Navitas UK Holdings Ltd

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

May 2012

Key findings about Navitas UK Holdings Ltd

The QAA review team (the team) formed the following judgements about Navitas UK Holdings Ltd:

The team has **confidence** in the provider's management of its responsibilities for the academic standards of the programmes it offers through its embedded college provision. However, **limited confidence** can be placed in the soundness of the provider's current and likely future management of the academic standards in its international collaborative provision.

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

The team considers that **reliance** on the accuracy and completeness of the information that the provider is responsible for publishing about itself, its embedded colleges, and the programmes that they deliver. However, **limited reliance** can be placed on the accuracy and completeness of the provider's public information for which it is responsible in its international collaborative provision.

Good practice

The QAA review team identified the following **features of good practice** at Navitas UK Holdings Ltd:

- the high-quality, individualised feedback on assessments provided in a timely manner (paragraph 1.29)
- the effective use of MAZE data, including the tracer study (paragraph 1.42)
- the effective teamwork which has created a caring, accessible and responsive learning environment (paragraphs 2.13 and 2.21)
- the effectiveness of the Students in Jeopardy Programme (paragraphs 2.17 and 2.21)
- the careful recruitment and effective use of agents (paragraph 2.23)
- the consistent and effective use made of teaching observation (paragraph 2.32).

Recommendations

The QAA review team makes the following recommendations to Navitas UK Holdings Ltd.

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

- ensure that policies and practice for the selection and approval of international collaborative partners fully reflect the *Code of practice*, *Section 2*: *Collaborative provision and flexible and distributed learning (including e-learning)* (paragraph 1.15)
- consistently apply their published procedures for programme approval (paragraph 1.18)
- ensure that policies and practice for the approval, monitoring, review and management of programmes delivered through international collaborative provision fully reflect the *Code of practice*, *Section 2*: *Collaborative provision and flexible and distributed learning (including e-learning)* (paragraph 1.19)

- ensure that robust and rigorous assessment and moderation policies and practice are in place for international collaborative provision (paragraph 1.26)
- work with its partner universities to provide students with formal recognition of modules passed, including credit and level, and any appropriate exit award (paragraph 1.44)
- ensure the material published by international collaborative partners is regularly monitored for accuracy (paragraph 3.9).

The team considers that it would be **desirable** for the provider to:

- continue to develop a more consistent approach to student engagement in quality assurance (paragraph 2.7).

About this report

This report presents the findings of the [Embedded College Review for Educational Oversight](1) (ECREO) conducted by [QAA](#) at Navitas UK Holdings Ltd (the provider; Navitas). 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 in partnership with Anglia Ruskin University, Brunel University, Edinburgh Napier University, Plymouth University, Robert Gordon University, Swansea University, University of Hertfordshire and University of Portsmouth. The review was carried out by Prof Brian Anderton, Prof Gwendolen Bradshaw, Dr Robert Davison and Dr Colin Dawson (reviewers), Ms Mary Flynn (review secretary), and Prof Peter Hodson (QAA Officer).

The review team conducted the review in agreement with the provider and in accordance with the *[Embedded College Review for Educational Oversight: Handbook](#)*.[2] Evidence in support of the review included the Navitas self-evaluation and supporting documents, meetings with Navitas staff at both the centre and at each embedded college, staff at each partner university, students at each of the embedded colleges, and multiple additional documents provided during the review from both the centre and each of the embedded colleges.

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

- the Academic Infrastructure.

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

Navitas University Programmes Division UK (Navitas UK Holdings Ltd) is part of a larger group, Navitas Ltd, whose headquarters is in Australia. Navitas Ltd operates globally with a focus on education and a mission which states that: 'Navitas is passionate about creating opportunities through lifelong learning and being a global leader in delivering better learning opportunities'. In this report, the title Navitas refers to the UK University Programmes Division. Navitas aims to be acknowledged as 'the UK's most trusted partner in delivering university pathways'.

Navitas was established in 2000, then known as IBT Education. Its first partner was the University of Hertfordshire. Since 2000, seven more embedded colleges have been established and have students studying a range of programmes. A further embedded college is under development.

At the time of the review, the provider offered the following higher education programmes, listed beneath their partner Higher Education Institute (HEI):

Cambridge Ruskin International College
- University Foundation in Architecture
- University Foundation in Art and Design
- University Foundation in Business
- University Foundation in Computing and Technology
- University Foundation in Communications and Humanities

---

[1] [www.qaa.ac.uk/InstitutionReports/types-of-review/tier-4](#)
[2] [www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Pages/embedded-college-handbook.aspx](#)

- University Foundation in Engineering and Built Environment
- University Foundation in Law
- University Foundation in Optometry
- University Foundation in Medical and Life Sciences

- Foundation Degree in Art and Design

- First Year Degree in Architecture
- First Year Degree in Business
- First Year Degree in Computing and Technology
- First Year Degree in Communications and Humanities
- First Year Degree in Engineering and Built Environment
- First Year Degree in Medical and Life Sciences

- Pre-Master's in Management

Edinburgh International College
- First Year Degree in Business
- Second Year Degree in Business
- Pre-Master's in Business Management

Hertfordshire International College
- Pre-sessional English

- University Foundation in Business
- University Foundation in Computer Science and IT
- University Foundation in Law
- University Foundation in Mass Communications
- University Foundation in Science and Engineering

- First Year Degree in Business
- First Year Degree in Computer Science and IT
- First Year Degree in Law
- First Year Degree in Mass Communications
- First Year Degree in Science and Engineering

- Pre-Master's in Business

International College Portsmouth
- University Foundation in Accounting and Finance
- University Foundation in Business
- University Foundation in Computing
- University Foundation in Creative Technologies
- University Foundation in Engineering
- University Foundation in Law
- University Foundation in Mathematics
- University Foundation in Science

- First Year Degree in Accounting and Finance
- First Year Degree in Business
- First Year Degree in Computing
- First Year Degree in Creative Technologies

- First Year Degree in Engineering
- First Year Degree in Law
- First Year Degree in Mathematics
- First Year Degree in Science

- Pre-Master's in Business
- Pre-Master's in Finance

International College Robert Gordon University
- First Year Degree in Accounting and Finance
- First Year Degree in Computing
- First Year Degree in Engineering
- First Year Degree in Management
- First Year Degree in Media and Communications

- Pre Master's in Management

International College Wales, Swansea
- University Foundation in Business and Economics
- University Foundation in Engineering
- University Foundation in Technology
- University Foundation in Law
- University Foundation in Science
- University Foundation in Mathematics
- University Foundation in Politics and International Relations (including Media Studies)

- First Year Degree in Business
- First Year Degree in Economics
- First Year Degree in Engineering
- First Year Degree in Technology
- First Year Degree in Computer Science
- First Year Degree in Genetics
- First Year Degree in Psychology
- First Year Degree in Science
- First Year Degree in Sports Science
- First Year Degree in Mathematics
- First Year Degree in Media Studies
- First Year Degree in Politics and International Relations

- Pre-Master's in Management
- Pre-Master's in Engineering
- Pre-Master's in Health Science (including Child Development)

London International College of Business and Technology
- University Foundation in Business and Management
- University Foundation in Information Systems and Computing
- University Foundation in Economics and Finance

- First Year Degree in Business and Management
- First Year Degree in Information Systems and Computing
- First Year Degree in Economics and Finance

- Pre-Master's in Business (Business/Management)
- Pre-Master's in Information Systems and Computing

Plymouth University International College
- English Language Programme 1
- English Language Programme 2
- English Language Programme 3

- University Foundation in Business and Enterprise
- University Foundation in Law
- University Foundation in Life Sciences
- University Foundation in Science and Engineering
- University Foundation in Sciences

- First Year Degree in Business
- First Year Degree in Economics
- First Year Degree in Maritime Business
- First Year Degree in Marketing
- First Year Degree in Accounting and Finance
- First Year Degree in Tourism
- First Year Degree in Hospitality
- First Year Degree in Tourism and Hospitality
- First Year Degree in Civil Engineering
- First Year Degree in Computing
- First Year Degree in Electrical Engineering
- First Year Degree in Mechanical Engineering
- First Year Degree in Ocean Science
- First Year Degree in Robotics
- First Year Degree in Biomedical Science
- First Year Degree in Biological Sciences
- First Year Degree in Environmental Sciences
- First Year Degree in Earth Sciences

- Pre-Master's in Business Management
- Pre-Master's in Tourism and Hospitality Management
- Pre-Master's in Publishing
- Pre-Master's in Creativity and Enterprise

The provider's stated responsibilities

Each embedded college offers a range of pathways leading to final awards of the partner university with seamless progression from embedded college to university. The embedded colleges themselves do not make awards, but on progression to university provision embedded college students are provided with a Confirmation of Attainment statement.

