QAA

Integrated quality and enhancement review

Summative review

June 2009

City Lit

SR37/2009

Preface

The mission of the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) is to safeguard the public interest in sound standards of higher education qualifications and to inform and encourage continual improvement in the management of the quality of higher education.

As part of this mission, QAA undertakes reviews of higher education provision delivered in further education colleges. This process is known as Integrated quality and enhancement review (IQER).

Purpose of IQER

Higher education programmes delivered by further education colleges (colleges) lead to awards made by higher education institutions or Edexcel. The awarding bodies retain ultimate responsibility for maintaining the academic standards of their awards and assuring the quality of the students' learning opportunities. The purpose of IQER is, therefore, to safeguard the public interest in the academic standards and quality of higher education delivered in colleges. It achieves this by providing objective and independent information about the way in which colleges discharge their responsibilities within the context of their partnership agreements with awarding bodies. IQER focuses on three core themes: academic standards, quality of learning opportunities and public information.

The IQER process

IQER is a peer review process. It is divided into two complementary stages: Developmental engagement and Summative review. In accordance with the published method, colleges with less than 100 full-time equivalent students funded by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) may elect not to take part in Developmental engagements, but all HEFCE-funded colleges will take part in Summative review.

Developmental engagement

Developmental engagements explore in an open and collegial way the challenges colleges face in specific areas of higher education provision. Each college's first, and often their only, Developmental engagement focuses on student assessment.

The main elements of a Developmental engagement are:

- a self-evaluation by the college

- an optional written submission by the student body

- a preparatory meeting between the college and the IQER coordinator several weeks before the Developmental engagement visit

- the Developmental engagement visit, which normally lasts two days

- the evaluation of the extent to which the college manages effectively its responsibilities for the delivery of academic standards and the quality of its higher education provision, plus the arrangements for assuring the accuracy and completeness of public information it is responsible for publishing about its higher education

- the production of a written report of the team's findings.

To promote a collegial approach, Developmental engagement teams include up to two members of staff from the further education college under review. They are known as nominees for this process.

Summative review

Summative review addresses all aspects of a college's HEFCE-funded higher education provision and provides judgements on the management and delivery of this provision against core themes one and two, and a conclusion against core theme three.

Summative review shares the main elements of Developmental engagement described above. Summative review teams, however, are composed of the IQER coordinator and QAA reviewers. They do not include nominees.

Evidence

In order to obtain evidence for the review, IQER teams carry out a number of activities, including:

- reviewing the college's self-evaluation and its internal procedures and documents

- reviewing the optional written submission from students

- asking questions of relevant staff

- talking to students about their experiences.

IQER teams' expectations of colleges are guided by a nationally agreed set of reference points, known as the Academic Infrastructure. These are published by QAA and consist of:

- *The framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland*, which includes descriptions of different higher education qualifications

- the *Code of practice for the assurance of academic quality and standards in higher education*

- subject benchmark statements, which describe the characteristics of degrees in different subjects

- *Guidelines for preparing programme specifications*, which are descriptions of what is on offer to students in individual programmes of study

- award benchmark statements, which describe the generic characteristics of an award, for example Foundation Degrees.

In addition, Developmental engagement teams gather evidence by focusing on particular aspects of the theme under review. These are known as 'lines of enquiry'.

Outcomes of IQER

Each Developmental engagement and Summative review results in a written report:

- Developmental engagement reports set out good practice and recommendations and implications for the college and its awarding bodies, but do not contain judgements. Recommendations will be at one of three levels - **essential, advisable** and **desirable**. To promote an open and collegial approach to Developmental engagements, the reports are not published.

- Summative review reports identify good practice and contain judgements about whether the college is discharging its responsibilities effectively against core themes one and two above. The judgements are **confidence, limited confidence** or **no confidence.** There is no judgement for the third core theme, instead the report will provide evaluation and a conclusion. Summative review reports are published.

Differentiated judgements can be made where a team judges a college's management of the standards and/or quality of the awards made by one awarding body to be different from those made by another.

Colleges are required to develop an action plan to address any recommendations arising from IQER. Progress against these action plans is monitored by QAA in conjunction with HEFCE and/or the college's awarding body(ies) as appropriate. The college's action plan in response to the conclusions of the Summative review will be published as part of the report.

Executive summary

The Summative review of the City Lit carried out in June 2009

As a result of its investigations, the Summative review team (the team) considers that there can be **no confidence** in the College's management of its responsibilities, as set out in its partnership agreement, for the standards of the award it offers on behalf of its awarding body. The team also considers that there can be **no confidence** in the College's management of its responsibilities, as set out in its partnership agreement, for the quality of learning opportunities it offers. The team considers that reliance **cannot** be placed on the accuracy and/or completeness of the information that the College is responsible for publishing about itself and the programme it delivers.

Good practice

The team has also identified the following good practice for dissemination:

- the programme combines deaf and hearing cultures in one programme, providing a specialist provision designed to meet demonstrable market needs in a large urban location

- the programme uses both English and British Sign Language as the language of tuition and assessment

- the programme includes an example of good practice in the use of the Proposition module handbook to support students on a module.

Recommendations

The team has identified a number of recommendations for the enhancement of the higher education provision.

The team considers that it is **essential** for the College to:

- review its management of academic standards and quality, and ensure that an effective means exists to act on the advice offered by the awarding body and the external examiner

- ensure that students receive appropriate academic guidance and information to support the achievement of module and programme learning outcomes.

The team considers that it would be **advisable** for the College to:

- develop a robust and systematic approach to engaging with the Academic Infrastructure so that the programme can benefit from the good practice for higher education it summarises

- reconsider the leadership of the programme to ensure clear lines of reporting both within the College and to the awarding body

- develop an effective means for gathering, and acting upon, student feedback at module and programme level and ensure that this is embedded in consistent practice across the programme

- ensure that the arrangements for staff development and the observation of teaching address the needs of higher education programmes and take account of the need for honours level teaching to be supported by scholarship

- develop the means of providing more complete and consistent information systematically at module level

- review the system for ensuring that the prospectus and web-based information supplied to potential applicants and for students at pre-entry stage is accurate and supportive.

A Introduction and context

1   This report presents the findings of the Summative review of higher education funded by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) conducted at the City Lit (the College). The purpose of the review is to provide public information about how the College discharges its responsibilities for the management and delivery of academic standards and the quality of learning opportunities available to students. The review applies to a single programme which the College delivers on behalf of Middlesex University. The review was carried out by Mr Peter Hymans, Dr Amanda Wilcox (reviewers) and Professor Clive Behagg (coordinator).

2   The Summative review team (the team) conducted the review in agreement with the College and in accordance with *The handbook for Integrated Quality and Enhancement Review* (the handbook), published by QAA. The Summative review was carried out as a desk-based exercise, followed by a visit, under the protocols published by QAA for such reviews. Evidence in support of the Summative review included documentation supplied by the College and awarding body to support the self-evaluation, and additional documentation supplied, following a preparatory meeting between the College and the coordinator. From the QAA briefing for colleges undergoing IQER, the College found that they were not required to undertake a Developmental engagement before the Summative review because of the size of provision. This review constituted the College's first experience of review of its higher education provision by a body external to its partnership.

