



London College of Engineering and Management

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

October 2012

Key findings about London College of Engineering and Management

As a result of its Review for Educational Oversight carried out in October 2012, the QAA review team (the team) considers that there can be **limited confidence** in how the provider manages its stated responsibilities for the standards of the awards it offers on behalf of the Association of Chartered Certified Accountants, the Association of Business Executives, the British Computer Society and Edexcel.

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

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

Good practice

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

- the feedback provided on the Edexcel level 7 Strategic Management and Leadership Skills programme is clear, detailed and effective (paragraph 2.6).

Recommendations

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

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

- review and revise the management and committee structures to ensure clear terms of reference, responsibilities and reporting lines (paragraph 1.2)
- implement effective procedures for annual monitoring and evaluation of programmes (paragraph 2.2)
- implement a robust process to ensure the accuracy and completeness of all published information including induction materials (paragraph 3.5).

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

- introduce effective procedures for recording and tracking the key outcomes of meetings (paragraph 1.3)
- ensure thorough analysis of students' examination results to monitor academic standards (paragraph 1.5)
- review and implement the Teaching and Learning Policy (paragraph 2.5)
- review the methodology for the collection and use of student feedback (paragraph 2.7)
- develop a tutorial system to ensure students that have consistent access to academic and pastoral support (paragraph 2.9)
- develop and implement an effective e-learning resource strategy (paragraph 2.15)

- identify how it will utilise and evaluate the virtual learning environment to support effective communication (paragraph 3.3).

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

- signpost external reference points within College policies and procedures (paragraph 1.6)
- develop a formal procedure to monitor the implementation of recommendations from external reports (paragraph 1.8)
- formalise procedures to identify, evaluate and share the outcomes of staff development and good practice (paragraph 2.14).

About this report

This report presents the findings of the [Review for Educational Oversight](#)¹ (REO) conducted by [QAA](#) at the London College of Engineering and Management (the provider; the College). The purpose of the review is to provide public information about how the provider discharges its stated responsibilities for the management and delivery of academic standards and the quality of learning opportunities available to students. The review applies to programmes of study that the provider delivers on behalf of the Association of Chartered Certified Accountants, the Association of Business Executives, the British Computer Society and Edexcel. The review was carried out by Mr Chris Davies, Professor MD Reza Joadat Kiaie, Mrs Kausar Malik (reviewers), and Mrs Mandy Hobart (coordinator).

The review team conducted the review in agreement with the provider and in accordance with the [Review for Educational Oversight: Handbook](#).² Evidence in support of the review included the self-evaluation document, copies of policies and procedures, minutes of meetings and awarding body and organisation reports, awarding body and organisation agreements, and meetings with staff and students.

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

- the Academic Infrastructure
- the Qualifications and Credit Framework (QCF).

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

London College of Engineering and Management (the College) was established in November 2006 and has been delivering programmes since September 2007. In 2009, it moved from its original location to its current building in order to accommodate a growth in student numbers. Following the change in UK Border Agency regulations, student numbers have declined, but the College has remained in its premises in Woolwich.

The College mission is 'Education with a vision for employment'. The College offers six programmes in business and management, computing and information technology, and accounting at QCF levels 5, 6 and 7, primarily to overseas students. Programmes are also available in health and social care, but have yet to recruit students. At the time of the review visit, the College had 286 students all studying on full-time programmes.

At the time of the review, the provider offered the following higher education programmes, listed beneath their awarding body and organisations, with full-time student numbers shown in brackets:

Association of Chartered Certified Accountants (ACCA)

- Level 5 Financial Accounting and Management (62)
- Level 6 Financial Accounting and Management (22)

Association of Business Executives (ABE)

- Level 4 Diploma in Business Management (8)
- Level 5 Higher Diploma in Business Management (0)
- Level 6 Graduate Diploma in Business Management (0)
- Level 6 Graduate Integrated Diploma in Business Management (71)

¹ www.qaa.ac.uk/InstitutionReports/types-of-review/tier-4.

² www.qaa.ac.uk/publications/informationandguidance/pages/reo-handbook.aspx.