The primary responsibility for academic standards at each embedded college is through a Joint Strategic Partnership Management Board, or equivalent, chaired by the university partner. An Academic Advisory Committee exists at each embedded college, and each is a subcommittee of the partnership's Joint Strategic Partnership Management Board. The subcommittee is responsible at each embedded college for reviewing the effectiveness of the academic environment, including outcomes achieved by students, curriculum approval and the quality regime.

Recent developments

Navitas has two new embedded colleges operating in their first year of intake, both are located in Scotland. Additionally, a new embedded college was established at the start of this year in partnership with Birmingham City University, with the intention of developing the structures to achieve a first intake in the academic year 2012-13. In the strategic plans of Navitas, there is provision for a small expansion of further embedded colleges.

Students' contribution to the review

Students studying on higher education programmes at the provider were invited to present a submission to the review team. An overall student written submission was not possible in the context of the embedded college structure that exists at Navitas. However, students were able to make an input, including a short written report in some cases, and held a meeting at every centre with members of the review team.

Detailed findings about Navitas UK Holdings Ltd

1 Academic standards

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

1.1 Navitas currently has a network of eight colleges throughout the UK. The Senior Management Team at Navitas is responsible for providing effective leadership and direction, and ensuring that business objectives are met. All embedded College Director and Principals are members of the Senior Management Team. The Senior Management Team has face-to-face monthly meetings to discuss strategic and operational aspects. These meetings are also used to share good practice. In addition to the monthly meetings, there is regular and frequent communication via telephone, email and online video interview between each College Director and Principal and the General Manager of Navitas UK Programmes.

1.2 Each college has a team responsible for student support and services, admissions, finance, information and communications technology and marketing. Each team is responsible to its own college principal, known as the College Director and Principal.

1.3 Colleges are supported centrally by Navitas headquarters, based in Swansea. The Quality and Standards Office of Navitas has oversight of the curriculum and maintains the Quality Manual, which sets out policies, procedures and regulations. Navitas has devised a standard governance structure that is employed in its network of colleges.

1.4 Responsibility for standards and quality in each college ultimately rests with the College Director and Principal. He/she undertakes this responsibility through the college's committee structure. This structure is designed to ensure effective communication between Navitas, the colleges and the partner universities.

1.5 Primary accountability for quality and standards at each college is through the Joint Strategic Partnership Management Board. This Board draws members from the senior staff of both the partner university and the college. It is chaired by a senior member of the partner university, and there is representation from Navitas. The Board oversees the relationship between the college and the partner university with reference to the Recognition and Articulation Agreement, and initiates strategic activity. Proposals for curriculum initiatives must be endorsed by the Joint Strategic Partnership Management Board, and reported through the Senior Management Team prior to development. The membership and terms of reference are contained in a schedule of the Recognition and Articulation Agreement.

1.6 Each Joint Strategic Partnership Management Board has an Academic Advisory Committee as a subcommittee. Typically embedded colleges also have an Operations Advisory Committee, a Marketing and Planning Advisory Committee and a Learning and Teaching Board, although there are some minor variations between colleges. For example, Cambridge Ruskin International College have merged their Operations and Marketing committees into one committee for efficiency.

1.7 The review team formed the view that the Joint Strategic Partnership Management Boards were effective, with the Boards demonstrating clear evidence of long-term strategic planning between the partner university and the college. The team noted that at one college this board had only met once and further meetings would commence following the very recent appointment of the College Director and Principal, who at the time of the visit had yet to take up her post.

1.8   The Academic Advisory Committee, on behalf of the Joint Strategic Partnership Management Board, is responsible for overseeing the academic environment and ensuring that academic processes are effective. Each one is responsible for overseeing the processes of curriculum approval, curriculum initiatives, academic quality assurance and the transfer of students from the college to the partner university. Its role is to ensure that academic standards are maintained, as set out in programme specifications and definitive module descriptions. It also has responsibility for the assessment process. In addition to the maintenance of standards, the Academic Advisory Committee has to ensure that teaching and learning facilities are appropriate. It gives consideration to student feedback and the results of tracer studies, in which the progress through university of previous Navitas students is monitored.

1.9   The Academic Advisory Committee is chaired by a senior academic of the partner university and has senior staff of both the partner university and the college as members. There is also representation from Navitas. The review team noted that discussions concerning operational details of curriculum delivery and development, and quality management, were being held at the Academic Advisory Committee meetings.

1.10   Each college's Learning and Teaching Board is chaired by the College Director and Principal, and is responsible for all day-to-day academic-related issues. They meet approximately once per month, and their remit and membership are contained in the schedules of the Recognition and Articulation Agreement. The annual plan of each Learning and Teaching Board is reported to the December meeting of the Navitas UK Board.

1.11   Policies, procedures and regulations for college-wide application are formally documented by the Navitas Quality and Standards Office. College policies cover, for example, approval, monitoring and review, assessment, student grievance, student experience, and attendance and monitoring. Collectively, these form the Quality Manual, available to all colleges in paper and electronic format. Policies seen by the review team were thorough and clear, and made a definite contribution to the effectiveness of the management of quality and standards. The policies and procedures detailed within the Quality Manual can be adapted to meet the individual operating environment of each college.

1.12   Each partner university appoints a link tutor to be the main operational contact between university and college. The link tutors that the review team met were knowledgeable and enthusiastic about their role. The team formed the view that the committee structure, link tutors and the Quality Manual all contribute to the maintenance of quality and standards in all colleges.

Written agreements with partners

1.13   Each embedded college is located on the campus of its partner university. The college and partner university enter into a formal contract with each other, known as a Recognition and Articulation Agreement (RAA). Navitas provides a template for the RAA, which can then be tailored to the specific requirements of individual colleges. Appendices to the agreement contain terms of reference and membership of key committees, such as the Joint Strategic Partnership Management Board and the Academic Advisory Committee. The RAAs seen by the review team were appropriate.

1.14   The agreement is updated regularly to meet any current operational requirements. Consideration of the RAA will also form part of the periodic review of the college by the partner university.

The provider's arrangements for approval, monitoring and periodic review of its provision

Approval of international collaborative partners

1.15   The review team learnt that one of the embedded colleges (International College Wales, Swansea) had entered into a collaboration with an international partner, to allow the that partner to deliver part of a Navitas pathway programme for entry to a degree programme at Swansea University. Navitas refer to this collaborative provision as Transnational Education-University Transfer Programme and the arrangement was the only international provision that had been entered into, although active discussions had taken place with another potential partner. In the absence of a Navitas procedure for the approval of such a partnership, advice was sought and followed from Navitas, as to how to proceed. Having obtained approval from Navitas a visit by a single member of the college staff, the College Director and Principal, was made to the international partner. A report of the visit was presented to Navitas where strategic approval was given, and subsequently a formal contract was drawn up and signed. There was no externality in the approval process and the procedure designed did not align with the *Code of practice for the assurance of academic quality and standards in higher education* (the *Code of practice*), *Section 2*: *Collaborative provision and flexible and distributed learning (including e-learning)*. A Collaborative Provision Committee, with a membership which included senior staff from the partner university, approved the proposal and the intended publicity material. Hence the Collaborative Provision Committee should have been fully aware of the expectation of the *Code of practice* through the partner university's involvement. The team viewed the process of partner approval as inadequate and recommend as advisable that policies and practices for the selection and approval of international collaborative partners should fully reflect the the *Code of practice*, *Section 2*: *Collaborative provision and flexible and distributed learning (including e-learning)*. By the end of the review the team understood that this international collaborative provision was in the process of being terminated.

Approval of a pathway

1.16   Both the college and partner university play key roles in the approval process. To ensure that a pathway prepares students adequately for progression to a partner university degree, the pathway is designed with the full involvement of academic staff from the partner university. This was confirmed in meetings that the review team had with college and partner university staff.

