05	Green	01/08/2016	October 2016 ARC	Charity research overhead rebate During our review we noted that when reviewing the recovery rates achieved on research projects funded by charities the College does not take into account the central government 22% rebate on overhead costs for conducting charity funded research. By not taking into account this additional contribution could make charity funded research look like it is achieving a lower recovery on overheads than it actually is. We recommend that when reviewing recovery rates in relation to charity funded research the 22% rebate from central government should be included to demonstrate the true financial position of the research.	Accepted There is no mechanism within the current costing tool to recognise the national charity support contribution to individual studies and therefore it does appear that these are under achieving in comparison to direct overhead bearing studies. We will request that finance shows the HEFCE Charity support fund income as a separate line in the Faculty and School accounts. One the Research Grants Management System is implemented (July 2016) we ensure this information is captured and can be reported on.	Gerry Collins, Contracts and Costing Manager and Manesh Patel, IT Management Accounts	Update April 2016: The Research Grants Management System may not be implemented until 2017. The analysis of how overheads will be presented to the immediate user on the GUI (general user interface) is currently on-going and yet to be agreed internally at QM and with supplier. The analysis of how overhead recovery on management reporting is currently on-going and yet to be agreed internally at QM and with supplier.	Not yet due	
1516	PART04	Green	31/07/2016	October 2016 ARC	Annual Programme Reviews Our review of a sample of agreements found some variations in how the Joint Programme Annual Reports are completed. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Nanchang and BUPT, the Annual Programme Review, as submitted to the Taught Programmes Board, is also submitted to the Partnerships Board as the Joint Programme Annual Report; and For Global Shakespeare, an ad hoc report is created which, while detailed in the program contents, did not contain comparative student enrolment or financial data or a summary of risks, issues, and student feedback with appropriate action plans. We recommend that the College create a template for the Joint Programme Annual Report which focuses on strategic objectives and contains consistent minimum content driven by the nature of the partnership against SMART objectives that are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound. This report should also contain an action plan with clearly defined milestones, timelines, and responsible parties to ensure that actions are being taken to	Accepted As above, we recognise the need to make improvements in this area by adapting reporting templates -for final approval by Senate in June 2016.	Deputy Academic Registrar	Update April 2016: The Partnerships Board has been discussing the reporting templates it receives and final guidance on these will be considered for final approval in June 2016.	Not yet due	July 2016

				maximize the benefit that the University realizes from the partnership.						
1415	ROR06	Green	31/08/2015	February 2017 ARC	<p>Measures of overhead recovery Currently overhead recovery is reported in terms of overheads recovered (total award less directly incurred costs) as a percentage of direct staff costs. Although this provides a uniform measure on an aspect of overhead recovery it is not a true measure of the overheads recovered in relation to overheads consumed. We recommend that an additional measure of overhead recovery is introduced that is calculated as the overheads recovered as a % of the full economic cost of the overheads for a project. Overheads recovered would be calculated as award total less full economic cost of directly incurred and attributable costs. This is documented further in Appendix B.</p>	<p>Accepted Historically overheads were awarded as a percentage of direct staff involvement at a rate of 46%. This was seen as the accepted level of overheads for non-commercial studies which attracted overheads. Whilst the methodology of costing changed with the introduction of FEC this rate was still retained by the University as a target/acceptable to achieve for this type of research. All costings are presented in the FEC format but it is expected that for commercial studies we should achieve a minimum the full direct and indirect cost recovery ie100% overhead. QMUL Financial Management team are currently involved in an exercise to agree the way we account and distribute the overhead element of research studies.</p>	Pardeep Dhooper, Head of Reporting and Financial Planning	<p>Update Apr 2016: The Research Overheads project was initiated on 18th December 2015. A series of meetings have already taken place with the next meeting due on 25th April. Some initial progress has been made on the short-term improvements including testing new coding on the Agresso test system. A briefing paper has also been drafted for approval by project stakeholders which was disseminated on 4th March. There is one remaining concern on the paper which needs to be addressed before this project can be moved forward.</p> <p>Update Dec 2015: The new Finance Partner for Research Grant is now in post and we are initiating a formal project with JRMO to review current processes. A list of short-term improvements will be investigated initially but more detailed work will be necessary to deliver more long-term benefits and which are likely to require significant systems changes. As a result, we are having to extend the deadline from April 2016 to Jan 2017.</p>	Not yet due	January 2017