



# **European School of Economics**

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

November 2013

## Key findings about European School of Economics

As a result of its Review for Educational Oversight carried out in November 2013, the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) review team (the team) considers that there can be **confidence** in how the provider manages its stated responsibilities for the standards of the programmes it offers on behalf of the University of Buckingham.

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

The team considers that reliance **can** be placed on the information that the provider produces for its intended audiences about the learning opportunities it offers.

### Good practice

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

- the opportunities for students to undertake comprehensive internships and transfer between international campuses (paragraph 2.7)
- the robust and systematic approach to the management of information, which is coordinated with partner campuses overseas (paragraph 3.4).

### Recommendations

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

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

- establish student representation on its deliberative academic committees (paragraph 2.2)
- introduce a formal policy and systematic procedures for the management of resources (paragraph 2.10).

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

- provide regular, formal opportunities for discussion within programme teams as part of the new committee and reporting structures (paragraph 1.4)
- progress with its plans to introduce peer observation of teaching (paragraph 2.4)
- improve consistency in the implementation of its clear assessment feedback arrangements (paragraph 2.5)
- provide staff development more systematically, within the framework of a published policy and explicit annual plan (paragraph 2.8).

## About this report

This report presents the findings of the [Review for Educational Oversight](#)<sup>1</sup> (REO) conducted at the European School of Economics (the School), which is a privately funded provider of higher education. The purpose of the review is to provide public information about how the School 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 School delivers on behalf of the University of Buckingham. The review was carried out by Dr Philip Davies, Mrs Trudy Stiles (reviewers) and Mr David Lewis (Coordinator).

The review team conducted the review in agreement with the School and in accordance with the [Review for Educational Oversight: Handbook](#).<sup>2</sup> This full review was requested by the School following the REO monitoring visit in May 2013. Evidence in support of the review has included a range of internal documentation, including policy, procedure and strategy statements; records of meetings; and information produced for students and staff, including handbooks, curriculum and teaching materials. The team looked at a sample of assessed student work and held meetings with staff, students, awarding body representatives and employers. It also considered external reports, including those from QAA and a recent annual monitoring report from the University of Buckingham.

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

- the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (Quality Code)
- *The framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland*
- subject benchmark statements
- the Qualifications and Credit Framework.

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

The School is a private international college located in central London, one of six campuses spread across Europe and the USA. The School was founded in Italy in 1995 and the London campus established in 1999. The School offers a range of bachelor and master's degrees in business and finance, as well as short, non-validated level 6 certificate programmes. The School is managed from its headquarters in Italy. In London, the provision is overseen by the Head of Academic Affairs, supported by an Academic Affairs Coordinator. There is also a Campus Manager. Three Programme Directors have academic responsibility for the awards across all campuses. The published vision and values of the School include: a learning experience that is intense, personal and exciting; the right of each individual (learner) to be free, unique and innovative; the equal value of career skills and individual human potential; a mutual responsibility between the School and the student for learning and growth. Qualifications, teaching and assessments are synchronised across all of the School's campuses, allowing students to move between centres during their studies.

The School has 98 higher education students (headcount), of which 54 are female. About 75 per cent of recruitment is from the European Economic Community, including approximately 40 per cent from Italy and 7 per cent from the UK. There are also students from Scandinavia, Africa, North America and South America. There are 21 staff teaching the programmes in London, all part-time, with a further 12 staff providing administrative and other support.

---

<sup>1</sup> [www.qaa.ac.uk/educational-oversight](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/educational-oversight)

<sup>2</sup> [www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Pages/REO-designated-providers-handbook-13.aspx](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Pages/REO-designated-providers-handbook-13.aspx)

At the time of the review, the School offered the following higher education programmes, listed beneath the awarding body, with student numbers in brackets:

### **University of Buckingham**

- BSc (Hons) Business Administration (31)
- Bachelor of Business Administration (Hons) (14)\*
- BSc (Hons) Global Business (7)\*
- BA (Hons) International Business (2)\*
- BA (Hons) Organisational Communication with Media Management (7)\*
- Master of Science (24)
- Master in Business Administration (3)

In addition, there are 10 students on the short, non-validated certificate programmes.

