



College of East London Ltd

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

March 2014

Key findings about the College of East London Ltd

As a result of its Review for Educational Oversight carried out in March 2014, 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 programmes it offers on behalf of Pearson; The Institute of Commercial Management; The Organisation for Tourism and Hospitality Management; the Confederation of Tourism and Hospitality; the Chartered Institute of Management Accountants; NCFE and ATHE, the Management Awarding Organisation.

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

The team considers that reliance **cannot** be placed on the information that the provider produces for its intended audiences about the learning opportunities it offers.

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:

- conduct Examination Boards in accordance with its quality assurance manual (paragraph 1.7)
- ensure that its responsibilities for managing and enhancing the quality of learning opportunities are fully met (paragraph 2.1)
- ensure that it adheres to and fully implements its processes for programme review and monitoring (paragraph 2.2)
- develop an effective publication policy with defined roles and responsibilities that ensures complete, consistent and accurate information is published to students and other stakeholders (paragraph 3.4).

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

- review its deliberative and management structure to ensure roles and responsibilities are clearly defined, understood and effectively fulfilled (paragraph 1.2)
- develop a more robust system for tracking student progress and achievement (paragraph 1.8)
- implement the objectives of the staff development plan to ensure that they are delivered and monitored (paragraph 2.16).

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

- fully embed the expectations of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education into its policies (paragraph 1.5)
- fully implement the anti-plagiarism software and evaluate its effectiveness (paragraph 1.9)
- include findings from lesson observations in the annual monitoring process (paragraph 2.4)
- develop the lesson observation process to include a greater focus on student learning and knowledge (paragraph 2.5)

- introduce a formal system for the selection of student representatives and clearly identify their role (paragraph 2.12)
- devise a process for special consideration and reasonable adjustments (paragraph 2.14)
- develop effective mechanisms for the identification and sharing of good practice (paragraph 2.18).

About this report

This report presents the findings of the [Review for Educational Oversight](#)¹ (REO) conducted by [QAA](#) at the College of East London Ltd (the College), which is a privately funded provider of higher education. 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 Pearson; The Institute of Commercial Management (ICM); The Organisation for Tourism and Hospitality Management (OTHM); the Confederation of Tourism and Hospitality (CTM); the Chartered Institute of Management Accountants (CIMA); NCFE and ATHE, the Management Awarding Organisation (ATHE). The review was carried out by Ms Brenda Eade, Mr Rob Mason, Mr Brian Sullivan (reviewers) and Dr Alun Thomas (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 documentation supplied by the provider and awarding organisations and meetings with staff and students. The report of the Review for Educational Oversight carried out in 2012, and the subsequent annual monitoring report from the review visit of March 2013, were also both used as evidence.

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

- requirements of the College's awarding organisations
- the Qualifications and Credit Framework (QCF)
- the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (Quality Code).

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

The College was established in 2005 as a private limited company. It is owned by three Directors. It moved from its original campus in Stratford to its current location alongside Mile End Park in February 2010. It has 493 students and operates solely from the one building it part occupies.

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

Pearson

- Level 7 Extended Diploma in Strategic Management and Leadership (81)
- Level 5 Higher National Diploma in Business (99)

ATHE, the Management Awarding Organisation (ATHE)

- Level 7 Diploma in Health Care Management (28)

Confederation of Tourism and Hospitality (CTH)

- Level 7 Diploma in Tourism (12)

The Organisation for Tourism and Hospitality Management (OTHM)

- Level 7 Diploma in Tourism and Hospitality Management (18)
- Level 6 Diploma in Tourism and Hospitality Management (4)

¹ www.qaa.ac.uk/educational-oversight

² www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Pages/REO-designated-providers-handbook-13.aspx

The Institute of Commercial Management (ICM)

- Level 6 Diploma in Business (186)

Chartered Institute of Management Accountants (CIMA)

- Level 7 Advanced Diploma in Management Accounting (65)

NCFE

- Level 7 Postgraduate Diploma in Education (0)

The provider's stated responsibilities

The College offers awards from seven awarding organisations. The responsibilities of the College vary between the different awarding organisations but the only significant difference is that, for Pearson awards, the College sets the assignments. Otherwise, the awarding organisations determine the intended learning outcomes, indicative content and assessment guidelines for each programme, and the College designs learning materials and manages the delivery of the programmes.