3   The review also considered the College's use of the Academic Infrastructure, developed by QAA on behalf of higher education providers, with reference to the *Code of practice for the assurance of academic quality and standards in higher education (Code of practice)*, subject and award benchmark statements, *The framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland* (FHEQ) and programme specifications.

4   The College was established in 1919 by the London County Council as one of five literary institutes. Its original brief was to stimulate demand for evening study among office workers, mainly in the arts and humanities. It was incorporated in 1990 and is both a company limited by guarantee and a registered charity. It is now one of four specialist designated institutes within central London, whose contribution to the capital city's post-compulsory lifelong learning was recognised in the 1992 Education Act, when guarantees of funding for their role in providing lifelong learning were given. Since 2001, the College has been funded by the Learning and Skills Council for London Central. In 2005, the College moved to new premises in Covent Garden. The building is the largest adult education centre in Europe and has 58 classrooms. The College offers programmes ranging from personal and management development, computing and languages to performing and visual arts, health, speech therapy, humanities and skills for life. It undertakes outreach and community work to meet the learning needs of underrepresented groups of adults in local neighbourhoods including the homeless, ex-offenders, single parents and those with learning difficulties. In recent years, the College has also increased its work with employers and this is seen as a strategic area for further growth in the future. With student numbers standing at some 49,900 enrolments a year, it is one of the UK's largest dedicated adult education colleges.

5   Since 1997, the College has held a Charter Mark award for excellence in public service; it achieved the Investors in People standard in 1998, and it has held Matrix accreditation for its information, advice and guidance services since 2004. In 2004, the College was awarded Beacon Status in recognition of the quality of the adult learning it provides, and in 2007, it became the first adult education provider to win the Queen's Anniversary Prize.

6   The College was last inspected by the Adult Learning Inspectorate in January 2007 and received an overall effectiveness Grade 2 (Good). Of the six areas inspected two were awarded Grade 1 (Outstanding), two were awarded Grade 2 (Good), one was Grade 3 (Satisfactory), and one Grade 4 (Inadequate).

7   The BA (Hons) Deaf Studies: Communication Support and Education, is the first higher education programme provided by the College. The course sits within the Communication and Training programme area of the Faculty for Deaf Education. At the time of the review there were some 27 full-time and 10 part-time students on the programme.

8   At the point of its review and revalidation, in September 2006, it was claimed to be the only Deaf Studies degree course in the south of England. Its distinctive features lie in the mapping of its curriculum to the standards in British Sign Language of the Council for the Advancement of Communication with Deaf People and its accessibility by both the deaf and the hearing cultures. The interpreting strand is recognised and monitored by the Independent Registration Panel. The location of the programme, in central London, means that it serves one of the largest deaf communities in the country.

Partnership agreements with the awarding body

9   The BA (Hons) in Deaf Studies has been delivered through the partnership between Middlesex University and the College since 2003. The current Memorandum of Cooperation between City Lit and Middlesex University, for the delivery of the programme, has been in place since 1 September 2006 and is current until 31 August 2012. The Memorandum defines the duration and mode of study as full and part-time. Within the University, the responsibility for the programme lies with the School of Health and Social Sciences.

10   The Memorandum of Cooperation gives clear guidance to the College on the nature of the validation relationship and the College's responsibilities under the partnership. Within the terms of the Memorandum of Cooperation, the College has full responsibility for the day-to-day direction of the programme under the overall responsibility of the University as a validated and funded programme. Under the terms of the agreement, the College is responsible for, among other things, tuition, assessment, the provision of learning resources, student support, programme management and quality assurance.

11   Admissions and student selection are carried out by the College and conform to the University and programme entry requirements including the accreditation of prior learning and the accreditation of prior experiential learning. The Memorandum of Cooperation recognises students on the programme as students of the University but they do not receive University student identity cards. However, they may apply to become Associate members of Middlesex University Students' Union.

12   The programme is subject to the quality assurance procedures of the University. There is a link tutor from the University who is responsible for ensuring the maintenance of standards and delivery of the programme. The operational arrangements for assessment are the responsibility of the College. Tuition is provided by the College in accordance with the arrangements described in a definitive programme handbook, agreed by the University at the programme's validation in September 2006.

13   Students are able to access the University's disability support service, including dyslexia support, but not the University services providing financial and welfare advice, childcare, careers advice or counselling. The University retains the right to monitor and approve the programme handbook, which must be agreed by the University prior to publication, as are any advertising and publicity materials.

Recent developments in higher education at the College

14 From its inception in September 2003 to September 2006, the programme was delivered as a 'joint' programme, as the cohort of students was taught at both the College and the University. In September 2006, the programme was reviewed and re-approved to change its status to that of a 'validated/funded' programme, to run as an in-house programme taught only at the College. A new Memorandum of Cooperation was signed at this point.

Students' contribution to the review, including the written submission

15 Students studying on higher education programmes at the College were invited to present a submission to the Summative review team. The College held student focus groups before they submitted the self-evaluation. A summary of the feedback from these sessions was made available to the team. During the preparatory visit the coordinator and a supporting QAA Assistant Director met a group of students. A summary of this meeting was part of the evidence base used by the team during the review.

B Evaluation of the management of HEFCE-funded higher education

Core theme 1: Academic standards

How are responsibilities for managing and delivering higher education standards delegated within the management structure and what reporting arrangements are in place?

16 The College's self-evaluation expresses the view that the partnership between the College and the University is not working effectively. In the team's view, the University has provided the College with comprehensive guidance on its responsibilities under the partnership. These are contained in the Memorandum of Cooperation and they are explained in detail in the University's Learning and Quality Enhancement Handbook 2008/09. This handbook gives the College clear and detailed guidance for managing those aspects of quality assurance for which it has an operational responsibility. This includes the role of the link tutor, support for authors of quality monitoring reports, including deadlines for submission and a comprehensive section on the *Code of practice*, including *Section 2: Collaborative provision and flexible and distributed learning (including e-learning)*, which gives clear guidance on its application to collaborative provision.

17 Within the provisions of the partnership arrangements the College must appoint an Institutional Link Tutor to work closely with the University Link Tutor to ensure that policies and procedures for the enhancement of quality and maintenance of standards are met in full. Although the College has designated a course coordinator to this role, the self evaluation in the annual monitoring report indicated that this role was not fully understood. The team found the link arrangement to be well conceived, but that the College is yet to benefit fully from the arrangement.

18 The College states in its self-evaluation that it felt uncomfortable at the speed with which it had been expected to move from joint to validated status, through a review and re-approval of the programme in September 2006. As a result of the rapid change to the nature of the relationship between the University and the College and the issues that have arisen since, the College may not have fully appreciated the implications of such a change

for its own systems for managing the academic standards and quality of the programme. As a result, the College has not yet established suitable reporting structures both internally and with the University.

