

Higher Education Review of UCFB College of Football Business Ltd

April 2014

Contents

About this review	1
Key findings	2
QAA's judgements about UCFB College of Football Business Ltd	2
Good practice	2
Recommendations	2
Affirmation of action being taken	3
Theme: Student Employability	3
About UCFB College of Football Business Ltd	3
Explanation of the findings about UCFB College of Football Business Ltd	5
1 Judgement: Maintenance of the threshold academic standards of awards	6
2 Judgement: Quality of student learning opportunities	13
3 Judgement: Quality of the information produced about its provision	28
4 Judgement: Enhancement of student learning opportunities	31
5 Commentary on the Theme: Student Employability	33
Glossary	34

About this review

This is a report of a Higher Education Review conducted by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) at UCFB College of Football Business Ltd. The review took place from 28 to 30 April 2014 and was conducted by a team of three reviewers, as follows:

- Mr Thomas Bee (student reviewer)
- Dr Peter Rae
- Dr Mike Wing.

The main purpose of the review was to investigate the higher education provided by UCFB College of Football Business Ltd and to make judgements as to whether or not its academic standards and quality meet UK expectations. These Expectations are the statements in the [UK Quality Code for Higher Education](#) (the Quality Code)¹ setting out what all UK higher education providers expect of themselves and of each other, and what the general public can therefore expect of them.

In Higher Education Review the QAA review team:

- makes judgements on
 - the setting and maintenance of threshold academic standards
 - the quality of student learning opportunities
 - the information provided about higher education provision
 - the enhancement of student learning opportunities
- provides a commentary on the selected theme
- makes recommendations
- identifies features of good practice
- affirms action that the provider is taking or plans to take.

A summary of the findings can be found in the section starting on page 2. [Explanations of the findings](#) are given in numbered paragraphs in the section starting on page 6.

In reviewing UCFB College of Football Business Ltd the review team has also considered a theme selected for particular focus across higher education in England and Northern Ireland. The [themes](#) for the academic year 2013-14 are Student Involvement in Quality Assurance and Enhancement and Student Employability,² and the provider is required to select, in consultation with student representatives, one of these themes to be explored through the review process.

The QAA website gives more information [about QAA](#) and its mission.³ A dedicated section explains the method for [Higher Education Review](#)⁴ and has links to the review handbook and other informative documents. For an explanation of terms see the [glossary](#) at the end of this report.

¹ The UK Quality Code for Higher Education is published at: www.qaa.ac.uk/qualitycode.

² Higher Education Review themes: www.qaa.ac.uk/publications/information-and-guidance/publication?PubID=106.

³ QAA website: www.qaa.ac.uk/aboutus.

⁴ Higher Education Review web pages: www.qaa.ac.uk/reviews-and-reports/how-we-review-higher-education/higher-education-review.

Key findings

QAA's judgements about UCFB College of Football Business Ltd

The QAA review team formed the following judgements about the higher education provision at UCFB College of Football Business Ltd.

- The maintenance of the threshold academic standards of awards offered on behalf of its degree-awarding body **meets** UK expectations.
- The quality of student learning opportunities **meets** UK expectations.
- The quality of the information produced about its provision **meets** UK expectations.
- The enhancement of student learning opportunities **meets** UK expectations.

Good practice

The QAA review team identified the following features of **good practice** at UCFB College of Football Business Ltd.

- Comprehensive module handbooks provide clear links between learning outcomes and assessment, and helpful guidance for students on how to achieve the intended learning outcomes (Expectations A3 and C).
- The extensive engagement with sector-leading professionals in the development of the College's employment-focused ethos (Expectation A4, Enhancement).
- The effective and well embedded pastoral support provided for students (Expectation B4).
- The impressive programme of guest speakers and high-profile links with professional football business (Expectation B4).

Recommendations

The QAA review team makes the following **recommendations** to UCFB College of Football Business Ltd.

By September 2014:

- comprehensively document the processes for ensuring that information is checked for accuracy and reliability and signed off by relevant stakeholders prior to publication (Expectation C).