1.17   Before full development of the curriculum and student guides, 'approval in principle' is required from the Joint Strategic Partnership Management Board, the Academic Advisory Committee, the relevant university committee dealing with collaborative provision, and Navitas. At this stage, resource requirements are reviewed and agreed. On gaining 'approval in principle', documents, including programme specifications and definitive module documents, are prepared. Programme specifications and definitive module documents seen by the review team were comprehensive.

1.18   Proposals are examined by a scrutiny panel convened by the partner university. The panel comprises senior staff from the relevant faculty of the partner university, the college and Navitas. Once approved by the scrutiny panel, the pathway may then recruit. The review team learnt of one college where scrutiny panels had not been convened in accordance with Navitas' own policy at the outset, but followed procedures of the partner university. The full procedures were subsequently applied following the team's visit to the college when additional programme choices were added to the provision. The review team recommends as advisable that Navitas should consistently apply their published procedures for programme approval.

1.19   The method of approval of the single programme for international collaboration provision was unclear to the review team. The mechanism for ongoing monitoring was also unclear. Recruitment had commenced in September 2010, and the team saw some evidence that annual monitoring of the programme had taken place, although they formed the view that this was managerially driven. The team recommends as advisable that policies and practice for the approval, monitoring, review and management of programmes delivered through international collaborative provision should fully reflect the *Code of practice*, *Section 2*: *Collaborative provision and flexible and distributed learning (including e-learning)*.

Annual Monitoring

1.20   Students are surveyed at the end of each module. Results of these surveys inform the annual monitoring process. An annual report is prepared, usually in October or November, which reports on the academic well-being of each pathway. The reports draw upon student feedback, feedback from link tutors, student achievement data, as well as results of tracer studies. Data are drawn from Navitas' management information system (MAZE), which routinely tracks the progress of students, including attendance, module grade data, pass rates and dropout rates. Annual monitoring is used to ensure that resources are still appropriate for the provision. Annual reports are considered by the Academic Advisory Committees and the Joint Strategic Partnership Management Boards. The annual reports seen by the review team were thorough and concluded with a plan of action to address any identified shortcomings.

Periodic Review

1.21   With the exception of one college (Edinburgh International College), periodic review of pathways will take place under the processes of the partner university. The delivery of the provision at Edinburgh International College is relatively new, and no agreement on how to undertake periodic review had been established at the time of the visit, although the university indicated it would not be under its procedures. Some colleges had not yet had a periodic review due to the limited time they had been operating.

How effectively does the provider manage the assessment of students?

1.22   Assessment regulations are set out in the College Policies and Regulations, Section 11, including regulations for coursework and examinations, extenuating circumstances, feedback, and module panels and progression boards. The review team found that staff were very aware of their responsibilities regarding assessment, and were very positive about the principles set out in Section 11 of the College Policies and Regulations.

1.23   The self-evaluation document states that assessment regimes are approved by the partner university as part of the approval process. The review team found this to be the case for level 4 and pre-master's assignments, although it was not always the case for level 3 assessment tasks. Assessment tasks are mapped onto the learning outcomes of the modules.

1.24   Students receive clear information about the assessment requirements and regulations. These are made available to students in handbooks and/or through the virtual learning environment. Students indicated that they had been fully briefed on the assessment process, that it was very clear to them, and that they understood what they needed to do in order to progress. They were also aware of the role that the partner university played in the assessment process.

1.25   Assessment tasks are marked by college tutors, and sometimes second marked internally. Staff at the partner universities are involved in the moderation of student work, especially at level 4 and pre-master's level. Each partner university's Link Tutor plays a

significant role in coordinating the moderation of assessed work. One partner university has formal procedures for the moderation of assessment, with work for moderation being submitted through a University Collaborative Committee.

1.26   Academic staff at ICWS, whom the review team met, were unaware of the international collaborative partnership, and had not been involved in the moderation of any student assessments. The subject area represented by at least one of the staff met by the team was aligned with the provision in the international collaborative partnership. It was unclear to the team how assessments, written in Spanish, had been scrutinised and moderated by the College, although it was clear that the issue was identified during the following visit to the collaborative partner and was being actively addressed. The team recommends as advisable that Navitas ensures that robust and rigorous assessment and moderation policies and procedures are in place for international collaborative provision.

1.27   Students acknowledged that they receive very prompt formative feedback, often within a ten-day turnaround time or better. They reported that the personal feedback they received on their assignments was very constructive and useful. Teaching staff reported that they provided generic feedback to students in classroom sessions and, in addition, engaged in one-to-one tutorials to provide feedback to students requiring additional support. This was confirmed by students, who reported that they received verbal feedback in one-to-one sessions, particularly if their marks were low.

1.28   Module examination panels are held at the end of each semester to determine the grades of students on each module. University staff, including heads of school, are invited to attend module panels. However, it is usually the link tutors who attend as representatives of the partner university. Progression between stages of a pathway is determined at College Progression Boards, which are attended by the link tutors and may also include representatives from the University's Registry, or Quality Office.

1.29   The review team concluded that very robust policies, procedures and practices are in place for the assessment of students. The team noted the high-quality, individualised feedback on assessments provided in a timely manner, which is considered to be a feature of good practice.

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

1.30   Policies and procedures for quality assurance are set out in the Navitas Quality Manual, and in the College Policies and Regulations. Both the College Policies and Regulations and the Quality Manual are closely aligned with the *Code of practice*, with the exception of the international collaborative provision approach. The review team was provided with outline evidence of a mapping of the College Policies and Regulations to the relevant sections of the *Code of practice*. The Navitas Quality and Standards Office undertakes an annual review of College Procedures and Regulations to incorporate any changes to external reference points, including the UK Quality Code for Higher Education.

1.31   The development of new pathways is informed by internal and external reference points, such as *The framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland* and the Scottish Qualifications and Credit Framework, the UK Quality Code, National Vocational Qualifications level 3 requirements, and the requirements of professional bodies.

1.32   Programme specifications are developed for each pathway, using a Navitas template adapted to the requirements of the partner university. They are reviewed annually by the college Learning and Teaching Boards or Committee, and monitored by the Navitas

Quality and Standards Office. Teaching staff the review team met at Cambridge Ruskin International College (CRIC) said they focused on the use of the standard definitive module documents in planning and scheduling delivery of their modules and were less familiar with programme specifications. Similarly, students were often not familiar with programme specifications, but said they regularly made use of the College Policies and Regulations and definitive module documents.

1.33   Most Navitas provision is outside of the subject benchmark statements, except for level 4 studies. In this case, reliance is upon the partner university developing its level 4 provision with reference to appropriate subject benchmark statements. For pre-master's programmes, relevant subject benchmark statements and any relevant professional, statutory or regulatory body information, are routinely taken into account.

1.34   The review team concluded that effective use was made of external reference points in the management of academic standards.

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

1.35   There is no documented requirement in the College Polices and Regulations Section 10 for external members of scrutiny panels beyond the requirements of the partner university, and practice varied in line with each partner university's policies and procedures. For programmes at level 4 and below the form of externality provided is via the partner university as the modules do not contribute to the award classification. The external examiner approach is not deployed at this stage. However, for pre-master's programmes scrutiny panels do include external membership.

1.36   In general, as college provision is non-award bearing, Navitas does not employ external examiners to moderate students' assessed work. Moderation is undertaken by college staff, and/or by staff in the relevant department at the partner university. The process is overseen by the partner university's link tutors.

1.37   External examiners are appointed by the partner universities in relation to their own provision; and where relevant they will have oversight of Navitas college provision. External examiners do not normally moderate programmes at level 4 and below. Only one partner university employed external examiners to moderate level 4 work. External examiners normally moderate pre-master's level work.

1.38   The review team heard that one college is exploring the feasibility of trialling the appointment of its own external examiner, but this is not a conventional external examiner's role. The purpose of the appointment is to provide independent reports on assessment processes, which would be disseminated through the committee structure.

1.39   The review team concluded that the embedded colleges adhered to the requirements of their respective partner university. There were very high levels of satisfaction with the quality of the work undertaken by Navitas on behalf of the partner universities.

How effectively does the provider use statistical information to monitor and assure academic standards?