19   The operational responsibility for the programme lies with three course coordinators who each manage a strand of the programme, reporting to a programme manager who also has responsibility for a range of further education programmes in deaf studies. In practice, the programme is run through the three course coordinators who have identical management roles reflected in their job descriptions. One is designated as the Institutional Link Tutor. There is some evidence that this flat structure for managing delivery is causing confusion for the coordinators themselves over their individual responsibilities for programme management. In the view of the team this situation is compounded by the fact that the programme has no staff course management committee. The self-evaluation states that the department had agreed to have formal weekly meetings from October 2008 but that it has proved difficult to achieve this in practice. The team was supplied with minutes from one meeting that took place on 16 January 2009 but noted that no matters relating to the standards of the programme were raised at that meeting. During the course of the review the College became aware of this problem and established a temporary acting course leader. The College reported to the team that it recognises that the management of the programme needs to be improved and is currently undertaking a review to bring this about.

20   The College has established a Board of Studies for the programme that meets twice each year. The remit of this board includes both academic issues and non-academic issues and the membership includes all academic staff and at least two students for each year of the programme. The University Link Tutor should also attend this meeting but in the 2007-08 session did not attend. The 2007-08 meeting was well attended by students and College staff. The minutes of the meeting indicate that students are aware of, and raise, issues relating to the programme; in this case including the absence of marking criteria on certain modules and the lack of a programme handbook. There is no evidence that these issues raised at the Board have been addressed in a timely manner through the management structure.

21   The University appointed an external examiner whose term of office ended in 2008. Although the College has made one nomination for a replacement this has been rejected by the University and another nomination has been made. At the time of the review there was no external examiner in place.

22   The external examiner reports for the last three years of the programme indicate that the external examiner is satisfied with the standards of the students' work. When the examiner was initially appointed, the University noted on the nomination form that the candidate had limited experience of higher education assessment procedures. When the programme changed from a joint delivery model to a 'validated/funded' model the validating panel recommended that the College should consider negotiating access to a Middlesex University, School of Health and Social Sciences external examiner for Research Methods and any other academic module that the programme team considers would be appropriate. The College considered this recommendation and rejected it

23   The external examiner's reports were formerly considered by the College's Academic Board but the College does not make a formal response to the report. Nor do the minutes of the Academic Board record detail of any discussion of the report that took place at its meeting. The Academic Board has now been replaced by the College's Quality Committee, to which the external examiner's reports will in future be sent. However, the terms of reference for this committee make no explicit reference to the maintenance of standards or the enhancement of quality for the higher education programme.

24 The Quality Committee minutes go to the College Executive Board and through that to the Quality and Standards Committee of the College Board of Governors. Clear guidance is given by the University in its Learning and Quality Handbook as to the way in which the College should fulfil its responsibilities under the *Code of practice,* with respect to the consideration of the external examiner's reports and production of a formal response. However, there is no evidence that formal responses were produced or actions arising were reported back to the assessment board or included in a timely annual monitoring report as required.

25 As a result of the lack of a coherent management and committee structure relating to the programme the team concluded that the arrangements for the management of the higher education academic standards for the programme are currently inadequate.

What account is taken of the Academic Infrastructure?

26 In the self-evaluation the College places the responsibility for the engagement with the Academic Infrastructure entirely with the validating body, reflected largely in the guidance contained in the University's Learning and Quality Handbook. In fact, this handbook contains sound guidance on the Academic Infrastructure generally, and makes clear reference to the College's own responsibility to engage with the provisions of the *Code of practice* and the external referencing of the programme.

27 There is a programme specification for students within the programme handbook. However, the standards of the degree are not externally referenced in the current version of this document to the FHEQ. In addition, the College has no formal means of ensuring that it maintains currency with the Academic Infrastructure as it is revised.

How does the College assure itself that it is fulfilling its obligations to ensure that the standards of higher education provision meet the requirements of validating partners and awarding bodies?

28 Under the terms of the Memorandum of Cooperation, the College is required to produce an annual monitoring report for the programme by a specified date in October following the completion of the academic year. The College did not supply a report for the academic session 2006-07 or for 2007-08. The College acknowledges this slippage in the self-assessment. Subsequent to the submission of the self-evaluation, the College carried out the annual monitoring process, and this covered the two years 2006-07 and 2007-08. This annual monitoring report was an extensive document, which included a comprehensive action plan for addressing many of the issues detailed in the self-evaluation. However, at the time of the review, it was too early to judge the effectiveness of the process in practice.

29 The result of the review and re-approval in September 2006 was approval subject to one condition relating to the programme, that by 22 September 2006 the College amend the handbook with reference to the specific comments made by the panel during the event concerning learning outcome descriptors, consistency in assessment, appropriateness of learning outcomes and consistency of references. There were also eight recommendations made including that relating to external examining and to the need to develop module handbooks where these did not yet exist.

30 The College responded to the condition set at validation by making a series of amendments to the handbook. However, the College considered the recommendations made at the validation and took no action. The team considers that the eight recommendations made at validation represented sound advice that could have been usefully followed.

31 Of the 18 graduates who have achieved an award to date, all have gained class 2 division 1 honours or above, apart from two gaining a class 2 division 2 award. The College noted at the Assessment Board of July 2007, that this is an unusually high classification curve. However, the team could find no evidence that the issue had been subsequently addressed by the College.

What are the College's arrangements for staff development to support the achievement of appropriate academic standard(s)?

32 The College offers staff a range of in-house opportunities for continuing professional development. It is the Head of Programme's responsibility to arrange staff development with the Staff Development Manager.

33 Staff attend an annual professional development meeting. The process works well and gives staff the opportunity to reflect on their own performance as well as development requirements.

34 Recently the Institutional Link Tutor has taken part in workshops at the University relating to the role and has had other meetings relating to administration. Most activity undertaken by staff relates to further education requirements but one member of staff has taken part in a workshop in assessment at the University.

35 The team concluded that the College's arrangements for staff development to support the achievement of appropriate academic standards are satisfactory.

The team concludes that it has no confidence in the College's management of its responsibilities as set out in its partnership agreement, for the management and delivery of the standards of the award it offers on behalf of its awarding body.

Core theme 2: Quality of learning opportunities

How are responsibilities for managing the quality of learning opportunities for higher education programmes delegated within the management structure and what reporting arrangements are in place?

36 The arrangements described in paragraphs 16 to 20 above also apply to the College's management of the quality of learning opportunities. The University has oversight of these responsibilities and the quality and delivery of the course through a mechanism of link tutors at both the University and the College, and the production of an annual monitoring report by the College. Clear submission deadlines for the annual report are also published.

37 The self-evaluation and the combined annual monitoring report for 2006-07 and 2007-08 indicate that programme staff felt generally unsupported in the delivery of the programme. However, the detailed information available in the University's Learning and Teaching Quality Handbook, together with the advisory framework of a thorough validation event in 2006, could, if followed, have supplied the College with sufficient guidance to deliver the programme successfully.

How does the College assure itself that it is fulfilling its obligations to its awarding body to ensure that students receive appropriate learning opportunities?

38   The reporting mechanisms for academic standards described in paragraphs 19 to 21 also apply to the quality of learning opportunities and are outlined above. However, the self-evaluation and the annual monitoring report both recognise a lack of adherence to internal quality procedures by the programme team. The staff profile of the teaching team consists
of three dedicated members of full-time staff, 16 other members of established staff who teach on some of the modules, and 13 part-time, hourly-paid staff. The complexity of the programme team has made it harder to establish the effective operation of the College's own quality processes. The self-evaluation also recognises the need for a more systematic approach by the College, to ensure that the requirements for a validated programme in the University's Learning and Quality Enhancement Handbook are met in full.

