



Camelot College

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

November 2012

Key findings about Camelot College

As a result of its Review for Educational Oversight carried out in November 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 Chartered Management Institute (CMI) and NCFE.

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

Recommendations

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

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

- implement procedures to ensure the information it provides is accurate and complete (paragraph 3.4).

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

- formalise systematically and embed clear and explicit procedures and policies for quality assurance (paragraph 1.2)
- formally review and respond to external reports in a clear and reflective manner (paragraph 1.5)
- clarify and integrate the internal verification policy and processes into the annual quality review and reporting procedures (paragraph 1.6)
- establish a formal appraisal system to identify and support the training and development needs of staff (paragraph 2.11)
- establish formal systems to evaluate the provision of learning resources (paragraph 2.13)
- provide comprehensive and accessible information on its website (paragraph 3.1)
- develop specific documented protocols for the engagement of overseas agents (paragraph 3.5).

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

- continue to develop its dialogue with its awarding organisations (paragraph 1.4)
- formally include student representatives in quality assurance processes (paragraph 2.2)
- implement formal student feedback mechanisms (paragraph 2.6)
- review the comprehensiveness of student induction (paragraph 2.9)
- continue the development of the virtual learning environment (paragraph 2.12)
- review the range of formats used to provide public information (paragraph 3.2).

About this report

This report presents the findings of the [Review for Educational Oversight](#)¹ (REO) conducted by [QAA](#) at Camelot College (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 NCFE and the Chartered Management Institute.

The review was carried out by Mr Jonathan Doney, Mr Siva Kumar Dinavahi (reviewers), and Mrs Brenda Hodgkinson (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 self evaluation document with appendix, meetings with staff, students, reports of reviews by the Accreditation Service for the International Colleges (ASIC) and Edexcel.

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

- awarding organisations: published syllabi and programme specifications
- the Academic Infrastructure
- Accreditation Service for International Colleges requirements.

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

Camelot College (the College) was established in March 2010, with the first student enrolled in January 2012. It states in its mission statement that it provides the best academic programmes and a learning environment to develop in intellectually capable young people creative minds. At the time of the review, 39 students were enrolled on four courses.

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

Chartered Management Institute (CMI)

- Level 4 Diploma in Management and Leadership (22)
- Level 5 Diploma in Management and Leadership (11)
- Level 7 Diploma in Strategic Management and Leadership (3)

NCFE

- Level 5 Diploma in Leadership for Health and Social Care (3)

The provider's stated responsibilities

The College has responsibilities in relation to the assessment of students with moderation being undertaken by its awarding organisations. All students register with the awarding organisation that accredits their award. Responsibility for student support lies with the College and the development of the curriculum and programme specifications are shared with the awarding organisations.

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

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

Recent developments

A new principal was appointed to the College in April 2012. Courses awarded by NCFE have been introduced to increase student numbers and assure viability. Work on formalising quality assurance procedures is ongoing, with the introduction of a Student Support Committee, for example, in September 2012.

Students' contribution to the review

Students studying on higher education programmes at the provider were invited to present a submission to the review team, but they chose not to do so. However, the review team was able to meet students both at the preparatory meeting and the review visit.

Detailed findings about Camelot College

1 Academic standards

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

1.1 The College's Quality Assurance Manual sets out a practical organisational structure. As the number of staff is small, senior managers have several roles and responsibilities for managing quality and academic standards across the four main committees: the Quality Assurance Standards Board, the Strategic Learning Committee, the Board of Examiners Committee and the Student Support Committee. The Manual is being revised so as to reflect future working practices. However, the revised document continued to lack currency in certain aspects, for example in referring to the Learning & Skills Council, which no longer exists. The Manual includes committee terms of reference and delegated reporting mechanisms, but these are not always clear. The purpose of the Quality Assurance Standards Board is defined as 'overview of quality assurance' and nothing more. The Strategic Learning Committee references reporting on semester performance reports, but these are not defined. There are many examples of conflicting evidence in the documentation provided both before and during the review visit. For example, some documentation details management boards, meetings and reports that were not in evidence.

