



OLC (Europe) Ltd t/a Organisational Learning Centre

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

April 2014

Key findings about OLC (Europe) Ltd t/a Organisational Learning Centre

As a result of its Review for Educational Oversight carried out in April 2014, the review team considers that there can be **confidence** in how the provider manages its stated responsibilities for the standards of the programmes it offers on behalf of Pearson and the Institute of Credit Management.

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

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

Good practice

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

- the contribution that the Quality Management Audits make to the management and enhancement of the quality of learning opportunities (paragraph 2.3).

Recommendations

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

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

- continue to develop the academic monitoring and reporting structure to include committee terms of reference and student representation (paragraphs 1.2 and 1.4)
- develop further its engagement with external reference points (paragraphs 1.5, 1.7, 2.6 and 3.6)
- use student feedback, including end-of-unit surveys and other student feedback mechanisms to enhance teaching quality (paragraph 2.10)
- develop an academic and pastoral tutorial policy (paragraph 2.12)
- include guidance on teaching and assessing at higher education levels in staff development activities (paragraphs 2.14 and 2.15)
- implement plagiarism-detection software (paragraph 2.17)
- ensure that published information is consistent and accurate (paragraph 3.1)
- revise programme specifications to improve accuracy and to fulfil awarding organisation and Quality Code requirements (paragraph 3.3).

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

- develop effective internal verification guidance (paragraph 1.9)
- record completed actions in committee minutes (paragraph 2.2)
- implement annual course reviews and evaluate their effectiveness (paragraph 2.4)
- engage consistently with its quality assurance code (paragraph 2.5)
- formalise the observation policy to support teaching and learning (paragraph 2.8)
- analyse student retention data (paragraphs 1.3 and 2.13).

About this report

This report presents the findings of the [Review for Educational Oversight](#)¹ (REO) conducted by [QAA](#) at OLC (Europe) Ltd t/a the Organisational Learning Centre (the Centre), which is a privately funded provider of higher education. The purpose of the review is to provide public information about how the Centre 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 and the Institute of Credit Management. The review was carried out by Mr Peter Hymans, Mr Millard Parkinson, Professor Anthony Whitehouse (reviewers) and Professor Patricia Higham (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 review team also considered the provider's use of the relevant external reference points:

- the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (the Quality Code)
- the awarding organisations' guidelines and requirements.

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

The Centre has operated in the Greater Manchester region since 1998. It is administered through two subsidiary organisational structures, OLC (Europe) Ltd and EETTEC Limited, and provides education to publicly funded students in the UK through OLC (Europe) Ltd and to privately funded corporate clients, including Libyan oil companies, through EETTEC. The Centre's headquarters are based in Bolton, with two other sites in Manchester and one site in London, in collaboration with the City of London Business College.

At the time of the review, 950 students were enrolled on higher education programmes: 240 at Bolton, 270 at Manchester Expressworks, 282 at Manchester Charles Street, and 158 students in London. Students on the Pearson awards are full-time, recruited mainly from the UK, and most apply for student loans. Students on the Institute of Credit Management programme are in employment, and study part-time in the evening at the premises of a local university.

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

Pearson

- Higher National Diploma in Business - 933 students
- Higher National Diploma in Electrical and Electronic Engineering - 5 students
- Higher National Diploma in Mechanical Engineering - 3 students
- Higher National Diploma in Chemical Science - 1 student
- Level 7 in Strategic Management and Leadership - 2 students

Institute of Credit Management

- Level 5 Diploma in Credit Management - 6 students

¹ www.gaa.ac.uk/educational-oversight

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

The provider's stated responsibilities

In relation to Pearson awards, the Centre is responsible for teaching and assessment, student recruitment, monitoring and support, library and learning resources for students, and for undertaking quality assurance and staff development. The Centre shares responsibilities with Pearson for curriculum development, regulatory matters, staff scholarship, monitoring teaching quality, employer engagement, responding to student opinion and public information.

In relation to the Institute of Credit Management Diploma, the awarding organisation is responsible for all summative assessment, curriculum development, and guidance on progression, while the Centre is responsible for annual quality monitoring, academic support, staff development, student feedback/opinion, and public information. The Centre and the Institute of Credit Management are jointly responsible for the quality review of higher education, staff updating, employer liaison, public information, strategic development, library and learning resources, monitoring student recruitment, retention and completion, and the student appeal system.

