



London Educators Limited

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

September 2012

Key findings about London Educators Limited

As a result of its Review for Educational Oversight carried out in September 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 Tourism and Hospitality Executives, the British Computer Society and the Organisation for Tourism and Hospitality Management.

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 these awarding organisations.

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

Good practice

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

- the provision of informal staffed timetabled sessions in response to student feedback (paragraph 2.9).

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:

- ensure effective management oversight of student performance data and assessment processes (paragraphs 1.5, 1.6 and 1.7)
- develop and fully implement annual monitoring processes that take full account of quality indicators (paragraph 1.8).

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

- develop and implement clear and effective management and committee structures to support the assurance of academic standards (paragraphs 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3)
- make use of relevant external reference points to inform the management of academic standards (paragraphs 1.9 and 2.3)
- adopt a systematic approach to responding to awarding organisation and other external reports (paragraph 2.2)
- develop a structured approach to monitoring the effectiveness of teaching and learning (paragraphs 2.5, 2.6 and 2.7)
- develop a set of coordinated policies and procedures that cover the management of all forms of public information (paragraph 3.2)
- ensure procedures for monitoring the accuracy of information on the website are rigorously implemented and regularly reviewed (paragraph 3.3).

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

- continue to provide staff development and support for marking and moderation processes (paragraph 1.10)
- continue to implement the staff development policy and monitor its effectiveness to inform staff development planning (paragraphs 2.12 and 2.13).

About this report

This report presents the findings of the [Review for Educational Oversight](#)¹ (REO) conducted by [QAA](#) at London Educators Limited (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 Tourism and Hospitality Executives, the British Computer Society and the Organisation for Tourism and Hospitality Management. The review was carried out by Professor Donald Pennington, Mr Philip Price, Mrs Trudy Stiles (reviewers), and Mrs Freda Richardson (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 provider's self-evaluation, the Accreditation Service for International Colleges report of May 2011, the quality assurance/procedures manual, responsibilities checklists, meetings with staff and students, and a telephone conversation with a representative of the Association of Tourism and Hospitality Executives.

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

- programme details provided by the British Computer Society
- programme details provided by the Association of Tourism and Hospitality Executives
- 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 London Educators Limited (the College) was incorporated on 16 October 2009 as a private limited company offering higher education courses to overseas students. The name of the company was changed to London Educators Limited on 4 February 2010 and the current management team took over the business in October 2011. The College is located on the third floor of a building in Whitechapel, east London. The facilities comprise four classrooms, a computer room that is also used for teaching, a small conference room, library, student common room/canteen, teachers' room, multi-faith room, three offices, a reception and a small server room. The library also has three computers for student use.

In 2011-12, the College was approved to offer programmes awarded by five awarding organisations. These are listed below:

- Association of Information Security Auditors and Business Executives
- Association of Tourism and Hospitality Executives
- British Computer Society
- Institute of Administrative Management
- Organisation for Tourism and Hospitality Management.

During this year, 109 students enrolled on programmes offered by the first three awarding organisations and none on the latter two. The College experienced major difficulties with the Association of Information Security Auditors and Business Executives. After repeated unsuccessful attempts to contact the organisations, the College has taken steps to transfer

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

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

all students to similar programmes offered by the Association of Tourism and Hospitality Executives and will no longer offer Association of Information Security Auditors and Business Executives programmes.

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

Association of Tourism and Hospitality Executives

- Level 4 Extended Diploma in Management
- Level 5 Extended Diploma in Management
- Level 6 Diploma in Management
- Level 7 Postgraduate Diploma in Strategic Management

British Computer Society

- Level 4 Certificate in Information Technology
- Level 5 Diploma in Information Technology
- Level 6 Professional Graduate Diploma in Information Technology

Organisation for Tourism and Hospitality Management

(none currently running)

- Level 4 Diploma in Tourism and Hospitality Management
- Level 5 Diploma in Tourism and Hospitality Management
- Level 6 Diploma in Tourism and Hospitality Management

The provider's stated responsibilities

The College has delegated responsibility for the strategic development of higher education, student recruitment, monitoring of student admission, retention and completion, reviewing and responding to annual monitoring module evaluations, and, for Association of Tourism and Hospitality Executives only, marking and internal moderation of assessments.