1.2 It is not clear how the quality cycle will be run systematically. There is no reference to how courses are approved. No module review has been undertaken in relation to units already completed for inclusion within future annual monitoring reports. The Board of Examiners terms of reference refer to regular reports, but what these should address is not explained. Although there are some records of the Strategic Learning Committee meeting, the meetings are short and the minutes limited in content. The frequency of committee meetings is noted in the Manual, but it is not clear how they are to be planned sequentially. Staff described processes differently to those set out in the Manual. The procedures and processes in place are not fit for purpose and do not reflect an understanding of the Academic Infrastructure. It is advisable that the College formalises systematically and embeds clear and explicit procedures and policies for quality assurance.

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

1.3 The College has included the procedural requirements of its awarding organisations into its quality cycle to ensure its responsibilities are met. Programme specifications prepared by the awarding organisations have been adopted and these reference subject benchmark statements and the Qualifications and Credit Framework (QCF) level descriptors.

1.4 The College selects awarding organisations that provide good support to accredited colleges. There are no formal reporting systems or returns sought by the awarding organisations to ensure compliance levels to the standards prescribed by them. There is no evidence to support claims made in the self-evaluation of the existence of a variety of mechanisms for maintaining an effective dialogue with the awarding organisations, for example business planning meetings, operational meetings, annual reviews and regular interactions at programme level. The awarding organisations provide support through emails offering clarifications on issues raised by the College. It is desirable that the College continues to develop its dialogue with its awarding organisations.

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

1.5 The College has limited understanding of the use of external reports. Awarding organisation approval reports and discussions with their representatives demonstrate the College is meeting its awarding organisation requirements. At the time of the review, the College had not received any visits from their awarding organisations, consequently no reports have been received. The College anticipates that an external moderator will visit at the end of its first academic year, January 2013, from CMI. External examiner reports will be considered as part of the quality assurance process, although, for example, there is no reference to them in the terms of reference of the Board of Examiners. It is advisable for the College to formally review and respond to external reports in a clear and reflective manner.

1.6 The College has an Internal Verification Strategy, but the process is not explicit in its documentation. The Policy exists as a separate document, but is not included in the revised Quality Assurance Manual. The revised Quality Assurance Manual sets out the responsibilities of the internal verifier/quality manager for coordinating external examiner visits, responding to reports and submitting action plans to the Director of Studies. Internal moderation reports are available for individual student work, but there is no evidence of the size of the sample or the range of marks awarded across the whole cohort. It is advisable that the College clarify and integrate the internal verification policy and processes into the annual quality review and reporting procedures.

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 Given the small student numbers, the management is able to meet its current responsibilities through a small staff team that informally provides support to students. The Principal is responsible for managing and enhancing learning opportunities. Together with the College mission statement, the Quality Assurance Manual provides the direction for the quality of learning. As noted in paragraph 1.1, procedures and processes are not clearly defined. Any increase in student numbers would lead to the informal systems not fulfilling their purpose. As noted in paragraph 1.2, these policies and processes should be more systematically embedded.

2.2 At present, there is no student representation on committees, although the College states that student views will play an important role in the management of academic quality. The College plans to use a number of methods to gain feedback from students, including student representation, module feedback, annual programme questionnaires and student surveys. Procedures are in place to capture this feedback, but have yet to be implemented. Currently, with the exception of the Student Support Committee, student representatives are not invited to attend meetings with senior staff on other committees. It is desirable for the College to formally include student representatives in quality assurance processes.

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

2.3 The College has limited engagement with external reference points. Reference to the awarding organisations is limited to the registration of students to these organisations and teaching students for the summative assessments. There is no evidence of a systematic formal interaction with the awarding organisations towards quality enhancement. The College does not use the support systems facilitated by the awarding organisations, such as tutor refresher training programmes. There is no evidence of explicit information to the students to avail them of the support provided by the awarding organisations. Although the self-evaluation states that the College regularly liaises with its awarding organisations, correspondence provided is not wide-ranging. The College does refer to the guidelines of the awarding organisations and adapts their student material into a College format. As noted in paragraph 1.4, further liaison with the awarding organisations should be developed.