Recent developments

The College merged with a significantly larger college, the London College of Computing and Management Sciences (LCCMS), in November 2013 and as a result the College was validated by two new awarding organisations, ATHE, the Management Awarding Organisation and CIMA. The LCCMS had undergone a Review of Educational Oversight in July 2012 and the report concluded that limited confidence could be given for how the provider managed its responsibilities, both for the standards of its awards and for the quality of learning opportunities.

At the time of the annual monitoring visit in March 2013 it was noted that the College had grown from 65 students in 2011-12 to 110 in 2012-13. Following the merger, the College has now grown to 493 students. It has a Certificate of Acceptance to Study of 550. Much of the last 12 months has been taken up in ensuring a successful merger and that students were not adversely affected.

Students' contribution to the review

Students studying on higher education programmes at the provider were invited to present a submission to the review team. Their submission was written by members of the Students' Union at the College independently of any members of staff and provided useful evidence for the review team. In addition, student representatives met the Coordinator during the preparatory meeting and 57 students attended a meeting with the team during the review visit.

Detailed findings about the College of East London Ltd

1 Academic standards

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

1.1 The College has recently introduced a matrix structure for the management of academic standards, but this requires further review as staff were unclear of their responsibilities. The Director of Studies has overall responsibility for the management of academic standards, assisted by programme leaders who deal with day-to-day matters. However, the roles and responsibilities of the programme leaders are unclear. Whereas the organisation chart identifies programme leaders as being responsible for programmes, the minutes of Academic Board identify them as being responsible for levels. As, following the merger, the College is now working with seven awarding organisations, it is important that the roles and responsibilities in the management structure are clearly defined.

1.2 The decision-making processes within the College's committee structure require further review. The Academic Board has overall responsibility for academic standards. The Academic Standards Committee is responsible for the delivery of the curriculum, including assessment, liaison with awarding organisations and responding to student feedback. The College Management Committee is responsible for strategic and financial planning and for writing and monitoring policies. However, the roles and responsibilities of each committee require further revision as they make reference to committees which no longer exist and are not consistent with the quality assurance manual. Minutes indicate that the issues discussed at all three committees are similar and the Academic Board does not act as the College's overall academic authority which results in the committees not fulfilling their separate roles effectively. It is **advisable** that the College review its deliberative and management structure to ensure roles and responsibilities are clearly defined, understood and effectively fulfilled.

1.3 The College has a process for conducting an annual monitoring review, but this has not been effectively implemented over the last 12 months. The minutes of the Academic Standards Committee meeting of October 2013 state that annual programme reviews were suspended because of the workload associated with the merger (see paragraph 2.2).

How effectively does the College make use of external reference points to manage academic standards?

1.4 The College effectively complies with the QCF through its relationship with its awarding organisations. Staff have received training from Pearson, ATHE, OTHM, ICM and CTH. Training from CIMA is planned for May 2014. External verification/examiner reports from Pearson confirm that the College is meeting the requirements of the level descriptors for that awarding organisation.

1.5 College staff are familiar with the expectations of the Quality Code. Some training was provided in March 2013 and a staff focus group has been subsequently held. The College updated its policies and procedures in August 2013 although there is no evidence that they have been mapped to the Quality Code. However, the College has produced separate mapping documents for all three parts of the Quality Code which link the expectations of the Quality Code to the appropriate College policy. It would be **desirable** for the College to fully embed the expectations of the Quality Code into its policies.

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

1.6 The College has an adequate internal verification policy and produces internal verification tracking sheets for student work. The College has appointed an external consultant to complete the internal verification process for its Pearson provision and the external examiner identifies this as good practice. External examiner reports from Pearson are responded to by the Director of Studies and then considered by the Academic Standards Committee.