\* these undergraduate programmes are being phased out and replaced by the consolidated BSc (Hons) Business Administration, which offers specialist options in management, marketing, finance, and media and communication.

### **The School's stated responsibilities**

The School states that it has delegated responsibility for managing most areas of activity that support the maintenance of academic standards, the quality of learning opportunities and the information produced about learning opportunities. Its responsibilities include: curriculum design and development; all areas of assessment; student recruitment; teaching delivery; staff development and scholarship; most features of student support; resources; employer engagement; the collection and use of student opinion; and the accuracy and currency of the information produced about learning opportunities. It shares responsibility with the awarding body for programme specifications, monitoring student admission and progression, the quality review of the provision, and monitoring the quality of learning and teaching.

### **Recent developments**

The School is part way through a major review of its higher education provision, giving attention to the currency and content of all academic programmes. The review of undergraduate provision was completed in 2013. It resulted in the consolidation of the various degree awards into a single BSc (Hons) in Business Administration, which offers specialist options. The review has also led to the introduction of a level 5 Foundation Pathway Programme. This programme offers a progression route to the honours degree for applicants without the necessary qualifications. The postgraduate master's awards will be reviewed over the period 2013 to 2015.

A number of structural and management changes have been introduced within the past year. These changes have been driven from the School's headquarters in Italy and have prioritised the need to overhaul committee and academic governance structures. Changes include the creation of an Academic Council to replace the previous Quality Assurance Department, and a new post of Head of Academic Affairs. Programme Directors have been established and have substantial responsibilities, including annual programme monitoring, within the new structures. Following the QAA monitoring visit in May 2013, which took place during the period of restructuring, the School has reviewed and updated its March 2012 review report action plan.

## **Students' contribution to the review**

Students on higher education programmes at the School were invited to present a submission to the review team. A short report was submitted on behalf of undergraduate students and this was supplemented by statements from two individual postgraduate students. The undergraduate report, which was coordinated by a student representative, made clear that the timing of the review had imposed severe time constraints on the evidence gathering and report writing. The report's conclusions were based on the findings of a voluntary survey, which had a response rate of about 35 per cent. The report offered summary comments on a range of topics, including: standards, staff and teaching, student services, workload and overall satisfaction. It also drew out the quality of communication as a key area of interest for students. The team recognised the impressionistic nature of the submission, including the supplementary statements, which proved helpful in preparing for the visit and as a reference point in discussions with students and staff. Students further contributed to the review in a meeting with reviewers and attendance at the preparatory meeting.

## Detailed findings about European School of Economics

### 1 Academic standards

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

1.1 The School is clear about the responsibilities devolved to it in its partnership agreement and works cooperatively with the supportive awarding body to fulfil them. The School has been supported by the awarding body in implementing robust new academic committee and reporting structures, as well as related staff management roles. These structures, some of which are still being embedded, offer a good framework for managing academic standards and quality, and are well understood by staff. The intended strategic outcomes of the revised structures include better reporting between the campus and senior central management, and greater consistency within and between the School's different campuses. The action plan from the 2012 review report has been substantially updated and is being used as a detailed strategic reference point for the changes. For example, the response to one recommendation has ensured that all formal School committees produce and circulate minutes, using a standard template. Further assurance is offered by the collaborative partner annual monitoring visits undertaken by the awarding body.

1.2 The remit, membership and lines of reporting for the various academic committees are clearly defined. Some of the key committees have responsibilities that bridge all of the six international campuses. The Academic Council, chaired by the Registrar and Head of Academic Governance, is the senior committee with overall responsibility for academic standards. The Council meets at least monthly and has a cross-school membership that includes the Head of Academic Affairs for each campus and all Programme Directors. The Academic Management Committee is the senior body for the campus and reports directly to the Academic Council.

1.3 There are clear lines of communication within the School for academic discussion and decision making. At the campus level, communication is focused on the monthly meetings of the Academic Management Committee and, less formally, faculty staff meetings. Both are chaired by the Head of Academic Affairs and can take account of student issues arising from formal meetings between staff and student representatives. For cross-campus meetings, including those of Academic Council and module leaders, regular use is made of electronic communication, including online video conferencing. This supports team dialogue between staff with similar academic responsibilities across the different campuses. Senior staff on the London campus indicate that they are fully engaged in corporate academic dialogue and decision making.