1.40   Navitas colleges use a student management information system called MAZE, which has been developed for Navitas and is used across the larger global Navitas group. The MAZE system allows students' progress to be monitored, including their attendance. The review team found evidence of the MAZE system being used rigorously and effectively

to enable each college to monitor student progress and to assure academic standards. In particular, data from MAZE was used in all the colleges to generate module reports and to inform semester and annual reports, which typically went to the Academic Advisory Committee and, sometimes, the Joint Strategic Partnership Management Board. Receipt of these reports by the Academic Advisory Committee and the Joint Strategic Partnership Management Board enabled the university partners to have oversight of student progression and academic standards, and their receipt by the Navitas Quality and Standards Office enabled Navitas to have similar oversight.

1.41   A further system called ARQUE (Navitas student performance analysis system), designed to allow 'drilling-down' into module data to analyse student performance and create reports for module panels, is being piloted. There is evidence of student statistical data being utilised to inform the college Learning and Teaching Boards or Committee, about student progress and achievement. In reviewing the individual colleges, there was evidence of the Director of Academic and Student Services reporting on progression and student feedback to Learning and Teaching Boards or Committee at the end of each semester. College Annual Monitoring Reports included an abundance of statistical information, and there was evidence of its analysis and use to inform relevant actions.

1.42   The review team concluded that the effective use of MAZE data was a feature of good practice, as was the systematic use of tracer studies, allowing the progress of Navitas students to be followed, as they moved forward on their university programme to eventual graduation. The team saw evidence of these tracer studies being used to compare performance of Navitas students against other students on the same university programme, and as a means of evaluating the effectiveness of the Navitas-delivered part of the programme in preparing students for later study.

1.43   An area of weakness is related to the interchange of student data between Navitas colleges and their partner universities. This contributes to the situation where the university transcripts show no evidence of credit gained in the Navitas-delivered part of the programme, and there was a lack of formal recognition of the modules and credits achieved by students during their period of study at the Navitas colleges. Navitas provides students with a Confirmation of Attainment statement when they progress to the university-delivered part of the programme, but this contains only the name of the modules studied and marks gained, and gives no indication of the level or volume of credit achieved by students. Moreover, should a student successfully complete the first year (level 4) of a degree programme delivered by Navitas, although they would have gained a level and volume of credit identical to that of students on the same programme within the university, if a change of personal circumstances meant they were unable to continue with their studies, they would not be eligible for the award of a Certificate of Higher Education as an exit qualification.

1.44   The review team was informed that a system for data interchange is being developed between Swansea University and International College Wales, Swansea, with the intention of producing a university transcript which would show the credit gained in both the Navitas and university-delivered parts of the programme. However, this remained at the trial stage and is not currently in use. The team considered it advisable that Navitas should work with its partner universities to provide students with formal recognition of modules passed, including credit and level, and any appropriate exit award.

The review team has **confidence** in the provider's management of its responsibilities for the standards of the awards it offers through embedded college provision. However, **limited confidence** can be placed in the soundness of the provider's current and likely future management of the academic standards in its international collaborative provision.

2   Quality of learning opportunities

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

2.1   Navitas states that, as a result of rapid growth, enhancement has focused on the development and refinement of practices and procedures captured in the College Policies and Regulations. The short history of the colleges means the enhancement agenda 'is just beginning to emerge'. The review team would concur with this view. Navitas regards enhancement as a 'culture of continuous improvement', and this is enshrined in the pro forma of the annual Quality Improvement Plan. Quality Improvement Plans have milestones for the introduction of developments and improvements, and they are signed off by the General Manager Navitas. The team examined Quality Improvement Plans for the individual colleges, and formed the view that they tended to be a list of routine activities together with the current status and dates for completion of identified actions. In practice, they were an action planning tool.

2.2   The recently established Learning and Teaching and Student Experience frameworks are seen as both enhancements in themselves and as a structure through which a more formal approach to enhancement might take place. Colleges continually consider the operational practice through their Learning and Teaching Boards or Committee, and introduce enhancements at local level, but again the emphasis is on operational practice as the focus for enhancement. Enhancements may be shared through the central Learning and Teaching Forum, and the review team was given several examples of innovations at college level which are likely to go forward to this Forum. The central Learning and Teaching Committee has promoting enhancement as one of its objectives. Overall, the team formed the view that the enhancement agenda is relatively underdeveloped in the Navitas colleges, but Navitas is aware of this and has confirmed its intent to give greater attention to it in the future.

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

2.3   All colleges have close relationships with their partner universities for the management and enhancement of learning opportunities. This is clear from the detailed agreements and the continued review arrangements, which are thorough and systematic.

2.4   There is no accreditation of the Navitas provision by external bodies, beyond its recognition by the respective partner universities within which the individual Navitas colleges are embedded.

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

2.5   Navitas presents a variable picture of representation and involvement of students in quality assurance. A Student Forum with student representatives is said to be 'typically established'. The main exception the review team identified was at Edinburgh International College, but this is a recently created college and the reviewers were told that that college intended to set up a Student Forum in the near future. In most cases, the Student Forum involved student representatives, but in the case of CRIC there was no representative system as such, and all students had the right to attend the Student Council. College Director and Principals said they believed the Student Forum was becoming a more effective mechanism for involving students in quality assurance, though cultural issues among a diverse group of international students could be an impediment to student engagement.

The Student Forum reports to the College Learning and Teaching Board, and Navitas states that there is also student representation on some college boards. However, this is not apparent from the terms of reference and membership of Learning and Teaching Boards, though the chair does have the power to determine additional 'invited members'.

2.6   College Director and Principals told the review team there was a move towards the inclusion of students in relevant agenda items of college management committees. The team's visits to the colleges established some level of involvement of students in other boards and committees outside the Student Forum, primarily in the more established colleges.

2.7   In some colleges, the union of students at the partner university had been involved in training student representatives for their role, and the Director of Academic and Student Services also frequently had a role in briefing students on their role as representatives of the student body. The review team formed the view that the involvement of students in quality assurance was an area which currently exhibited a level of variance between colleges, both in terms of current practice and future intentions. Senior Navitas staff recognised the need to have a more standardised approach, and indicated a preference for the election of representatives and for the extension of representation to the Learning and Teaching Board. It was recommended as desirable that Navitas should continue to develop a more consistent approach to student engagement in quality assurance based on best practice.

How effectively does the provider make use of student feedback to assure and enhance the quality of learning opportunities?

2.8   One theme within the Learning and Teaching Strategy 2010-14 is to 'develop students as active partners'. It requires that their feedback on learning opportunities should be collated and reviewed, and used to inform strategies and plans, especially relating to enhancement. Module surveys are carried out each time the module operates, which could be more than once each year, supplemented by college surveys, annual Navitas surveys, and the two-yearly International Student Barometer. Module and college surveys are college-based and use locally devised survey instruments, but the annual student satisfaction and alumni surveys use a standard Navitas online survey. The International Student Barometer survey allows benchmarking against other Navitas provision internationally. Visits to all the partner colleges confirmed that the system of student feedback questionnaires was implemented. Visits also confirmed the outcomes of module questionnaires are made available to the relevant academic staff, and there is an expectation they will consider these and make appropriate responses and changes.

2.9   The College Learning and Teaching Boards or Committee identify key issues from the outcomes of student feedback, share them with students through the college Student Forum, and report them to the Navitas Senior Management Team, which requires each college to produce an action plan relating to the outcomes. Progress with the action plan is reported to the Academic Advisory Committee, enabling partner universities to gain information concerning student feedback, and in the college annual reports to the Quality and Standards Office. Outcomes from the feedback questionnaires and action being taken are published for students via the student portal and sometimes via posters. Students in the individual colleges confirmed all of these arrangements. They were universally of the view that their college was responsive to their feedback. It was also clear from meetings with both college staff and students that informal routes for providing feedback were equally effective mechanisms, and this reflected the low student-staff ratios in the colleges coupled with good working relations between staff and students, which were frequently commented on by students. Overall, the review team was satisfied that Navitas and its embedded colleges made effective use of student feedback.

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

2.10   The delivery of teaching that is currently supported is focused on a classroom-based approach. There are two models of delivery used. In a standard delivery model students undertake all classes with staff appointed by the College. This approach is used for programmes that are not laboratory based. In the other model, known as the integrated delivery model, students follow the university's programme but receive supplemental support from the college. In particular, the Navitas-delivered Interactive Learning Skills and Communication module was universally praised by students and also by university partners.

2.11   Absence of blended and online learning capability is identified in the Navitas Strategic Plan 2012-16 as a weakness. The review team was told there is currently a global Navitas initiative to review online and blended approaches to learning and teaching.