Recent developments

Until July 2013, enrolments comprised self-funding overseas students on Pearson business courses and privately sponsored students from Libyan oil companies on Pearson engineering courses. At the February 2012 Review, 104 students were enrolled on higher education programmes, and at the monitoring visit in April 2013, 83 students were enrolled. Increasing Home Office restrictions on Tier 4 students and difficulties in getting students to pay their fees made self-funded overseas students unviable by the middle of 2013. In response, the Centre expanded its efforts to increase the number of publicly funded students (through the Student Loan Company) on the Pearson HND in Business programme. Numbers of full-time students increased to over 900 from October to December 2013. Some students subsequently dropped out due to difficulty in securing a student loan. The Centre expanded its staffing and accommodation at its Bolton and Manchester Express Networks sites, and set up two new sites: Manchester Charles Street and London Lee Valley Technopark. The Centre had a successful review in February 2012. An annual monitoring review in April 2013 found that the Centre was making acceptable progress. However, the subsequent substantial increase in the Centre's total student numbers automatically triggered the present Review.

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 did not do so. Reviewers met students during the review visit, and the Coordinator met students at the preparatory meeting. Both meetings were productive and informative.

Detailed findings about OLC (Europe) Ltd t/a Organisational Learning Centre

Academic standards

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

1.1 The Centre's management of academic standards delegated by its awarding organisations is effective. The Centre's management structure specifies explicit duties for the management of academic standards, set out in documents that define roles and responsibilities. Pearson annual monitoring reports, together with external examiners' reports, indicate satisfaction with the Centre's academic standards. The Centre is responsible only for teaching and creating learning materials for the Institute of Credit Management (ICM) level 5 Diploma. Standards of the ICM award are satisfactory. The Centre's understanding of its responsibilities for the management of academic standards is largely dependent on information from its awarding organisations and complies with their requirements. The Director of Academic Affairs, who has overall strategic and executive responsibility, manages academic standards, supported by the Managing Director in his role as Quality Management Representative. The Programme Manager has overall responsibility for effective delivery and assessment, supported by Unit Lead Tutors. The Operations Director, who reports to the Managing Director, is responsible for operational management of academic standards.

1.2 Committees operate within a standard agenda but lack terms of reference. The Board oversees and considers matters affecting academic standards identified by academic meetings and the Academic Committee, together with commercial issues. The Director of Academic Affairs chairs monthly meetings of the Academic Committee attended by Bolton-based academic staff, and quarterly meetings of the Programme Committee attended by all unit lead tutors. Minutes confirm that both committees consider academic issues and include input from external advisers. The Centre has an informal system for sharing good practice. Lack of staff involvement from the three sites other than Bolton limits opportunities to improve academic monitoring further.

1.3 Programmes are delivered across four geographically dispersed sites. Staff at the Bolton site control academic management and support systems, producing and distributing teaching materials and assessment briefs to the other three sites and marking and internally verifying assessments for Pearson programmes submitted by students at the Bolton and Manchester sites. Assessments submitted by London-based students are marked in London, with Bolton staff undertaking internal verification and holding standardisation meetings depending on cohort size. Marking and internal verification of Pearson programmes are clearly evidenced. External examiners' reports confirm that marking and verification at the time of their reports are appropriate for the student numbers and is carried out 'to the required standard, with all quality processes in place and effective'. However, the Centre has not routinely collected and analysed data to monitor its admissions, progression and completion rates.

1.4 Student engagement is underdeveloped. Students are not members of either the Academic or Programme committees. The Centre misses valuable perspectives that students bring to the management of academic standards. It is **advisable** for the Centre to continue developing the academic monitoring and reporting structure to include committee terms of reference and student representation.

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

1.5 Annual monitoring in April 2013 identified the need to monitor the Centre's progress in using the Quality Code. The Centre recently reviewed its use of the Quality Code, and the Academic Committee approved an action plan to embed it in policies for managing academic standards. However, the Centre lacks documented evidence of making acceptable progress in its engagement with the Quality Code.

