London School of Marketing

Review for Educational Oversight by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education

May 2012

Key findings about London School of Marketing

As a result of its Review for Educational Oversight carried out in May 2012, the QAA review team (the team) considers that there can be **confidence** in how the provider manages its stated responsibilities for the standards of the awards it offers on behalf of Anglia Ruskin University, the Association of Business Practitioners, The Chartered Institute of Marketing and the Confederation of Tourism and Hospitality.

The team also considers that there can be **confidence** in how the provider manages its stated responsibilities for the quality and enhancement of the learning opportunities it offers on behalf of this awarding body and these awarding organisations.

The team considers that **reliance can** be placed on the accuracy and completeness of the information that the provider is responsible for publishing about itself and the programmes it delivers.

Good practice

The team has identified the following **good practice**:

- the accessibility of a fully developed and systematically enhanced e-learning platform that provides an extensive 'one stop' resource for information to support learning and enhance achievement (paragraph 2.8)
- the use of extensive auditing processes to secure the accuracy of information prior to its publication (paragraph 3.5).

Recommendations

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

The team considers that it is **advisable** for the provider to:

- formalise and enhance the current arrangements for the central recording and tracking of internal verification of assessment (paragraph 1.7)
- establish clear terms of reference for academic committees and formalise its record-keeping processes (paragraph 2.2)
- devise a staff recruitment policy (paragraph 2.5)
- formalise the disabilities policy (paragraph 2.6).

About this report

This report presents the findings of the [Review for Educational Oversight](1) (REO) conducted by [QAA](#) at London School of Marketing (the provider; the School). The purpose of the review is to provide public information about how the provider discharges its stated responsibilities for the management and delivery of academic standards and the quality of learning opportunities available to students. The review applies to programmes of study that the provider delivers on behalf of Anglia Ruskin University, the Association of Business Practitioners, The Chartered Institute of Marketing and the Confederation of Tourism and Hospitality. The review was carried out by Ms Ana Almeida, Mr Jonathan Baker and Mr Gary Hargreaves (reviewers), and Dr Anne Miller (coordinator).

The review team conducted the review in agreement with the provider and in accordance with the *[Review for Educational Oversight: Handbook](#)*.[2] Evidence in support of the review included:

- the written agreement, approval document, annual monitoring reports, including the report of the external examiner from Anglia Ruskin University
- the formal agreements and annual reports from the Association of Business Practitioners, The Chartered Institute of Marketing and the Confederation of Tourism and Hospitality
- meetings with students who study in London and with online students based in Russia and Romania
- meetings with staff from the School's offices in London and, through web conferencing, in Sri Lanka
- samples of marked student work
- access to the learning support materials for students on the School's dedicated electronic learning platform.

The review team also considered the provider's use of the relevant external reference points:

- the Academic Infrastructure
- the reports from the awarding body and organisations' external examiners and external verifiers
- the regulations and requirements of the awarding body and organisations.

Please note that if you are unfamiliar with any of the terms used in this report you can find them in the [Glossary](#).

The London School of Marketing (the School) is a private college offering marketing and business qualifications. It began as a provider of weekend courses for 15 students in 2002 and then expanded to offer online learning. Since 2008, it has offered face-to-face delivery of its programmes in central London venues. The School rents teaching facilities at Birkbeck College and Imperial College in which to hold classes, and where students can use social and library facilities. Over 8,000 students have been educated by the School since its inception, including 1,000 on the MA in Marketing and Innovation with Anglia Ruskin University. A branch of the School is based in Sri Lanka and known as LSM Lanka (Lanka). The role of Lanka is to prepare online learning materials and provide online academic support for students. There are 39 full-time members of academic and information technology staff.

---

[1] www.qaa.ac.uk/InstitutionReports/types-of-review/tier-4.
[2] www.qaa.ac.uk/publications/informationandguidance/pages/reo-handbook.aspx.

Following the development of online publishing for selected professional publications in accounting and finance, the School has developed a comprehensive set of online resources to support its students. The online resources were initially published in 2008 on the electronic learning platform and are being migrated to a new system known as the Integrated Modular Study System (IMSS) by September 2012. Library resources, including electronic books, are provided for students through the IMSS. Access to electronic journals is available through the learning resources provided by the awarding body and the awarding organisations.