British Computer Society (BCS)

- Level 4 Certificate in Information Technology (0)
- Level 5 Diploma in Information Technology (0)
- Level 6 Professional Graduate Diploma in Information Technology (27)

Edexcel

- Level 5 Diploma in Management and Leadership (32)
- Level 7 Extended Diploma in Strategic Management and Leadership Skills (64)
- HND in Electrical and Electronic Engineering (0)
- HND in Computing and Systems Development (0)
- HND in Health and Social Care (0)

The provider's stated responsibilities

The College has responsibility for managing the assessment of its Edexcel programmes, including the setting, marking and internal verification of assessments. In the case of ACCA, ABE and BCS provision, all assessments are externally set and marked. Programme specifications are devised by the awarding body and organisations and the College follows the guidance provided on the delivery of the qualifications. The College is responsible for the recruitment of students in accordance with its Admissions Policy and complies with appropriate legislation and regulations. Student attendance is closely monitored.

Recent developments

The College has operated on a single campus in Woolwich since 2010, when the original premises were finally vacated. Programmes in Dental Nursing have been discontinued, and the College will cease to offer ACCA qualifications once the current cohort of students have completed their programmes in 2012. The HNC/D in Electrical and Electronic Engineering is not being run and students recruited to the programme have transferred to a local further education college. Total student numbers have declined in the last two years due to changes in UK Border Agency regulations.

Students' contribution to the review

Students studying on higher education programmes at the provider were invited to present a submission to the review team. No submission was received by the team. Students met the coordinator as part the preparatory meeting and the team during the review visit.

Detailed findings about London College of Engineering and Management

1 Academic standards

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

1.1 The Board of Directors and the College Principal have responsibility for the oversight of academic standards. The College management and committee structures, reporting lines and responsibilities are not clear and do not effectively reflect the systems for the management of academic standards and learning opportunities. The Principal chairs most committees and the Senior Management Team is the main body tasked with the management of learning opportunities across the College. The College's Quality Assurance Policy briefly outlines staff roles and responsibilities, but does not specify how academic standards are managed within and across programmes. Programme leaders are responsible for the standards of academic delivery and the Director of Studies is responsible for overseeing the day-to-day operations of academic staff. However, there is no clarity as to how the College maintains oversight of academic standards and how improvements are identified, implemented and monitored.

1.2 There is no clear College organisational structure which reflects all current responsibilities. The College structure for its committees and boards is very general, and the team was not able to identify clear terms of reference, reporting processes and overall responsibilities. For example, the College states that programme assessment boards are responsible for the operational quality assurance and academic standards of provision, and compliance with external awarding body and organisation requirements. These responsibilities overlap with those of the Academic Board. It is not clear which committees are responsible for the management of complaints, discipline and academic misconduct. The committee structure and reporting methods are not effective and do not reflect the structures and procedures outlined in the self-evaluation. It is essential that the College reviews and revises the management and committee structures to ensure clear terms of reference, responsibilities and reporting lines.

1.3 Oversight of academic standards is monitored through Academic Board and Senior Management Team meetings. The minutes of meetings are brief and some are recorded less formally. No action plans are in place to enable transparent monitoring of key actions and priorities. It is not clear how key priorities from external examiner reports are monitored. It is advisable that the College introduces effective procedures for recording and tracking the key outcomes of meetings to support the management of academic standards.

1.4 The College adheres to the guidelines as set by its awarding body and organisations. Edexcel assessments are set by the College and externally verified by Edexcel-appointed examiners before being given to students. Assessments for ACCA, ABE and BCS are externally managed through examinations set and marked by awarding organisations.

1.5 The College process for annual monitoring of programmes and annual self-assessment reports have not been implemented. The British Accreditation Council report and Edexcel Centre Report in 2012 advised the College to complete a self-assessment report and to improve its recording of the monitoring of external examiner recommendations, progression and analysis of exam results. The College has not implemented the Annual Course Monitoring Procedure, and no annual monitoring reports have been completed for individual programmes. The team found no consistent mechanisms

for the monitoring of external examiner recommendations, or how analysis of results informs the monitoring of academic standards. It is advisable that the College ensures thorough analysis of students' examination results to monitor academic standards, and that this analysis informs the annual programme reviews.