39   However, within this framework, there are a number of potential mechanisms that the College does not yet use fully to assure itself that students receive appropriate learning opportunities. These include student feedback; module feedback; external examiner's reports; boards of study and annual monitoring reports. The main mechanism for obtaining student feedback is the boards of study meetings, which should be held biannually by the College, with the University link tutor attending at least one of these. While the students use these meetings to raise issues, they report that they do not feel that they provide an effective forum for open dialogue with the course team.

40   Module feedback forms are reported in the self-evaluation to be distributed throughout the academic year, with results being recorded on a quality spreadsheet. The College reports that not all tutors have returned their feedback forms, which has resulted in much of the feedback not being recorded or monitored. Students report that they have concerns over the lack of anonymity in the feedback processes at module level.

41   External examiner reports are summarised through the annual monitoring process; however, this process has not been carried out since the revalidation of September 2006, and the College does not have a formal process in place for ensuring that issues raised by these reports are effectively managed.

What account is taken of the Academic Infrastructure?

42   As discussed in paragraphs 26-27 the team was unable to find any reference to the Academic Infrastructure in the documentation provided by the College and, in discussion with staff, the team found a very limited level of awareness of the contributory elements of the *Code of practice*, for example on the Admission of students.

43   Although the College has in place some of the systems that would be expected to support student learning, there is no evidence that these have been considered in the light of the *Code of practice*. For example, there is no clear policy on assessment, provision for assessment criteria or policy for students on placement. Nor is there any calibration against the *Code*, for example for admissions practice, careers guidance and education or support for students with disabilities. The student handbook contains a reference to making complaints but there is no guidance on making an appeal.

How does the College assure itself that the quality of teaching and learning is being maintained and enhanced?

44   Lesson observations are the responsibility of the College, whose guidance states that these should be carried out at least on an annual basis for every member of staff. The College's lesson observation programme is closely linked to a performance review scheme through professional development meetings between staff and managers. Only two members of staff from the programme were formally observed in the year preceding the review. Records for these observations indicated a focus on organisational issues rather than suitability of programme content or level of delivery. There is a less formal but supportive mechanism for peer observation of classroom practice, which includes part-time staff. The College recognises that this process could be strengthened by a formal input into the staff appraisal system.

45   The University makes available its own policies and procedures on teaching and peer observation of teaching, but the College does not use these in operating its own procedure for observation. Feedback from students indicates that they have some concerns about the effectiveness of the structure and organisation of teaching sessions. The annual monitoring report indicates a high volume of complaints from students.

46   Academic qualifications of teaching staff are reported to be checked by the University although the College's mechanism for managing this process is unclear.

47   On the basis of the evidence presented by the College, which included staff development programmes and staff curricula vitae, the team was unable to identify how staff demonstrated engagement with scholarly activity or research to inform their teaching, particularly those with responsibilities for delivering modules at honours level.

How does the College assure itself that students are supported effectively?

48   The students spoke highly of the value to them of their studies, stressing the unique nature of the programme. A number of students travel considerable distances in order to take the programme.

49   Students are offered a range of tutorials at both programme and module level. The self-evaluation reports that students are aware of this support, however, students reported that increased class sizes at Level 1 has led to reduced levels of support. However, class sizes remain small even with the higher intake for Level 1.

50   Precise arrangements for assessments, support service, module structure and learning outcomes are detailed in the programme handbook, which students should receive at the start of the course. The handbook is comprehensive and informative. However, the current programme handbook lists erroneously all but one of the Level 2 modules as being offered at Level 3. This is likely to cause confusion among students. In addition, students in all years reported difficulties obtaining the definitive programme handbook, and saw this as a significant gap in the support they receive for the programme.

51   The programme provides a range of assessment types and British Sign Language is a recognised language for tuition and assessment within the programme, with students able to submit using a DVD; this represents good practice. The College, however, does not have an overarching assessment policy relating to this programme and students are not given information about penalties for late submission of work, assessment extensions or over-length assessments. However, module handbooks are only available for a minority of

modules for the programme, despite this being a recommendation from the University on validation. The College takes the view that module handbooks are appropriate only in a minority of cases. Instead, it provides a range of documentation to students as they take the module, although this information is variable in both content and presentation. Nevertheless, the module handbook for the Proposition module provided an example of good practice in guidance for students. The team considers that this good practice could, with benefit, be extended to the rest of the programme.

52   Students are provided with assessment briefs detailing their module assessments. None of the briefs viewed by the team contained relevant learning outcomes that matched those stated in the programme specification. Assessment criteria were also absent, although generic marking criteria were available for some modules.

53   Students reported that feedback on module assessments was inconsistent, difficult to interpret and often too late to benefit the next assignment. Students generally do not receive copies of their submitted work back with the feedback. This causes difficulty in interpreting feedback, especially for videoed assessments.

54   The College has a student services officer offering a drop-in service for students, although not all students were aware that this service existed. The College provides advice and guidance on financial issues; counselling; and course and careers advice, but the self-evaluation acknowledges that study skills and study advice (additional needs) are not provided.

What are the College's arrangements for staff development to maintain and/or enhance the quality of learning opportunities?

55   Staff involved in the programme take part in the range of activities offered by the College as part of its staff development policy. The team noted, however, that there was no explicit programme or activity within this policy that was aimed at supporting learning opportunities within higher education.

56   Middlesex University encourages opportunities for joint staff development; however, the process of publication and application of such activities has not resulted in extensive take-up of this opportunity.

How does the College ensure the sufficiency and accessibility of the learning resources the students need to achieve the intended learning outcomes for their programmes?

57   The College states that it has a mechanism for assuring itself that students have access to sufficient, appropriate learning resources. The mechanism is through the established quality assurance processes, notably, the approval process, the annual monitoring report, programme management team meetings and periodic review. Students on the programme do not have access to the University library. Library resources at the College have been improved recently and the programme team is developing the use of the virtual learning environment for some modules to improve support and accessibility for students. Student feedback indicates that they welcome these developments.

58   Staffing resources for the programme have experienced some changes since validation. These are required to be reported to the University through the annual monitoring report. Given the slippage in the annual review process, this has not occurred in the intended way. The coordinators responsible for the day-to-day management of the programme have reported difficulties in carrying out their responsibilities since the programme became

validated in 2006. Students also commented on this pressure of insufficient staff resources, though they recognise the commitment of the full-time staff.

The team concludes that it has no confidence in the College's management of its responsibilities for the quality of the learning opportunities as required by the awarding body to enable students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Core theme 3: Public information

What information is the College responsible for publishing about its HEFCE-funded higher education?

59 The College produces a programme handbook for students on an annual basis; however, the self-evaluation reports difficulties with its timely production. Students report that this has been a recurrent problem and that they had either not received a handbook or received it late. In addition, there are significant errors in the current handbook in relation to the level ascribed to a large number of modules. Some aspects of the handbook could be clarified. For example, the modules necessary to complete to follow the interpreting pathway could be highlighted better, and there is no reference to appeals as required by guidance in the University Learning and Quality Handbook. The College should develop a procedure that will ensure the completeness and accuracy of the information provided to students.