1.7 The consideration of student achievement is not undertaken through an Examination Board as defined in the quality assurance manual but on an informal basis. The outcomes of meetings to consider schemes of work, and the standardisation of assessment briefs are not recorded, as assessors and verifiers meet only informally. The Academic Standards Committee is responsible for confirming student marks, but receives only verbal confirmation that the standardisation and verification processes have taken place. Examination Boards have a particularly important responsibility for the maintenance of academic standards and are expected by Pearson. The College recognises that they need to have Examination Board meetings, but they have not been implemented because of the merger. It is **essential** that the College conduct Examination Boards in accordance with its quality assurance manual.

1.8 The process for tracking student progress is currently adequate but a more robust system will need to be developed to support the increase in student numbers, the diversity of programmes offered through different awarding organisations and the multiple entry points onto these programmes. Currently, progress is tracked solely by the Director of Studies through the students' independent learning plans and results are entered onto a spreadsheet. This is not sustainable with increased student numbers. It is **advisable** that the College develop a more robust system for tracking student progress and achievement.

1.9 The College has an adequate policy relating to academic malpractice and plagiarism, but this relies on staff to identify cases of plagiarism. New anti-plagiarism software is being piloted and the College intends to roll this out to students after Easter. It would be **desirable** for the College to fully implement the anti-plagiarism software and evaluate its effectiveness.

1.10 The team concluded that there are significant weaknesses in the College's deliberative and management structures for managing academic standards. The recent merger with LCCMS has adversely impacted on the College's ability to adhere to its own quality assurance processes. The College uses its awarding organisations as its main link to the QCF and has done some work on identifying how its policies meet the expectations of the Quality Code. However, further embedding of the expectations of the Quality Code into the College policies is required. The College's procedures for standardisation of assessments and confirmation of student marks are presently conducted on an informal basis. These need to be strengthened and formalised. To support the planned growth in student numbers the system for tracking student progress and achievement needs to be more robust. The College relies on staff to identify plagiarism but should make the new anti-plagiarism software fully operational and available for student submission. An annual monitoring review has not taken place over the last twelve months and this should be reinstated to ensure there is effective oversight of academic standards.

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

2 Quality of learning opportunities

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

2.1 The team could find no evidence that the College had made effective efforts to oversee or enhance the quality of learning opportunities in the period since the merger. Since the merger the College is delivering two new programmes through two awarding organisations it has not previously worked with, and has recruited an additional 380 students, quadrupling its size. According to the College's terms of reference, the Academic Standards Committee is responsible for 'academic oversight' and 'academic quality'. However, notes from meetings show little evidence that this, or any other Committee, is addressing these responsibilities. In addition, the team found no evidence that the College had given proper consideration to the effects of the merger on the quality of learning opportunities, such as learning resources and staffing. Furthermore, there is evidence that the College accepted students on to programmes before it had obtained the necessary approval from the awarding organisation, thereby breaching its own quality assurance processes for programme approval. During the visit the College acknowledged the lack of adherence to its own quality assurance processes, such as annual monitoring. It is **essential** that the College ensure that its responsibilities for managing and enhancing the quality of learning opportunities are fully met.

2.2 Oversight and reporting on the management of academic standards, the management and enhancement of the quality of learning opportunities is through the annual monitoring process (see paragraph 1.3), but this has not been effectively carried out for the last year (2012-13). A consolidated view of the information from the monitoring process is produced by the Academic Standards Committee for their consideration and action planning, and for reporting academic issues, including resource issues, to the Academic Board. However, in 2012-13 this process was not completed because of the additional work associated with the merger, resulting in a lack of oversight by senior management of potential issues, including the allocation of resources, at a particularly important time for the College. The College recognises this position and the need to complete the full review cycle in the current year although no formal action plan to do this was identified by the team. It is **essential** for the College to ensure that it adheres to and fully implements its processes for programme review and monitoring.