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

1.6 There is limited evidence of the use of external reference points by the College, including the Academic Infrastructure. The College delivers programmes accredited by the QCF. The programme specifications are provided by the awarding body and organisations, and reference professional body standards and codes of practice. The College ensures that these reference points are reflected in teaching and formative assessment for ACCA, ABE and BCS programmes, and in the summative assignments for Edexcel provision. The team could not identify evidence that the College has embedded relevant external reference points, including the Academic Infrastructure, into its internal policies and procedures as stated in the self-evaluation, for example in relation to admissions, academic appeals and complaints policies. Alignment with the appropriate level descriptors is also not explicit in the documentation provided to students. It is desirable that the College signposts external reference points within appropriate College policies and procedures to further assure academic standards.

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

1.7 The College has limited responsibility for the management of academic standards. It is responsible for formative and summative assessment on the Edexcel programmes, and for formative assessment only on other programmes, which are externally examined. Internal verification is applied consistently for Edexcel programmes and there are clear and effective procedures to ensure assignments meet awarding body and organisation requirements. For ACCA, ABE and BCS programmes, internal verification of formative assessment is informal, and programme leaders ensure assessments are appropriate. Students are also able to provide feedback through student experience questionnaires, which staff take into account when reviewing assessment strategies.

1.8 Edexcel external examiners' reports confirm academic standards and compliance with the awarding body requirements. The College delivery of appropriate assessment to the specified levels is confirmed by external examiner reports for Edexcel provision, and through continued centre accreditation for the other three awarding organisations, who do not issue reports but monitor the College annually. However, the team found no evidence of the use of action planning in minutes of meetings so that the College might ensure improvements are implemented and monitored, and no evidence of how the College deals with recommendations of external examiners (see also paragraph 1.3). The College does not operate examination or progress boards to review the academic progress of individual students. It is desirable that the College develops a formal procedure to monitor the implementation of recommendations from external reports.

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

2 Quality of learning opportunities

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

2.1 The College is responsible for the management of the quality of learning opportunities for all programmes. For the ABE, BCS, and ACCA qualifications, the College is responsible for preparing students for external examinations. Edexcel awards are assessed through coursework, which is devised by the College and externally verified by the awarding body. Staff teaching on other programmes utilise teaching materials provided by the awarding organisations and make use of past examination papers for students to practice their approach to assessment. Students are aware of and make use of awarding body and organisation websites, which they find useful for additional guidance.

2.2 The College does not have effective or transparent processes for discharging its responsibility for managing the quality of learning opportunities. There is very little consideration of the management of learning opportunities in Senior Management Team meetings, and limited evidence of action planning and monitoring. Similarly, the team found little evidence that the College's policies for the assurance of learning opportunities are implemented at programme level. The College has not implemented annual programme monitoring procedures and there is limited evidence of the review of programmes and student performance (see paragraph 1.5). It is essential that the College implements effective procedures for annual monitoring and evaluation of programmes to support the quality of learning opportunities.

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

2.3 External reference points are not explicitly used by the College for the management and enhancement of learning opportunities. The College relies on the awarding body and organisations to embed external reference points in their programme specifications (see paragraph 1.6). College policies on, for example, academic appeals, student complaints, disability and careers do not make reference to the relevant sections of the *Code of practice for the assurance of academic quality and standards in higher education*.

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

2.4 The College has developed a Teaching and Learning Strategy to support the delivery and enhancement of learning opportunities, but the team found little evidence that this is being implemented. For example, the individual learning plans, value added data, the tutorial policy and the Learning and Teaching Development Forum outlined in the self-evaluation document are not in use, and the Learning Development Manager and standards learning coaches are not in post.