At the time of the review, the provider offered the following higher education programmes, listed beneath their awarding body and organisations:

Anglia Ruskin University
- MA in Marketing and Innovation (430 students)

Association of Business Practitioners
- Postgraduate Diploma in Business and Management Consultancy (4 students)
- Postgraduate Diploma in Business Management and Research Methods (11 students)
- Postgraduate Diploma in Business and Marketing Strategy (6 students)

The Chartered Institute of Marketing including the Communication, Advertising and Marketing Foundation
- CIM Introductory Certificate in Marketing (13 online students)
- CIM Professional Certificate in Marketing (22 part-time face-to-face students, 35 online students)
- CIM Professional Diploma in Marketing (31 part-time face-to-face students, 54 online students)
- CIM Postgraduate Diploma in Marketing (12 part-time face-to-face students, 18 online students)
- CAM Diploma in Marketing Communications (13 part-time face-to-face students, 14 online students)
- CAM Diploma in Digital Marketing (32 part-time face-to-face, 34 online students)
- CAM Diploma in Managing Digital Media (6 part-time face-to-face students, 8 online students)
- CAM Diploma in Mobile Marketing (0 students)
- CAM Diploma in Digital Metrics and Analysis (2 part-time face-to-face students, 0 online students)
- CAM Diploma in Digital Campaign Planning (2 part-time face-to-face students, 1 online student)
- CAM Diploma in Digital Media and Branding (7 part-time face-to-face students, 1 online student)

Confederation of Tourism and Hospitality
- Graduate Diploma in Hospitality and Tourism Management (14 students)
- Postgraduate Diploma in Hospitality and Tourism Management (5 students)

The provider's stated responsibilities

The School clearly identifies its management responsibilities in four completed QAA checklists from the REO handbook that accompanied the self-evaluation. These indicate the mutual responsibilities of the School, the awarding body and the three awarding organisations. All four checklists indicate that the School has limited responsibility for

academic standards, with responsibility being retained by its awarding body and awarding organisations. However, all the awarding organisations and the awarding body have delegated responsibility for maintaining the quality of the higher education it provides to the School.

The School is responsible for the recruitment of students, their induction and guidance throughout the programmes. It provides teaching that is delivered either to groups of students in London, or using online learning materials to students located around the world. The student assignments for Anglia Ruskin University and the Association of Business Practitioners are marked by School staff who provide both formative and summative feedback that is subject to moderation by the awarding body and organisation. School staff mark student assignments and provide formative feedback before work is submitted to The Chartered Institute of Marketing and the Confederation of Business Practitioners for summative feedback. The School responds to annual monitoring reviews and to the reports from external examiners and external verifiers. It is responsible for providing online learning resources, gathering and acting upon student feedback. The awarding body and organisations are responsible for the quality assurance of the delivery by the School of their awards. For public information, the School is responsible for the completeness and accuracy of information in its online prospectus, learning materials and website.

Recent developments

The School intends to develop its provision in accounting and finance and is currently developing its portfolio with Anglia Ruskin University at undergraduate and postgraduate levels. A new partnership with a second university is under discussion.

Students' contribution to the review

Students studying on higher education programmes at the provider were invited to present a submission to the review team. The submission was compiled by the leader of the forum for student representatives, utilising information from a survey which was administered among the student body. The team found the student submission helpful and explored its content in meetings both at the preparatory meeting and during the visit to gain a clear picture of the student learning experience.

Detailed findings about London School of Marketing

1 Academic standards

How effectively does the provider fulfil its responsibilities for the management of academic standards?

1.1 The School is effective in delivering qualifications on behalf of its awarding body and awarding organisations. Under the terms of written agreements, the awarding body and organisations retain overall responsibility for the management of academic standards. The Chartered Institute of Marketing and the Confederation of Tourism and Hospitality undertake marking of assessments, whereas Anglia Ruskin University and the Association of Business Practitioners have delegated this responsibility to the School. The School is responsible for student recruitment, supplying staff and resources, the delivery of teaching and monitoring the quality of the provision.

1.2 There is an effective management structure with clear leadership responsibilities. There are well managed teams of staff for marketing, information technology, online learning, teaching delivery, finance, admissions, and short courses. The Group Academic Manager is responsible for curriculum planning, implementation and administration of the programmes. This includes the management of teaching staff and their performance. Programme leaders determine module schedules, delivery methods and programme direction, while modules are managed and taught by module leaders. Assurance of standards and quality is the remit of the Academic and Quality Assurance Director.