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

2.3 The College has made progress in raising awareness of the Quality Code although this process is not yet complete (paragraph 1.5). The College notes comments from external examiner reports relating to student support, teaching and resources.

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

2.4 The College uses a peer process for lesson observation, known as assessor observation. Experienced lecturers pair with less experienced staff to view and exchange ideas on teaching and learning techniques and strategies. In addition, all lecturers have been formally observed by managers or senior staff over the last eighteen months. Although the consideration of teaching quality derived from lesson observations is part of the annual monitoring process, it was not addressed in the two programme reviews carried out in 2012-13. It would be **desirable** for the College to include findings from lesson observations in the annual monitoring process.

2.5 Written feedback from lesson observations is brief and there is limited focus on how much students learn and the acquisition of skills and essential knowledge which are important parts of the teaching and learning process. It would be **desirable** for the College to develop the lesson observation process to include a greater focus on student learning and knowledge.

2.6 As part of the module evaluation process, students complete module questionnaires to seek their views on the quality of teaching. These show consistently high levels of satisfaction with teaching and this is confirmed by students.

2.7 A teaching and learning strategy is in the development phase as part of the Academic Standards Committee's responsibilities although it has yet to be drafted.

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

2.8 A comprehensive admissions policy ensures that prospective students are given clear guidance and information on the College and their desired course. All prospective students undergo checks to ensure that their applications are legitimate although some were accepted onto a course before the course was approved. Students confirmed that the process is rigorous and supportive.

2.9 Induction for new students takes place early on in their programme. All students also receive timetables and a student handbook which provides guidance and information relating to academic rules. However, some of the content in the student handbook contradicts information from other sources, for example attendance policy and the student charter (see paragraph 3.2).

2.10 The College operates an open-door policy where students are able to seek advice and guidance from staff at any reasonable time. Response times by staff to student queries are good. Students the team met commented positively on the value of this type of support.

2.11 Although entitlement to formal tutorial support is set to at least one individual tutorial per term, these occur more frequently in practice, typically once a week. Each student keeps an individual learning plan which records assessment details, reviews and reports.

2.12 The current system for determining student representation on College committees is informal. Members of the Students' Union are encouraged to volunteer to be representatives on College committees. However, students were unsure of this representation or the roles of these committees. It would be **desirable** for the College to introduce a formal system for the selection of student representatives and clearly identify their role.

2.13 A staff-student representative body meets weekly. This gives students a forum to discuss issues of an academic and pastoral nature with College management. Appropriate actions, completion dates and progress are noted and progress fed back to students. Students value this regular opportunity to meet and discuss their concerns with staff.

2.14 The College has a policy relating to extensions for the submission of assessment, but this does not include a process for special consideration and reasonable adjustments and this has been commented on in the most recent external verifier report. Students the team met were not aware of the procedures for special consideration should they be unable to submit their assessment by the deadline provided. It would be **desirable** for the College to devise a process for special consideration and reasonable adjustments.

How effectively does the College develop its staff in order to improve student learning opportunities?

2.15 The College has a comprehensive staff recruitment procedure. Criteria and minimum levels of skills and qualifications are set out in the College's quality assurance manual.

2.16 The College staff development policy outlines the key objectives of staff development. It also states that the programmes will be delivered, disseminated, monitored and evaluated to meet the required standards but the team found no evidence of this. It is **advisable** that the College implement the objectives of the staff development plan to ensure that they are delivered and monitored.

2.17 All academic staff are required to take part in the College's staff development and appraisal programme. This records annual progress, objectives for the next year and a review of training and development activities since the last appraisal meeting. Agreed actions are instigated by an appropriate head of department.

2.18 The identification and dissemination of good practice and enhancement opportunities is informal and not systematic. Lecturers working in small, mutually supportive teams discuss their learning and teaching strategies during informal meetings. It would be **desirable** for the College to develop effective mechanisms for the identification and sharing of good practice.