2.4 The College has also been inspected and approved by both the Accreditation Service for International Colleges (ASIC) in June 2011 and Edexcel in April 2012 when it was granted a recognised centre status, on meeting the specified standards of Edexcel, although no courses have yet been delivered.

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

2.5 The Teaching and Learning Policy set out in the quality documentation describes the College's ambitions in relation to teaching quality. There is an emerging process for assuring that the quality of teaching and learning is being maintained and enhanced. The Director of Studies checks all teaching materials that are adapted from the awarding organisations' resources. Lesson plans are set out with identical timings for very different tasks and require further pedagogic review. Some teaching observations have taken place and the College plans to undertake more. The Director of Studies gives individual staff feedback on these observations. However, there are no formal mechanisms for the sharing of good practice. Within the Quality Assurance Manual, the responsibility for maintaining and enhancing the quality of teaching is not clearly defined. The Manual states the Manager Academics will have responsibility for supporting and advising teachers in relation to teaching materials, rather than the Director of Studies who currently undertakes this role. As noted in paragraph 1.1, further clarification of quality roles and processes should be undertaken.

2.6 Students are satisfied with the overall quality of teaching, including the learning materials provided, the challenging class sessions and regular formative assessments. Formats to receive student feedback on various modules have been devised, but are yet to be implemented. Owing to the small number of students, feedback is currently obtained informally and issues are resolved appropriately. The students are satisfied with how the College resolves any problems. It is desirable that the College implements formal student feedback mechanisms.

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

2.7 Informally, students are well supported by the College in their studies. Students are given adequate information for choosing their programme. They found the induction they received on joining the College satisfactory. The Student Support Committee oversees the welfare issues of students and its role is clearly stated in the revised Quality Assurance Manual. Students can raise matters with staff through their representatives who sit on this committee.

2.8 Due to the small numbers, the needs of students have been identified informally and additional class sessions offered. For example, classes in academic English and information technology have been provided. At the commencement of the NCFE programme in September 2012, a study skills programme was made a prerequisite and will be employed at the start of all future programmes. Sessions for personal development planning are also used to support student learning.

2.9 Students are provided with a course pack and student handbook that contains course-related and College welfare information. Students are generally aware of course procedures, for example in relation to complaints and appeals. However, they are unsure of where to find detailed documentation if it proved necessary to use such a procedure. The team considers it desirable that the College reviews the comprehensiveness of student induction.

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

2.10 Procedures are satisfactory for hiring staff and all staff are appropriately qualified in their subject specialism. Systems are in place to provide induction for new members of staff on general issues related to the College and the course requirements of the awarding organisations. There is a formal staff meeting organised every month and the minutes are recorded, with issues identified and resolved.

2.11 The College recognises the importance of staff development and has a staff development policy for implementation. No formal systems are in place for annual appraisals or identifying training needs to support individual members of staff, although funds are available for staff development activities, if requested. Mandatory training for Preparing to Teach in the Lifelong Learning Sector (PTLLS) is scheduled to take place in 2013. However, none of the members of the staff had attended any conferences or workshops, for example those organised by the awarding organisations. It is advisable that the College establishes a formal appraisal system to identify and support the training and development needs of staff.

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

2.12 The College is developing a virtual learning environment that is available to all students. Students on CMI programmes have access to a wide range of learning material offered by CMI via the virtual learning environment. Further development to include this resource for NCFE students is planned. Students are encouraged by their teachers to access resources online and provide appropriate references. Despite this resource being in its embryonic stage, students have already started to use it and were positive in their support of it. It is desirable that the College continues the development of the virtual learning environment.