2.5 The management of the quality of teaching and learning and its enhancement is underdeveloped. Schemes of work indicate that the scope of student learning activities is limited, as is the evaluation of the effectiveness of learning. The team was not able to identify evidence of any monitoring of planning, including schemes of work, by programme leaders. All teaching staff are observed delivering classes, and while the scope of the observations is appropriate, the team found no evidence of reflection and discussion to support enhancement. The teaching observation criteria employed are derived from the Preparing to Teach in the Lifelong Learning Sector programme. However, the team found no evidence of observation outcomes being used to improve learning opportunities for students.

It is advisable that the College reviews and implements its Teaching and Learning Policy in order to assure and enhance the quality of learning opportunities and enhancements.

2.6 The College has appropriate mechanisms to ensure that students receive feedback on their assessed work. Students reported that the feedback they receive is effective and enables them to improve their learning. Marked assignment work includes comments that indicate how the assignments can be improved, and feedback on the Edexcel level 7 Strategic Management and Leadership Skills programme is clear, detailed and effective in supporting student achievement, and represents good practice. On ACCA programmes, feedback is provided on student performance in mock examinations, but it is less clear how this is achieved on other examined programmes.

2.7 Mechanisms for the collection of student feedback are appreciated by students, who feel that their voice is heard. A questionnaire is used to collect students' views, but the range of information collected is limited and does not facilitate programme enhancement. The student surveys indicate that, overall, students are satisfied with their experience, but that satisfaction levels are variable across programmes. The team found limited evidence that the results of the internal Course Experience Questionnaire are made available to students, as set out in the self-evaluation document, and information is largely communicated informally by tutors or through meetings with student representatives. Currently, there is no student representation on the College committees, though student representatives as a group meet regularly with the Student Welfare Officer and with the Principal. Students reported that the issues they raised have been dealt with effectively. It is unclear how the student feedback data is used by management at programme or College level. It is advisable that the College reviews the methodology for the collection and use of student feedback to inform the monitoring and evaluation of programmes.

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

2.8 The student induction programme ensures that students receive a range of helpful information. They receive a memory stick containing information on policies relevant to students and a student handbook. However, students are given only outline programme information, and no programme handbooks are provided. More detailed programme information would ensure students are clear about the programme content and assessments. While students are asked to declare any specific learning needs on application forms and during enrolment, the availability of support services are not effectively signposted.

2.9 The College does not operate a generic personal tutor system, though some student support is provided through administrative welfare and academic systems. Additional support for learning and pastoral care is based on students making requests of lecturers or approaching senior staff. While student access to staff is good, the College does not have a tutorial policy and there are no timetabled tutorial sessions to ensure support is provided. Individual learning plans are not in use and the availability of student support services is unclear. It is advisable that the College develops a tutorial system to ensure students have consistent access to academic and pastoral support.

2.10 Systems for tracking of students' progress and the provision of support vary between programmes. On Edexcel programmes, student progress is clearly tracked and feedback on assessed work effectively supports learning. For ACCA, ABE and BCS programmes, student progress and achievement tracking is largely based on examination results, though analysis of results is not formally recorded (see paragraphs 1.5 and 2.2). Students are offered additional support including academic writing and English language skills. Some students reported that they have received career advice and most were aware of the availability of the College's scholarships, which are based on well understood criteria.

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

2.11 The College strategy for staff development is informal and adaptive. The Staff Development Policy provides an appropriate framework, but it has been overtaken by the strategic need to substantially reduce staffing.

2.12 The College has clear processes for the recruitment and induction of staff. New staff are selected on the basis of previous teaching experience in the required professional or vocational area. Staff induction information is limited and largely focused on teaching. All staff undergo a three-month probation period during which the effectiveness of their teaching is monitored through both classroom observations and informal feedback from students.

2.13 Staff are appraised each year and previous targets are reviewed. While appraisal targets are specific, they relate to short time horizons and the process as a whole is not reflective or evaluative. Staff are able to identify their needs during the staff appraisal process, but reported that emerging development needs are only discussed informally.