2.19 All teaching staff are expected to either hold or be working towards an appropriate teaching qualification and most staff have taken the opportunity to study for the Postgraduate Diploma in Education run by the College. In addition all teaching staff are required to undertake assessor and internal verification training and many have completed this.

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

2.20 The College has an adequate, but informal process for the renewal and replacement of resources. Although the responsibility for the process formally lies with the Academic Board, the College Management Committee performs the operational role. This Committee allocates resources from a central budget, based on their priority, need and value. In addition, programme reviews, where carried out (see paragraph 2.2), which include student feedback, identify resource issues and this information also feeds into the process. An annual library budget ensures that texts are renewed where appropriate.

2.21 The virtual learning environment has recently been populated with a range of course-related documentation. Student access is available within the College and remotely.

2.22 The review team found that significant concerns exist about aspects of the provider's current and likely future management of the quality of learning opportunities. The Academic Standards Committee does not effectively or regularly address its stated functions. The annual monitoring process is ineffective and the process was not completed in the last academic year because of the merger. The effect of the merger on students' learning opportunities was not fully considered. In addition the annual monitoring process does not adequately evaluate the quality of learning opportunities, and differentiate between strengths and good practice. The lesson observation process does not effectively focus on student learning and the acquisition of knowledge and findings from this are not included in the annual monitoring review process. Although students value the staff-student meetings,

there is no formal selection process of student representatives, and students are unclear how they represent the student body on committees. Students value the staff open door policy for seeking advice. The objectives of the staff development policy are not effectively met and fail to adequately monitor and evaluate staff development. The identification and dissemination of good practice is largely informal.

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

3 Information about learning opportunities

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

3.1 The main sources of information for prospective students are the College website and its prospectus but these are not fit for purpose as they do not, as they should, give a fair and accurate reflection of the higher education opportunities the College offers. Both sources of information provide users with detail about the courses on offer. The website, though, provides information that is incomplete or has the potential to mislead prospective students. For example: it advises international students that the College offers courses from bachelor's to master's level although the College does not actually offer bachelor's or master's qualifications; entry information for some qualifications is incomplete; fee information does not make it clear that the amount payable is an annual sum and does not clarify that the fee is for full-time tuition only.

3.2 The College provides a range of documents for students and other internal stakeholders but these often contain errors or are inconsistent. The range of documents includes the student handbook, business plan, mission and vision statements, and quality assurance manual, as well as a key range of policies and procedures including those related to attendance and punctuality. However, they contain many inaccuracies and inconsistencies. For example: the student handbook makes reference to a student charter that College managers were not aware of; the attendance policy detailed in the student induction presentation is inconsistent with that given in the student handbook; the mission statement on the college website is very different to the version detailed in the College quality assurance manual. One programme guide states that the qualification is 'QAA benchmarked' but the relevant awarding organisation website makes no such reference, and the curriculum described within the guide is not consistent with the units described by the awarding organisation. Several policies make reference to committees and roles that do not exist. For example the publication policy describes a Head of International Development, a role that does not exist; the student handbook makes reference to an Assessment Board whereas the quality assurance manual cites an Examination Board as undertaking the same role.

3.3 The College publishes information via social media sites. These include accurate but limited information. Students the team met find this information useful. The College has had to set up another social media page as the original had been hacked and they are unable to delete the hacked page.

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

3.4 The processes for assuring information are ineffective. The College has produced a publication policy which states that key responsibilities for the accuracy of information lie with the Public Information Team, an informal subgroup of the College Management Committee. The minutes of the College Management Committee make very limited reference to public information issues and one of the key roles defined in the policy does not exist in the college structure. The inconsistencies noted in paragraphs 3.1 to 3.3 provide the key evidence as to the ineffectiveness of this policy. It is **essential** that the College develop an effective publication policy with defined roles and responsibilities that ensures complete, consistent and accurate information is published to students and other stakeholders.

3.5 The College has commenced mapping its public information to *Part C: Information about higher education provision* of the Quality Code. This activity is in its early stages.