1.6 Qualifications offered by the Centre are aligned to the Qualifications and Credit Framework (QCF). The Centre relies on its awarding organisations to engage with external reference points in the design of programmes, including the use of subject benchmark statements and level indicators.

1.7 Staff members do not use or engage sufficiently with external reference points, including those produced by professional bodies. For example, programme specifications list 210 hours for every unit, regardless of credit size. It is **advisable** for the Centre to develop further its engagement with external reference points, including the Quality Code.

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

1.8 Pearson annual monitoring reports, together with external examiners' reports, indicate satisfaction with the Centre's academic standards. The Centre has an effective procedure for recording an action plan to respond to external examiner recommendations and Centre external advisers. Actions arising from committees are used to update the action plan, which the Director of Academic Affairs oversees. The Academic Committee receives reports on progress against recommendations. The Centre relies on the experience of senior staff to ensure that monitoring takes place.

1.9 Pearson assessments are subject to internal verification by the Centre and external verification by Pearson. A policy on internal verification of marked work guides the process. Pearson external examiners confirm that the policy complies with their guidelines. The policy does not specify the sample size to ensure that a representative sample of student work is verified internally and does not identify the committee that monitors the policy. It would be **desirable** for the Centre to develop effective internal verification guidance.

1.10 In summary, the management of academic standards delegated to the Centre by its awarding organisations is effective, and awarding organisations' annual monitoring reports and external examiners' reports indicate satisfaction with the Centre's academic standards. Reviewers found that terms of reference for guiding formal committee structure are lacking, and staff involvement from all four Centre sites, student engagement processes, systematic collection and analysis of academic data, and use of external reference points are underdeveloped.

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

2 Quality of learning opportunities

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

2.1 The Centre fulfils its responsibilities for providing and managing learning opportunities. The Managing Director is responsible for quality management. The Director of Academic Affairs reports to the Managing Director and is assisted by an administrative Course Coordinator. All three posts exercise responsibilities across the four sites, supported by delivery teams based at those locations.

2.2 The Centre's committees address matters relating to the quality of learning opportunities appropriately. Minutes demonstrate discussion of quality issues such as teaching, learning, and programme resources, but it is unclear whether actions indicated within the minutes of one meeting are followed up at subsequent meetings. It would be **desirable** for the Centre to record completed actions in committee minutes.

2.3 The Centre has developed a Quality Management Audit Schedule that considers the quality of learning opportunities and information as well as business-focused topics. The Audit reports identify issues and actions to be taken, which are considered systematically in Operations, Board and Academic Committee meetings. The contribution that the Quality Management Audits make to the management and enhancement of the quality of learning opportunities is **good practice**.

2.4 The Centre has not yet undertaken annual course reviews, but intends to do so in the summer of 2014 for consideration (with external examiner reports) by the Director of Academic Affairs and the Board of Directors. It would be **desirable** for the Centre to implement annual course reviews and evaluate their effectiveness.

2.5 The Centre's own quality assurance code of practice is not used effectively in defining its policies or practices relating to the quality of learning opportunities. The section on admissions does not comply with Tier 4 requirements. The section on staff recruitment does not reflect the policy understood by staff. It would be **desirable** for the Centre to engage consistently with its quality assurance code.

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

2.6 The Centre's policies and procedures for managing the quality of its learning opportunities in relation to the Quality Code are underdeveloped. The Centre's 2013 review of its provision in relation to the Quality Code lacks evidence of impact. The Centre relies on the awarding organisations to ensure that programmes are current and meet the requirements of industry and professional bodies.

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

2.7 The key document that defines learning and teaching strategy within the Centre is the recently updated Teaching and Learning Handbook. This is a comprehensive document which contains sections on all aspects of teaching, learning and assessment. Staff members are aware of the Teaching and Learning Handbook but are not fully familiar with its content.

2.8 Teaching staff are appropriately experienced and qualified. Tutors are recruited from different backgrounds. Most have taught in other institutions, including universities. The Centre maintains and enhances the quality of teaching. Staff members undertake a teaching observation and assessment conducted by a senior staff member once a year.