By October 2014:

- further develop and implement quality assurance structures and policies, clarify responsibilities, and identify clear reporting lines and actions (Expectation A4)
- introduce and embed a systematic and consistent process for annual review and monitoring at programme and institutional level (Expectations A4 and B8).

By December 2014:

- devise a formal internal process for the design and approval of new programmes (Expectation B1)
- develop an explicit process for strategic oversight of quality enhancement and for identifying areas of good practice for dissemination (Enhancement).

Affirmation of action being taken

The QAA review team **affirms** the following actions that the UCFB College of Football Business Ltd is already taking to make academic standards secure and/or improve the educational provision offered to its students.

- The actions taken to develop a more strategic approach to staff development (Expectation B3).
- The plans in place to undertake a regular review of student engagement, provide training for student representatives, and further develop representation on key committees (Expectation B5).
- The introduction of staff development to support assessment practice (Expectation B6).
- The actions agreed with the awarding body to ensure that external examiners' reports provide comprehensive feedback and an overview of standards and quality for each programme (Expectation B7).

Theme: Student Employability

All programmes embed employability skills in the curriculum. Visiting professionals and guest speakers contribute valuable expertise, and most staff have extensive and effective links with employers. The College uses project work that is employment based. The complementary curriculum draws a wide range of high-profile professionals from relevant business contexts and guest lectures and presentations from them enrich the students' experience. This offers a unique opportunity for students to begin to build the professional networks that will help them into employment, and is a key part of the College's distinctive character and ethos.

The College is based at Burnley Football Club, Turf Moor, and is embedded within the professional football environment. This location offers an excellent opportunity to engage learning with practice. Extracurricular work-related internship opportunities support employability and are highly valued by students. The College's complementary curriculum offers formal careers advice sessions to support student employability. Each student's personal development plan is intended to support the understanding of skills and attributes useful for gaining employment.

Further explanation of the key findings can be found in the handbook available on the QAA webpage explaining [Higher Education Review](#).

About UCFB College of Football Business Ltd

UCFB College of Football Business Ltd (the College) is a limited company dedicated to the delivery of undergraduate degree programmes and executive education in the operational and business aspects of the football and sports industries. The College's mission is to be 'the world's leading neurological centre for football business education'. Its aim is to develop students' administrative, management and operational skills and capabilities and provide them with qualifications relevant to work in the football and sports industries.

The College is currently located at Burnley Football Club, Lancashire. In autumn 2014 it intends to expand its provision and open a second campus at Wembley Stadium, London, and offer a wider range of undergraduate programmes. Recruitment of students is in progress and programmes have been validated for delivery at Wembley in September 2014.

The College admitted its first cohort of students in September 2011 and has 269 students enrolled on three programmes of study in football business, management, marketing and media. The College works in partnership with Buckinghamshire New University which validates all the programmes offered. The first cohort of students is due to graduate in summer 2014. There are 25 staff teaching and supporting students academically and pastorally.

Key challenges facing the College are embedding its relatively new deliberative structures and processes, the successful completion of the first cohort of undergraduate students, the rapid expansion of its provision (including a move to develop master's-level programmes), and the replication of its mission, vision and ethos at the new Wembley campus.

As a new provider of higher education, the College has not been part of any previous review activity.

At the time of the review, the College had students on the following programmes:

Buckinghamshire New University

- BA (Hons) Football Business and Finance
- BA (Hons) Football Business and Marketing
- BA (Hons) Football Business and Media.

Explanation of the findings about UCFB College of Football Business Ltd

This section explains the review findings in more detail.

Terms that may be unfamiliar to some readers have been included in a [brief glossary](#) at the end of this report. A fuller [glossary of terms](#) is available on the QAA website, and formal definitions of certain terms may be found in the operational description and handbook for the [review method](#), also on the QAA website.