1.3 The staff work with a clear understanding of the School's reporting structure and responsibilities to the awarding body and organisations. The Academic Board maintains oversight of academic standards and the quality of higher education programmes and is supported by three panels. The Internal Verification Panel organises assessment schedules and approves module assessment tasks. The Student Progression Panel reviews academic attainment, and the Student Issues Panel considers matters raised by students. Under the terms of the franchise agreement with Anglia Ruskin University, there is also a Curriculum Management Committee that meets every semester. It considers and takes relevant action in respect of student feedback and module evaluation and the annual monitoring report generated by the School for the University.

1.4 The oversight of the management of academic standards is clear and well managed in both the UK and Sri Lanka. Reports from external examiners indicate that student attainment meets the required standard. Representatives from the awarding organisations conduct verification and moderation visits and report satisfaction with academic standards. The School responds constructively to recommendations from external examiners and verifiers. It uses an Academic Quality Assurance and Control Framework to ensure that it meets relevant academic requirements. The awarding body and organisations use a mixture of personal contact, verification and moderation visits to maintain regular communication with the School to ensure that it implements any required improvements.

How effectively are external reference points used in the management of academic standards?

1.5 Through its awarding body and organisations, the School makes effective use of external reference points. The strategic plan encompasses product, economic and social mission and prioritises the maintenance of standards and quality. The School uses a clear four-point plan to assure standards and quality. It takes account of *The framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland* by ensuring that applicants

from the UK and overseas have appropriate entry qualifications. The School works with its awarding body and organisations to standardise programme specifications and operate a systematic internal verification procedure. These relationships also ensure that it implements an attendance policy, gathers student feedback and provides a suitable student complaints procedure. The resultant procedures are in line with the *Code of practice for the assurance of academic quality and standards in higher education* (the *Code of practice)*. The team concluded that members of the senior management team and teaching staff are well informed about the Academic Infrastructure and use it effectively to maintain standards.

How does the provider use external moderation, verification or examining to assure academic standards?

1.6   The School ensures that the assessment of students is externally moderated or verified according to the requirements of the awarding body or organisations. The School staff mark and internally moderate the assessments which are set and externally moderated by Anglia Ruskin University and its external examiner. The School conducts formative and summative assessment using assignments set and externally verified by the Association of Business Practitioners. The Chartered Institute of Marketing and the Confederation of Tourism and Hospitality set and mark the assessments on their awards.

1.7   The School adopts a thorough approach to double marking and internal verification of assignments for Anglia Ruskin University, and participates effectively in moderation meetings with representatives of the University. Assessments are checked for plagiarism using the standard anti-plagiarism software package in accordance with the academic regulations of the University. Internal verification of assessment for the Association of Business Practitioners is carried out to the satisfaction of the awarding organisation and confirmed in their published reports. However, the team was not shown the internal verification records and concluded that there is a need to formalise the School's arrangements for recording and tracking of the internal verification process. The team considers that it is advisable for the School to formalise and enhance the current arrangements for the central recording and tracking of internal verification of assessment.

1.8   The School has an open and transparent approach to dialogue with its awarding body and organisations that fosters the maintenance of academic standards. The School enthusiastically evaluates its performance, identifies good practice, areas for improvement and generates action plans that lead to revisions in the strategies for maintaining standards.

The review team has **confidence** in the provider's management of its responsibilities for the standards of the awards it offers on behalf of its awarding body and organisations.

---

2   Quality of learning opportunities

How effectively does the provider fulfil its responsibilities for managing and enhancing the quality of learning opportunities?

2.1   The School manages the quality of learning opportunities successfully. It is solely responsible for managing the quality of the student learning experience, including delivery of learning and teaching and for assessment of the awards of Anglia Ruskin University and the Association of Business Practitioners, as outlined in paragraph 1.1. Leadership roles and responsibilities are clearly specified in job descriptions. The Group Academic Manager is responsible for managing the quality of learning opportunities and is well supported in this by

the Academic and Quality Assurance Director, programme leaders, module leaders and online subject group leaders.

2.2   The School has a tight management and academic structure, which enables it to maintain the quality of learning opportunities. The School has developed mechanisms for supporting students and for staff appointments, appraisal and development. While there are systems in place to ensure the quality of the provision, some have yet to be fully embedded. For example, the School has recognised the need to develop clear terms of reference for its academic committees and to standardise its records of meetings. The team considers that it is advisable for the School to establish clear terms of reference for academic committees and formalise its record-keeping processes.