Good practice is identified and shared through peer-to-peer observations of each other's classes and discussion at academic meetings. The Centre recently conducted a detailed review of the observations undertaken in the current academic year. The Teaching Evaluation and Learning Committee considers outcomes from observations. Observation reports show that in some cases improvement strategies are agreed with tutors, but feedback is generally poor. The Teaching and Learning Handbook contains no reference to lesson observation or observation policies. It would be **desirable** for the Centre to formalise the observation policy to support teaching and learning.

2.9 Academic meetings monitor and measure the effectiveness of student engagement, the percentage of students who respond to surveys, the percentage of teaching groups with a student representative, and subsequent actions taken. Results of the student engagement process are fed back to students and included in the Academic Meeting review and in the Operations meeting review.

2.10 Student views of the teaching at the Centre are generally positive. The Centre actively seeks student views through anonymised end-of-unit surveys and suggestion boxes. The surveys do not provide for in-depth comments. Students are encouraged to give feedback at Student Representative Council meetings, student sessions by course group, and special meetings arranged to obtain feedback on specific subjects such as one held in the autumn of 2012 on teaching and learning. Student representatives volunteer from each individual teaching group and meet staff members to discuss issues they wish to raise. The Centre conducted a Student Feedback Evaluation in the autumn of 2013 that highlighted key issues, including the quality of the premises and the information technology infrastructure. It is **advisable** for the Centre to use data from end-of-unit surveys and other student feedback mechanisms to enhance teaching quality.

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

2.11 An admissions policy within the Centre's Quality Assurance Code of Practice clearly indicates admissions criteria although this has not been updated. Senior staff members interview all potential students but qualifications certificates are not always available for checking. In those instances, the Centre uses student experience as a selection criterion. The Centre does not use the National Recognition Information Centre (NARIC) to assess qualification levels.

2.12 Student support is underdeveloped. Welfare officers based at each site provide pastoral support and can direct students to external agencies. Students state that they are aware of the welfare officers' roles. There is no formal tutorial policy that informs students of their entitlements. Because of previous small cohort sizes, students used to be able to access tutors on an informal basis, but this is no longer the case because of increased student numbers. Students do not have a named tutor to guide their overall development. Students state that some tutors are hard to access because they are based at other sites, but they receive general help from some staff who are available at all times. The Centre recently recruited a tutor with experience in providing support for students with additional learning support requirements. The number of withdrawals for financial reasons indicates that student support may need additional resources. It is **advisable** for the Centre to develop an academic and pastoral tutorial policy.

2.13 Use of retention and progression data is not analysed to determine reasons for non-completion of courses. The Centre lacks a formal process for evaluating its student support. Provision of academic or pastoral support is not discussed at committee meetings. It would be **desirable** for the Centre to analyse student retention data.

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

2.14 Staff development activity (including induction) to support understanding of higher education levels, progression, assessment, teaching and learning methods, and scholarly activity to ensure subject currency is underdeveloped. The Centre's appraisal system does not contain explicit reference to teaching and learning. Most staff members have teaching qualifications and those that do not are encouraged to undertake Preparing to Teach in the Lifelong Learning Sector (PTLLS) courses or a level 7 Postgraduate Diploma in Education validated by Pearson and the University of Huddersfield for Centre staff. Teaching development is mostly concentrated at PTLLS level, which does not address matters related to teaching in higher education. The staff development log indicates that most staff development concerns business or operational requirements.

2.15 Induction of new teaching staff members is satisfactory. New staff members have a mentor who supports them during their initial employment. Unit lead tutors support new staff members with teaching and assessment. Because many staff members gained prior experience at other higher education institutions, the support level is adjusted to meet individual needs. The Staff Handbook contains details of a four week induction that focuses on procedural matters rather than learning and teaching. It is **advisable** for the Centre to include guidance on teaching and assessing at higher education levels in staff development activities.

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

2.16 The Bolton site is located in a Victorian building with some spaces unsuited to teaching. The Centre leases more modern premises in central Manchester and London. Current students state that they are happy with the premises. At Bolton, computing suites with internet access are provided for student use, including a drop-in facility, but the design of the building precludes installation of a wireless network. The Centre operates a small, modestly resourced library that includes core texts. Students are given advice on the use of local public libraries, which many use. ICM provides required texts for the credit management diploma. Students are generally satisfied with the learning resources, although they note the absence of electronic media, and the lack of a virtual learning environment (VLE).