2.12   Navitas states that support for students starts with the issuing of a pre-departure guide and the review team agreed that the guide was an effective means of preparing students for their transition into the UK education system.

2.13   The review team concluded that staff commitment to effective teamwork has created a caring, accessible and responsive learning environment, and is a feature of good practice. Students the review team met confirmed that staff were all very approachable, friendly and supportive, and that they created a very safe and secure environment for international students.

2.14   All students receive a comprehensive induction, and the review team heard that as a result of student feedback, individual induction arrangements are now in place for any students arriving after the start of the semester. In some instances, the team found that the College Student Support Services was heavily involved in the induction programme. In addition to the college programme, students on integrated delivery programmes are also often inducted by the partner university alongside university students on the same programme. Students at one college commented on the very valuable support they receive from student mentors throughout the induction week. The review team considered the introduction of the student mentor role to be a strength of the colleges.

2.15   Personal support is also available from the student support teams within colleges, all of whom operate an open-door policy. Students the review team met reported that support was effective, and praised the level of engagement with individual module leaders and, in particular, their direct access to the College Director and Principal, should this be needed. Students have access to information through a range of mechanisms, including the Student Portal, their respective university website, a text messaging service, social networking page and the Student Handbook. The team learnt that students have access to the College Policies and Regulations and programme specifications and that they were aware of the processes concerning complaints and appeals. Students reported having 24-hour access, through the telephone, to emergency support should this ever be required.

2.16   In addition, the students whom the review team met reported that the learning outcomes for all modules were explained in detail by the teaching staff. For day-to-day information, plasma screens or noticeboards are utilised within the various colleges as a means of communicating with students. Students reported the value of the easily accessible online platform and the e-learning portal, which was used effectively by college staff to communicate with them.

2.17   Student attendance is monitored closely and any absence is investigated to ascertain what can be done to assist the student, including home visits if necessary.

Students under 18 years of age, those with a disability, or those with falling grades,
 were immediately placed on the Students in Jeopardy Programme to ensure appropriate
levels of remedial support. The review team considered the effectiveness of the Students in
Jeopardy Programme to be a feature of good practice across the colleges.

2.18   Within the workload allocation model, some colleges allocate time for teaching staff
to provide academic and pastoral support to students. This is in addition to the support
provided by the Student Support Staff Team. Staff check and respond to student emails on a
prompt, daily basis and the students the review team met commended the effectiveness of
the communication between students and teaching staff, praising college staff for the 'family
atmosphere'. Students indicated to the team that access to both academic and personal
support from teaching and administrative staff could be facilitated through drop-in sessions
or booked meetings and also electronically. The team found that student satisfaction with the
level of support provided is routinely fed back through surveys and Student Council
meetings.

2.19   The review team heard that at one college students were incentivised through a
special recognition award scheme, which was designed to promote and commend student
achievement. The scheme was reported by the teaching staff to be valued by the students.
The team noted the wide range of extra-curricular activities organised by Hertfordshire
International College staff, and considers this to be a strength of the College.

2.20   While a personal tutor scheme generally exists, at the time of the review visit one
college was in the process of introducing a new scheme. Through this scheme, students are
generally allocated a specific named tutor as their personal tutor. There is also an
expectation, at one college in particular, that students will meet with their personal tutor to
discuss their progress at least three times during each semester. The review team
considered this to be a supportive arrangement.

2.21   The review team concluded that there was evidence that the Students in Jeopardy
Programme, along with other reliable mechanisms, resulted in effective teamwork and the
creation of a caring, accessible and responsive learning environment, where students are
supported both academically and pastorally.

How effectively does the provider manage the recruitment and admission of students?

2.22   Section 3 of the College Policies and Regulations details the Navitas' approach to
admissions, and visits by the review team to the individual colleges provided evidence that
their practice closely followed these procedures. Admission of students is at the discretion of
the individual colleges, but threshold entry standards are agreed with the partner university.
In practice, students choose their partner university, and the choice of Navitas college at
which to study is dependent on that. Confirmation of Acceptance for Studies is issued by the
partner university for the whole award-bearing programme. Visits to the colleges confirmed
that applications which met the entry criteria agreed with the university partner were
managed variously by an admissions team, admissions officer or admissions coordinator,
and offers were made at this level in the college to prospective students. For non-standard
applications, the review team had been told that admissions decisions were always jointly
undertaken with the relevant staff in the partner university. In practice, visits by the team to
the individual colleges showed some variance. In some cases, non-standard applications
were referred to the College Director and Principal for consideration, in others the Learning
and Teaching Board appeared to have a role in the decision-making. Generally, there was
evidence of a close working relationship between college admissions staff and the
admissions office or international office at the partner university.

2.23   It was clear from the evidence provided by both staff and students at the colleges that the vast majority of applications originated through Navitas-appointed agents. There was evidence of a careful scrutiny process undertaken by Navitas in relation to appointment of the agents it used, with instances of good practice in terms of agent information and training inputs from colleges, and in some cases agents were shared by the Navitas college and its university partner. Students with the review team met reported a positive experience in processing their applications through Navitas-appointed agents. Overall, the team formed the view that the careful recruitment and effective use of agents constituted good practice.

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

2.24   Recruitment of staff to all the embedded colleges follows Navitas' standard recruitment and appointment processes, and these appear robust. Staff appointees are usually subject to the approval of the partner university, particularly so if they are to teach level 4 of the Navitas programme. The review team found that this approval of teaching appointments may be through the link tutor. The team noted that many of the college teaching staff were also employed by the respective partner university and often held teaching qualifications.

2.25   Following appointment, an induction programme is in place for newly appointed staff. Navitas provides very clear guidance for tutors in relation to programme specifications, learning outcomes, and assessment procedures, and these are set out in Section 11 of the College Policies and Regulations.

2.26   Although Navitas does not currently have a central Staff Development Policy for academic staff there is a centrally driven policy for ongoing administrative staff which is managed through annual performance appraisal. Opportunities ranged from shadowing experienced staff members to accessing workshops and in-house or partner university courses. The review team heard that some partner universities have introduced a fee waiver for college staff who are pursuing postgraduate programmes. The staff the review team met valued the opportunities available for personal and professional development, and the team notes that the overall attendance at staff development events at one college was reported to be between 70 and 100 per cent.

2.27   The college staff the review team met felt very well supported and expressed absolute clarity in relation to what was expected of them by their employer and by their students. The review team regarded the teamwork arrangements adopted by staff as being very supportive of each other and contributing to the effectiveness of the induction arrangements for staff.

2.28   The review team heard that colleges implement a robust system whereby all teaching staff have their teaching performance reviewed at least annually, with some staff being observed more frequently. New members of staff may be observed within their first month of appointment. Discussions with teaching staff confirmed this and highlighted the opportunities for peer observation that were available. A standard template is used to both prepare staff for their teaching observation and to provide them with feedback, which is then used to inform the staff appraisal process. The team heard that the outcome of individual teaching observations can trigger a staff appraisal meeting and may also be used in the decision-making process for the renewal of employment contracts. The link tutors contributed to the identification of staff development needs at some colleges.

2.29   The review team heard that as a result of the teaching observation exercises, workshops were introduced to assist staff with the use of modern technology in the delivery

of their teaching. In addition, a cultural awareness workshop was organised to provide staff with enhanced skills for teaching international students.

2.30   A number of staff are members of professional organisations, which allows them to keep abreast of new developments in their discipline. The teaching staff the review team met stated the benefits of the formal and informal opportunities for their development. The team considered this to be a strength in facilitating the sharing of knowledge and learning resources.

2.31   Where PhD students are recruited to teach, this is seen as a developmental opportunity with appropriate support and access to in-house staff development being provided. The review team noted that PhD students were supported through access to teaching modules at the partner university. They also received additional encouragement from college module leaders and had their teaching observed regularly. Having met a wide range of teaching staff across the colleges, the review team regarded the provision of staff development to be a key strength.

2.32   The review team concluded that the arrangements for staff appointment, appraisal, support and development both maintained and enhanced the quality of teaching, and considered the consistent and effective use made of teaching observations to be a feature of good practice.

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

2.33   While each embedded college is supported centrally, Navitas states that each is responsible for managing the learning resources associated with its programmes. The review team noted that this responsibility lies with the college Learning and Teaching Board or Committee. The review team heard that the College Director and Principal is responsible for the quality of the learning opportunities available to students in the respective college and chairs its college Learning and Teaching Board.