How effectively are external reference points used in the management and enhancement of learning opportunities?

2.3   The School has an emerging understanding of and has already engaged with the elements of the Academic Infrastructure (paragraph 1.5). The approach adopted by the School to assure the quality of the Anglia Ruskin University award is aligned with the *Code of practice, Section 8: Career education, information, advice and guidance.* However, this approach is not yet fully disseminated to other programmes, which rely on various sources to guarantee the quality of the provision. Across the provision there is sound evidence that staff, including online tutors, are actively aware of their responsibilities. Students and staff were aware of the *Code of practice, Section 3: Disabled students* and *Section 9: Work-based and placement learning.* The School is developing its approach to quality management by clarifying the relationship between its Academic Quality Assurance and Control Framework and the *Code of practice.*

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

2.4   The School has recently created guidelines on enhancing the quality of teaching and learning for its new Academic Quality Assurance and Control Framework. This enables the School to assess whether the quality of teaching and learning is being maintained and enhanced. The School is very active in creating e-learning materials and providing web-based seminars for students, which enhance their learning experience. The accessibility and use of the e-learning materials is closely monitored by the information technology team.

2.5   The School does not have a specific teaching and learning strategy and adopts the strategies of the awarding body and awarding organisations. Student feedback indicates satisfaction with tutors, in the UK and Sri Lanka. Concerns about delay in the return of written feedback on assessed work and inconsistent marking have been addressed swiftly. Students and representatives of the awarding body and organisations confirm that tutors teach effectively, use material that is current, and show a full understanding of, and operate in accordance with, the requirements and procedures of the awarding body and organisations. The School seeks the approval of Anglia Ruskin University for proposed new tutors. The Association of Business Practitioners verifies the suitability of academic staff during routine visits. For the remaining programmes, the School follows its own selection processes and in such cases it endeavours to recruit the best candidate for any vacancy. The School plans to expand its operation. There is no formal policy on staff recruitment and the ways in which the School makes appointments are neither documented nor transparent. The team considers that it is advisable for the School to devise a staff recruitment policy.

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

2.6 The School is highly student-centred and provides comprehensive support for students from enquiry to enrolment and thereafter on a consistent basis, using policies and procedures that are aligned with the *Code of practice*, with the exception of *Section 3: Disabled students.* The School does not have a systematic approach to supporting students with disabilities. For this reason, it does not recruit students who declare a disability. The premises used by the School are accessible by people with disabilities and the web-based learning materials can be adapted to suit a variety of learning needs. Students confirm being well supported, especially those who report special learning needs, such as dyslexia. While students report that they are well supported, the team considers that it is advisable for the School to formalise the disabilities policy.

2.7 Feedback from students is regularly sought using an electronic survey, but low response rates led to the awarding body seeking student feedback using a paper-based survey administered by the School. The School recognises the need to be more effective when collecting student feedback and aims to secure higher student participation rates using different approaches to collecting feedback.

2.8 The School extensively analyses market trends and swiftly adapts its website and modes of communication. Examples include introducing a new e-learning platform, providing learning materials accessible through multimedia devices, and online tutor support and assessment feedback. The comprehensive provision of online learning resources coupled with the responsiveness to student needs is especially beneficial for part-time and online students. The team considers as good practice the accessibility of a fully developed and systematically enhanced e-learning platform that provides an extensive 'one stop' resource for information to support learning and enhance achievement (see paragraph 3.7).

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

2.9 There is an effective staff development policy which sets out the School's commitment to developing staff. This entails the use of annual staff appraisal, biannual staff development review, allowing for both in-house and external development. The School has an effective and positive peer observation system in place, which supports and enhances staff development. It aims to promote discussion of approaches to learning and teaching, disseminate examples of good practice and identify training needs to ensure that delivery is at the appropriate level.

2.10 Records of peer observation contain examples of effective teaching and learning and show identification of areas for improvement. For example, this recently led to the School sponsoring four tutors to undertake teaching qualifications. Opportunities for dissemination of good practice and development occur on an informal basis among academic staff and at staff meetings.