2.14 Teaching staff have been provided with a range of training to support the delivery of teaching over the last two years. The training has focused on initial teaching qualifications, higher level qualifications and verifier awards. Other staff development activities include IT training, attendance at awarding body and organisation events and updating on a commercial software package used in the delivery of teaching. Scholarly activity is at the development stage. The College supports staff undertaking development activities through contributing to the cost of external events, paying for teacher training programmes, providing study leave and access to learning resources in the College. However, the team could not identify how the College evaluates the impact of this training either at an individual level or on a cross-college basis. Similarly, the sharing of good practice and updating is undertaken informally. It is desirable that the College formalises procedures to identify, evaluate and share the outcomes of staff development and 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?

2.15 The College has no clear planning processes to support the development of key learning resources. There is no College policy or strategy for the development of the IT infrastructure and no formal resource development plan. However, the College recognises that the introduction of new programmes or the revalidation of existing ones have resource requirements and new resources are being developed, partly in response to student concerns. The software infrastructure of the site, previously maintained by the information technology department, has now been outsourced. The intranet and virtual learning systems are currently undergoing major development, which entails a review of the content to be developed, maintained and overseen. However, the lack of resources planning has had a negative impact on access to learning materials both through the College library and the virtual learning environment. While the College has recently signed a contract to provide access to e-journals and e-books, no e-learning resources are available. Staff currently utilise email to provide students with copies of lecture notes and presentations. The College library book stocks have not been updated or restocked to replace lost books. Students reported that they make use of the local public facilities. The team concluded that student access to learning materials through the College is inadequate, and it is advisable that the College develops and implements an effective e-learning resource strategy to ensure students have sufficient access to teaching materials, journals and books.

2.16 Physical teaching resources offered by the College meet the students' needs. The College provides both open access to computers and free wireless access throughout the building. At the time of the review, the College employed nine tutors and six support staff, two of whom also teach. Five of the nine tutors are part-time. Staff are appropriately qualified and it is the College policy to appoint staff with qualifications at least one level higher than the programme on which they teach. However, student pastoral support is limited (see paragraphs 2.8, 2.9 and 2.10), and should be reviewed to ensure student needs are adequately supported, as described in the self-evaluation.

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

3 Public information

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

3.1 The College provides an appropriate range of information about its provision through its website and other publications. The College Prospectus is informative and covers key information about the programmes offered; however, it does not always clearly or accurately define the level of study for each programme and progression opportunities. Module handbooks provided are not consistently updated and some contained reference to previous semester dates. The College is responsible for providing public information for programmes accredited by ACCA, ABE, BCS and Edexcel, and the information is available both online and in hard copy. Induction materials are currently issued to students at enrolment on a memory stick, with the planned intention that such materials will in future be provided through the College's virtual learning environment (see paragraph 2.15).

3.2 The primary means of information communication with both staff and students is through email. In addition, a selection of College policies and other documents are available both online and in hard copy. However, the team found no evidence that learning materials such as schemes of work, lesson plans and module handbooks are easily accessible to students. Some of the documents available to students are not up to date or accurate (see paragraph 3.1).

3.3 The College is seeking to develop the virtual learning environment to support clear and accessible information communication for students and staff. However, the College does not have an information communication strategy or policy to inform its use of the virtual learning environment as a communications tool. It is advisable that the College identifies how it will utilise and evaluate the virtual learning environment to support effective communication.

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

3.4 The College does not have clear procedures for ensuring that the information it is responsible for publishing is complete and accurate. Current systems are largely informal and the College has limited documentation setting out its responsibilities for publishing information on the programmes it offers. The College's self-evaluation document identifies the Marketing and Communications Team as having responsibility for developing and updating material along with the Quality Team. However, there was no evidence of a

consistent system for supplying the Marketing and Communications Team with the curriculum information. Nor was there evidence of clear processes for overseeing programme information and publicity materials, which require the approval of the awarding body and organisations. The Principal is responsible through an informal process for final sign-off of all published information, though no clear calendar or cycle is in place to ensure consistent monitoring of updates.