1 Judgement: Maintenance of the threshold academic standards of awards

Expectation (A1): Each qualification (including those awarded through arrangements with other delivery organisations or support providers) is allocated to the appropriate level in *The framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FHEQ)*.

Quality Code, Chapter A1: The national level

Findings

1.1 The College is responsible for initiating new programmes and supporting curriculum development, and for ensuring programmes are mapped to the appropriate level of the FHEQ. The College's single awarding body, Buckinghamshire New University (the University), has overall responsibility for the design, development and approval of all programmes of study and for assuring that appropriate standards are achieved. The College's Senior Management Team approves the initial concept for new programmes and takes advice from the College's external Advisory Board, which provides helpful comment on industrial relevance. The Academic Quality Directorate works closely with the University link tutor and partnerships manager to ensure that programmes are at an appropriate level. The College's policies and procedures enable it to meet the Expectation in *Chapter A1: The national level* of the Quality Code.

1.2 The review team confirmed these arrangements through scrutiny of the Academic Collaborative Agreement with the University, meeting with members of the Advisory Board, and examining the checklist where responsibilities are clearly set out. These are well understood within the College. Through meetings with staff from the College and the University and a review of the College's handbooks, programme specifications and module outlines, the team further confirmed the division of responsibilities, and concludes that awards are based on an appropriate credit structure and require an appropriate allocation of learning hours.

1.3 Overall, the College effectively discharges its responsibilities within the context of its agreement with its awarding body. Qualifications are allocated to the appropriate level of the FHEQ and therefore meet the requirement of Expectation A1. However, the programme development and review process is yet to be fully embedded within the College's committee structure. This is reflected in the recommendation made under Expectation B1: *Programme design and approval*. The College provides academic staff with appropriate support and guidance to assist with programme design and the understanding of academic levels. These processes are backed up by strong links with employers and close working arrangements with the awarding body. The review team therefore concludes that the Expectation in *Chapter A1: The national level* is met, both in design and operation, and the associated risk level is low.

Expectation: Met

Level of risk: Low

Expectation (A2): All higher education programmes of study take account of relevant subject and qualification benchmark statements.

Quality Code, Chapter A2: The subject and qualification level

Findings

1.4 The College's agreement with the University includes clearly outlined responsibilities for designing and maintaining validated programmes. Subject benchmark statements are used effectively by the College to inform standards and are referenced to the intended learning outcomes. The awarding body carries ultimate responsibility for maintaining threshold academic standards. The team confirms engagement with subject benchmark statements through a review of programme specifications. These provide evidence that programmes delivered are based on an appropriate credit structure, and a review of module outlines indicates appropriate allocation of learning hours. Meetings with staff established a wide understanding of appropriate subject benchmark statements and an awareness of the link between learning outcomes and student progression. The College's procedures are in principle appropriate to meet the Expectation in *Chapter A2: The subject and qualification level* of the Quality Code.

1.5 The self-evaluation document submitted by the College as part of this review notes that it places great importance on the role of the external examiner in the assessment of subject benchmark statements. However, the team notes that, as there has yet to be a graduating cohort, no complete external examiner reports on programmes have yet been submitted.

1.6 Employers confirmed that they are consulted in the shaping of new programmes and in ensuring their industrial relevance. The College has decided not to include validation by professional, statutory or regulatory bodies within the scope of its provision, but instead has embedded key elements within its complementary curriculum.

1.7 Overall, the team considers that the College discharges its responsibilities effectively to ensure that programme design takes account of relevant subject and qualification benchmarks. There is developing use of external examiner reports in assessing how well subject benchmark statements are addressed. The team thus concludes that Expectation A2 is met and that the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (A3): Higher education providers make available definitive information on the aims, intended learning outcomes and expected learner achievements for a programme of study.

Quality Code, Chapter A3: The programme level

Findings

1.8 The College is responsible for producing and disseminating definitive information for its stakeholders on aims, intended learning outcomes and expected achievements. Programme specifications are made available on its website and virtual learning environment (VLE). Programme specifications are also embedded within programme handbooks, which are produced annually and provide comprehensive information. The College's processes enable it to meet the Expectation in *Chapter A3: The programme level* of the Quality Code.