2.11 Members of academic staff make full use of development opportunities organised by the awarding body and organisations. Online seminars are particularly popular and effective, as they can be accessed by the academic teams in London and Sri Lanka. The School further monitors the quality of teaching by analysing module surveys completed by students. There is a clear appeals and anti-plagiarism procedure, which is systematically communicated and enforced by the School.

How effectively does the provider ensure that learning resources are accessible to students and sufficient to enable them to achieve the learning outcomes?

2.12   The School provides strong academic support to students via their e-learning platforms, which include an e-library, assessment kits, formative assessment and the provision of written feedback. Academic support is mainly managed by the efficient academic team in Sri Lanka, which works closely with the senior management and academic teams in the UK. The quality and timeliness of the feedback given to the students is constantly monitored and improved.

2.13   The School's agreement with Anglia Ruskin University enables students to be issued with a student card, granting access to the students' union, careers service and the University's library facilities, albeit without borrowing rights. The central London venues used by the School for teaching are well equipped and provide good learning environments. Students can use social facilities and gain access to library resources at Birkbeck and Imperial Colleges, although they did not fully express awareness of these available resources and do not have borrowing rights in the libraries.

2.14   The e-learning platforms are managed efficiently by the information technology and academic teams in Sri Lanka. In response to students' complaints, the School has investigated ways of enhancing the electronic learning platform, leading to the introduction of the newer e-learning platform. The Sri Lanka team is currently working on creating case studies, the development of which would benefit from a collaborative relationship with sponsoring employers (see also paragraph 3.4).

The review team has **confidence** that the provider is fulfilling its responsibilities for managing and enhancing the quality of the intended learning opportunities it provides for students.

---

3   Public information

How effectively does the provider's public information communicate to students and other stakeholders about the higher education it provides?

3.1   The School has clear and effective mechanisms for monitoring and ensuring the accuracy and completeness of public information. It is responsible for a large amount of information, including the website, electronic learning portal resources, e-brochures, sales materials, plus teaching and learning materials that are exclusively electronic. The School provides all of its information to stakeholders in electronic format, although some printed materials are available on request. A range of information is provided for potential students, during the admission process, and guidance on programmes includes course materials and information for the wider public. The awarding body and organisations outline the School's responsibilities in written agreements. For example, Anglia Ruskin University requires oversight of all marketing materials.

3.2   The information the School provides to its students includes induction pack, course materials, class handouts, programme handbooks and access to awarding body and organisations' materials. They include policies on assessment, plagiarism and advice on mitigating circumstances. The format of information provided online is consistent at programme and module level and follows the guidelines laid down by the awarding body and organisations and the School's Communications Policy.

3.3   The School has created valuable open web-based learning materials that are currently freely available in multimedia format to students and the wider public. Employers have access to the website and the open access materials. The School acknowledged that employers sponsor most of the School's students and could provide contemporary work-related case studies. Despite this, the School does not engage with sponsoring employers, nor provide specific information for this group.

How effective are the provider's arrangements for assuring the accuracy and completeness of information it has responsibility for publishing?

3.4   The School's processes for checking the accuracy and completeness of published information are robust and rigorous. The awarding body and organisations check and regularly audit the School's public information, including that contained on the website and the online virtual learning environment. Anglia Ruskin University works closely with the School during programme approval to ensure that information is accurate and comprehensive. Effective monitoring has identified minor issues, for example misinformation by an overseas agent, which was quickly resolved. The Association of Business Practitioners checks the information during regular external verification visits. The Chartered Institute of Marketing similarly checks public information using contemporary marketing research techniques.

3.5   The School's Communications Policy affords a systematic process for ensuring the accuracy and completeness of published information. It outlines the processes and scope for publishing and auditing published information, including the steps for determining accuracy, quality, revision and republication of materials. Staff use an electronic project management collaboration tool that provides a clear audit trail for the development of e-learning materials. The marketing department has oversight of published information to ensure compliance in collaboration with academic departments. Staff in London and Sri Lanka confirmed that information was passed in sequence from the awarding body and organisations to subject group leaders, to the quality control team with the Head of Information Technology providing checks on language and grammar, and then a further check by the subject group leader. A final check is made by the marketing team before uploading to the website and the e-learning platform. A full-time Cyber Patrol Officer in the School maintains oversight of published information and undertakes anonymous audits. The team considers as good practice the use of extensive auditing processes to secure the accuracy of information prior to its publication.