2.34   The review team learned that detailed consideration is given to the resource requirements of all programmes. Each college works closely with its partner university during the curriculum development stage to ensure that appropriate learning resources are available to enable students to meet the learning outcomes of their respective programme. The team noted that colleges followed the College Policies and Regulations and partner university processes and procedures during the approval processes, where detailed consideration is given to learning resources. The team saw evidence which demonstrated that details of learning resources are recorded in the definitive module documents and are provided to students at the commencement of their studies.

2.35   Where specialist facilities are required, for example within engineering pathways, the review team heard that the Navitas 'integrated model' is usually adopted. This enables students to fully access university resources and expertise. The team also saw evidence of college facilities integrated with those of the partner university. For example, the computer suite at one particular college was linked directly to the university, thus enabling students to access state-of-the-art software associated with their studies.

2.36   Further evidence of a partnership approach to the provision of learning resources was noted by the review team when it heard that requests for university teaching space were considered equally alongside in-house requests.

2.37   The review team confirmed that students generally enjoy access to university facilities, including the virtual learning environment. Students reported that they feel part of the university from the outset.The students the team met confirmed that this assisted their transition to the university environment. They also reported that structured induction programmes take place in the first week of each semester, including introduction to learning materials and to the virtual leaning environments.

2.38   When developing learning materials for a module, the review team noted that some staff author their own material, yet they may also draw upon the material of the partner university. The team heard of an example where the teaching team have introduced peer review of teaching materials and are moving towards having leaders for subject clusters to enhance delivery and provide additional peer support.

2.39   The students the review team met stated that they are able to provide feedback regarding the sufficiency and appropriateness of learning resources to college staff through module evaluation questionnaires at the completion of each module. The team heard that college staff also monitor student achievement to help them judge the adequacy of learning resources. In addition, students were able to communicate any of their concerns either individually or through a more formal means, such as the Student Council or Student Forum.

2.40   The review team concluded from the evidence derived both from students and from staff that learning resources receive diligent consideration in all respects. This ensures that learning resources are accessible to students in sufficient volume and quality to enable them to achieve the intended learning outcomes for their particular programme of study.

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

---

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   Navitas pathways lead to final awards of the partner university. Navitas does not make any awards, and therefore does not provide certificates. However, at the point of progression from Navitas to partner university provision, each student receives a personal transcript in the form of a Confirmation of Attainment statement.

3.2   There was some uncertainty among students about the certification, if any, that would be provided when they completed that part of their studies delivered by Navitas. Some students did not appear to be familiar with the Navitas Confirmation of Attainment statement as the evidence of their attainment; and others were unsure whether this constituted a certificate. However, most students stated they would like a certificate for the Navitas part of their pathway.

3.3   Students across all colleges reported that they had found the pre-entry information, for the most part, to be accurate and complete. The majority of students the review team met had been provided with information by the Navitas in-country agents. These agents were appointed by the Navitas Group, with colleges being actively involved in their recruitment, training and management. Students said that once they had joined the college, their experience had exceeded their pre-entry expectations. Students were also satisfied with the

quality and comprehensiveness of on-course information provided within student handbooks and through the student portal.

3.4   Students received information on their entitlements and their obligations, and generally felt confident in their knowledge of such issues as progression, assessment regulations and plagiarism. Students were also keen to emphasise the ease of access they enjoyed to both teaching and administrative staff, which enabled them to seek prompt clarification on any issues about which they were unsure. The widespread use of the virtual learning environment as a repository for information, including handbooks, module guides and College Policies and Regulations was seen as effective and was valued by students. Programme specifications and definitive module documents are freely available and provide adequate information for both staff and students.

3.5   Having viewed a range of documentation and websites at each college, the review team formed the view that potential students, existing students and alumni are able to view a set of consistent information about Navitas, the college and the partner university.

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

3.6   The Board of Directors of Navitas takes overall responsibility for all of the company's publicity material and this was confirmed throughout the series of visits made by the review team to individual colleges. It was confirmed that the General Manager for the University Programme Division UK, together with the various partner university nominees, approves each college brochure. The review team also noted that each College Director and Principal is in turn responsible for the accuracy and completeness of all college public information, including that found on the website. Each college employs a Director of Marketing and Recruitment. In addition, the team heard that the directors of Marketing and Recruitment worked closely with their university counterparts to ensure the accuracy of materials that are published. The team noted the use being made of Marketing Advisory Groups at college level in ensuring the rigorousness of marketing material. The team also heard that, before it goes live, each college website is reviewed by its partner university and by the Navitas Quality and Standards Office.

3.7   There are regular follow-up checks on websites to ensure the currency of the information available to both students and staff. The review team heard of the role played by the link tutor in ensuring the accuracy of information that is published by each college.

3.8   The review team concluded that, with the exception of one college, robust procedures are in place for assuring the accuracy and completeness of published information.

3.9   The review team saw publicity material produced by the international collaborative partner. The material contained the phrase, 'Swansea University UK: Fully taught in Mexico'. In reality, the international partner is responsible for teaching only one semester of the business pathway to which this claim refers. The original draft was approved by both International College Wales, Swansea, and Swansea University, but it was stated that changes must have occurred since that draft approval. The team recommends as advisable that Navitas ensures the material published by international collaborative partners is regularly monitored for accuracy. The team concluded that this particular publicity material was misleading and that limited reliance can be placed on the information produced by the single international collaborative partner for which International College Wales, Swansea is responsible. The same limited reliance can be placed in the control that was exercised in checking the operational publicity material used and, especially so, the web-based material.

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. However, **limited reliance can be placed** on the accuracy and completeness of the provider's public information for which it is responsible in its international collaborative provision.

Action plan[3]

Navitas UK Holdings Ltd action plan relating to the Embedded College 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 high-quality, individualised feedback on assessments provided in a timely manner (paragraph 1.29)	**At Navitas UK** Consolidate via Learning and Teaching Forum and review annually Continuous monitoring of student feedback; progression and retention rates **At embedded college** Conduct an annual workshop specific to 'Managing Assessments - the importance of	Nov 2012	**Navitas UK** Director of Learning and Teaching Quality **Embedded college** College Director Director of Academic and Student Services (or equivalent)	Improved turnaround time for marking and providing feedback to students Positive module evaluations from students Increased regularity of student/teacher communications	Learning and Teaching Committee Learning and Teaching Forum College Learning and Teaching Board/ Committee (CLTB) Senior Management Team Navitas UK Student Forum Executive General Manager	Annual programme reviews Data analysis from student surveys and module evaluations Key performance indicators reviewed in quarterly reports Minutes of CLTB Minutes of Learning and Teaching

---

[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 partner higher education institution.

	immediacy of quality informative feedback to students' Implement the portal based brief for new staff on managing assessments and student feedback Continuous monitoring and analysis of student feedback and survey data; progression and retention rates				Navitas Limited College Enhancement Task Force (CETF)	Committee Minutes of Learning and Teaching Forum Minutes of Student Forum Meetings Anecdotal feedback from students Minutes of CETF Quality Improvement Plan (QIP)
• the effective use of MAZE data, including the tracer study (paragraph 1.42)	**At Navitas UK** 'Using MAZE Effectively' training workshop session twice each year 'Advanced Mining of MAZE' Training sessions on demand Create awareness of and provide training on Project Accord (new integrated	Nov 2012	**Navitas UK** Senior Manager ICT Systems and Services; Director of Compliance Services and Systems General Manager Navitas UK **Embedded**	Improved accuracy of data entry on MAZE Improved reliability of data analysis and reporting from MAZE Controlled improvements to programme structures and delivery tactics	Learning and Teaching Committee Learning and Teaching Forum College Enhancement Task Force (CETF) Senior Management Team Navitas UK	Annual Programme Reviews Minutes of AAC Minutes of SMT Minutes of JSPMB Navitas UPD (database) Quarterly Reports SIMS Audit