3.5 The College is responsible for ensuring quality of the information it publishes on its website and intranet. Programme information pages on the website do not contain links to programme specifications or to full course documents. The procedures for programme approval, monitoring and review are not made available. Schemes of work and module handbooks have not been consistently updated. No programme handbooks are made available by the College. The team concluded that the mechanisms for the management of published information are not reliable. It is essential that the College implements a robust process to ensure the accuracy and completeness of all published information.

3.6 There are limited mechanisms for ensuring that key information on the College's management arrangement is made available to staff and other stakeholders. The College management structure is outlined on the website, but greater detail about governance and management is not yet available on the intranet. The strategic plan is not currently available on the website, though a range of supporting strategies are available on the strategic planning section of the intranet, including the Learning and Teaching Strategy.

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

Action plan³

London College of Engineering and Management action plan relating to the Review for Educational Oversight October 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:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the feedback provided on the Edexcel level 7 Strategic Management and Leadership Skills programme is clear, detailed and effective (paragraph 2.6). 	Continue to monitor and enhance the quality of developmental feedback and implement in other similar programmes as well	1 February 2013	Director of Studies, Programme team leaders	Quality of teaching and learning improved	Principal	External examiner report
Essential	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
The team considers that it is essential for the provider to:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> review and revise the management and committee structures to ensure clear terms of 	A workshop participated in by the Board of Directors, Principal and the Senior Management	4-8 February 2013	Principal	All members of the board, Principal, Senior Management Team and student	Board of Directors	Workshop report

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

reference, responsibilities and reporting lines (paragraph 1.2)	Team organised to review the management and committee structures			representatives attend the workshop and contribute to establish clear management and committee structure		
	Management and committee structure is reviewed and revised and a committee structure chart is prepared	11 February 2013	Principal	New revised chart of management and committee structure	Board of Directors	File copy of management and committee structure chart showing clear reporting line
	Clear terms of reference along with responsibilities and reporting lines for each committee is drafted	12 February 2013	Principal	New revised terms of reference for each committee is in place showing working relationships and reporting lines	Board of Directors	File copies of the approved terms of reference for each committee
	The revised management and committee structure and the terms of reference are approved by the Board of Directors	13 February 2013	Principal	Management of Academic Standards is effective and quality of learning opportunities enhanced	Board of Directors	Board of Directors meeting minutes

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> implement effective procedures for annual monitoring and evaluation of programmes (paragraph 2.2) 	<p>A workshop attended by Board of Directors, Principal and the Senior Management Team members including student representatives organised to revise and further develop a template for annual monitoring and evaluation of the programmes</p>	4-8 February 2013	Director of Studies	All members of the Board, Principal, Senior Management Team and student representatives attend the workshop and contribute to the development of annual monitoring and evaluation template covering all aspects	Principal	Workshop report
	<p>Annual monitoring and evaluation template is developed</p>	14-15 February 2013	Director of Studies	Annual monitoring and evaluation template	Principal	Copy of the annual monitoring and evaluation template
	<p>Implement annual monitoring and evaluation of all the programmes delivered</p>	18-22 February 2013, and every year thereafter	Director of Studies	Management of the quality of learning opportunities improved	Principal	Copy of annual monitoring and evaluation report, QAA review/ monitoring report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> implement a robust process to ensure the accuracy and completeness of all published information including induction materials (paragraph 3.5). 	<p>A workshop attended by Board of Directors, Principal and the Senior Management Team members, including student representatives, organised to review, revise and develop a robust policy and process to ensure the</p>	4-8 February 2013	Principal	All members of the Board, Principal, Senior Management Team and student representatives attend the workshop and contribute in the development of Public Information	Board of Directors	Workshop report

	accuracy and completeness of all published information			Policy and Procedures		
	Public information policy and procedures drafted	25 February 2013	Principal	Copy of public information policy and procedures	Board of Directors	File copy of public information policy and procedures
	Public information policy and procedures is approved by the Board of Directors	26 February 2013	Principal	Copy of public information policy and procedures is in place	Board of Directors	Board Of Directors meeting minutes
	Public information policy and procedures implemented	1 March 2013 onwards	Principal	Accuracy and completeness of all published information	Board of Directors	Copy of public information policy and procedures and QAA review report
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:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> introduce effective procedures for recording and tracking the key outcomes of meetings (paragraph 1.3) 	Meeting minutes for each agenda item are formally recorded having clear sections for discussion, decision, action points, and responsible person to implement the action with a deadline Minutes recorded	1 December 2012 onwards	Director of Studies	An effective process for recording meeting minutes is implemented successfully and decisions are implemented timely and monitored	Principal	Copies of the meeting minutes and QAA review/monitoring reports