3.6   The School provides extensive and exclusively online learning resources. Currently, there are two parallel systems available to students. The School enhances the online resources in response to comments from staff and students. Students and staff agreed that the new e-learning platform is an extremely valuable resource that supports students' understanding of their learning requirements. The Sri Lanka team is largely responsible for the development of these resources, using the same rigorous processes noted in paragraphs 3.4 and 3.5.

The team concludes that **reliance can be placed** on the accuracy and completeness of the information that the provider is responsible for publishing about itself and the programmes it delivers.

Action plan[3]

London School of Marketing action plan relating to the Review for Educational Oversight May 2012						
Good practice	**Action to be taken**	**Target date**	**Action by**	**Success indicators**	**Reported to**	**Evaluation**
The review team identified the following areas of **good practice** that are worthy of wider dissemination within the provider:						
• the accessibility of a fully developed and systematically enhanced e-learning platform that provides an extensive 'one stop' resource for information to support learning and enhance achievement (paragraph 2.8)	A review of the e-learning platform is already under way in order to identify further ways of enhancing the learning resources It has already been decided to incorporate extra visualisations into the learning resources to enhance text and aid learner understanding even more In addition, links to the websites of	August 2012 before the commencement of the autumn term Thereafter, at the end of every term after reviewing student and other stakeholders' feedback in order to incorporate improvements in the system for each following term	The Lanka team in cooperation with the academic department team in the UK and in conjunction with the information technology team in Colombo	Agreement between the Lanka team and the academic department team that improvement is evident Working links with awarding body and organisations Specifically: • positive comments from the scheduled Anglia Ruskin University audit in August 2012	The Chief Operating Officer and the Director of Academic and Quality Compliance	Student feedback, from the bi-term questionnaires, about the e-learning platform's effectiveness and ease of navigation, as shown in the success indicators column Student feedback from these questionnaires, as is the practice of the School in the last three years, are

[3] The provider has been required to develop this action plan to follow up on good practice and address any recommendations arising from the review. QAA monitors progress against the action plan, in conjunction with the provider's awarding body and organisations.

	partner awarding body and organisations are also currently being incorporated into the system in an effort to create a central platform that provides access to information from diverse sources from one central point			• 70 per cent upwards of student satisfaction levels of online resources in every survey conducted, in terms of: accessibility, ease of navigation, relevance of material in the context of the module(s), quality of material in the context of the module(s)		analysed by an independent agency and a full report is prepared for discussion in departmental meetings In addition, there are also other various internal and external audits For example, one external audit has already been scheduled for August 2012 by Anglia Ruskin University before the commencement of the newly validated degrees in September 2012 Internal audits include the termly inspections of online resources and full reports are again produced for

						consideration by the academic department Furthermore, all external and internal reports are also discussed in the bimonthly management meetings and corrective action (if necessary) is taken
• the use of extensive auditing processes to secure the accuracy of information prior to its publication (paragraph 3.5).	Maintain the rigorous systems and processes that already exist to ensure the appropriateness and accuracy of public information prior to publication Maintain the regular reviews after publication in order to identify timely amendments, as and when needed	Monthly reviews	Relevant key staff members according to the type of information under examination	Appropriateness and accuracy of information in the context of the source This includes both internal requirements, such as School fees and timetables, and external requirements, such as course structures and assessment details	The Chief Operating Officer	Appropriate internal individuals, such as the department heads, responsible for the type of published information and external key individuals' comments, such as applicants and periodic inspections from the awarding body and organisations about relevance

						and accuracy of information according to the brief In addition, there are monthly internal audits regarding the accuracy of public information and the reports from these audits are discussed in the bimonthly management meetings All these reports and records from the diverse meetings are kept for future reference
Advisable	**Action to be taken**	**Target date**	**Action by**	**Success indicators**	**Reported to**	**Evaluation**
The team considers that it is **advisable** for the provider to:						
• formalise and enhance the current arrangements for the central recording and	Review current internal verification process of student assessments in order to enhance practice	July 2012	The Director of Academic and Quality Compliance	The updated policy Comparability of the updated policy with other	The Chief Operating Officer	The internal verification policy Findings from comparisons made with Anglia