60 Despite the recommendation made at the re-approval in 2006, only three modules are currently supported by a module handbook. However, the module handbook for QM309 Proposition for a desk-based research module was comprehensive and clear and represents good practice that could be shared across the programme. The book lists contained in the module specifications within the programme handbook lack currency.

61 The College has a virtual learning environment that students on the programme can access; however, the team found only limited evidence of staff making use of this facility to improve the students' learning experience.

What arrangements does the College have in place to assure the accuracy and completeness of information the College has responsibility for publishing? How does the College know that these arrangements are effective?

62 Under the terms of the Memorandum of Cooperation, the University reserves the right to approve the programme handbook and all advertising and publicity material relating to the programme. The College is responsible for all of its own publicity and marketing about its HEFCE-funded higher education. The University states that this should be checked by the University prior to the start of the academic year, to ensure that the relationship with the University is accurately represented, and makes proper use of the University name and logo, paying particular attention to the correct title of the qualification.

63 The College's student handbook 'Your Guide' is produced by the marketing staff in cooperation with all programme areas and then submitted to the Quality and Standards Committee and the Quality Committee. However, there is no evidence that the material specifically produced for the degree programme is subject to any scrutiny by the awarding body in accordance with the Memorandum of Cooperation. Students report that they have been unclear, until after entry, that British Sign Language tuition is not an integral part of all routes through the programme after Level 1.

64 The degree is advertised in both the College printed prospectus and on its website. The relationship with Middlesex University is stated but the information provided in both of these media is brief with the full degree title not being articulated clearly in either print or electronic versions. Other information such as entry requirements, pathways within the programme and their pre-requisites and outputs, along with information about assessment methodology, is absent.

65 Publicity material is signed off at the College by the course coordinators and, where appropriate, the Head of Faculty. The College acknowledges that there have been a number of difficulties in the production of the web information and are currently looking at how these issues can be resolved.

The team considers that reliance cannot be placed on the accuracy and/or completeness of the information that the College is responsible for publishing about itself and the programmes it delivers.

C Summary of findings from the Developmental engagement in assessment

66 As the total full-time equivalent students funded by HEFCE at the College is less than 100, in accordance with the published review method, the College noted that they were not required to take part in a Developmental engagement.

D Foundation Degrees

67 The College does not offer Foundation Degrees.

E Conclusions and summary of judgements

68 The Summative review team has identified a number of features of good practice in the College's management of its responsibilities for academic standards and for the quality of learning opportunities of the awards the College offers on behalf of its awarding bodies. This was based upon discussion with staff and students and scrutiny of evidence provided by the College and its awarding body Middlesex University.

69 In the course of the review, the team identified the following areas of **good practice**:

- the programme combines deaf and hearing cultures in one programme, providing a specialist provision designed to meet demonstrable market needs in a large urban location (paragraphs 8, 48)

- the programme uses both English and British Sign Language as the language of tuition and assessment (paragraph 51)

- the programme includes an example of good practice in the use of a handbook for the Proposition module to support students on a module (paragraph 60).

70 The team also makes some recommendations for consideration by the College and its awarding bodies.

The team considers that it is **essential** for the College to:

- review its management of academic standards and quality, and ensure that an effective means exists to act on the advice offered by the awarding body and the external examiner (paragraphs 16 to 25 and 36 to 41)

- ensure that students receive appropriate academic guidance and information to support the achievement of module and programme learning outcomes (paragraphs 48 to 52, 59).

The team considers that it would be advisable for the College to:

- develop a robust and systematic approach to engaging with the Academic Infrastructure so that the programme can benefit from the good practice for higher education it summarises (paragraphs 26, 27, 42, 43)

- reconsider the leadership of the programme to ensure clear lines of reporting both within the College and to the awarding body (paragraph 38)

- develop an effective means for gathering, and acting upon, student feedback at module and programme level and ensure that this is embedded in consistent practice across the programme (paragraphs 39, 40)

- ensure that the arrangements for staff development and the observation of teaching address the needs of the higher education programme and take account of the need for honours level teaching to be supported by scholarship (paragraphs 44 to 47, 55, 56)

- develop the means of providing more complete and consistent information systematically at module level (paragraphs 51, 60)

- review the system for ensuring that the prospectus and web-based information supplied to potential applicants and for students at pre-entry stage is accurate and supportive (paragraphs 63 to 65).

71 Based upon its analysis of the College's self-evaluation, and other documentary evidence and from its meetings with staff and students, the team concludes that it has **no confidence** that, in the context of this Summative review, the College discharges its responsibilities effectively, as set out in the relevant partnership agreement for the management of the standards of the awards of its awarding bodies.

72 Based upon its analysis of the College's self-evaluation, and other documentary evidence and from its meetings with staff and students, the team concludes that it has **no confidence** that, in the context of this Summative review, the College discharges its responsibilities effectively, as set out in the relevant partnership agreement for the management of the quality of learning opportunities to enable students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

73 Based upon its analysis of the College's self-evaluation, and other documentary evidence and from its meetings with staff and students, the team concludes that, in the context of this Summative review, reliance **cannot** be placed on the accuracy and/or completeness of the information that the College is responsible for publishing about itself and the programmes it delivers.

City Lit action plan relating to the Summative review: June 2009

Good practice	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
In the course of the Summative review the team identified the following areas of **good practice** that are worthy of wider dissemination within the College:						
• the programme is a specialist provision designed to meet demonstrable market needs in a large urban location (paragraphs 8, 48)	Continue with current offers - monitor market demand	Ongoing	Head of Programme and Team	Healthy enrolment numbers year on year	Head of Faculty	HE Steering Group - Quality and Standards Committee to receive and evaluate annual reports
• the programme uses both English and British Sign Language as the language of tuition and assessment (paragraph 51)	Continue using good practice	Ongoing	Head of Programme and Team	Good rates of students satisfactions - positive students' feedback	Head of Faculty	HE Steering Group - Quality and Standards Committee to receive and evaluate annual reports
• the programme includes an example of good practice in the use of a module handbook to support	(i) Create module Handbooks modelled on the Proposition	Dec 09 and Sept 2010	Team with Advice from HEI	Clear and comprehensive module handbooks are available for all	Head of Programme & Head of Faculty	HEI/ Board of Studies to monitor and comment on handbook

City Lit action plan relating to the Summative review: June 2009

Good practice	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
students on a module (paragraph 60).	module Handbook			modules. These clearly lay out all assessment and marking criteria to help students understand what is required from them		layout and content on a yearly basis

City Lit action plan relating to the Summative review: June 2009

Essential	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
The team agreed the following areas where it would be essential for the College to take action:						
• to review its management of academic standards and quality to ensure that an effective means exists to act on the advice offered by the awarding body and the external examiner (Core Theme 1 and Core Theme 2) (paragraphs 16 to 25 and 36 to 41)						
• The College has not yet established suitable reporting structures both internally and with the University (paragraph 18)	(i) Actions identified at team meetings are accurately recorded and their completion monitored at subsequent meetings and reported to the	From Oct 09	Head of Programme & Senior Admin	There is documented evidence that minuted actions have been followed through and completed	Head of Faculty via minutes	Head of Faculty to receive minutes and verbal report from Head of Programme on completion of key actions