2.13 There is no formal system to evaluate the adequacy and availability of learning resources, although the College is considering developing an online library. Very limited hard copy resources are available at the College and there are no formal arrangements in place or proposed to give students access to other library resources. The Manager Academics is currently responsible for identifying resource needs and will place orders for books whenever necessary. The revised Quality Assurance Manual does not address the library and learning resources management overall. In order to ensure currency, adequacy and relevance to the

courses offered, it is advisable that the College establishes formal systems to evaluate the provision of learning resources.

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 College adequately communicates basic information about itself and its courses with its stakeholders, primarily through its website. Its prospectus and programme information are accessed via a link on the College website home page. Responses to student enquiries are supplemented by email attachments extracted from relevant documents. The College states that its detailed procedures and regulations are also available electronically from the website, but these could not be found at the time of the review. The list of the courses on offer is not complete and accrediting organisations are listed whose courses are not available. It is advisable that the College provides comprehensive and accessible information on its website.

3.2 The College has made no provision for the presentation of either printed or electronic public information in alternative formats. The website states that it is regularly updated to include vital information for disabled users. Again, the team found no evidence of this process of updating and also that the website has yet to be the subject of an accessibility audit. It is desirable that the College reviews the range of formats used to provide public information.

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

3.3 The content approval procedures currently in place for assuring the accuracy of public information are not robust. The College has formal procedures for ensuring that all printed and electronically published information is accurate, complete and current, but these are not fully effective. Course tutors work with the Director of Studies, who approves the content, and prepares student and programme handbooks. The finished document is submitted to the Quality Assurance Standards Board for approval. The College also states that, prior to publication, the awarding organisation approves the content of programme handbooks, compiled by the College. However, this approval had not been undertaken, and this was confirmed at a meeting with the College staff.

3.4 Other material for publication is drafted by the Manager Administration & Marketing, who circulates copies to members of the Quality Assurance Standards Board for scrutiny and final approval. While this process was confirmed by staff, it is not detailed in the Quality Assurance Manual or as a designated responsibility of the Quality Assurance Standard Board, and no evidence of a formal approval process was provided as evidence. The website contains a number of inaccuracies, omissions and errors. For example, as noted in paragraph 3.1, not all accreditations are listed; the programme list is incomplete, and there is misleading and inaccurate information regarding resources, student support, welfare and fees. College staff are unaware of these errors or their implications.

It is essential that the College implements procedures to ensure the information it provides is accurate and complete.

3.5 The College has no formal process for appointing overseas agents, only an online application form. There is no evidence of any procedure in place to process agent applications and how information given to an agent would be overseen. Staff reported that an agent is sent course materials and details of the courses and that the College tries to put an agreement in place, but none were made available to the team. To ensure that the information agents receive is accurate and complete, it is advisable that the College develops specific documented protocols for the engagement of overseas agents.

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

Action plan³

| Camelot College action plan relating to the Review for Educational Oversight November 2012 | | | | | | |
|--|--|--------------|--|---|-------------|--|
| 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"> implement procedures to ensure the information it provides is accurate and complete (paragraph 3.4). | <p>Audit (by 30 May) of current procedures to identify weaknesses - leading to publication (by 30 June) of a new policies and procedures document</p> <p>Establish levels of responsibility and tracking; editorial control and version control</p> <p>Audit (by 30 June) of website to remove inaccuracies and/or omissions</p> | 15 July 2013 | Director of Studies and Manager Administration | <p>Clear lines of reporting evident</p> <p>College able to evidence process in action</p> <p>Staff take responsibility for managing own curriculum content</p> <p>Information is accurate and complete with refined management of version control</p> | Principal | <p>Audit of website and newly developed policies/procedures publication process for managing content Web Manager to report to Quality Assurance Group on monthly action agenda</p> <p>Information is accurate and complete</p> |
| 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: | | | | | | |

³The 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.