The awarding organisations retain responsibilities in respect of academic standards for the curricula, programme content, setting and moderation of summative assessments and reviewing the quality of the College's higher education provision. The awarding organisations are also responsible for ensuring the levels of the awards within Ofqual's National Qualifications Framework and the Qualifications and Credit Framework.

For qualifications awarded by the British Computer Society, all summative assessments are based on external exams set, marked and moderated by the awarding organisation.

For Association of Tourism and Hospitality Executives programmes, all assessment tasks are coursework-based. The College uses sample assignments provided by the awarding organisation. The College is responsible for marking and internal moderation of student work. The marked assignments are then submitted to the awarding organisation for external moderation and confirmation of the student outcomes.

Responsibilities for ensuring the accuracy and completeness of public information are shared with the awarding organisations. This is achieved primarily through direct links from the College's website to the websites of the awarding organisations for programme and module level information.

Recent developments

The College changed ownership in October 2011 and a new senior management team took over running the business. Since then, there has been a complete change of staff with no members of staff recruited under the previous management team now working at the

College. Many members of staff are very new; several were recruited in March 2012 and some have joined more recently. The College inherited programmes and relationships with awarding organisations set up by the previous management team; it also inherited some of the current students who enrolled on programmes in September 2011.

Students' contribution to the review

Students studying on higher education programmes at the provider were invited to present a submission to the review team. A submission was provided by one student at the College. It included very brief representative comments of students at the College and a completed questionnaire containing five questions. Further evidence of completed questionnaires was provided at the visit. The submission supported students' views expressed at the student meeting.

Detailed findings about London Educators Limited

1 Academic standards

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

1.1 The College has devised a new management structure that is not yet operational and is in transition from a structure inherited from the previous management team. The team was given confusing information regarding current committee structures and reporting lines. The College provided lists of its delegated responsibilities for each awarding organisation; these were identical and inaccurate, and, as a result, conflicting information was provided on assessment responsibilities. Other evidence provided was unclear and confusing, for example file names and frequency of management meetings. The team saw some committee meeting minutes, but none that demonstrated a rigorous or structured approach to the management of standards.

1.2 The Executive Management Team, chaired by the Managing Director, has been in place since March 2012. An Academic Board is being set up. It will be chaired by the Head of Academics and will act as the link between executive and operational management. It will include student representation and will be supported by an Assessment Board and scrutiny boards for each awarding organisation. Post-visit evidence has clarified that two formal committees will be set up: the Student Committee and the Quality Committee, and that these will report directly into Academic Board. As these committees were not fully operational at the time of the visit, their impact could not be assessed. The streamlined committee structure is reflective of the needs of the College and should enable the College to more effectively monitor the assurance of academic standards in the future.

1.3 The quality assurance and procedures manual, which was due for review in June 2012, refers to previous and future committee structures. It includes a range of policies that have yet to be introduced and their impact is therefore untested. Staff had limited understanding of the manual and confirmed that the academic structures are a work in progress. Management responsibilities were clarified in additional evidence provided following the review visit. The College's intention to simplify management and committee structures, and to appoint programme managers with clear responsibilities for programmes and the student learning experience, is welcomed by the team, although the impact of these measures cannot yet be tested. It is advisable that the College develops and implements clear and effective management and committee structures to support the assurance of academic standards.

1.4 The management acted promptly and effectively when they discovered that the Association of Information Security Auditors and Business Executives was no longer operating. Students registered on Association of Information Security Auditors and Business Executives programmes confirmed that the College managed their transfer to an equivalent Association of Tourism and Hospitality Executives (ATHE) programme well. They were kept informed and provided with additional support, guidance and teaching to match their completed assessments to the new ones. The Assessment Board convened informally to undertake mapping of the learning outcomes of Association of Information Security Auditors and Business Executives units to ATHE units. No formal record was taken of this process.