1.4 Management responsibilities are clearly defined for the academic programmes, each being led by a Programme Director, supported by module leaders. All of the roles operate across the campuses. The Programme Director chairs meetings of the module leaders and also produces an annual programme review report, with explicit action plans, drawing on the outcomes of module evaluations for the year. However, it is unclear whether these arrangements will give sufficient opportunity for all staff teaching on a programme to share experiences or contribute to programme development. It would therefore be **desirable** for the School to provide regular, formal opportunities for discussion within programme teams as part of the new committee and reporting structures.

### **How effectively does the School make use of external reference points to manage academic standards?**

1.5 The School is making increasing and appropriate use of external reference points in its management of academic standards, particularly the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (Quality Code). It is supported in this by the procedures of the awarding body, which take account of the Quality Code, *The framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland*, and subject benchmark statements during programme development and approval. Detailed programme specifications are produced for all of the provision. Staff awareness of the Quality Code has been increased for those engaged in the recent validation of the BSc (Hons) Business Administration. The School is monitoring the awareness of the Quality Code among all staff and is collaborating with the awarding body to provide further training for those academic and administrative staff who may need it.

### **How does the School use external moderation, verification or examining to assure academic standards?**

1.6 The School has effective procedures and guidance in place for managing its assessment responsibilities, including those relating to internal verification and external examining. Assessment tasks are devised by module leaders before being verified by the Programme Director and approved, where appropriate, by the external examiner. Assessments are marked and second marked internally, with a one-week turnaround that students confirm is usually met. Where the two markers cannot agree, a third marker is used. The moderation process allows for the adjustment of marks for an individual student, a module cohort, across a campus or the whole School. Increased attention is being given to improving the consistency of marking across the campuses, focused on the careful monitoring of module assessments and the scrutiny of scripts by the external examiner.

1.7 There is a clear process for receiving and responding to the reports of external examiners. Reports are sent to the link tutor at the awarding body and to the Registrar and Head of Academic Governance within the School. Action points arising from the reports are agreed by the Academic Council and passed to the relevant Programme Director, and module leaders as appropriate, for response. The external examiner is informed of the School's responses and proposed actions through the awarding body. External examiners are nominated by the School but selected and appointed by the awarding body. The School has recently taken an important initiative by publishing external examiner reports on its intranet where they are available for staff and student scrutiny.

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

## **2 Quality of learning opportunities**

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

2.1 The arrangements for managing and enhancing the quality of learning opportunities are the same as those described in paragraphs 1.1 to 1.4 for managing academic standards. Teaching staff are aware of their responsibilities in relation to the management structures and quality procedures. The quality of the learning opportunities is monitored through annual course reviews conducted by Programme Directors and programme monitoring undertaken by the awarding body.

2.2 The School provides extensive opportunities for students to express their opinions, but this does not extend to membership of decision-making academic committees. All programmes have student representatives, who are members of the Student Representative Committee, which meets termly. The feedback from representatives is formally summarised and circulated in an annual report. Students also complete termly survey questionnaires and feel able to approach staff informally to raise any concerns. While the current arrangements are effective, they do not fully reflect Indicator 3 in Part B: Assuring and enhancing academic quality, *Chapter B5: Student engagement* of the Quality Code. For example, students do not have representation on the Academic Council or the campus Academic Management Committee, nor do they have access to the minutes of the meetings. It is **advisable** that the School moves to establish student representation on its deliberative academic committees.

### **How effectively does the School make use of external reference points to manage and enhance learning opportunities?**

2.3 The School is making increased use of the Quality Code, as described in paragraph 1.5, particularly Part B: 'Assuring and enhancing academic quality', to support the quality of learning opportunities. Staff are given copies of relevant chapters for personal reference and are aware of the implications of the Quality Code for their own practice. The School is committed to working with the awarding body to ensure that staff awareness and use of the Quality Code is maintained and developed.