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|--------------|---------------------|---|-----------|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> formalise systematically and embed clear and explicit procedures and policies for quality assurance (paragraph 1.2) | <p>Review/revise (by 20 April) Quality Assurance Manual to include: course approval; module review; annual monitoring; role/scope of committees; internal verification; embed Academic Infrastructure</p> <p>Support (by 30 April) staff have training in minute taking and meeting management and action agenda</p> | 30 May 2013 | Director of Studies | <p>Policies are clearly defined and embedded in Camelot College operations and strategic vision</p> <p>Heightened level of staff awareness demonstrated in reduction in number of staff queries</p> <p>College adopts more formal system of management and control and staff have greater ownership of vision and comment on improved communication in staff appraisal meetings</p> | Principal | <p>Audit of policies and procedures demonstrates clarity of role/focus</p> <p>Meetings recorded (detailed) and demonstrate focus and functionality - recognised in awarding organisation reports</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> formally review and respond to external reports in a clear and reflective manner (paragraph 1.5) | <p>Brief (by 30 April) staff on role/scope of external reports</p> <p>Ensure (by 30 June) efficient and effective response mechanisms in place</p> <p>Liaise (by 30 May) with awarding organisations to</p> | 20 June 2013 | Director of Studies | <p>External examiner/moderator reports received and actioned efficiently and effectively</p> <p>Role of Board of Examiners clarified and refined</p> <p>Heightened level of staff awareness</p> | Principal | <p>Relationship with awarding organisations (recognised in assessment boards; responses to external examiner reports; annual reports in their presentation to the Quality Assurance Group)</p> |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--------------|---------------------|---|---------------------|--|
| | ensure maximum benefit from staff development opportunities: date set for NCFE moderation visit; Chartered Management Institute external verifier visit | | | Positive response mechanisms | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> clarify and integrate the internal verification policy and processes into the annual quality review and reporting procedures (paragraph 1.6) | <p>Review/revise (by 30 May) internal verification policy and procedures; address issues of sample size; range of marks, and so on</p> <p>Use Quality Assurance manual as context for internal verification information - integrated with annual quality review and reporting protocols (by 20 June)</p> | 30 June 2013 | Manager Academics | <p>Internal verification strategy focused and refined</p> <p>Issues (to be resolved) reduced in number</p> <p>Staff awareness of awarding organisations is refined</p> <p>Student and awarding body recognition of clarity of assessment material</p> | Director of Studies | <p>Awarding organisation review of effectiveness of internal verification strategy - recognised in annual reports</p> <p>Retention and progression statistics show positive year on year changes</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> establish a formal appraisal system to identify and support the training and development needs of staff (paragraph 2.11) | <p>Identify (by 20 May) staff development priorities: annual appraisal; training and development needs of staff</p> <p>Review (by 10 June)</p> | 30 June 2013 | Director of Studies | <p>Appraisal system operating effectively - identifies needs and offers support and structured solutions</p> <p>Staff development budget supporting participation in</p> | Principal | <p>Increased participation in staff development activities - internal and external</p> <p>Preparing to Teach in the Lifelong Learning Sector training</p> |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|----------------|------------------------|--|-----------|---|