2.17 The Centre has a secure system for managing written assessments. Students on the ICM programme are assessed externally. Students on the Pearson programmes undertake some assignments and some secure examinations to ensure candidate authenticity. The Centre is considering the use of plagiarism-detection software to further ensure security. It is **advisable** for the Centre to implement plagiarism-detection software.

2.18 In summary, the Centre manages its responsibilities for the management and enhancement of the quality of its learning opportunities in accordance with agreements with its awarding organisations. The Centre's Quality Management Audit Schedule provides an effective tool for identifying and acting on relevant issues. Staff development activities and student engagement opportunities support the quality of learning activities. Students indicate satisfaction with the Centre's provision but provision for students could be enhanced by regularly reviewing and formalising relevant policies and procedures.

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

3 Information about learning opportunities

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

3.1 The Centre provides comprehensive information and guidance on its provision. The internally produced website is the principal means of providing information about the Centre. Applicants find details of the programmes and a link to the application process on the website. The website includes details of teaching accommodation and resources at each site, and guidance on required levels of English and visa procedures for international students. It enables downloading of the Centre prospectus that contains separate sections with details of each programme. However, it does not clarify whether every programme is running. There are some anomalies between website and prospectus listings of programmes. It is not clear which engineering programmes are offered as Higher National Diplomas and which are short professional courses. The website and prospectus omit information about tuition fees, additional costs and eligibility for student loans. Applicants receive information on fees at interview. The prospectus and website include lists of professional bodies, universities and other organisations with which the Centre is in partnership. The Centre has informal links with institutions where staff have been employed, engaged as external examiners or involved in other activities, rather than formal partnerships that provide articulated progression routes. It is **advisable** for the Centre to ensure that public information is consistent and accurate.

3.2 Students are issued with a Centre student handbook. They must sign a declaration that they will adhere to its policies and regulations. Students confirm that they were provided with handbooks during induction or at the start of each unit, and that they find these useful. Unit handbooks include Pearson unit descriptors, learning outcomes, weekly teaching content, assessment details and learning materials. The Centre's information pack for its HND Business programme lists units and progression opportunities, including universities that provide progression from HND to honours degree top-up. The Centre produces an annual newsletter that provides information about new developments and celebrates achievements.

3.3 The Centre's programme specifications for its Pearson programmes contain programme and unit information provided by Pearson, with some information provided by the Centre. The Centre's information contains some inaccuracies and does not clearly identify how programme learning outcomes link to unit learning outcomes or how to achieve unit learning outcomes through assessment. It is **advisable** for the Centre to revise programme specifications to improve accuracy and to fulfil awarding organisation and Quality Code requirements.

3.4 Students note the lack of electronic media and a VLE for teaching and learning. The Centre is beginning to develop its VLE as the main vehicle for communication between staff and students, and to provide students with details of course delivery, unit content, assessment, Centre policies and learning materials. The Centre currently uses a social media platform to communicate with students and provide information, which is unpopular with some students and will be replaced by the VLE. The Centre's guidelines for using social media are issued separately and are not included within the Communications Policy. Information for academic staff, including policies, conditions of employment and staff induction, is provided on the developing VLE and in the Staff Handbook.

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

3.5 The Centre introduced its Communications Policy in 2009 and will review it in the autumn of 2015. The policy outlines processes for communication, approval and security of

information. The Centre conducted an audit of its marketing and stakeholder needs in April 2013 as part of its audit and review process.

3.6 Awarding organisations provide most of the programme information. The Director of Academic Affairs has editorial control of the production of Centre information. Final responsibility for signing off information rests with the Managing Director who acts as the public relations officer responsible for governance and approval of external and internal communications of policies, procedures, information and data. The prospectus and website are reviewed and updated when required. The Educational Support Officer/IT supervisor puts material on the website and prospectus. Most publicity images are bought from agencies. Where images and testimonials of actual students are used, the Centre has no current process for signed consent or explanation of the full use of their images. The Centre's processes for compilation, publication, checking and approval of information do not contain references to the Quality Code, *Part C: Information about higher education provision*.