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

2.4 A range of mechanisms is in place to monitor the quality of teaching and learning, but there remains scope to strengthen opportunities for promoting good practice. The mechanisms include a formal and well-documented system of annual lesson observations, undertaken by the Head of Academic Affairs. The system is effective in checking the quality of lessons and identifying the professional development needs of teachers. There is no separate appraisal system to put the lesson observations into a wider context, or to identify wider issues. Students are able to evaluate the quality of teaching after every lesson, using a standard form. The School is at an early stage of planning a scheme of peer observations, acknowledging the potential for sharing good practice in teaching and assessment between colleagues. Such a scheme is already in place on one other campus. It would be **desirable** for the School to progress with its plans to introduce peer observation of teaching.

2.5 The School has made substantial progress in establishing a standardised approach to assessment feedback, although there are still inconsistencies in the quality of feedback from different staff. Feedback arrangements have been developed to enhance student learning, by ensuring that written comments identify areas of good performance and those in need of improvement. Students are appreciative of the quality of most feedback, which staff are expected to provide within one week of assignments being submitted. The scrutiny of assessed student work confirms that written feedback is provided systematically and that most is clear and helpful. The assessed work also reveals some inconsistencies between staff, for example in the match of comments to the level of achievement. It would be **desirable** for the School to improve consistency in the implementation of its clear assessment feedback arrangements.



## **How does the School assure itself that students are supported effectively?**

2.6 Students confirm that they are well supported, academically and personally, through a combination of formal and informal arrangements. A student services manual contains a wide range of academic and pastoral information, including guidance on the use of commercial plagiarism software. The comprehensive induction for new students includes a series of workshops that cover topics such as critical thinking and research methodology. Postgraduate students appreciate the flexible approach to tutorial support, which requires them to negotiate times with staff to discuss their progress. Some undergraduates would appreciate a more structured scheme of regular academic tutorials, particularly in the early stages of their programme. All students acknowledge the general accessibility of staff for advice and support.

2.7 The School has a comprehensive and innovative internship programme, which is highly attractive to students and clearly enhances their learning. The well-established and carefully managed programme operates for all programmes and involves an extensive network of companies across many countries. The internships enable students to link theory to practice and gain real employment experience, including realistic appointment interviews. There is a record of students gaining employment as a direct result of their internship. Employers and students highlight the growth in professional confidence among the many benefits for students. Internships are formally assessed through a reflective analysis report. The programme is being further strengthened by the introduction of more formal student and employer feedback procedures, as well as more assessor training, in line with the School's 2012 review report action plan. Further major enhancement to student learning comes from the flexibility for students to transfer between the School's international campuses during their study, including for their internships. The opportunities for students to undertake comprehensive internships and transfer between international campuses are highly distinctive features of the provision and together constitute **good practice**.

## **How effectively does the School develop its staff in order to improve student learning opportunities?**

2.8 The School is using the updated 2012 review report action plan to help target a number of key areas for staff development, but these are not offered as part of a coherent policy. All staff are given a lecturers' handbook at the start of the year, and are invited to an induction workshop. Together, these provide a range of information and guidance about their teaching role and the School. Formal development is largely limited to the outcomes of teaching observations, although recently introduced termly lecturer meetings will allow some sharing of experiences. The awarding body offers some development activity, for example in relation to its own regulations and the Quality Code. The self-evaluation acknowledges the need to review the sufficiency of the School's personal development review process, as well as the importance of managing development activities within a clearer structure. In moving forward with the action plan, it would be **desirable** for the School to provide staff development more systematically, within the framework of a published policy and explicit annual plan.

## **How effectively does the School ensure that learning resources are accessible to students and sufficient to enable them to achieve the intended learning outcomes?**

2.9 There have been clear recent improvements to learning resources, but some aspects of the provision are still limited and there is need for a more strategic approach to the provision of resources overall. Physical resources are monitored by module leaders and Programme Directors through programme reviews. The awarding body also checks

resources during programme approval and as part of its annual monitoring visits. The updated REO action plan has led to a new initiative, which will result in student opinion being collected formally and resultant actions fed back to students.