| | <p>staff development budget and provide details to staff alongside details of opportunities</p> <p>Timetable (by 10 June) three internal staff development events each year</p> | | | <p>external staff development events</p> <p>Internal events on College calendar</p> | | <p>scheme established</p> <p>Quality of teaching increased - student feedback positive</p> <p>College utilising awarding organisation staff development opportunities</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> establish formal systems to evaluate the provision of learning resources (paragraph 2.13) | <p>Develop (by 30 May) system for evaluating adequacy of learning and teaching</p> <p>Resources: staff feedback; student feedback; awarding body feedback; per capita expenditure monitored and evaluated (by 20 July)</p> <p>Negotiate (by 30 June) access to external library resources</p> <p>Progress (by 15 June) development of online library</p> | 30 July 2013 | Director of Studies | <p>Expanded library provision: hard copy access to local resources and recently acquired online library</p> <p>Links to online library of awarding organisations</p> <p>Linked to greater referencing in student work and enhanced capability to undertake local' research</p> | Principal | <p>Improved access to learning (internal and external) resources evident in quality of student submissions</p> <p>College refining system for measuring number of times individual student's access resources - measures degree of participation</p> <p>Awarding organisation recognition of changes in their reports</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> provide comprehensive and accessible information on | <p>Increase (by 30 July) the range of academic material and student support</p> | 15 August 2013 | Manager Administration | <p>Expanded and clearly defined (complete) and delineated website</p> | Principal | <p>Monthly audit of content and website (structures) - including solicited</p> |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|---------------------|----------------------------|--|------------------|--|
| <p>its website (paragraph 3.1)</p> | <p>information on website</p> <p>Establish (by 30 July) audit and/or update mechanisms</p> <p>Audit (by 30 June) of list of awarding bodies and associated courses</p> <p>Ensure (by 10 August) effective version control and editorial responsibility</p> | | | <p>information (financial, administrative and support) needs of current and/or prospective students and other stakeholders satisfied</p> <p>Issues of content management and version control resolved - see the essential recommendation</p> | | <p>feedback from students, agents and awarding organisations</p> <p>Web Manager reports to Quality Assurance Group</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> develop specific documented protocols for the engagement of overseas agents (paragraph 3.5). | <p>Develop (by 30 May) appointment system (protocols) for engagement and subsequent management of overseas agents</p> <p>Review (by 10 June) role of agents in use of public information; version control and approval mechanisms</p> | <p>30 June 2013</p> | <p>Director of Studies</p> | <p>Agency contract agreed and signed utilising good practice from other centres and awarding organisation advice</p> <p>Increased level of recruitment via small number of trained and trusted agents</p> <p>Clarity of understanding regarding limits of the agent's role in the preparation and use of public information - see the essential recommendation</p> | <p>Principal</p> | <p>Annual review of agents - performance and level of activity - utilising student feedback</p> <p>Use agents to evaluate sufficiency and accuracy of public information</p> |