3.6 The College publishes a wide range of information about itself for students and other stakeholders. This includes the website, prospectus, student handbook and enrolment information. The College has a publication policy but this is not rigorously implemented. The team found several examples of incomplete or inconsistent information produced by the College. The team concluded that the College does not have in place effective mechanisms for ensuring the information it produces is fit for purpose, accessible and trustworthy.

The team concludes that reliance **cannot** be placed on the information that the provider produces for its intended audiences about the learning opportunities it offers.

Action plan³

College of East London Ltd action plan relating to the Review for Educational Oversight of March 2014						
Essential	Intended outcomes	Actions to be taken to achieve intended outcomes	Target date(s)	Action by	Reported to	Evaluation (process or evidence)
The team considers that it is essential for the College to:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> conduct Examination Boards in accordance with its quality assurance manual (paragraph 1.7) 	Ensure all student work is assessed appropriately and reviewed through the College Management Structure	<p>For all 8 Reviews between June 2014 and October 2014 the following will take place</p> <p>Allocate members to each Exam Board</p> <p>Review students marks</p> <p>Propose lists to go to awarding bodies</p> <p>Sanction lists at Academic Standards Committee</p> <p>Ratify lists at the Academic Board</p>	June 2014 to October 2014	<p>Director of Studies</p> <p>Director of Studies</p> <p>Director of Studies</p> <p>Director of Studies</p> <p>Director of Studies</p>	<p>Operations Director</p> <p>Operations Director</p> <p>Operations Director</p> <p>Operations Director</p> <p>Director of Studies</p>	<p>Members allocated as proposed</p> <p>Minutes of meetings + lists</p> <p>Examination Board Minutes</p> <p>Academic Standards Committee minutes</p> <p>Complete process sign off/</p>

³ The College 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 College's awarding organisations.

		Send final agreed lists to appropriate awarding body		Director of Studies	Operations Director	evidence of submission
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ensure that its responsibilities for managing and enhancing the quality of learning opportunities are fully met (paragraph 2.1) 	<p>An effective deliberative committee structure which enables the effective management and oversight of students' quality of learning opportunities</p>	Produce a discussion document addressing the risks and challenges associated with the increased student numbers	End June 2014	Director of Studies	Operations Director	Formal action plan
		Produce and carry out an action plan to minimise risks	Jun to Sep 2014	Director of Studies	Operations Director	Observed and recorded progress against the plan
		Redefine the role of the Academic Standards Committee to ensure it is more effective in safeguarding academic standards	End July 2014	Director of Studies	Operations Director	Evidence of the Academic Standards Committee being more effective (more focused discussions, tighter minuting, clear actions with assigned responsibilities and timescales)
		Develop the team structure to ensure more effective support and management of increased student numbers	May to Sep 2014	Director of Studies	Operations Director	Evidence of a more structured and focused team supporting the student base
		Carry out an audit of resources in the college and submit recommendations for additional resources (if needed) to the Academic Board	End Sep 2014	Admissions Manager	Operations Director	Detailed report
			Oct 2014	Admissions	Operations	

				Manager	Director	and evidence of action being taken
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ensure that it adheres to and fully implements its processes for programme review and monitoring (paragraph 2.2) 	<p>The comprehensive review of modules and programmes which allows problems to be identified and addressed promptly</p>	Written review on each module	Mid July	Course Tutors	Director of Studies	Written report and minutes of Academic Standards Committee meeting that considered the reviews
		Written review on each course	End July	Programme Managers	Director of Studies	
		Consolidated programme review	End August	Director of Studies	Operations Director	Consolidated report outlining the issues and actions recommended by the Academic Board
						Evidence of progress on the actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> develop an effective publication policy that ensures complete, consistent and accurate information is published to students and other 	<p>Ensure that information produced by the College is fit-for-purpose, accessible and trustworthy?</p>	Complete a review of the college website to ensure accuracy and appropriateness of information	May to Oct 2014	Operations Director	Independent External Auditor	Minutes of College Management Committee, monthly timetable and Action Plan
		Review and possible revision of college business plan	End Sept 2014	Operations Director	Independent External Auditor	Revised Business Plan