1.9 The review team read relevant documents, including the awarding body partnership agreement, minutes of monitoring meetings, templates and handbooks, student surveys and results of surveys, and the College's prospectus and website. The team checked their understanding of these documents and their outputs by talking to senior staff, academic staff, students and employers.

1.10 The review team confirms that students are inducted into the content of programme specifications early in the programme. Students stated their appreciation of the way in which the handbooks provided detailed information which is readily available on the VLE. Module handbooks provide comprehensive information and guidance for students. Handbooks demonstrate explicitly how specific learning outcomes are linked to assessment practice. These are reviewed annually and improved and updated by course teams in response to feedback from students and staff. This is **good practice**.

1.11 The team considers the design and operation of the processes used by the College for preparing, disseminating, monitoring and enhancing information on its programmes of study to be sound and aligned with *Chapter A3: The programme level*. The team concludes therefore that the Expectation A3 is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (A4): Higher education providers have in place effective processes to approve and periodically review the validity and relevance of programmes.

Quality Code, Chapter A4: Approval and review

Findings

1.12 The College currently delivers three validated undergraduate programmes, with the first graduating cohort expected in summer 2014. A fourth programme has been approved for a first intake in September 2014. The College initiates development of new programmes and modules, though these are not currently processed through the College's embryonic committee structures, but are undertaken by 'task groups' with guidance from the University's link tutor and partnerships manager. These groups report directly to the Provost and Senior Management Team. The College's processes need further development to meet the Expectation in *Chapter A4: Approval and review* of the Quality Code.

1.13 The review team looked at the minutes of course team meetings and the Academic Quality Committee, reports submitted to the University, the Annual Academic Report and talked to senior staff, academic staff and employers.

1.14 The newly formed Academic Quality Committee includes in its remit the responsibility to develop a systematic monitoring process for student success and to oversee the process of self-evaluation. The recently introduced Quality Assurance Manual provides broad guidance on some key quality assurance activities. However, the structures and processes for review and evaluation require further development and greater clarity about responsibilities and timeframes. The review team **recommends** that, by October 2014, the College further develop and implement its quality assurance structures and policies, clarify responsibilities, and identify clear reporting lines and actions. This matter is also considered under Expectation B2.

1.15 The College submits an annual review and evaluation report each year to the University. The team heard that this report is compiled by the Head of Quality and provides a broad review of the provision validated by the University. The report demonstrates some evidence of programme-level evaluation, but provides only limited institutional oversight. Annual academic reports are compiled by Heads of Year and give a detailed review at module level which allows for some areas of good practice to be identified and disseminated. This evaluation is supported by the recommendation under Expectation B8 that, by October 2014, the College introduce and embed a systematic and consistent process for annual review and monitoring at programme and institutional level.

1.16 The College makes extensive use of sector-leading professionals in the development, delivery and review of programmes and the shaping of the academic ethos of the College, and in developing a distinctive student experience. Members of the Advisory Board provide considerable experience of the football and sports industries, and have regular discussions with both staff and students. This involvement is further discussed in the section of the report on Enhancement, where good practice is identified.

1.17 Overall, the review team concludes that the College does not meet the Expectation in *Chapter A4: Approval and review* and that the associated level of risk is moderate. This is because the College has yet to develop and embed effective processes to approve and periodically review the validity and relevance of programmes.

Expectation: Not met
Level of risk: Moderate

Expectation (A5): Higher education providers ensure independent and external participation in the management of threshold academic standards.

Quality Code, Chapter A5: Externality

Findings

1.18 In line with its delegated responsibilities, the College fulfils its obligations and makes use of appropriate externality in its higher education programmes (see also Expectation B1). External examiners are nominated by the College and are appointed and inducted by the University. External members are required by the University to be part of the panels for validation, revalidation and periodic review. The College does not have its own institutional process for external participation in the management of threshold standards in line with *Chapter A5: Externality*.