3.7 In summary, students state that the information they received prior to application and arrival was useful and accurate and that their experience lives up to expectations, but processes for managing the accuracy of information need improvement.

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

Action plan³

OLC (Europe) Ltd t/a Organisational Learning Centre action plan relating to the Review for Educational Oversight of April 2014						
Good practice	Intended outcomes	Actions to be taken to achieve intended outcomes	Target date(s)	Action by	Reported to	Evaluation (process or evidence)
The review team identified the following areas of good practice that are worthy of wider dissemination within the Centre:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the contribution that the Quality Management Audits make to the management and enhancement of the quality of learning opportunities (paragraph 2.3). 	To further the enhancement of the quality of learning opportunities in relation to maintaining academic standards, via the quality management audits	Maintain the good practice of identifying areas within the College where there are best practices and gaps in support of the enhancement of the quality of teaching and learning opportunities	September 2014 and then annually	Operations Director	Board of Directors	Audit of plans for policy revision and/or implementation Audit of effectiveness of revision and/or implementation planning

³ The Centre 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 Centre's awarding organisations.

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 Centre to:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> continue to develop the academic monitoring and reporting structure to include committee terms of reference and student representation (paragraphs 1.2, 1.4) 	<p>Published terms of reference for committee and minutes showing inclusion of student representation</p> <p>Define the roles and functions of committees and incorporate the students into the Academic Committee and other relevant committees</p>	<p>Review and develop terms of reference for each committee</p> <p>Review roles, responsibilities and reporting lines and communicate to all staff members and students' representative if needed</p>	<p>May 2014-onwards</p> <p>June 2014-onwards</p>	<p>Course Coordinator</p> <p>Director of Academic Affairs</p>	<p>Teaching and Learning Review meeting</p> <p>Board of Directors Meeting</p>	<p>Teaching and Learning review will monitor the progress of the reporting cycle</p> <p>Evaluation of the complete cycle will take place annually at the Annual Programme Review</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> further develop its engagement with external reference points (paragraphs 1.5, 1.7, 2.6 and 3.6) 	<p>Identify any update requirements in the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (the Quality Code) and provide additional training for all teaching and academic staff</p> <p>Effective process in place to embed the Quality Code and awarding organisation requirements in policies</p>	<p>Develop the training activities on Quality Code for staff with new update</p> <p>Revise the policies annually to conform to the requirements of the awarding organisation and new updates of the Quality</p>	<p>June, 2014-onwards</p> <p>July 2014-onwards</p>	<p>Director of Academic Affairs</p> <p>Course Coordinator</p>	<p>Teaching and Learning Review meeting</p> <p>Director of Academic Affairs</p>	<p>Staff Training Activities evaluated in Teaching and Learning Review meetings</p> <p>Updated and revised policies in compliance with relevant Quality Codes</p>

	for managing academic standards; that is Tutorial Policy, Teaching, Learning and Assessment Policy, Programme Specification and so on	Code				and awarding organisation requirements Policy review added to annual audit schedule
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> use student feedback, including end-of-unit surveys and other student feedback mechanisms to enhance teaching quality (paragraph 2.10) 	<p>Provide comprehensive analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data collected</p> <p>Student feedback processes are evaluated at each stage, including the involvement of student representatives</p> <p>At the unit level, student feedback is reported in the Annual Programme Review and action plan form</p>	Student feedback is reviewed and fed into the academic supporting structure to provide the opportunity to enhance teaching quality	Every March, June and December throughout the academic year	Course Coordinator	Teaching and Learning Review meeting, Annual Programme Review	<p>Evaluation of student feedback is evident in Teaching and Learning Review meetings</p> <p>Action plans are created for evaluation of student feedback, with clear goals to monitor progress towards fulfilling the plan</p> <p>Number of student representatives being appointed</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> develop an academic and pastoral tutorial policy (paragraph 2.12) 	Learner centredness - respect for each student as an active learner and as an individual with their own particular set of needs	Provide students with a personal contact point with a tutor who can help with students' individual needs	May 2014, then it will be reviewed regularly and update annually	Programme Leader, Director of Academic Affairs	Academic Committee, Annual Programme Review	Monitor the appropriateness and effectiveness of the tutorial programme through review of