stakeholders (paragraph 3.4).		Review and possible revision of college Quality Manual	End Sept 2014	Operations Director	Independent External Auditor	Revised quality manual
		Review and possible revision of student induction documentation	End Sept 2014	Operations Director	Independent External Auditor	Revised induction pack
		Review and possible revision of student handbook	End Sept 2014	Operations Director	Independent External Auditor	Revised student handbook
		Review of staff handbook	End Sept 2014	Operations Director	Independent External Auditor	Revised staff handbook
		Revise and, if necessary, modify, all electronic documents on college databases	End Oct 2014	Operations Director	Independent External Auditor	Audit records
		Undertake the physical destruction of outdated paper documents	End Oct 2014	Operations Director	Independent External Auditor	Evidence of action taken
		Implement a standard version control numbering system	End Nov 2014	Operations Director	Independent External Auditor	New documents with version control references
		Consolidate and disseminate policies and procedures	End Nov 2014	Operations Director	Independent External Auditor	New policy documents

Advisable	Intended outcomes	Actions to be taken to achieve intended outcomes	Target date(s)	Action by	Reported to	Evaluation (process or evidence)
The team considers that it is advisable for the College to:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> review its deliberative and management structure to ensure roles and responsibilities are clearly defined, understood and effectively fulfilled (paragraph 1.2) 	Clearly define the roles and responsibilities in the college and ensure they are understood and effectively fulfilled	Rewrite job descriptions for all management and academic staff Map these duties to defined procedures and responsibilities within the college Obtain staff sign off to ensure all staff understand their role Produce a variance report (if appropriate) and develop a resource plan	End Sep 2014 End Sep 2014 Mid Oct 2014 Mid Oct 2014	Human Resources Consultant Human Resources Consultant Director of Studies Director of Studies	Operations Director Operations Director Operations Director Operations Director	New job descriptions Mapping document Signed off job descriptions Variance Report and approved resource actions list
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> develop a more robust system for tracking student progress and achievement (paragraph 1.8) 	Ensure student progress is effectively monitored in order to improve learner progression	Produce Individual Learning Plan files for all students Develop a control chart for each student showing progress across their programmes by module	Jun to Nov 2014 Jun to Nov 2014	Course Tutors Course Tutors	Director of Studies Director of Studies	Individual Learning Plan files Control Chart