	<p>electronically and printouts kept in separate files for each meeting</p> <p>Minutes e-mailed to all concerned immediately after the meeting</p> <p>Implementation of the decisions of previous meetings followed up and monitored in the next meeting</p>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ensure thorough analysis of students' examination results to monitor academic standards (paragraph 1.5) 	<p>A system to keep records of students' exam registration (Association of Chartered Certified Accountants, British Computer Society and Association of Business Executives) is implemented and student results are collected in every semester from the qualification awarding bodies and analysed</p> <p>Edexcel external examiner's recommendations are analysed and recommendations</p>	<p>15 December 2012 onwards</p> <p>Every year in the month of June</p>	<p>Director of Studies</p> <p>Director of Studies</p>	<p>Academic Standards are monitored and reflected in the annual monitoring and evaluation of the programmes</p> <p>Academic Standards are monitored and reflected in the annual monitoring</p>	<p>Principal</p> <p>Principal</p>	<p>File records of students exam registration</p> <p>File records of students exam results obtained from the qualification awarding body and organisations</p> <p>Meeting minutes of the Academic Committee</p> <p>QAA review reports</p>

	implemented			and evaluation of the programmes		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> review and implement the Teaching and Learning Policy (paragraph 2.5) 	A workshop participated by Academic Committee Team, Quality Assurance Team, Senior Management Team, programme leaders, tutors and student representatives from all programmes is organised to review the Teaching and Learning Policy	4-8 February 2013	Director of Studies	The quality of learning opportunities enhanced	Principal	Workshop report
	Teaching and Learning Policy reviewed and approved by the Principal	15 March 2013	Director of Studies	The quality of learning opportunities enhanced	Principal	File copy of the Teaching and Learning Policy
	Revised Teaching and Learning Policy implemented	15 March 2013 onwards	Director of Studies	The quality of learning opportunities enhanced	Principal	Teaching observation reports, student feedback
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> review the methodology for the collection and use of student feedback (paragraph 2.7) 	A workshop attended by Academic Committee Team, Quality Assurance Team, Senior Management Team, programme leaders, tutors and student representatives from	4-8 February 2013	Director of Studies	Students from all programmes are included and are able to give comprehensive feedback contributing to programme enhancement	Principal	Workshop report

	all programmes is organised to review student feedback policy and procedures					
	A comprehensive Student Feedback Policy with procedures is developed and approved by the Principal	15 March 2013	Director of Studies		Principal	File copy of revised Feedback Policy
	Revised Student Feedback Policy implemented	15 March 2013 onwards	Director of Studies		Principal	Annual monitoring and evaluation report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> develop a tutorial system to ensure that students have consistent access to academic and pastoral support (paragraph 2.9) 	A workshop attended by Academic Committee Team, Quality Assurance Team, Senior Management Team, programme leaders, tutors and student representatives from all programmes is organised to review tutorial system	4-8 February 2013	Director of Studies	Students from all programmes have consistent access to academic and pastoral support	Principal	Workshop report
	A revised tutorial system is developed and approved by the Principal	15 March 2013	Director of Studies		Principal	File copy of tutorial system
	Revised tutorial system	15 March	Director of		Principal	Annual monitoring