City Lit action plan relating to the Summative review: June 2009

Essential	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
	next level of the management structure					
	(ii) Establish Higher Education Steering Group and develop a Higher Education Strategy. HE Steering Group to monitor all HE provision across the college and provide recommenda-tions as necessary	From Oct 09	Deputy Principal and Head of Programme/Fac ulty responsible for HE provision	DRAFT HE strategy is completed by Dec 09. HE Steering Group to include HE college-wide issues on agenda in Nov 09 and according to schedule subsequently	Quality & Standards Committee	Quality & Standards Committee to receive minutes and reports from the HE Steering Group and to make recommendatio ns on quality assurance procedures
● The flat structure for managing delivery is causing confusion. The management of the programme needs to be improved (paragraph 19)	(i) Appoint Head of Programme	By Oct 2009	Head of Faculty	(i-iv) There are clear reporting lines for the programme management and the programme	Executive and HEI	(i-iv) Both the Team and the HEI are satisfied that there are clear lines of communications and allocation
	(ii) Designate Head of Programme to act as link tutor	Oct 2009	Head of Programme		HEI	

City Lit action plan relating to the Summative review: June 2009

Essential	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
	(iii) Revise management structure	Oct 2009	Head of Programme	delivery. Information is distributed to Team and HEI via MoC Admin Annex	Head of Faculty	of responsibilities and the programme is effectively managed
	(iv) Clarify the FT teaching team and communicate to University	30 Sep 09	Head of Programme		Head of Faculty	
• There is no evidence that issues raised at Board of Studies have been addressed in a timely manner through the management structure (paragraph 20)	(i) Actions from Board of Studies to be implemented by Programme Management Team or referred to relevant Senior Manager or Committee	From Nov 09	Head of Programme/ Team	Regular implementation of actions through Programme Management Team or deliberative structure is documented and reported back to Board of Studies	Board of Studies - HEI via AMR	HEI to check how issues raised at relevant fora have been addressed and make recommenda-tions if relevant
	(ii) Minutes from Board of Studies to be uploaded on VLE - and	From Dec 09	Head of E-Learning/ Senior Admin	All parties involved receive the minutes in a timely manner,	Head of Programme	Board of Studies to confirm timely circulation of previous

City Lit action plan relating to the Summative review: June 2009

Essential	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
	emailed to all students & attendees			ie no later than two weeks after meeting		minutes at subsequent minutes
	(iii) University Link Tutor to attend Board of Studies meetings	From Nov 09	ULT	ULT in attendance	Head of Programme	Attendance recorded and monitored by college
	(iv) Relevant actions from Board of Studies included in the AMR	Oct 09	Head of Programme - Senior Admin	Actions recorded in AMR and students informed of outcomes via Board of Studies	Head of Faculty	HEI to monitor via AMR and BoS minutes
• At the time of the review there was no external examiner in place (paragraphs 21-22)	(i) Appoint External Examiner with relevant experience of HE assessment procedures	Mar 09	Head Faculty	External Examiner in place	University	University evaluates and accepts proposed EE

City Lit action plan relating to the Summative review: June 2009

Essential	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
• The terms of reference for the College Quality Committee make no explicit reference to the maintenance of standards (paragraphs 22-23)	(i) HE Steering Group terms of reference to include consideration of recommendations from partners and external agencies	Oct 09	Deputy Principal	HE Steering Group regularly monitors academic standards and makes recommendations to managers and HE teams	Quality & Standards Committee	(i, ii) Quality & Standards Committee and HEI are satisfied with the quality of academic standards and implementation of recommendations
	(ii) Recommendations from external parties are referred to relevant level of the college deliberative structure	Dec 09	Head of Programme - Head of Faculty	Any relevant issue is considered at an appropriate level and recommendations implemented	HE Steering Group	
• There is no evidence that formal responses were produced or actions arising were reported back to the assessment board or included in the AMR. The College does not have a formal process in	(i) Send formal response to External Examiner for 08-09	Oct 09	Head of Programme	Response sent that sets out actions to be taken.	Head of Faculty	(i, ii, ii) External Examiner, Assessment Board and HEI are satisfied that actions have been completed
	(ii) Consideration from External	Oct 09	Head of Programme	Considerations included in AMR	Head of Faculty/HEI	

City Lit action plan relating to the Summative review: June 2009

Essential	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
place for ensuring that issues raised by these reports are effectively managed (paragraphs 24 & 41)	Examiner feedback to be included in AMR and relevant actions identified					
	(iii) Discussion of conditions and recomendation from External Examiner report to be included in next Assessment Board's agenda	Feb 2010	Head of Programme- Head of Faculty	Recommendati ons included in the agenda, actions taken and update reported	Head of Faculty/HEI link tutor	
● the complexity of the team has made it harder to establish effective operations of the College's own quality processes (paragraph 38)	(i) Designate Head of Programme to act as link tutor (**also point 1b**)	By Oct 2009	Head of Faculty	(i-ii)There are clear reporting lines for the programme management and the programme delivery. Information is distributed to Team and HEI	Executive and HEI	(i-ii) Both the Team and the HEI are satisfied that there are clear lines of communications and allocation of responsibilities for Quality Assurance
	(ii) Revise management structure and responsibility for Quality	Oct 2009	Head of Programme			

City Lit action plan relating to the Summative review: June 2009

Essential	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
	Assurance			via MoC Admin Annex		
• The College does not fully use potential mechanisms to assure itself that students receive appropriate learning opportunities (paragraph 39)	(iii) Establish Higher Education Steering Group to closely monitor HE provision across the college	From Oct 09	Deputy Principal and Head of Programme/Faculty responsible for HE provision	HE Steering Group to include relevant agenda items in Nov 09 meeting and according to schedule subsequently. Group to make recommendations as necessary	Quality & Standards Committee	Quality & Standards Committee to receive minutes and reports from the HE Steering Group and to make recommendations on effectiveness of quality improvements.
	(i) Make effective use of student feedback mechanisms including Boards of Study and Annual Monitoring Reports	From Nov 09	Head of Programme/ Team	Regular implementation of actions through Programme Management Team or deliberative structure is documented and reported back to Board of Studies	Board of Studies - HEI via AMR	Quality & Standards Committee to check how issues raised at relevant fora have been addressed and make recommendations if relevant

City Lit action plan relating to the Summative review: June 2009

Essential	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
	(ii) Use observation of teaching to assess learning opportunities and make recommendations to teaching staff	From Dec 09	Head of Programme	All staff are observed every two years achieve the required minimum level of performance (ref. City Lit OTL KPIs)	Head of Faculty/HE Steering Group	Quality & Standards Committee /HEI to monitor implementation via AMR
	(iii) Analyse quality indicators in AMR (e.g. recruitment, retention and completion rates) and identify improvement actions	Oct 09	Head of Programme/ Senior Admin	Actions recorded in AMR and implemented. Students informed of outcomes via Board of Studies	Head of Faculty	HEI to monitor via AMR and BoS minutes