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> implement the objectives of the staff development plan to ensure that they are delivered and monitored (paragraph 2.16). 	<p>Create a continuous profession development ethos within the college to ensure improvement of the students learning experience</p>	<p>Carry out appraisals with all staff</p> <p>Ensure all academic staff have a development programme which is appropriate to their role and which meets the college's strategic aims</p>	<p>End Sep 2014</p> <p>End Sep 2014</p>	<p>Human Resources Consultant</p> <p>Human Resources Consultant</p>	<p>Director of Studies</p> <p>Director of Studies</p>	<p>Appraisal reports with clearly identified outcomes</p> <p>Development programmes which meet identified needs</p>
<p>Desirable</p>	<p>Intended outcomes</p>	<p>Actions to be taken to achieve intended outcomes</p>	<p>Target date/s</p>	<p>Action by</p>	<p>Reported to</p>	<p>Evaluation (process or evidence)</p>
<p>The team considers that it would be desirable for the College to:</p>						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> fully embed the expectations of the Quality Code into its policies (paragraph 1.5) 	<p>Integration and referencing of the indicative content of the UK Quality Code into college policies and procedures</p>	<p>Review the UK Quality Code and determine the key elements to be referenced in college policies and procedures</p> <p>Integrate these into the policies and procedures</p> <p>Communicate issues and brief all members of staff</p>	<p>End Jul 2014</p> <p>End Sept 2014</p> <p>End Oct 2014</p>	<p>Operations Director</p> <p>Operations Director</p> <p>Operations Director</p>	<p>Independent External Auditor</p> <p>Independent External Auditor</p> <p>Independent External Auditor</p>	<p>Quality Control Guidance document</p> <p>Policies and procedures appropriately reflecting the guidance of the Code</p> <p>Presentation notes</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> fully implement the anti-plagiarism system and evaluates its effectiveness (paragraph 1.9) 	<p>Improve the quality of students work through the use of more structured formative feedback</p>	<p>Standardise the use of anti plagiarism across all programmes (where permitted)</p>	Jun to Nov 2014	Course Tutors	Director of Studies	Examples of formative work with anti-plagiarism reports
		<p>Provide formative feedback with plagiarism reports on all programmes</p>	From July 2014	Course Tutors	Director of Studies	Module reviews
		<p>Incorporate a plagiarism review in module reviews</p>	December 2014			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> include findings from lesson observations in the annual monitoring process (paragraph 2.4) 	<p>Ensure actions and recommendations for lesson observations are incorporated into professional development plans and module reviews</p>	<p>Establish a directory of lesson observations</p>	End June 2014	Course Tutors	Director of Studies	Review of the utility and effectiveness of the directory
		<p>Summarise the results</p>	End July 2014	Course Tutors	Director of Studies	Lesson Observation summary report
		<p>Incorporate the results and recommendations into module reviews</p>	End July 2014	Programme Managers	Director of Studies	Module Reviews
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> develop the lesson observation process to include a greater focus on student learning and knowledge (paragraph 2.5) 	<p>Ensure the learning opportunity and process is improved within the classroom</p>	<p>Review the observation template to incorporate student experience in the observation record</p>	End June 2014	Programme Managers	Director of Studies	Example of new template
		<p>Score interactive involvement on a Likert scale</p>	End June 2014	Course Tutors	Director of Studies	Summary reports
		<p>Develop a commentary to be incorporated in the</p>	End July 2014	Course Tutors	Director of Studies	Module reviews

		module review				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> introduce a formal system for the selection of student representatives and clearly identify their role (paragraph 2.12) 	Ensure the college adopts a more formal productive and engaging platform for student representation in the college	Set out a timetable and roles/responsibilities for the Staff/Student Forum	End June 2014	Admissions Manager	Director of Studies	Timetable published and shared with student body
		Elect representatives for the Academic Standards Committee, College Management Committee and Academic Board	End July 2014	Admissions Manager	Director of Studies	Election paperwork (Nomination papers and election results)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> devise a process for special consideration and reasonable adjustments (paragraph 2.14) 	Ensure there is an effective special consideration and reasonable adjustment process in place and that it is communicated to the student body	Draft a special consideration and reasonable adjustment policy	End Aug 2014	Operations Director	Independent External Auditor	Special consideration and reasonable adjustment policy document
		Incorporate it in the student induction process	End Sept 2014	Operations Director	Independent External Auditor	Revised Induction pack
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> develop effective mechanisms for the identification and sharing of good practice (paragraph 2.18). 	Ensure best practice is disseminated throughout the college with the aim of improving the quality of the learning experience.	Hold a staff workshop to explore ways of sharing best practice	End July 2014	All academic Staff	Director of Studies	Agenda and record of discussions
		Pilot the ideas which come out of the workshop	Aug to Nov 2014	All Academic Staff	Director of Studies	Good practice ideas and follow up notes

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/educational-oversight.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

⁴ www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Pages/REO-designated-providers-handbook-13.aspx

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

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

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

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

provider (s) (of higher education) Organisations that deliver higher education. In the UK they may be a degree-awarding body or another organisation that offers programmes of higher education on behalf of degree-awarding bodies or awarding organisations. In the context of Review for Specific Course Designation the term means an independent college.

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

quality See **academic quality**.

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

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

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

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

QAA801 - R3959 - Jun 14

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

Tel 01452 557000
Email enquiries@qaa.ac.uk
Web www.qaa.ac.uk

Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786