| 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 develop its dialogue with its awarding organisations (paragraph 1.4) | Arrange (by 30 June) strategic meetings with partner/awarding organisations at management level to review the effectiveness of the relationship for further development (by 20 July) and to discuss and address any programme-specific issues | 30 July 2013 | Director of Studies | <p>Evidence of ongoing dialogue between the College and awarding organisations</p> <p>Recognition of reactive (not proactive) role of awarding organisations, building informed self-sufficiency</p> <p>Use of awarding organisation staff development opportunities as/when available - see fourth advisable recommendation</p> | Principal | <p>Internal verifier and external verifier reports indicating depth/range of awarding organisation activity</p> <p>Awarding organisation annual reports</p> <p>Internal committee records (minutes) noting activity and/or progress</p> <p>Staff awareness of awarding organisation activity assessed at appraisal - focused on regulatory issues and resources</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> formally include student representatives in quality assurance processes (paragraph 2.2) | Establish (by 30 May) robust documentation system to provide feedback from students via development of revised student | 10 August 2013 | Director of Studies | Enhanced role of 'student voice' within all College groups Student feedback on teaching/learning, resources and public information adds to | Principal | Use of students in reflection and/or evaluation process provides effective feedback and promotes targeted action |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|--------------|---------------------|--|-----------|---|
| | <p>feedback form and utilising newly establish Students Union</p> <p>Ensure (by 20 July) student representation on all key groups and promote role of student representatives within courses/cohorts</p> <p>Provide (by 30 July) funding to facilitate establishment of Students Union and/or social activities</p> <p>Promote membership and ownership of Students Union as representative vehicle</p> | | | <p>sense of ownership - see seventh advisable recommendation</p> <p>Students Union adds new dimension to study at Camelot College - promotes positive attitude among students - impact on retention/ progression</p> | | <p>Students Union creating new student dynamic</p> <p>Ensure Students Union promoted in classes by effective student representation</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> implement formal student feedback mechanisms (paragraph 2.6) | <p>Formalise (by 30 May) student representation on key groups (see second desirable recommendation) to provide feedback on key areas (teaching/ learning, resources and public information) and promote sense of ownership</p> <p>Initiate and promote</p> | 30 June 2013 | Director of Studies | <p>Establishment of long and short-term feedback loops to solve issues</p> <p>Issues resolved - and fed back to initiator</p> <p>Students Union as communication vehicle - example of proactive approach to student issues -</p> | Principal | <p>Annual audit (with Students Union) of nature and scope of student feedback and feedback mechanisms</p> <p>Number of students active in Students Union feedback (student questionnaires) on all</p> |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|--------------|---------------------|---|-----------|--|
| | <p>cohort/group representation</p> <p>Promote (by 10 June) start of Camelot College Students Union</p> <p>Reflect the UK Quality Code for Higher Education, <i>Chapter B5: Student engagement</i></p> | | | <p>providing group feedback mechanisms</p> <p>Enhanced role of student voice within all College groups</p> | | <p>aspects improved</p> <p>Increased sense of ownership/voice - see sixth advisable recommendation</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> review the comprehensiveness of student induction (paragraph 2.9) | <p>Review and revise the induction programme for students - follows Quality Assurance Agency guidelines on international students - and implement for September 2013 intake</p> <p>Refined focus on academic (policies and procedures), social and cultural aspects of living and studying in the UK</p> <p>Ensure all students covered - including late starters - and promote ongoing activities/visits as part</p> | 20 June 2013 | Director of Studies | <p>Clear understanding of rights and responsibilities for students</p> <p>Students feel part of Camelot College community</p> <p>Able to actively engage in College and/or community life</p> <p>Involve current students</p> <p>Promotes learning and engagement</p> | Principal | <p>Number of queries reduced - initial understanding</p> <p>Earlier engagement</p> <p>Solicit student feedback on effectiveness of induction process - revise as appropriate</p> |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|--------------|--|--|-----------|---|
| | of extended induction programme | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> continue the development of the virtual learning environment (paragraph 2.12) | <p>Continue to develop (by 30 June) the virtual learning environment to include lecture notes and other learning resources - some exclusive to the virtual learning environment</p> <p>Promote (by 10 July) availability of College policies/procedures and forms as online resource</p> <p>Raise awareness (staff and students) and provide staff training as appropriate (by 10 July) - see fourth and sixth advisable recommendations</p> | 30 July 2013 | Manager Administration | <p>Reduction in number of direct enquiries regarding policies and procedures</p> <p>Evidence of more effective learning - wider reading and better referencing - with improved performance outcome</p> <p>Progression and retention both improved</p> <p>Staff actively involved</p> | Principal | <p>Initiate monthly audit of activity</p> <p>Monitor management systems to ensure currency of content</p> <p>Solicit regular feedback from students and staff - evaluate/action</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> review the range of formats used to provide public information (paragraph 3.2). | <p>Review (by 30 May) and revise (by 25 June) the range of formats used in the provision of public information to ensure they do not directly or indirectly exclude any disadvantaged group</p> | 30 June 2013 | <p>Manager Administration</p> <p>External reviewer website</p> | <p>Revised website offers clarity of information and offers incentives/support for applications from disabled students</p> | Principal | <p>Initiate six-monthly accessibility audit of website</p> <p>Solicit views of any disadvantaged and/or disabled student on nature and scope of provision</p> |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | Ensure (by 10 June) provision of information for disabled groups - all key areas, including assessment - and noting process of reasonable adjustment | | | | | Ensure recruitment and enrolment identify students will support needs |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|

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.gaa.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 Organisations.

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:

⁴www.gaa.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 1137 03/13

The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education

Southgate House
Southgate Street
Gloucester
GL1 1UB

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

© The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education 2013

ISBN 978 1 84979 831 0

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

Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786