1.5 However, there is evidence of significant weaknesses in the management of other issues relating to student achievement and assessment. Of 17 students enrolled on the level 7 Postgraduate Diploma in Strategic Management in 2011, none have submitted their assignments to ATHE and only two are still active students at the College. While some

students may have left the UK due to issues outside of the control of the College, the reasons for this high drop-out rate have not been analysed and are not fully understood. This is particularly concerning at a time when a significant number of students who had enrolled on other qualifications are being transferred to ATHE programmes. In addition, the College advised level 4 Certificate in Information Technology students not to sit their British Computer Society examination in June as they were not ready. Some students took the exam and failed. The College is aware of the problem, and tutors, supported by the Information Technology Officer, have provided additional support to help prepare students for the resit opportunity in September. There is, however, no clear understanding of the cause of this lack of preparedness for the first exam.

1.6 The team also discovered some confusion over the marking of level 7 ATHE assessments and a lack of speedy response and resolution of specific issues to ensure student work is marked correctly against the appropriate criteria.

1.7 There is a lack of ownership and critical analysis of student achievement and performance data at strategic management level. Data eventually provided by the College indicates that, of 109 students enrolled in 2011 and 2012, 32 (29 per cent) withdrew or were withdrawn by the College due to paperwork issues with the UK Border Agency, 15 (14 per cent) have completed their programmes, and 62 (57 per cent) are still active. The College has little awareness of this data and no processes to scrutinise it or use it to secure standards and enhance the quality of learning opportunities. It is essential that the College ensures effective management oversight of student performance data and assessment processes.

1.8 The programme teams have informal course review meetings at the end of semester, but the team found no evidence of a rigorous annual monitoring process. There is a review process that assesses awarding organisations and the appropriateness of the awards they offer. Limited unit level review takes place in the form of basic tutor and student feedback, but this is not evaluated at programme level. The College has no systematic approach to programme monitoring and evaluation. It is essential that the College develops and fully implements annual monitoring processes that take full account of quality indicators. Following the visit, the College has reviewed its annual and module monitoring processes and has developed new processes and templates that should support more effective monitoring of student performance, modules and programmes.

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

1.9 There is an overall lack of awareness of external reference points, such as the Academic Infrastructure. The College's main use of external reference points is through the application of awarding organisations' curriculum and assessment guidance. There has been a preliminary review of the *Code of practice for the assurance of academic quality and standards in higher education, Section 6: Assessment of students* and its impact on formative assessment, but this is not yet developed or understood by staff. The programme teams rely on awarding organisation programme outlines, recommended textbooks, examination papers and model answers, and their own experience, to judge the required level. It is advisable that the College makes use of relevant reference points to inform the management of academic standards.

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

1.10 The College has an internal verification policy, but there is no clear evidence of its implementation and there is a lack of coherence and consistency in documentation being applied to moderation processes. The College has recently appointed an Internal Verifier to develop more effective marking and moderation processes. The Internal Verifier has conducted a standardisation meeting to ensure staff are assessing against learning outcomes. This is having some impact on standards through more precise marking and internal verification. It is desirable that the College continues to provide staff development and support for marking and moderation processes.

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 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 has a range of practices and processes that support student learning. However, these are not comprehensively and systematically brought together to give the College a clear account of its performance; see paragraphs 1.1 to 1.3.

2.2 In June 2012, ATHE conducted a centre health check. This made a number of recommendations that the College agreed could be completed in a short timescale. These included improving strategies to assess individual units, employing staff with specialist qualifications to facilitate effective teaching, and developing criterion-referenced assessment. There was some evidence of responses to the issues raised in the health check, but no evidence of a systematic approach to monitoring of actions that have taken place, or their impact. ATHE has renewed recognition of the College and will undertake a centre visit to monitor actions against the recommendations and provide follow-up support, once students are registered. The College is advised to adopt a systematic approach to responding to awarding organisation and other external reports.

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

2.3 Paragraph 1.9 describes the engagement with the Academic Infrastructure for standards that also applies to quality of learning opportunities. In addition, the team found some formative assessment tasks to be insufficiently challenging or inappropriately focused to adequately prepare students for summative assessment. These would benefit from better understanding and use of relevant external reference points to ensure appropriateness of level and content; see paragraph 1.9.