1.19 The review team tested the College approach by meeting staff, students, employers and members of the Advisory Board, and looking at minutes of programme development meetings and validation reports.

1.20 The College is actively engaged with employers and sector partners in the design, content and delivery of its higher education programmes. Evidence shows that external advice is consistently sought and acted upon during programme and curriculum development. The team found evidence of strong engagement from employers, particularly evidenced through the complementary curriculum and student placements.

1.21 Overall, the team found evidence that confirms the procedures work adequately. There is externality in programme development, approval and delivery processes, as well as in assessment. The team therefore concludes that Expectation A5 is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (A6): Higher education providers ensure the assessment of students is robust, valid and reliable and that the award of qualifications and credit are based on the achievement of the intended learning outcomes.

Quality Code, Chapter A6: Assessment of achievement of learning outcomes

Findings

1.22 The College operates according to the University's assessment regulations and is further developing its own procedures as part of its Quality Assurance Manual. This is intended to provide a further summary guide to College staff and to support the University's procedural guidance for academic and professional standards. Details of all assessments, including learning outcomes and grading criteria, are in module handbooks. Questions for both examinations and coursework are internally moderated before being sent to the relevant external examiner. External examiners specifically comment on assessment matters. The College operates an effective internal assessment moderation process, with moderation meetings held at the end of each semester. These processes enable the College to meet the Expectation in *Chapter A6: Assessment of achievement of learning outcomes* of the Quality Code.

1.23 The review team tested the policy by meeting staff and students and reviewing a range of evidence, including module and course handbooks, assessment briefs and feedback reports, external examiner and validation documents, and staff development activities.

1.24 The team saw evidence that newly appointed academic staff, and associate lecturers, are provided with mentors who support them in gaining an understanding of assessment regulations and processes. This is being developed in response to recommendations from the external examiner about over-generous marking and the need for more developmental assessment feedback. The team further **affirms** the College's provision of staff development to support assessment practices under Expectation B6: *Assessment of students and accreditation of prior learning*.

1.25 The external examiner reports on the consistency of assessment practice to the Examination Board and produces a written report for the University. Adjustments to grades are considered at Examination Boards. Programme teams respond by compiling a detailed action plan. The team heard that revisions to assessment practice are proposed through the annual module review, in consultation with the University link tutor, prior to formal approval.

1.26 The review team therefore concludes that procedures are effective and further staff development is planned to improve assessment practice. The College meets Expectation A6 and the level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Maintenance of the threshold academic standards of awards: Summary of findings

1.27 In reaching its positive judgement, the review team matched its findings against the criteria specified in Annex two of the published handbook. All but one of the Expectations for this judgement area are met and the associated levels of risk are low, with one moderate risk identified. There is one feature of good practice in the comprehensive guidance for students and provision of clear links between learning outcomes and assessment which supports student achievement.

1.28 In all sections related to academic standards the College is also required to adhere to the procedures of its awarding body. The review team makes one recommendation to support the further development and implementation of the College's own quality assurance structures and policies to provide greater institutional oversight and action planning. The team also affirms the provision of staff development supporting assessment practice, which is addressed more explicitly under Expectation B6: *Assessment of students*.

1.29 The review team therefore concludes that the maintenance of the threshold academic standards of awards offered on behalf of Buckinghamshire New University at UCFB College of Football Business Ltd **meets** UK expectations.

2 Judgement: Quality of student learning opportunities

Expectation (B1): Higher education providers have effective processes for the design and approval of programmes.

Quality Code, Chapter B1: Programme design and approval

Findings

2.1 The College's programme approval policy and procedures are not yet fully formalised or embedded within the committee structure. Final approval for the introduction of new programmes is the responsibility of the College's degree-awarding body. This is clearly stated in the College's responsibilities checklist. The College establishes areas for programme development in consultation with the University link tutor and other members of the partnership team. Developments are overseen by senior managers and members of the Quality Assurance Directorate at the College. Programme approval and re-approval goes through the University Quality and Enhancement Committee before being approved by the Senate. The College is developing internal processes to meet the Expectation in *Chapter B1: Programme design and approval*.