tracking of internal verification of assessment (paragraph 1.7)	As a result of the review: • formalise an updated policy in line with awarding body and organisations' requirements and QAA guidelines • develop related processes for recording and presenting the data and a system for storing the information	August 2012 September 2012	The director of academic and quality compliance The director of academic quality and compliance together with the information technology team responsible for the newly developed Intranet	similar schools in order to follow standard, and acceptable, practice Satisfaction of the comments made by the Association of Business Practitioners and Anglia Ruskin University latest external examiners' visits An internal verification flow chart that illustrates the internal marking and verification process to complement the policy The design of a spreadsheet that enables the full recording of student work and clearly shows marking, double marking and		Ruskin University's internal verification policy and processes, to ensure standardisation and synchronisation of practice The formalisation and adoption of the updated policy and its associated systems and processes Approval of external examiner(s) about the updated policy and processes in the next set of scheduled external examination visits A clearly illustrated flow chart that shows the relevant linkages and

				internal verification records per assessed work		interactions between relevant parties Relevant spreadsheets per internal verification according to the requirements of the awarding body and organisations, and positive external examiners' comments after the visit as to the effectiveness of the spreadsheet in showing all the relevant information clearly
• establish clear terms of reference for academic committees and formalise its record-keeping processes (paragraph 2.2)	Review the current academic committees and panel	July 2012	The Director of Academic and Quality Compliance	Comparability with Anglia Ruskin University and other associate awarding organisations' requirements	Management team via the bimonthly scheduled meetings	
	Develop a flow chart of activities to	August 2012		Completed flow chart		The flow chart

	illustrate responsibilities and reporting mechanisms for each			Embedded responsibilities and reporting mechanisms Ability of committee and panel members to understand the role of each activity and event		Effectiveness of meetings and processes according to the scheduled events in the academic calendar
	Create terms of reference per committee and panel	August 2012		Clear and completed terms of reference per committee and panel, according to QAA guidelines		Terms of reference Clear records of minutes and reporting of activities and findings
	Formalise the requirement for minute-taking and record-keeping	August 2012		Formalisation and adoption of the terms of reference for each committee and panel Signing off of the minutes after production and periodical audit of the record files		Easily identifiable stored records
• devise a staff recruitment policy (paragraph 2.5)	This already partially exists for academic staff as part of the academic quality		The Chief Operating Officer in cooperation with		Group's legal adviser	

	and compliance framework developed three years ago		the various department heads			
	However, a review will take place in order to identify an appropriate policy in line with the requirements of the organisation	August 2012		Comments from department heads as to the requirements of the policy for academic and non-academic staff in terms of processes, systems and other specialist departmental requirements that will need to be incorporated in the document		Feedback from all relevant heads as to the appropriateness and effectiveness of the policy
	As a result of the review, a new policy will be developed clearly articulating the various key characteristics for academic and non-academic staff	September 2012				Approval from the group's legal adviser as to the legal standing of the policy
				Final approval of the organisation's recruitment policy by the group's legal adviser		
				An embedded recruitment policy		
• formalise the disabilities policy (paragraph 2.6).	Develop a clear disabilities policy in the context of a learning institution by taking into	September 2012	The Chief Operating Officer in cooperation with the various	Agreement between the various associates	Management team via the bimonthly scheduled meetings	Formalisation and adoption of the policy Comparability of

consideration all associate awarding body and organisations' current policies in the area, venue (campuses) providers' guidelines and legal and regulatory requirements in academia For example, in the online learning resources access to online tutors has already been incorporated in the system in order to support learners that need further help In addition, module webinars are also scheduled, providing the opportunity for learners that have learning difficulties to ask questions and clarify requirements during a live meeting		department heads, partner institutions and venue providers	For example, the final draft of the policy will be sent to the partner awarding body and organisations and venue providers for comments and recommendations for further improvements, if necessary Approval of policy by the organisation's legal adviser Publication of disabilities policy Comparability of policy against Anglia Ruskin University and other associate awarding organisations' guidelines and current policies		policy against associate awarding body and organisations Meeting minutes and emails showing acceptability of policy by department heads and associate awarding body and organisations

About QAA

QAA is the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education. QAA's mission is to safeguard standards and improve the quality of UK higher education.

QAA's aims are to:

- meet students' needs and be valued by them
- safeguard standards in an increasingly diverse UK and international context
- drive improvements in UK higher education
- improve public understanding of higher education standards and quality.

QAA conducts reviews of higher education institutions and publishes reports on the findings. QAA also publishes a range of guidance documents to help safeguard standards and improve quality.