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

2.4 The College has a range of mechanisms for evaluating teaching and learning, but these are not effectively monitored at strategic level. The mechanisms include peer observations, staff appraisal processes and student evaluations, including views from the recently inaugurated Student Council. Students are encouraged to express their views on

the quality of learning and teaching informally through face-to-face contact with appropriate College staff. Staff at programme level review the effectiveness of teaching and learning, although formal records are not taken.

2.5 The College has no teaching and learning strategy, although the quality assurance manual places expectations on teaching staff to draw up schemes of work and lesson plans. Staff produce structured schemes of work which enable them to signal session topics and assessment requirements in advance to students and upload relevant information to the virtual learning environment. This practice helps to cover classes, should unavoidable staff absences occur.

2.6 Teaching observations take place to check the quality of teaching, but they are not used effectively to inform appraisal and the identification of training and development needs. Observation forms provide generalised comments only and basic student feedback is gathered on preferred teaching methods. Programme leaders have a role in overseeing and identifying the needs of teachers, including reviewing outcomes from student evaluations of teaching, and peer and staff appraisal processes.

2.7 The quality assurance manual sets very broad expectations about managing diversity and embracing individual learning styles. Staff expressed minimal awareness of this and of strategies for enhancing learning opportunities. It is advisable that the College develops a structured approach to monitoring the effectiveness of teaching and learning.

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

2.8 The College has no formal systematic process to analyse and evaluate student support and link it to retention, progression and achievement rates. There are documented procedures for the structured interviewing of prospective students via a voice-over-internet medium or on a face-to-face basis. The College sets clear basic requirements for admission. This can include pre-session English support undertaken by a separate company in the same building. Students value the induction process which supports them in settling into the UK.

2.9 In response to student feedback, some student timetables have recently been adapted by concentrating teaching into two days and adding an informal but staffed session on Wednesday mornings. These enable students to access the facilities and work independently, supported by tutors as required. Students confirmed that they appreciate the opportunity to gain additional support and staff confirmed that they are able to provide tailored support according to individual need. The team considers this to be an example of good practice.

2.10 The College uses basic skills audit processes and simple individual learning plans to identify broad needs of students and respond to additional learning needs. These are recorded and signed off by teaching staff and held in well organised student files. It is not clear how these outputs are collated to determine responses to students' individual or collective learning needs.

2.11 The College does not have a formal tutorial policy, although students report that they feel secure in asking for individual support from any member of staff. They enjoy the small classes and the subsequent individual attention afforded.

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

2.12 The College has a staff development policy which it recognises it is yet to fully implement. The policy stipulates that managers have responsibility for evaluating staff development activities and are accountable to the Management Committee. There is no evidence that this happens in a purposeful manner. The College has a range of relevant staff development activities and a structured and documented approach to the induction of staff. This has a focus on conditions of employment, but also affords staff the opportunity to express individual needs and aspirations. Each new member of staff has a mentor who conducts initial appraisals and offers support. Development and training needs are identified through staff appraisal processes and recorded in staff files.

2.13 There is no overall coordinated approach to staff development planning. Recent staff development activities include orientation sessions offered by awarding organisations, teacher training and other external programmes, and training on internal verification and assessment. The latter, led by the College's Internal Verifier, has resulted in appropriate developments in the practice of setting formative assignments and improved feedback to students. Staff share useful teaching and learning practice informally. The Information Technology Officer provides practical computing support for staff and students. It is desirable that the College continues to implement the staff development policy and to monitor its effectiveness to inform staff development planning.

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

2.14 The College has mechanisms to respond adequately to the needs of students and meet awarding organisations' requirements. There is a library with adequate resources to address student programme needs and the College provides advice on local external resources. Additionally, students on British Computer Society programmes can access awarding organisation's resources provided through their registration. Students utilise the virtual learning environment to support their learning and have electronic access to tutor support from outside the College.

2.15 There are processes for identifying resource needs. Programme leaders combine their own experience with student feedback to review resources in their areas. They then indicate resource needs to the College management and these are reported at Academic Committee.