2.10 The School has a modest campus library, but the book collection is enhanced by subscription to a commercial collection of online books and journals. Together, the provision is adequate for students to achieve the learning outcomes for their programmes. A new web portal, or intranet, has been established, which contains a range of useful learning materials for taught modules. Staff have recognised the validity of student complaints about the campus IT provision, which students judge to be limited and out of date. Most students access the internet and School electronic materials on personal laptop computers and mobile phones, although they feel constrained in this by an unreliable wireless internet connection. The procedure for identifying and responding to resource needs is imprecise and unduly reactive. The self-evaluation recognises the need for more strategic resource planning. Given the lack of clarity in current processes, it is **advisable** that the School introduce a formal policy and systematic procedures for the management of resources.

2.11 There is a clear process for the appointment of teaching staff, most of whom are part-time, to ensure their suitability for working in the School. Applications are tested against clear criteria before interviews are arranged. At interview, applicants are required to provide a demonstration activity to show their teaching skills. All new appointments are ratified by the awarding body.

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

### 3 Information about learning opportunities

#### How effectively does the School communicate information about learning opportunities to students and other stakeholders?

3.1 The School communicates effectively with students and other stakeholders, using a wide range of published information. Senior staff are clear about the School's responsibilities for information under the terms of the agreement with its awarding body. The information produced includes a mission statement, strategic plan, student and lecturer handbooks, programme and module specifications, programme brochures, assessment information, and a variety of formal policies and procedures. The School Recruitment and Marketing Manager is responsible for marketing materials, most of which are published on the School's website. Other well-targeted publications include an internship manual and a student companion that provides general information, including regulatory statements, in student friendly language.

3.2 Students confirm the accuracy and usefulness of the information provided for them before and following enrolment. All students receive an induction pack, as well as access to the School's intranet, a month before they commence study. The induction pack includes a campus-specific student guide, which contains detailed information about studying and living in London. It also has the relevant module specifications, which give information about any resources, such as reading lists, that will be needed.

3.3 The establishment of the intranet has resulted from the 2012 review report action plan and is responsible for a major improvement in the provision of information, particularly for students. It provides a single repository for a range of learning information, including

official programme and module reference materials, lecture notes, workshops content, reading lists, online books and journals. It also houses policy and regulatory documents and is used administratively for the circulation of items such as the School calendar, minutes and reports. The School has produced guidance for staff on what module materials should be provided for students and most are meeting the minimum expectation. Students report positively on the intranet, reflecting that it has enhanced their learning experience. The intranet does not allow for interactive learning exchanges between students and staff.

**How effective are the School arrangements for assuring that information about learning opportunities is fit for purpose, accessible and trustworthy?**

3.4 The School has implemented the 2012 review report action plan rigorously in the introduction of a systematic approach to the management of information, including approval procedures and version control. The approach is underpinned by a documented set of public information policies and procedures. All public information is located on the intranet, which allows tight control over what is published and ensures that only current versions may be accessed by teaching staff and students. All public documents must be approved by the School's Head of Academic Governance and can only be uploaded by the Online Content Manager. The approved version is then used as the master copy for any additional use. These detailed procedures, which can be audited, ensure the accuracy and currency of all published information. A further level of security is provided by the awarding body, which must approve all information relating to its awards and undertakes random checks on published School information. The robust and systematic approach to the management of information, which is coordinated with partner campuses overseas, is **good practice**.

The team concludes that reliance **can** be placed on the information that the provider produces for its intended audiences about the learning opportunities it offers.

## Action plan<sup>3</sup>

European School of Economics action plan relating to the Review for Educational Oversight November 2013						
Good practice	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
The review team identified the following areas of <b>good practice</b> that are worthy of wider dissemination within the School:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the opportunities for students to undertake comprehensive internships and transfer between international campuses (paragraph 2.7)</li> </ul>	<p>Explore opportunities in new companies where students may be placed</p> <p>Procedures for approval and report monitoring of inter-campus transfers to be improved to ensure all student academic needs are being met, in particular focusing on progression needs of the student and module availability at the receiving campus. Approval will be required from Registrar and Head of</p>	<p>June 2014</p> <p>May 2014</p>	<p>Head Internship Coordinator</p> <p>Campus Academic Co-ordinator and Head of Academic Governance</p>	<p>Report of increased variety of opportunities for internships</p> <p>Forestalling of student progression problems after an inter-campus transfer by reducing number of problem reports to target of zero</p>	<p>Academic Council</p> <p>Academic Council</p>	<p>Evaluation of reports on internship opportunities and progression problems by Academic Council and noted in the minutes of the Academic Council with any further follow up actions considered necessary</p>

<sup>3</sup> The School 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 School's awarding body.