	<p>Concern for all aspects of students' learning - educational, career, personal and social</p> <p>Equality of opportunity and diversity - ensuring and promoting equality of opportunity and diversity including eliminating unlawful discrimination</p>	<p>Implement a clear and consistent framework for the management, monitoring and evaluation of the delivery of tutorial support</p>	<p>August 2014</p>			<p>student and staff feedback on the process and evaluation of student results and retention data, identifying opportunities for development and improvement</p> <p>Equal opportunities statistics fed into Annual Programme Review</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> include guidance on teaching and assessing at higher education levels in staff development activities (paragraphs 2.14 and 2.15) 	<p>Successful implementation of a Staff Development Policy suitable for higher education provision in relation to professionalism, their role in enhancing learning, teaching and assessment, and discipline-specific expertise</p>	<p>Newly appointed academic staff will be provided with a copy of the Teaching, Learning and Assessment Policy</p> <p>An induction programme on teaching and assessment practices unless prior knowledge can be demonstrated</p> <p>Termly staff development activities arranged where needs have been identified in Academic Committees and monitored through the</p>	<p>July 2014</p> <p>August 2014</p>	<p>Operations Director</p> <p>Director of Academic Affairs</p>	<p>Academic Committee meetings</p> <p>Teaching and Learning Review meeting</p>	<p>Staff appraisal</p> <p>Staff development records/training documentation</p> <p>Staff Induction Handbook</p> <p>Teaching and Learning Review reviews the above points of evidence to evaluate the guidance available to staff,</p>

		Teaching and Learning Review				and the effectiveness of staff development activities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> implement plagiarism-detection software (paragraph 2.17) 	<p>Plagiarism-detection software effectively used to identify and reduce instances of plagiarism</p> <p>Internal verification process evidences instances of and responses to plagiarism in student work</p>	<p>Purchase anti-plagiarism software and provide staff and students with appropriate training</p> <p>A control in place to ensure that student work cannot progress through our records system without having first passed through a plagiarism checker</p>	<p>June 2014</p> <p>August 2014</p>	<p>Operations Director</p> <p>Course Coordinator</p>	<p>Board of Directors</p> <p>Teaching and Learning Review</p>	<p>Plagiarism-detection software reports of students' work</p> <p>Purchase receipt</p> <p>Meeting minutes Unit Assessment Board and Programme Assessment will collate statistics on plagiarised work, passing these to the Teaching and Learning Review for evaluation</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ensure that published information is consistent and accurate (paragraph 3.1) 	All inaccuracies identified and corrected	Undertake scheduled accuracy checks to identify areas where website or student brochure is inaccurate and feedback to Director of Academic Affairs	June 2014, then quarterly	Unit leaders and administration staff	Teaching and Learning Review meeting	<p>Quarterly audit of published information for students</p> <p>Student feedback</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> revise programme specifications to improve 	Create a specification to act as a framework for discussing and promoting effective	Review of programme specifications with inclusion of credit weighting and Teaching	September 2014 then every September	Programme leaders	Programme Committee	Programme design, approval and validation policies and

accuracy and to fulfil awarding organisation and Quality Code requirements (paragraph 3.3).	practice in all aspects of curriculum design, learning, teaching and assessment, and as a basis for the evaluation and ongoing development of the provision	and Assessment strategy				procedures Signed programme approval and validation documents
Desirable	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 would be desirable for the Centre to:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> develop effective internal verification guidance (paragraph 1.9) 	<p>Fully embedded formal policy on internal verification</p> <p>All staff competently follow policy and procedures</p> <p>External verifier reports comment on an effective internal verification system</p>	<p>Review and revise existing Internal Verification Policy, ensuring compliance with the Quality Code</p> <p>Include within the Teaching and Learning Handbook a new robust Internal Verification Policy which ensures the quality in the assessment of students' work</p>	<p>August 2014 and then annually</p> <p>August 2014</p>	<p>Examinations Officer</p> <p>Course Coordinator</p>	<p>Academic Committee, Annual Programme Review</p>	<p>Internal verification documents demonstrating revision on small group samplings</p> <p>Evaluation on the effectiveness of the Internal Verification Policy, and its internal guidance, will take place at the Annual Programme Review through review of sampling</p>