More information about the work of QAA is available at: www.qaa.ac.uk.

More detail about Review for Educational Oversight can be found at: www.qaa.ac.uk/institutionreports/types-of-review/tier-4.

Glossary

This glossary explains terms used in this report.   You can find a fuller glossary at: www.qaa.ac.uk/aboutus/glossary. Formal definitions of key terms can be found in the *Review for Educational Oversight: Handbook*[4]

Academic Infrastructure Guidance developed and agreed by the higher education community and published by QAA, which is used by institutions to ensure that their courses meet national expectations for academic standards and that students have access to a suitable environment for learning (academic quality). It consists of four groups of reference points: the **frameworks for higher education qualifications**, the **subject benchmark statements**, the **programme specifications** and the **Code of practice**. Work is underway (2011-12) to revise the Academic Infrastructure as the UK Quality Code for Higher Education.

academic quality A comprehensive term referring to how, and how well, institutions manage teaching and learning opportunities to help students progress and succeed.

academic standards The standards set and maintained by institutions for their courses and expected for their awards. See also **threshold academic standard**.

awarding body A body with the authority to award academic qualifications located on the **framework for higher education qualifications**, such as diplomas or degrees.

awarding organisation An organisation with the authority to award academic qualifications located on the Qualifications and Credit Framework for England and Northern Ireland (these qualifications are at levels 1 to 8, with levels 4 and above being classed as 'higher education').

Code of practice *The Code of practice for the assurance of academic quality and standards in higher education*, published by QAA: a set of interrelated documents giving guidance for higher education institutions.

designated body An organisation that has been formally appointed to perform a particular function.

differentiated judgements In a Review for Educational Oversight, separate judgements respectively for the provision validated by separate awarding bodies.

enhancement Taking deliberate steps at institutional level to improve the quality of **learning opportunities**. It is used as a technical term in QAA's audit and review processes.

feature of good practice A positive aspect of the way a higher education institution manages quality and standards, which may be seen as exemplary to others.

framework A published formal structure. See also **framework for higher education qualifications**.

framework for higher education qualifications A published formal structure that identifies a hierarchy of national qualification levels and describes the general achievement expected of holders of the main qualification types at each level, thus assisting higher education providers in maintaining academic standards. QAA publishes the following frameworks:

---

[4] www.qaa.ac.uk/publications/informationandguidance/pages/reo-handbook.aspx.

The framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FHEQ) and *The framework for qualifications of higher education institutions in Scotland*.

highly trusted sponsor An education provider that the UK government trusts to admit migrant students from overseas, according to Tier 4 of the UK Border Agency's points-based immigration system. Higher education providers wishing to obtain this status must undergo a successful review by QAA.

learning opportunities The provision made for students' learning, including planned **programmes of study**, teaching, assessment, academic and personal support, resources (such as libraries and information systems, laboratories or studios) and staff development.

learning outcome What a learner is expected to know, understand and/or be able to demonstrate after completing a process of learning.

operational definition A formal definition of a term, which establishes exactly what QAA means when using it in reports.

programme (of study) An approved course of study which provides a coherent learning experience and normally leads to a qualification.

programme specifications Published statements about the intended **learning outcomes** of **programmes of study**, containing information about teaching and learning methods, support and assessment methods, and how individual units relate to levels of achievement.

provider An institution that offers courses of higher education, typically on behalf of a separate **awarding body or organisation**. In the context of REO, the term means an independent college.

public information Information that is freely available to the public (sometimes referred to as being 'in the public domain').

reference points Statements and other publications that establish criteria against which performance can be measured. Internal reference points may be used by providers for purposes of self-regulation; external ones are used and accepted throughout the higher education community for the checking of standards and quality.

quality See **academic quality**.

subject benchmark statement A published statement that sets out what knowledge, understanding, abilities and skills are expected of those graduating in each of the main subject areas (mostly applying to bachelor's degrees), and explains what gives that particular discipline its coherence and identity.

threshold academic standard The minimum standard that a student should reach in order to gain a particular qualification or award, as set out in the **subject benchmark statements** and national qualifications frameworks. Threshold standards are distinct from the standards of performance that students need to achieve in order to gain any particular class of award, for example a first-class bachelor's degree. See also **academic standard**.

widening participation Increasing the involvement in higher education of people from a wider range of backgrounds.

All QAA's publications are available on our website www.qaa.ac.uk