	Academic Affairs of the receiving campus					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the robust and systematic approach to the management of information, which is coordinated with partner campuses overseas (paragraph 3.4).</li> </ul>	Further technical improvements in the intranet system aiming at interactive sections available to students for uploading projects	June 2014	Intranet Management team	Ability of students to upload work	Academic Council	Report of achievements in the minutes of the Academic Council
<b>Advisable</b>	<b>Action to be taken</b>	<b>Target date</b>	<b>Action by</b>	<b>Success indicators</b>	<b>Reported to</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>
The team considers that it is <b>advisable</b> for the School to:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>establish student representation on its deliberative academic committees (paragraph 2.2)</li> </ul>	Invite student representative onto monthly Campus Academic Management Committee	April 2014	Campus Head of Academic Affairs	Number of meetings attended and number of suggestions/input by student representatives on campus-level issues from students concerning their participation	Academic Council and Campus Managers	Termly reports of attendance levels, suggestions made by student representatives and impact on campus-level issues in minutes of the Academic Council
	Establish bi-termly programme-level meetings between the Academic Council, programme directors and student	April 2014	Head of Academic Governance	Number of meetings attended and number of suggestions/input by student	Academic Council	Termly reports of attendance levels, suggestions made by student representatives and impact on

	representatives from every campus which is running module(s) from the relevant degree programme (BSc, MSc, MBA) in order to ensure the student voice is incorporated not only at campus level, but also at specific programme level within the matrix management structure of School			representatives on programme level and inter-campus issues concerning their participation		programme level issues in minutes of the Academic Council
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>introduce a formal policy and systematic procedures for the management of resources (paragraph 2.10).</li> </ul>	Create a Campus Resource Committee to discuss and evaluate current resources and needs	March 2014	Campus Managers and Head of Academic Governance	Termly reports by Campus Resource Committee concerning staff, lecturer and training needs; teaching resources; and building resources. Head of Academic Governance to combine and evaluate campus-level reports to create master level Resource Report	Academic Council and Managing Director	Appropriate number of skilled lecturers recruited at least one month before start of term for modules running; staff roles and identified staff needs filled within two months of identification; less than two per cent computer failure rate during lectures; continuous wireless availability during opening hours; need to purchase

						resources beyond identified and previously approved needs
<b>Desirable</b>	<b>Action to be taken</b>	<b>Target date</b>	<b>Action by</b>	<b>Success indicators</b>	<b>Reported to</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>
The team considers that it is <b>desirable</b> for the School to:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>provide regular, formal opportunities for discussion within programme teams as part of the new committee and reporting structures (paragraph 1.4)</li> </ul>	Programme directors Meet bi-termly with module leaders and lecturers for each module	April 2014	Programme directors	Attendance by lecturers at meetings. Input on appropriateness or otherwise of module specifications, intended learning outcomes, appropriateness of recommended reading, input from lecturers on assessment questions and cross-feeding between lecturers on lecture and tutorial materials used. Reduction in number of queries raised outside of meetings by lecturers on	Academic Council	Review of meeting minutes and action points derived from meetings by Academic Council

				module structure, teaching and evaluation processes		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>progress with its plans to introduce peer observation of teaching (paragraph 2.4)</li> </ul>	Lecturers will be asked and expected to peer observe a colleague at least once per year in order to identify and use best practice for the benefit of both lecturers. Lecturers will also be encouraged to post-up best practice ideas for the benefit of all lecturers	Already implemented in 2013	Head of Academic Affairs	Lecturers noting peer observation has taken place in register	Academic Council	Peer observations are confidential between the two lecturers  Evaluation will be from offered feedback by lecturers at Faculty meetings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>improve consistency in the implementation of its clear assessment feedback arrangements (paragraph 2.5)</li> </ul>	Provide lecturers with examples of expected level and detail of feedback; programme directors to monitor samples of assessment feedback across campuses	December 2014	Head of Academic Governance	Programme directors' termly reports on consistency of feedback; students' evaluation of quality and consistency of feedback received	Academic Council	Academic Council review directors' termly reports and follow up any action points identified by Academic Council
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>provide staff development more systematically, within the framework of a published policy and explicit annual plan (paragraph 2.8).</li> </ul>	Establish register for each lecturer of self-development activities undertaken each year with expectation communicated to lecturers that at least	December 2014	Campus Manager	Register duly completed by each lecturer	Head of Academic Governance and Academic Council	Review of exceptions to annual register and whether further support is needed