City Lit action plan relating to the Summative review: June 2009

Essential	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
● The College reports that not all tutors have returned their feedback forms, which has resulted in much of the feedback not being recorded or monitored (paragraphs 39–40)	(i) Consider improved instruments for appropriate module-level student feedback at the November Board of Studies meeting. Introduce system that enables students to leave feedback anonymously	Nov 09	Team - Head of Programme	Module and/or course feedback instrument introduced and approved by the Board of Study. New feedback form design does not disclose student's identify	HE Steering Group/ Head of Faculty	Board of Studies/HEI via link tutor satisfied with method of collecting feedback
	(ii) Review of mechanism to ensure that student feedback is adequately recorded and monitored via the existing AMR and its	Nov 09	Team & Head of Programme	All students on the course have an opportunity to provide feedback. This is collected, recorded and analysed by the team and actions for	HE Steering Group - Head of Faculty - Board of Studies - Quality & Standards Committee via AMR	Quality & Standards Committee to receive minutes and reports from the HE Steering Group and AMR each year and to make recomm-

City Lit action plan relating to the Summative review: June 2009

Essential	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
	action plan. A check list to be added to the relevant section of the AMR to report on rate of return by module/ module leader			improvement identified. Feedback and actions are recorded in the appropriate section of the AMR. Students informed via Board of Studies reps		endations on effectiveness of quality improvements
● ensure that students receive appropriate academic guidance to support the achievement and programme learning outcomes (Core Theme 2) (paragraphs 48-52, 59)	● The current programme handbook lists erroneously all but one of the Level 2 modules as being offered at Level 3. Students in all years report difficulties in obtaining the definitive (i) Distribute programme handbook at commencement of programme. Head of Programme to monitor	Oct 09	Team to provide information. Senior Admin to produce handbook. Team to distribute	Handbook given to students at start of programme each year. Students' feedback (during class	Head of Programme	Student reps at Board of Studies to report on timely distribution of course handbook

City Lit action plan relating to the Summative review: June 2009

Essential	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
programme handbook (paragraph 50)	distribution at the start of each academic year			visits from managers) and Board of Studies reps to confirm timely distribution		Outcome recorded in minutes of meeting
	(ii) Ensure that handbook is informative and comprehensive and all information is accurate and clear. Ensure students are updated on any amendments to the handbook in a timely manner and provided with up-to-date copies	Nov 09	Head of Programme with contribution from Team	The accuracy and relevance of the handbook is endorsed on an annual basis by the HE Steering Group and approved by the HEI	Head of Faculty/HE Steering Group/HEI	Student reps at Board of Studies to report on quality of course handbook. Outcomes recorded in minutes of meeting
	(iii) Create central system for annual review of HE	Nov 09	Head of Faculty/Deputy Principal	HE Steering Group terms of reference include annual	HE Steering Group/HEI	Process evaluated by Head of Programme

City Lit action plan relating to the Summative review: June 2009

Essential	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
	handbook content			review of handbooks. These are submitted to the group annually and feedback from the group minuted and fed back to the Team		and reported to HEI via the AMR submission
• The College does not have an overarching assessment policy relating to this programme. Module handbooks are only available for a minority of modules (paragraph 51)	(i) Integrate the HEI assessment policy into handbook to include guidance for students and information on penalties for late submission of work, assessment extensions and appeals	June 2010	Head of Programme/ Team	Assessment policy written and operational and made available to all students	Head of Faculty	HEI to approve policy in handbook. Board of Studies to provide feedback on revised information in handbook
	(ii) Ensure module	Jan 2010	Team	Module handbooks	Head of Programme	Head of Programme &

City Lit action plan relating to the Summative review: June 2009

Essential	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
	handbooks are available for all modules			available for all modules, include clear assessment criteria and distributed to all students at the beginning of each course		Head of Faculty to monitor quality of handbook and ensure consistency. Sample handbooks submitted to HEI/Link Tutor for comments
• None of the assessment briefs contained relevant learning outcomes that matched those in the programme specifications. Assessment criteria were also absent (paragraph 52)	(i) Ensure that assessment briefs are available for all modules, are accurate and contain relevant assessment information	Dec 09	Team	Comprehensive assessment briefs included in module handbooks are clear an accessible to students	Head of Programme	Gather feedback at Board of Studies in the spring term about the quality of assessment information
	(ii) Organise staff develop-ment sessions on assessment of HE learning outcomes and	18 Dec 09 (at City Lit) Form Jan 2010	Head of Programme	Assessment criteria support students in undertaking their assignments	Head of Faculty	Board of Studies/Assess ment Board and External Examiner to ensure that

City Lit action plan relating to the Summative review: June 2009

Essential	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
	provide ongoing support to teaching staff in devising and assessing outcomes			and demonstrating achievement of the module learning outcomes		assessment clearly demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes
● Feedback on module assessment is inconsistent, difficult to interpret and often too late (paragraph 53).	(i) Set target time of 3 weeks to provide feedback to students on their assessment	Jan-Mar 2010	Head of Programme	Feedback is clear, consistent and provided in a timely manner	Head of Faculty	(i-ii) Students' feedback via course evaluations and Board of Studies on quality of feedback on module assessment
	(ii) Introduce an informal moderation of feedback to ensure consistency and accuracy	Sept 2010	Head of Programme	Feedback is clear, consistent and provided in a timely manner	Head of Faculty	

City Lit action plan relating to the Summative review: June 2009

Advisable	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
The team agreed a number of areas where the College should be advised to take action:						
• to develop a robust and systematic approach to engaging with the Academic Infrastructure so that the programme can benefit from best practice across the sector (Core Theme 1 and Core Theme 2) (paragraphs 26, 27, 42, 43)						
○ The college places the responsibility for the engagement with the Academic Infrastructure with the validating body. The standards of the degree are not externally referenced. There is no evidence that the college systems have been considered in the light of the *Code of*	(i) Ensure that the FHEQ, the subject benchmark statements and relevant National Occupational Standards are considered and that these are included in the	Dec 09	Head of Faculty/Head of Programme	Programme specifications provide clear information about the content and level of the programme and meet the validation requirement of the HEI. Regular	HE Steering Group /Standard & Quality Committee /HEI	HEI validation panel. External examiner during Assessment Board meetings. HEI via Examiner report and AMR

City Lit action plan relating to the Summative review: June 2009

Advisable	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
practice (paragraphs 26-27 & 42-43)	course specification and reflected in the teaching practice			assessment of teaching and learning outcomes through observation confirm that the learning outcomes are appropriate for the level of the award		
	(ii) Review the QAA Code of Practice precepts in the LQE Handbook 2008/9 p58-69 and ensure that City Lit policies, systems and procedures comply and address any outstanding needs	From April 2010	Head of Faculty/Deputy Principal	HE Steering Group/ Quality & Standards Committee are satisfied that there is full compliance with QAA *Code of practice* precepts	HE Steering Group/ Quality & Standards Committee	HEI link to check and approve relevant policies