2.16 Students are encouraged to express their experiences of College resources to all staff members informally. Student feedback questionnaires and Student Council consider resourcing and make recommendations. Students feel their learning needs are well supported, particularly through the availability and academic knowledge of staff.

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

3 Public information

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

3.1 The website is the main means by which the College communicates information about its programmes to students and other stakeholders. This is supported by printed brochures, which summarise information about higher education and other programmes. The website includes information about the admissions process, awarding organisations, teaching facilities and useful information about living in London. Students found the website informative and helpful in deciding which programme to apply for at the College.

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

3.2 There is no overall coordination of the management of public information. The College has recently introduced a new website policy and procedure, but this does not cover other forms of information and is not yet fully operational. Recently introduced sign-off forms are used to ensure timely correction of errors identified with the website and the virtual learning environment. Tutors are responsible for uploading materials to the virtual learning environment and programme leaders, overseen by the Principal, are responsible for checking its accuracy. The Information Technology Officer ensures that information on the virtual learning environment is appropriate and up to date. Student handbooks are updated annually and the College is in the process of developing a system to formally include student feedback on these. It is advisable that the College develops a set of coordinated policies and procedures that cover the management of all forms of public information.

3.3 The College is developing systems and processes to monitor the accuracy and completeness of information on the website, but these are not yet effective. The College uses an external web administrator to manage and review its website. This business relationship works well and the external administrator works under clear instruction from the Principal. However, at the time of the review visit, the website included misleading and inaccurate information about the programmes that the College is approved to operate. The team drew the College's attention to these inaccuracies and corrections have now been made. These errors raise concern regarding the robustness of mechanisms used to manage public information. It is advisable that the College ensures procedures for monitoring the accuracy of information on the website are rigorously implemented and regularly reviewed. Following the visit, the College has reviewed its processes for managing information on the website and is developing more rigorous and systematic monitoring and reporting mechanisms.

3.4 Formal and informal feedback indicates student satisfaction with the accuracy and completeness of public information. The College seeks students' views on how helpful public information was in informing their decision to apply to the College. Students confirmed that they are provided with all the information they require on the website, the virtual learning environment and in their student handbook.

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

Action plan³

London Educators action plan relating to the Review for Educational Oversight September 2012						
Good practice	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation and action taken
The review team identified the following area of good practice that is worthy of wider dissemination within the provider:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the provision of informal staffed timetabled sessions in response to student feedback (paragraph 2.9) 	<p>Optional informal personalised staffed sessions are timetabled each Wednesday</p> <p>Effectiveness of these will be monitored through either personal one-to-one or student committees. Students will provide feedback on the sessions. Meetings will continue until students are satisfied. These will be recorded.</p>	<p>Dec 2012</p> <p>April 2013</p>	<p>Head of Operations to set student committee meetings calendar</p> <p>As above</p>	<p>Minutes of meetings with relevant and agreed actions to be taken in response to feedback</p> <p>As above</p>	<p>Principal and/or Head of Academics</p> <p>As above</p>	<p>Evaluation by Principal and/or external consultant</p> <p>Internal evaluation by Senior Management Team</p> <p>Appropriate action to be taken by Programme Managers</p> <p>Evaluated by Senior Management team and/or Principal</p>

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 organisations.

	Hold student committee meetings, every semester, to facilitate feedback to the student body as a whole	April 2013	As above	As above	As above	
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"> ensure effective management oversight of student performance data and assessment processes (paragraphs 1.5, 1.6 and 1.7) 	<p>Revise the College's operational management structure, clearly indicating delegated responsibilities for data collection, reporting and monitoring</p> <p>Staff member appointed to collect and analyse quarterly the critical student</p>	<p>Implement the revised management structure by April 2013</p> <p>Student performance data collected on quarterly basis from February 2013</p> <p>End March 2013</p>	<p>Senior Management Team</p> <p>Programme Managers/Head of Operations</p> <p>Head of Operations or senior management staff</p>	<p>New organisational structure and revised job descriptions</p> <p>Student data reports</p> <p>Production of reports of data on termly basis</p>	<p>Senior Management Team</p> <p>Senior Management Team</p> <p>Senior Management Team</p>	<p>Evaluation by Principal and/or external consultant</p> <p>Quarterly Senior Management Team meetings will review reports based upon student data</p> <p>Evaluated by Principal and/or Head of Academics</p>