	SIMS) Manage rollout of Project Accord across the college network Evaluate Tracer Study data to maintain relevancy and currency of the educational experience in each College **At embedded college** Ongoing training on correct use of MAZE Use pass rates/levels and withdrawal data from MAZE to review and enhance the student experience Secure annual tracer study data from partner university and address negative and positive trend data contained therein Implement Project Accord in partnership	Sep 2013 (please note this is a Navitas Group Project and we will be tied to the Group deadlines)	**college** College Director	based on tracer study feedback Tracer study data available from partner University	(SMT) Academic Advisory Committee (AAC) Joint Strategic Partnership Management Board (JSPMB) Executive General Manager Navitas Limited College Learning and Teaching Board/Committee (CLTB)	Reports Minutes of CLTB Minutes of Learning and Teaching Committee Minutes of Learning and Teaching Forum Minutes of CETF Quarterly Reports to Navitas HQ in Australia Student Movement data as required by UKBA QIP

	with ICT Team Navitas UK					
• the effective teamwork which has created a caring, accessible and responsive learning environment (paragraphs 2.13 and 2.21)	**At Navitas UK** Continue 'Welcome to Navitas UK ' induction Monitoring Staff Appraisal Process and individual staff professional development plans Approve and monitor College Continuous Improvement Plans Approve and monitor Quality Improvement Plans **At embedded college** Staff induction programmes Maintain college continuous improvement plans Maintain Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)	Nov 2012	**Navitas UK** General Manager Navitas UK Manager HR/OSH Human Resources/ Occupational Health and Safety) Systems and Services Director of Learning and Teaching Quality Director of Compliance Systems and Services **Embedded college** College Director College Senior Management Team Manager HR/OSH,	Student surveys Staff annual appraisal system Teaching observations and peer review Student Forum minutes Module feedback	SMT Navitas UK Student Forum College Senior Management Team College Enhancement Task Force (CETF) College Learning and Teaching Board/ Committee(CLTB) Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) Learning and Teaching Forum (LTF)	Annual staff appraisal outcomes Observation Reports Student Surveys Agent Feedback Anecdotal feedback from students and other stakeholders College continuous improvements plans Navitas UK Quarterly Reports College month end reports Minutes CETF Minutes CLTB Minutes of LTF

	Monthly staff meetings Staff professional training and development plans Formal and informal continuing professional development for all sessional academics Continuous improvement plans for student induction processes inclusive of pre-departure information and activities		Systems and Services			Minutes of LTC QEP
• the effectiveness of the Students in Jeopardy Programme (paragraphs 2.17 and 2.21)	**At Navitas UK** Review and enhance implementation of Students in Jeopardy Programme (SiJP) across College network Provide awareness briefings on: *Chapter B5: Student engagement* of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (the	Sep 2012	**Navitas UK** Director of Learning and Teaching Quality Navitas UK Director of Compliance Systems and Services Navitas UK **Embedded college**	Improved attendance levels Improved retention rates Improved completion and progression rates	Learning and Teaching Forum Learning and Teaching Committee College Learning and Teaching Board Senior Management Team Navitas UK	Minutes of L and T forum Minutes of L and T Committee College reports submitted to SMT Navitas UK Reports submitted to AAC and AAC Minutes Student Forum

	Quality Code), Part B: Assuring and enhancing academic quality **At embedded college** Provide training for staff on SiJP as part of induction process Annual Review of 'SiJP in Action' Action principles of *Chapter B5: Student engagement* of the Quality Code		Director of Academic and Student Services College Director		Academic Advisory Committee Student Forum College Enhancement Task Force	Minutes Minutes of CLTB Minutes of CETF Absentee records Progression and completion data
• the careful recruitment and effective use of agents (paragraph 2.23)	**At Navitas UK** Review and monitor implementation of agent training and management process Annual review of agent contracts Oversee management of rogue agents **At embedded college**	Sep 2012	**Navitas UK** General Manager Navitas UK Director of Compliance Systems and Services Navitas UK **Embedded college** Director of Marketing and	Feedback from Navitas offshore office network Decreased visa rejections Improved student arrival data/statistics Successful application scrutiny record Positive student	Executive General Manager (GM) UPD Navitas Limited Month End Reports (MERs) to General Manager Navitas UK Weekly visa rejection statistical reports Student Forum	Quarterly Reports to Executive GM UPD Navitas Limited SMT Minutes Reports from Group General Manager Marketing and Recruitment Navitas Limited JSPMB minutes

	Establish update process for agent information and training Maintain Agent Training Manual Preparation of agent contract Regular monitoring of Agent activity Management of all marketing collateral as used by Agents Implement 'on demand' reviews of 'rogue' agent activity in response to negative feedback		Recruitment (DoMaR) College Director	feedback loops	JSPMB Marketing Advisory Committee/ Marketing Planning Advisory Committee Director of Marketing and Recruitment Forum Senior Management Team Navitas UK	MAC minutes DoMaR Forum minutes Student Forum minutes MERs Email traffic
• the consistent and effective use made of teaching observation (paragraph 2.32)	**At Navitas UK** Annual review of teaching observation and feedback processes and implementation across the network Training of staff to undertake	September 2012	**Navitas UK** Director of Learning and Teaching Quality Navitas UK Manager of Learning and Teaching Quality Navitas UK	Improved feedback in Module surveys Improved feedback in Student surveys and anecdotal feedback	Director of Learning and Teaching Quality General Manager Navitas UK Executive General Manager	Minutes of Learning and Teaching Forum Minutes of Learning and Teaching Committee

	observations and peer reviews		Director of Compliance Systems and Services	Reduction in turnover of academics	UPD Navitas Limited	Academic Advisory Committee minutes
	Spot check observation (management) activities		**Embedded college**	Improved pass rates and completion rates	Learning and Teaching Committee	Student Forum minutes
	Annual audit of teaching resources and facilities		Director of Academic and Student Services		College Learning and Teaching Board	Month end reports and minutes of CLTB
	At embedded college		College Director		CETF and Student Forum	Copies of teaching observation reports
	Semester Schedule for Observation (management) and Peer review					Minutes of CETF and Student Forum
	Completion of Observation Reports and Feedback Sheets and Packs					
	Feedback sessions with academics observed					
	Preparation of remedial action plan for academics in need of support and training					

	Implement periodic training for academic staff carrying out peer observations Identify good practice for dissemination					
• the range of extra-curricular activities organised by HIC staff (paragraph 15 in Annex 3)	**At Navitas UK** Establish SMT working party to audit range of extra curricula programme in existence across the UK College network **At Hertfordshire International College (HIC)** Prepare report and analysis of extra curricula programme in existence, inclusive of resource, human and financial involved in the provision of the extra curricular programme (ECP) Implement mapping process for current extra curricula activity	Dec 2012	**Navitas UK** General Manager Navitas UK Director of Learning and Teaching Quality Navitas UK **HIC** Director of Academic and Student Services College Director	Improved range of extra curricula activities in place in every college Positive feedback from student surveys Positive anecdotal feedback from students Successful inter-college sporting team involvement	Senior Management Team Navitas UK College Senior Management Team Student Forum College Enhancement Task Force (CETF)	Working Party Report College directors' reports on ECAP in each College SMT Minutes JSPMB Minutes Student Forum minutes CETF minutes

	against the HIC exemplar Implement coherent and consistent extra-curricular activity programme (ECAP)					
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:						
• ensure that policies and practice for the selection and approval of international collaborative partners fully reflect the *Code of practice, Section 2: Collaborative provision and flexible and distributed learning (including e-learning)* (paragraph 1.15)	**At Navitas UK** Issued diktat regarding a permanent moratorium on the establishment of TNE-UTP ANROD projects **At embedded college** Comply with diktat issued by email 17 May 2012	May 2012	**Navitas UK** General Manager Navitas UK **Embedded college** College Director and all members of College SMT	TNE-UTP ANROD closed down (04/04/2012) No new proposals received or approved	Executive General Manager Navitas Limited Swansea University Senior Management Team Navitas UK Joint Strategic Partnership Management Board Academic Advisory Committee	Solicitor's letters to ANROD with DHL receipts SMT minutes JSPMB minutes AAC minutes
• consistently apply their published procedures for	**At Navitas UK** Review College	July 2012	**Navitas UK** Director of Learning and	Signed approval documentation and report from	General Manager Navitas UK	Approval reports SMT minutes

| programme approval (paragraph 1.18) | Policy and Regulation (CPR) 10 with a view to mapping against the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (the Quality Code)

Ensure CPR 10 Academic Monitoring, Approval and Review is in place in every College

Distribute templates for: programme specifications; definitive module documents; pathway operations document; student guides

At college
Ensure CPR 10 is mapped against partner University's equivalent UPR and remains current at all times

Prepare programme specifications; definitive module documents; pathway operations documents; student | | Teaching