2.2 The review team took account of the minutes of meetings of senior management, the Advisory Board and programme teams, along with validation reports, and talked to senior staff, academic staff and employers.

2.3 New programmes are proposed either through market research, or after considering areas of academic specialism available within the College. A business case is put together for approval by senior managers. The external Advisory Board, consisting of highly experienced senior members in the football industry, provides helpful comment on industrial and vocational relevance. Senior managers consider the financial and market viability of new proposals. The outline business case includes resource planning and consideration of an appropriate fit with the institutional strategic plan and the distinctive ethos of the College. The three programmes of study currently delivered have been conceptualised and developed within the College to respond to its specific football business focus. However, the College is currently completing a round of programme development (especially in relation to its expansion at Wembley Stadium) which will also use modules and programmes franchised from the University.

2.4 Following outline approval, programmes are developed by academic staff working with the link tutor, using the standardised University documentation. The approval process requires appropriate consideration to be given to external reference points, including the Quality Code and subject benchmark statements, as the programme specification is developed. The draft programme documentation is then scrutinised by externals and peers before being submitted to the University for approval.

2.5 The awarding body requires that all programmes will be submitted for re-approval at least every six years. Curriculum relevance and student achievement are reviewed annually through the University's Strategic University Review and Evaluation process to ensure currency.

2.6 The review team finds that, while the programme design and approval process is understood and is generally effective in action, it is yet to be documented as part of a coherent College quality assurance framework. Staff stated that programme teams are responsible for designing programmes, but it is unclear how responsibilities are reflected in the terms of reference of committees. There is no formal process for recording discussions and actions about programme design and development. The review team **recommends**

that, by December 2014, the College devise a formal process for the design and approval of programmes in line with *Chapter B1: Programme design and approval* of the Quality Code.

2.7 The review team concludes that the College needs to further develop systematic internal processes for the design and approval of programmes and therefore does not meet Expectation B1, and that the associated level of risk is moderate.

Expectation: Not met

Level of risk: Moderate

Expectation (B2): Policies and procedures used to admit students are clear, fair, explicit and consistently applied.

Quality Code, Chapter B2: Admissions

Findings

2.8 The College's process for the recruitment, selection and admissions of students is based on the University's requirements. Applications are submitted through UCAS to the University, which forwards these to the College. Admissions staff at the College approve most applications on the basis of the criteria agreed as part of programme validation, and communicate admissions decisions back to the University. More complex cases are referred by the College to University staff for consideration. There is a clear process for students applying on the basis of accreditation of prior learning (APL). The information provided to students on programme entry requirements is comprehensive, clear and accurate. College systems provide appropriate processes for the Expectation in *Chapter B2: Admissions* to be met in principle.

2.9 The review team looked at the admissions process in detail, and talked to students, admissions and support staff, academic staff and employers.

2.10 The process for complaints and appeals related to the admissions process is defined in the University admissions procedures. However, the admissions guidelines do not make clear the role of the College in the recruitment, selection and admission of students and in making offers to students. This matter is addressed as part of the recommendation under Expectation A4, which asks the College to further develop and implement its quality assurance structures and policies and clarify responsibilities.

2.11 Admissions decisions are recorded in the College's customer relationship management system. This is used to provide feedback to applicants on admissions decisions. Following a review and feedback on the admissions process, the College has recently appointed a management information systems support manager to oversee the admissions and enrolment process.

2.12 The review team tested the operation of the admissions policies and procedures by talking to students and their representatives and academic and support staff, and by scrutinising the guidance given to staff.

2.13 Throughout the admissions process, the College provides extensive information to prospective students, who may also attend open days. Students consider that open days are useful and informative and provide a clear understanding of the support available. Successful applicants receive a briefing pack, also available online, which explains the process for enrolment, induction and related matters. There is frequent communication between the College and students in the period prior to students attending. Students are positive about the application, recruitment and registration process and said that they were provided with full and accurate information.