	<p>performance data on course enrolment by subject, attendance, course completion and progression</p> <p>Senior Management team will take appropriate action to improve these performance indicators</p> <p>Instruct staff member to review, revise and implement overall assessment processes, both internal and external</p>	End March 2013	<p>member</p> <p>Senior Management Team</p>	Generation of improved and reviewed processes and procedures	Principal/Head of Academics	Principal and/or Head of Academics
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> develop and fully implement annual monitoring processes that take full account of quality indicators (paragraph 1.8) 	Develop and implement annual monitoring and reporting process which takes account of quality indicators, using all appropriate internal sources. To include: student enrolment; withdrawal; successful completion of course and progression, as well as comments relating to each programme	End March 2013	Programme managers and/or Head of Academics	A realistic and appropriate process which is clearly understood by all staff	Senior Management Team	Evaluation by Principal and/or external consultant

	on teaching, assessment, learning resource provision					
	Produce an annual self-assessment report	End July 2013	Senior Management Team	A self-assessment report which accurately reflects College's situations	Principal	Evaluative review of process and annual report by Principal and or Senior Management Team
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"> develop and implement clear and effective management and committee structures to support the assurance of academic standards (paragraphs 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3) 	Set up immediately new management and committee structure to support academic standards	End March 2013	Senior Management Team	Better and more informed decision-making	Senior Management Team/Principal	Evaluation by Principal and/or external consultant
	Student and management committee meetings to be held once a term to identify good practice and areas for improvement and address concerns raised by students and staff	As above	As above	Committees operating smoothly, effectively, and in accordance with their terms of reference	Principal	Review by Senior Management Team
	Take committee meetings' minutes	End of April 2013	Admin and Senior Management team			

	<p>and identify who will take actions to resolve issues by a target date</p> <p>Discuss if issues and targets have been resolved in the following meeting</p> <p>Monitor the way these committees operate. Review, revise and improve effectiveness of these committees. Effectiveness of the meeting to be measured by improvement to academic standards and through addressing issues raised.</p>	End July 2013	Senior Management Team	As above	As above	As above
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> make use of relevant external reference points to inform the management of academic standards (paragraphs 1.9 and 2.3) 	Ensure that the expectations of the UK Quality Code and relevant external reference points (for example the <i>Code of practice</i> , awarding bodies), where appropriate to the College's operations, are fully understood	End June 2013 End Sept 2013	Principal, Head of Operations Head of Operations and/or Senior Management	Use of external reference points to improve academic standards Revised and improved College procedures will be produced	Head of Academics Principal	Evaluation by Principal and/or external consultant Evaluation by Principal and/or external consultant

	<p>by staff. This will be achieved through attendance at workshops provided by awarding or other bodies and QAA briefings and the monitoring of actions taken. Actions recommended at the workshop training given by the awarding or other bodies and QAA meetings.</p> <p>Review, revise and implement practices to bring College procedures into alignment with expectations of the above codes</p>	As above	Team As above	As above	As above	As above
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> adopt a systematic approach to responding to awarding organisation and other external reports (paragraph 2.2) 	Assign responsibility to programme managers to liaise with each awarding body to keep up to date with evolving teaching strategies, health checks and any programme changes. Programme managers to ensure that relevant target	End March 2013	Programme Managers	<p>Termly reports on awarding body links by programme managers</p> <p>Successful achievement of health check from each awarding body</p>	Principal, Head of Academics	<p>Evaluation by Principal and/or external consultant</p> <p>Principal and awarding bodies</p> <p>Awarding bodies</p>