College
College Director

Director of Academic and Support Services | the Approval Panel Chair

Pathway documents all in place and contain current and accurate information | Director of Learning and Teaching Navitas UK | Learning and Teaching Committee minutes |

	guides				
• ensure that policies and practice for the approval, monitoring, review and management of programmes delivered through international collaborative provision fully reflect the *Code of practice, Section 2*: *Collaborative provision and flexible and distributed learning (including e-learning)* (paragraph 1.19)	**At Navitas UK** Withdraw CPR 23 from circulation across the UK college network Audit CPR folders to ensure CPR 23 has been redacted in its entirety **At embedded college** Comply with request to redact all mention of CPR 23 from the college's CPR manual other literature	May 2012	**Navitas UK** General Manager Navitas UK Director of Learning and Teaching Quality Navitas UK Director of Compliance Systems and Services Navitas UK **Embedded college** College Director	CPR 23 removed and destroyed	General Manager Navitas UK JSPMB AAC	Email 17 May 2012 and subsequent confirmation from college directors that this has been destroyed JSMPB minutes AAC minutes
• ensure that robust and rigorous assessment and moderation policies and practice are in place for international collaborative provision (paragraph 1.26)	**At Navitas UK** Require all Colleges to adhere to CPR 10 *Academic Approval, Monitoring and Review* Remind all colleges of email sent on 17/05/2012 regarding the moratorium on all TNE-UTP ANROD or similar projects	May 2012	**Navitas UK** General Manager Navitas UK **Embedded college** College Director	No TNE-UTP ANDROD projects in operation or pending approval	General Manager Navitas Director of Learning and Teaching Quality Navitas UK	Email dated 17 May 2012 Learning and Teaching Committee minutes

	At embedded college Comply with processes as set out in CPR 10 for any new UK based programmes Comply with diktat issued in email dated 17/05/2012					
• work with its partner universities to provide students with formal recognition of modules passed, including credit and level, and any appropriate exit award (paragraph 1.44)	**At Navitas UK** Determine strategic position with respect to type of formal recognition of modules completed in Stages undertaken at each Navitas college Prepare and distribute template for detailed and enhanced 'Confirmation of Attainment' (CoA) Facilitate through Student Information Management Systems (SIMS) preparation of required enhanced	January 2013 October 2013 (techno-logy interface depen-dent)	**Navitas UK** General Manager Navitas UK **College** College Director	Template document prepared and in use **NHEAR awarded to Navitas students** Certificate of higher education (or equivalent) awarded University Partner transcripts show results, inclusive of credit points, achieved at embedded College	SMT Navitas UK JSPMB at each College Academic Advisory Committee Operations Advisory Committee Executive General Manager UPD Navitas Limited Student Forum	Minutes of SMT Navitas UK Minutes of JSPMB Minutes of AAC Minutes of OAC Quarterly Report UPD UK Student Forum minutes **NHEAR template on SIMS**

	CoA Establish Project Team to review possibility of providing students with something akin to Higher Education Academic Report (HEAR) such as Navitas HE Academic Report (NHEAR) **At college** Agree with each partner University the best way to facilitate this recognition of achievement at the embedded College such as awarding of Certificate of Higher Education Distribute NHEAR (Navitas College equivalent) to all students					
• ensure the material published by international collaborative	**At Navitas UK** Confirm that all marketing collateral	May 2012	**Navitas UK** General Manager Navitas UK	Zero complaints relating to misleading information	General Manager Navitas UK College Director	Approved and signed copies of all print based collateral on file

| partners is regularly monitored for accuracy (paragraph 3.9) | related to the TNE-UTP ANDROD in Mexico has been removed

Reinforce and audit procedures for approval of all marketing collateral - sign off all marketing collateral

Random and regular sweeps of electronic media

'mystery shopper' activities

At embedded college

Destroy/redact/ remove/delete all material and mention of the ANROD TNE-UTP activity in Mexico

Implement and follow procedures for approval of all marketing collateral print and electronic

Monthly sweeps of | | Director of Compliance Systems and Services Navitas UK

Manager Electronic Marketing Navitas UK

Group Marketing Australia

Embedded college

Director of Marketing and Recruitment

College Director | Clean 'bill of health' from sweeps of electronic media

Collateral (print and electronic) signed by all parties

Signed approvals of print marketing collateral held with samples of collateral at college | Director of Compliance Systems and Services Navitas UK

Marketing Advisory Committee/Marke ting Planning Advisory Committee (MAC/MPAC) | Reports from Emarketing sweeps of electronic collateral

Master copies of all collateral held on file

Minutes of MAC

Minutes of College SMT |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

	electronic collateral 'ongoing mystery shopper' calls					
• always adhere to a more robust and formal method of approval for new pathways in future (paragraph 4 in Annex 2)	**At Navitas UK** Enforce Programme Approval Process as set out in revised CPR 10 Train College Principal on use of CPR 10 **At EIC** Work with QaSO Navitas UK in preparing for new programme approvals Follow details as set out in revised CPR10 (see attached process flow document)	January 2013	**Navitas UK** Director of Learning and Teaching Quality Navitas UK **College** College Principal	Approval Panel established and proceedings minuted	General Manager Navitas UK Academic Advisory Committee JSPMB Learning and Teaching Committee Navitas UK	Month End Report Minutes of AAC Minutes of JSMPB Minutes of Learning and Teaching Committee Approval Committee report
• secure a periodic review process (paragraph 6 in Annex 2).	**At Navitas UK** Meet with University D-VC Chair of the JSPMB to set out blueprint for need to establish the periodic review process	June 2013	**Navitas UK** General Manager Navitas UK Director of Learning and Teaching Quality	Periodic Review process is agreed and emplaced Contract amended	General Counsel Navitas Limited Executive General Manager UPD Navitas Limited	Contract amendment Minutes of JSPMB Minutes of AAC Month End Report

	Action to be taken		Action by		Reported to	Evaluation
	Prepare amended clause for Contract and agree same with the University Liaise with Director of Quality at the University **At EIC** Assist the General Manager in securing this addition to the Contract Establish with Director Quality the details of making operational this PR process		Navitas UK Director of Compliance Systems and Services Navitas UK **College** College Principal		General Manager Navitas UK JSPMB AAC University's Quality Office Director of Learning and Teaching Navitas UK SMT Navitas UK	SMT Minutes
Desirable	**Action to be taken**	**Target date**	**Action by**	**Success indicators**	**Reported to**	**Evaluation**
The team considers that it is **desirable** for the provider to:						
• Continue to develop a more consistent approach to student engagement in quality assurance (paragraph 2.7).	**At Navitas UK** Develop Policy regarding student engagement informed by *Chapter B5*: *Student engagement*	January 2013	**Navitas UK** General Manager Navitas UK SMT Navitas UK	CETF established across the College network Terms of Reference agreed	College Learning and Teaching Board (CLTB) Executive General Manager UPD Navitas	Minutes of CETF Minutes of CLTB Minutes of SMT Navitas UK

			College	Student representatives providing positive feedback and input	Limited	Minutes of JSPMB
	of the Quality Code to address three key areas related to: • operational issues • curriculum issues • pedagogical issues Establish a blueprint to govern the establishment, management and engagement of a Student Forum Distribute and monitor implementation of blueprint Secure support for College Enhancement Task Force (CETF) as a subset of the College Learning and Teaching Board/Committee The CETF would include student representative(s); Learning and Teaching (Director of Academic and Student Services (DASS) or		College Director College SMT	Academic staff providing regular feedback Annual Audit process by Navitas UK in place Improved progression and retention rates (students have higher levels of satisfaction)	General Manager Navitas UK SMT Navitas UK JSPMB AAC Student Forum	Minutes of AAC College annual report Navitas UK UPD annual report Minutes of Student Forum Minutes of LTC

	equivalent); Academic staff representative(s); Academic Services; student services; Marketing				
	Implement terms of reference for College Enhancement Task Force				
	Audit implementation				
	At College				
	Implement the agreed blueprint				
	Establishing College Enhancement Task Force in line with terms of reference				
	Establish training and induction process for members of College Enhancement Task Force				
	Establish meeting schedule for CETF				

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 Embedded College 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
Embedded College 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**.

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.

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**.

frameworks 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: *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.

---

[4] www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Pages/embedded-college-handbook.aspx

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.

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

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 **partner HEI**. In the context of ECREO, 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.