						documents and staff feedback on guidance
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> record completed actions in committee minutes (paragraph 2.2) 	To include within minutes of the academic reporting structure records and evaluation of completed actions	Create a documented set of agendas for all structural meetings which explicitly records completed actions	August 2014	Course Coordinator	Annual Programme Review, Board of Directors	<p>Minutes of Operations Meeting and Annual Review of reports and action plans</p> <p>The Annual Programme Review takes all previous minutes of meetings for review</p> <p>The Board of Directors will review whether all actions are completed</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> implement annual course reviews and evaluate their effectiveness (paragraph 2.4) 	Conform to the Centre's Quality Assurance Code which should accurately reflect the compliance of the Quality Code and awarding body requirements	<p>Consolidate and review policies manual and make it useful as a central reference</p> <p>Review roles, responsibilities and reporting lines within quality procedures and produce revised documentation to ensure greater clarity and engagement</p>	July 2014 and then annually	<p>Course Coordinator</p> <p>Director of Academic Affairs</p>	Annual Programme Review	<p>Centre Quality Assurance Code that is formed from the review of teaching and quality assurance and matched to the Quality Code</p> <p>The Annual Programme Review will review the</p>

						Quality Code and how effectively the College is engaging with it
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> engage consistently with its quality assurance code (paragraph 2.5) 	The Centre conforms to its Quality Assurance Code which should accurately reflect the compliance of the Quality Code and awarding organisation requirements	<p>Consolidate and review policies manual and make it useful as a central reference</p> <p>Review roles, responsibilities and reporting lines within quality procedures and produce revised documentation to ensure greater clarity and engagement</p>	July 2014 and then annually	<p>Course Coordinator</p> <p>Director of Academic Affairs</p>	Annual Programme Review	<p>Centre Quality Assurance Code that is formed from the review of teaching and quality assurance and matched to the Quality Code</p> <p>The Annual Programme Review will review the updated Quality Code and how effectively the College is engaging with it</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> formalise the observation policy to support teaching and learning (paragraph 2.8) 	<p>All teaching staff undergo a teaching observation at least once per term</p> <p>Where a development requirement is identified, additional support is provided and at least one more observation takes place until no longer required</p>	Discuss and agree details of class observation strategy including the post-observation stage (collection, analysis and communication of findings, as well as action to be taken in response to them)	June 2014 then annually	Course Coordinator, Director of Academic Affairs	Academic Committee, Director of Academic Affairs	<p>Evaluation of observations, including relevant policy, during staff appraisal process</p> <p>Peer observation sheets and analysis</p> <p>Student feedback</p>

						Staff-Student Committee Formalised strategy
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> analyse student retention data (paragraphs 1.3 and 2.13). 	<p>Assess the Centre's retention strategy for any gaps and opportunities</p> <p>Uncover meaningful data about our students that we can act on immediately</p> <p>Identify factors that put students at risk of dropping out</p> <p>Create a roadmap for a data informed retention action plan</p>	<p>Staff to develop Student Retention Analysis Policy and Template Reflection on data during the Annual Programme Review informs strategic and operational management decisions</p> <p>Annual data returns produced, analysed and communicated to staff</p> <p>Draw action plan through retention data analysis</p>	September, 2014; then every September	<p>Director of Academic Affairs</p> <p>Support Services Manager</p> <p>Support Services Manager</p> <p>Support Services Manager</p>	Board of Directors	<p>Annual monitoring reports</p> <p>External verifier reports</p> <p>Board of Directors' minutes</p> <p>Academic Committee minutes</p> <p>Retention rates</p> <p>The Annual Programme Review will review previous minutes to evaluate the effect of the data it reviews and how this feeds through the reporting structure</p>

About QAA

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

QAA's aims are to:

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

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

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

More detail about Review for Educational Oversight can be found at: www.qaa.ac.uk/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.

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.

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).

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

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**.

QAA815 - R3963 - Jul 14

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

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

Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786