	<p>dates for their link awarding bodies are met</p> <p>Programme managers will attend workshop training provided by the awarding and other bodies. Effectiveness will be monitored by an internal verifier who will be appointed to ensure adherence to awarding body practices. External assessor or consultants may be invited to monitor our practices or to provide training to improve our practices</p>			Receipt of an acceptable report and renewal of licence from each awarding body		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> develop a structured approach to monitoring the effectiveness of teaching and learning (paragraphs 2.5, 2.6 and 2.7) 	<p>Monitoring of the effectiveness of teaching by developing schemes of work and lesson plans in line with learning outcomes and learning criteria as outlined by the awarding bodies</p> <p>Effectiveness of teaching and learning</p>	End June 2013	<p>Programme managers</p> <p>Head of Academics and/or</p>	<p>Positive student feedback on teaching</p> <p>Students' learning and performance</p>	<p>Head of Academics</p> <p>As above</p>	<p>Evaluation by Principal and/or external consultant</p> <p>Formal review on annual basis by Head of Academics</p> <p>As above</p>

	will be monitored termly by feedback from students on appropriateness of facilities, teachers' subject knowledge, communication, overall satisfaction and actions taken to address issues raised. Peer observation of teaching or observation by an external body/ consultant.	Every 3 months	programme managers	will be improved		
	Completion of teacher observation forms to monitor teaching quality. Performance indicators will include subject knowledge, communication skills and student achievement measured against the previous terms	As above	As above	As above and teaching will improve	As above	As above
	Annual teacher appraisals, identification of training needs, and attendance at awarding body	As above	As above	As above	As above	As above

	workshops or other appropriate training events					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> develop a set of coordinated policies and procedures that cover the management of all forms of public information (paragraph 3.2) 	Coherent set of procedures implemented to ensure that public information is produced and issued in a reliable and systematic manner. Procedures will be monitored for implementation and effectiveness.	End April 2013	Information Technology Officer, Head of Academics, Head of Operations	Accurate, reliable and timely public information	Principal	Evaluation by Principal/external consultant
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ensure procedures for monitoring the accuracy of information on website are rigorously implemented and reviewed (paragraph 3.3) 	<p>A staff member appointed to ensure procedures to monitor the accuracy of the information are implemented. The website to be reviewed quarterly and updated where appropriate</p> <p>An external consultant/reviewer to be appointed to</p>	April 2013	Senior Management Team and/or external consultant	Positive feedback about website content from public and students	Principal and/or Head of Academics	<p>Evaluation by Principal and/or external consultant</p> <p>Annual review by Head of Academics</p>

	monitor the website on a bimonthly basis. Formal monitoring reports to be submitted to the Principal. Staff member appointed to ensure website information is directly linked to the contents of the website of awarding bodies to maintain accuracy and completeness of the information. Information to be monitored on a monthly basis to ensure accuracy.	April 2013	Senior Management Team	As above	As above	Evaluation by principal or another Senior Management Team member
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"> continue to provide staff development and support for marking and moderation processes 	Staff members to attend marking and moderation workshops provided by the awarding bodies to ensure	End April 2013	Lead External Verifier Programme Managers	Improvement in quality of learning, improved feedback from students,	Head of Academics	Evaluation by Principal and/or external consultant

(paragraph 1.10)	assignments are appropriately assessed against awarding bodies' learning outcomes. Use teacher observation feedback to provide staff with training and development	April 2013	Principal and/or Senior Management Team member	reduction in assessment issues As above	As above	Monitoring by Head of Academics
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> continue to implement the staff development policy and monitor its effectiveness to inform staff development planning (paragraphs 2.12 and 2.13). 	Based on yearly appraisal and teaching and learning observations, provide appropriate staff development activities for each member of staff	April 2013	Head of Academics, Head of Operations	Improvement in staff satisfaction and effectiveness	Principal	Evaluation by Principal and/or external consultant
	Review staff development policy on an annual basis	End July 2013 and ongoing	Head of Academics, Head of Operations	An appropriate and cost-effective staff development policy	Principal	Review by Head of Academics Annual review meeting with staff

About QAA

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

QAA's aims are to:

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

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

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

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

Glossary

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

quality See **academic quality**.

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

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

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

RG 1045 11/12

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 719 1

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

Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786