	implemented	2013	Studies			and evaluation report	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> develop and implement an effective e-learning resource strategy (paragraph 2.15) 	A workshop attended by Academic Committee Team, Quality Assurance Team, Senior Management Team, programme leaders, tutors and student representatives from all programmes is organised to develop an e-learning resource strategy	4-8 February 2013	Director of Studies	Students have an easy access to learning resources	Principal	Workshop report	
	E-learning resource strategy is developed and approved	15 March 2013	Director of Studies			Principal	File copy of the e-learning strategy
	E-learning resource strategy is implemented	15 March 2013 onwards	Director of Studies			Principal	Annual monitoring and evaluation report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> identify how it will utilise and evaluate the virtual learning environment to support effective communication (paragraph 3.3). 	A demonstration will be organised to explain to the students and the staff about how the virtual learning environment can be used and its benefits to the students Information Technology Administrator will	15 March 2013 onwards	Information Technology staff	Students feedback, Information Technology Administrator's comments	Principal	Student feedback	

	regularly check how effectively students are utilising the virtual learning environment					
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:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> signpost external reference points within College policies and procedures (paragraph 1.6) 	College policies and procedures will be reviewed to signpost the external reference points	March 2013	Principal	External reference points are reflected in the policies and procedures	Board of Directors	Review of the policies and procedures
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> develop a formal procedure to monitor the implementation of recommendations from external reports (paragraph 1.8) 	A workshop attended by Academic Committee Team, Quality Assurance Team, Senior Management Team, programme leaders, tutors and student representatives from all programmes is organised to discuss and disseminate external reports including Quality Assurance Agency, British Accreditation Council and Edexcel external verifiers; and to develop a formal procedure to monitor	4-8 February 2013	Director of Studies	Annual monitoring reviews	Principal	Annual monitoring report

	<p>the implementation of the recommendations</p> <p>Based on the outcomes of the workshop, a procedure is developed and implemented</p>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> formalise procedures to identify, evaluate and share the outcomes of staff development and good practice (paragraph 2.14). 	<p>Tutors will be interviewed consistently and records kept to identify training requirement individually</p>	4-8 February 2013	Principal with Director of studies	Tutor satisfaction survey,	Principal	
	<p>Staff induction with updated staff handbook, peer observation and student feedback will be maintained</p>	1 March 2013 onwards	Director of Studies	Staff induction package, student feedback analysis and peer observation records	Principal	Review of continuous professional development record, peer observation report and student feedback
	<p>A continuous professional development record will be kept</p>	11 March 2013 onwards	Director of Studies	Tutors personal files	Principal	File copy of the records reviewed
	<p>Teachers training including assessor and verification will be established with awarding body and organisations and</p>	1 June 2013 onwards	Director of Studies	Training report	Principal	Documentation of existing tutors will be examined to ensure that all tutors have at least attended some

	<p>by external consultancy</p> <p>A seminar will be organised in each semester to share the outcomes of staff development and good practices</p>	15 June 2013	Director of Studies	Seminar report	Principal	<p>kind of training and they are teaching subjects in line with their experience and qualifications</p> <p>Interaction meeting with the programme team leaders, tutors and the students and peer observation reports</p>
--	--	--------------	---------------------	----------------	-----------	--

About QAA

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

QAA's aims are to:

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

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

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

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

Glossary

This glossary explains terms used in this report. You can find a fuller glossary at: www.qaa.ac.uk/aboutus/glossary. Formal definitions of key terms can be found in the [Review for Educational Oversight: Handbook⁴](#)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

quality See **academic quality**.

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

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

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

This glossary explains terms used in this report. You can find a fuller glossary at: www.qaa.ac.uk/aboutus/glossary. Formal definitions of key terms can be found in the [Review for Educational Oversight: Handbook](#)⁵

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

framework for higher education qualifications A published formal structure that identifies a hierarchy of national qualification levels and describes the general achievement expected of holders of the main qualification types at each level, thus assisting higher education providers in maintaining academic standards. QAA publishes the following frameworks: *The framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland* (FHEQ) and *The framework for qualifications of higher education institutions in Scotland*.

⁵ www.qaa.ac.uk/publications/informationandguidance/pages/reo-handbook.aspx.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

quality See **academic quality**.

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

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

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

RG 1084 01/13

The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education

Southgate House
Southgate Street
Gloucester
GL1 1UB

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

© The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education 2013

ISBN 978 1 84979 765 8

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

Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786