City Lit action plan relating to the Summative review: June 2009

Advisable	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
	(iii) HE Steering Group Terms of Reference to include responsibility for benchmarking current practice against QAA updates to Code of Practice and include relevant information on the meeting agendas for consideration and implementation	From Nov 09	Head of Faculty/Head of Programme/ Members of the HE Steering Group	HE Steering Group/ Quality & Standards Committee are satisfied that there is full compliance with QAA Code of Practice precepts	HE Steering Group/ Quality & Standards Committee	HEI link to check and approve relevant policies
• to reconsider the leadership of the programme to ensure clear lines of reporting both within the College and to the awarding body (Core Theme 2) (paragraph 38)	(i) Appoint new Head of Programme (ii) Designate Head of Programme to act as link tutor	By Oct 2009 Oct 2009	Head of Faculty Head of Programme	(i-iii) There are clear reporting lines for the programme management and the programme delivery. Information is	Executive and HEI HEI	(i-iii) Both the Team and the HEI are satisfied that there are clear lines of communications and allocation of responsibilities

City Lit action plan relating to the Summative review: June 2009

Advisable	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
	(iii) Revise management structure	Oct 2009	Head of Programme	distributed to Team and HEI via MoC Admin Annex	Head of Faculty	
• to develop an effective means for gathering, and acting upon, student feedback at module and programme level and ensure that this is embedded in consistent practice across the programme (Core Theme 2) (paragraphs 39, 40)	(i) Consider improved instruments for appropriate module-level student feedback at the November Board of Studies meeting. Introduce system that enables students to leave feedback anonymously	Nov 09	Team - Head of Programme	Module and/or course feedback instrument introduced and approved by the Board of Study. New feedback form design does not disclose student's identify.	HE Steering Group/ Head of Faculty	Board of Studies/HEI via link tutor satisfied with method of collecting feedback
	(ii) Review of mechanism to ensure that student feedback is adequately recorded and	Nov 09	Team & Head of Programme	All students on the course have an opportunity to provide feedback. This is collected, recorded and	HE Steering Group - Head of Faculty - Board of Studies - Quality & Standards	Quality & Standards Committee to receive minutes and reports from the HE Steering Group

City Lit action plan relating to the Summative review: June 2009

Advisable	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
	monitored via the existing AMR and its action plan. A check list to be added to the relevant section of the AMR to report on rate of return by module/module leader			analysed by the team and actions for improvement identified. Feedback and actions are recorded in the appropriate section of the AMR. Students informed via Board of Studies reps	Committee via AMR	and AMR each year and to make recommendations on effectiveness of quality improvements
• to ensure that the arrangements for staff development and the observation of teaching address the needs of higher education programmes and take account of the need for Honours level teaching to be supported by scholarship (Core Theme 2) (paragraphs 44 to 47, 55, 56)						

City Lit action plan relating to the Summative review: June 2009

Advisable	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
○ Only two members of staff from the programme were formally observed in the year preceding the review (paragraphs 44-45)	(i) Review process of teaching observations and develop a rota spanning a 2 year cycle to ensure all staff are observed within a specified time frame	Dec 09	Head of Programme	All staff are observed every two years achieve the required minimum level of performance (ref. City Lit OTL KPIs)	Head of Faculty/HE Steering Group	Quality & Standards Committee via annual report/ HEI via AMR
	(ii) Incorporate outcomes of teaching observation into staff appraisal and identify HE specific training needs and opportunities for CPD, including those provided by the HEI and on QAA website	From June 2010	Head of Programme	Training needs are recorded on observation action plans and CPD monitored via supervision meetings and recorded	Head of Faculty/HE Steering Group	CPD monitored by Quality & Standards Committee / HEI via AMR

City Lit action plan relating to the Summative review: June 2009

Advisable	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
○ Academic qualifications of teaching staff are reported although the mechanism for managing this process is unclear (paragraph 46)	(i) Provide information about new staff and their qualifications via the AMR each year	Oct 09	Head of Programme	All relevant information submitted to University and update as necessary each year	HEI	Link tutor and team to check accuracy of information at meetings
○ The team was unable to identify how staff demonstrated engagement with scholarly activity or research to inform their teaching. There was no explicit programme or activity that was aimed at supporting learning opportunities within higher education (paragraphs 47, 55-56)	(i) Encourage and support teaching staff in establishing networks with other institutions offering similar awards in the field to promote professional exchanges and scholarly activity	From April 2010	Head of Programme/ Head of Faculty	Teaching staff are engaged in regular exchanges with other institutions to discuss issues in the subject field. This activity is evidenced in their CPD records and through good practice observed during teaching observation	Head of Faculty/HE Steering Group	Standards of teaching are reported to the Quality & Standards Committee/ HEI via AMR

City Lit action plan relating to the Summative review: June 2009

Advisable	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
	(iii) City Lit to develop college policy on HE staff development and allocate relevant Staff Development budget for HE related training	June 2010 June 2011	HE Steering Group/ Deputy Principal	Policy operational and sets out requirements for staff engaged in HE activities. Compliance with policy is monitored via staff appraisals	Quality & Standards Committee	Quality & Standards Committee via end of year reports on Staff Development activity
• **develop the means of systematically providing more complete and consistent information at module level. (Core Theme 3) (paragraphs 51 and 59)**						
○ Module handbooks are only available for a minority of modules. However the module handbook for the proposition module was comprehensive and clear and represent good practice that	(i) Create module Handbooks modelled on the Proposition module Handbook	Dec 09 and Sept 2010	Team with Advice from HEI	Clear and comprehensive module handbooks are available for all modules. These clearly lay out all assessment and marking	Head of Programme & Head of Faculty	HEI/Board of Studies to monitor and comment on handbook layout and content on a yearly basis.

City Lit action plan relating to the Summative review: June 2009

Advisable	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
could be shared across the programme (paragraphs 51 & 60)				criteria to help students understand what is required from them		
● review the system for ensuring that the prospectus and web-based information supplied to potential applicants and for students at pre-entry stage is accurate and supportive (Core Theme 3) (paragraphs 63-65)	(i) Ensure that Prospectus and other printed course information is accurate and accessible to potential user groups	Starting from the 09-10 planning cycle for 2010-11	Programme Manager, Senior Admin, Marketing Department	The draft Prospectus at the final proofing stage each year (April) is accurate	Head of Faculty/ Marketing Department	(i-ii) Feedback on accuracy of printed and electronic information collected via the Board of Studies and end of course evaluations each year, reported to the HEI and Quality & Standards Committee via the AMR
	(ii) Information on the web to be amended in a timely manner to reflect any changes to the programme. Any changes to be discussed at regular team meetings, minuted and	Process in place from Oct 09	Programme Manager, Senior Admin, Marketing Department	The Team monitor the information on the website at regular intervals and is satisfied that this is accurate and up-to-date. This is noted at regular intervals during team meetings	Head of Faculty/HEI	

City Lit action plan relating to the Summative review: June 2009						
Advisable	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
	fed back to Senior Admin and Marketing for amendments to department and college web pages respectively					

The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education
Southgate House
Southgate Street
Gloucester
GL1 1UB

Tel   01452 557000
Fax   01452 557070
Email   comms@qaa.ac.uk
Web   www.qaa.ac.uk