2.14 The team therefore concludes that there are effective processes for the admission of students and that Expectation B2 is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B3): Higher education providers, working with their staff, students and other stakeholders, articulate and systematically review and enhance the provision of learning opportunities and teaching practices, so that every student is enabled to develop as an independent learner, study their chosen subject(s) in depth, and enhance their capacity for analytical, critical and creative thinking.

Quality Code, *Chapter B3: Learning and teaching*

Findings

2.15 Staff stated that the University's Learning and Teaching Strategy underpins the College's approach. The College provides students with clear curriculum documentation that clearly lays out the module and programme learning outcomes. Students stated that learning, teaching and assessment practices are generally of a high standard. The College's processes enable it to meet the Expectation in *Chapter B3: Learning and teaching* of the Quality Code.

2.16 In considering whether this Expectation has been met in practice, the review team tested the evidence by speaking to senior staff, academic staff, students and their representatives, and by scrutinising relevant policies, procedures and meeting minutes.

2.17 Discussions with academic staff, and a review of guidance issued, demonstrate that College procedures and protocols along with staff practices reflect the principles of the University Learning and Teaching Strategy. Staff are appropriately qualified and experienced. Academic staff are recruited on the basis of selection and interview against clear role specifications. Newly appointed staff attend an induction event and are provided with appropriate information about the College, staff policies and employment. All new staff are fully inducted into their roles and responsibilities. Mentors are appointed from among existing staff to support new appointees for up to a year. Teaching staff who do not already have a teaching qualification are required to achieve this, or a similar professional recognition, within two years of appointment. The College also employs a number of practising professionals, supported through a mentoring process, to deliver specialist areas of the curriculum. The College operates an annual staff appraisal process. This reviews the past year, sets objectives for the coming year and plans individuals' professional development. In addition, staff find the peer observation process to be extremely valuable. There is in addition an annual teaching observation by management, with staff judged against specific grading criteria. Effective use is made of student feedback in enhancing learning and teaching. Staff have access to appropriate internal and external staff development, and often attend high-profile guest speaker sessions provided for students. The module tutor handbook provides helpful written guidance on teaching practice.

2.18 The College is developing an online professional development resource for staff. This will include programmes in health and safety, data protection and related topics. The team notes the extensive opportunities for staff development and the College's process for the identification of individual staff development needs. The need for a more strategic process for planning and reviewing staff development has been recognised by the College. The review team **affirms** the actions taken by the College to develop a more strategic approach to staff development.

2.19 Each student meets with an assigned academic mentor to review progress at least three times each academic year. Students complete an academic mentoring report which provides a detailed record of their academic progress. The College has recently recruited a specialist teacher to offer study skills support (such as academic writing and examination techniques) for all students. Students consider the mentoring process to be helpful and

supportive. In addition, students also pointed to the useful developmental feedback they receive on their work to support their learning.

2.20 All students also follow a personal development programme. This is designed to allow students to develop key transferable skills, and to plan their future careers. This plan is supported by their academic mentor. Students consider the personal development programme to be very useful in preparing them for employment.

2.21 Students have access to appropriate learning resources, which include a library and VLE called MyUCFB. Students can also access the University's facilities, including online resources. Learning resources are planned during programme approval and students provide regular feedback directly to learning resource staff, and through College feedback processes. Learning resources are introduced during student induction, and information is given in programme and module handbooks, and electronically. Students find that the resources are appropriate and enable them to achieve their learning objectives.

2.22 The review team concludes that the College has effective policies and processes in place to deliver, monitor and enhance learning and teaching. These policies include systems for teaching observation, support for staff development, and the wide range of processes in place to monitor and act on student feedback. The review team **affirms** the College's intention to take a more strategic approach to staff development. Therefore, Expectation B3 is met and the level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B4): Higher education providers have in place, monitor and evaluate arrangements and resources which enable students to develop their academic, personal and professional potential.