	<p>two appropriate activities are expected each year</p> <p>Systematically hold annual lecturer appraisals</p>	<p>December 2014</p>	<p>Campus Head of Academic Affairs</p>	<p>Indicators of any training needs/ support requirements identified and plans developed for the lecturer within the financial constraints set by the School</p>	<p>Head of Academic Governance and Academic Council</p>	<p>Individual needs and support arrangements analysed for systemic requirements of faculty</p>
	<p>Provide training workshop as part of each Faculty Meeting</p>	<p>Already implemented</p>	<p>Campus Head of Academic Affairs</p>	<p>Participation by lecturers; subject areas requested by lecturers; and feedback obtained from lecturers on success of workshops</p>	<p>Academic Council</p>	<p>Annual report provided to Academic Council from Campus Head of Academic Affairs and follow up any action points identified by Academic Council</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](http://www.qaa.ac.uk).

More detail about Review for Educational Oversight can be found at: [www.qaa.ac.uk/educational-oversight](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/educational-oversight).

## Glossary

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

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

**academic standards** The standards set and maintained by degree-awarding bodies for their courses (programmes and modules) and expected for their awards. See also **threshold academic standards**.

**awarding body** A UK higher education provider (typically a university) with the power to award degrees, conferred by Royal Charter, or under Section 76 of the Further and Higher Education Act 1992, or under Section 48 of the Further and Higher Education (Scotland) Act 1992, or by Papal Bull, or, since 1999, granted by the Privy Council on advice from QAA .

**awarding organisation** An organisation authorised to award a particular qualification; an organisation recognised by Ofqual to award Ofqual-regulated qualifications.

**designated body** An organisation that has been formally appointed or recognised to perform a particular function. QAA has been recognised by UKBA as a designated body for the purpose of providing educational oversight.

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

**enhancement** The process by which higher education providers systematically improve the quality of provision and the ways in which students' learning is supported. It is used as a technical term in QAA's review processes.

**external examiner** An independent expert appointed by an institution to comment on student achievement in relation to established academic standards and to look at approaches to assessment.

**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*.

**good practice** A process or way of working that, in the view of a QAA review team, makes a particularly positive contribution to a higher education provider's management of academic standards and the quality of its educational provision. It is used as a technical term in QAA's review processes.

**highly trusted sponsor** An organisation 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.

---

<sup>4</sup> [www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Pages/REO-designated-providers-handbook-13.aspx](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Pages/REO-designated-providers-handbook-13.aspx)

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

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

**programme (of study)** An approved course of study that 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 (s) (of higher education)** Organisations that deliver higher education. In the UK they may be a degree-awarding body or another organisation that offers programmes of higher education on behalf of degree-awarding bodies or awarding organisations. In the context of Review for Specific Course Designation 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').

**quality** See **academic quality**.

**Quality Code** Short term for the UK Quality Code for Higher Education, which is the UK-wide set of reference points for higher education providers (agreed through consultation with the higher education community, and published by QAA), which states the Expectations that all providers are required to meet.

**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.

**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 standards** The minimum acceptable level of achievement that a student has to demonstrate to be eligible for an academic award. Threshold academic standards are set out in the national **frameworks for higher education qualifications** and **subject benchmark statements**. See also **academic standards**.

## QAA619 - R3583 - Feb 14

© The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education 2014  
Southgate House, Southgate Street, Gloucester GL1 1UB

Tel 01452 557000  
Email [enquiries@qaa.ac.uk](mailto:enquiries@qaa.ac.uk)  
Web [www.qaa.ac.uk](http://www.qaa.ac.uk)

Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786