Quality Code, Chapter B4: Enabling student development and achievement

Findings

2.23 The College's stated aim is 'putting our students first'. New students undergo an extensive induction programme. Programme handbooks contain comprehensive information and advice on finance, healthcare, accommodation, personal safety and emergency services. The College's processes enable it to meet the Expectation in *Chapter B4: Enabling student development and achievement* of the Quality Code.

2.24 The review team tested the support and guidance for students by meeting senior, academic and support staff, students and their representatives, and by scrutinising the documents referenced in the previous paragraph.

2.25 Students are well informed about the support mechanisms available and endorse the high level of support provided. Students are assigned a pastoral mentor who is responsible for personal development and well-being. In addition, support is provided by the Student Services Department which provides a wide range of help with student finance, welfare, careers advice, counselling, faith support, occupational health and accommodation. The department provides a 24-hour helpline. Pastoral support staff are recruited, inducted, appraised and developed in a rigorous manner. Students state that pastoral support is a particular strength of the College, and that student services staff are approachable and extremely helpful. The effective and well embedded pastoral support provided for students is **good practice**.

2.26 The Students' Union has an important role in supporting and promoting the sports and social dimension of the student experience. The College is committed to supporting students with disabilities, and encourages them to engage in sporting activities, such as wheelchair basketball.

2.27 In addition to the validated programme, the College also offers a complementary curriculum. This is designed to provide additional learning and experiential opportunities for students. The complementary curriculum provides a wide range of activities. These include: a series of guest speakers who are experienced and respected professionals from the football and sports industries; the opportunity for students to attend sports industry training programmes (covering such topics as sports journalism or match commentary); a strategic management and leadership course delivered by a leading figure in the world of football; training courses provided by sports industry trainers; field trips; and the opportunity to participate in a range of sports. Students are appreciative of the involvement of sports professionals in the complementary curriculum. The impressive programme of guest speakers and high-profile links with professional football business is **good practice**.

2.28 Support provided for students is comprehensive, and there are many opportunities for engagement with leading sports business professionals. The team concludes, therefore, that Expectation B4 is met, with two examples of good practice identified, and that the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B5): Higher education providers take deliberate steps to engage all students, individually and collectively, as partners in the assurance and enhancement of their educational experience.

Quality Code, Chapter B5: Student engagement

Findings

2.29 Students are involved in a variety of ways in the assurance and enhancement of their educational experience. All students complete feedback forms at the end of each module and the College has recently introduced interim module surveys. The results of module feedback are considered by teaching staff, the Student Council and at programme team meetings. Outcomes are included in the module review report, which is considered by the Academic Quality Committee. The College has in place appropriate mechanisms to meet the Expectation in *Chapter B5: Student engagement* of the Quality Code.

2.30 The review team considered the methods in place for student engagement, including College policies, minutes of the Student Council, discussions with students and student representatives and talking with academic and support staff.

2.31 The Student Council is the main deliberative body considering feedback. The Council includes representatives elected from each programme and year group, members of staff and the president of the Students' Union. In addition, College managers report to the Student Council on actions taken to improve student experiences. Student representatives are provided with clear guidance on their role and responsibilities as representatives and council members. Academic managers ensure that representatives are elected and prepared for their roles. At present no formal training is provided for student representatives. The Chair of the Student Council attends the Academic Quality Committee and reports to the committee on student concerns. Students consider that the College responds appropriately to their concerns.

2.32 The College is in the process of reviewing and extending the involvement of students in its deliberative structures. Future plans include student representatives being invited to attend programme team meetings to report on module and programme-level matters. Student representation on the Academic Quality Committee, and the Programme Team Meeting, is not explicit in their terms of reference or membership.

2.33 The team considers that student feedback is properly elicited, considered and responded to at module and programme level. However, the process for an institution-wide strategic consideration of student feedback is less clearly defined and embedded. There are no specific performance indicators in place to measure student engagement. The review team heard that the College is developing a set of indicators and is planning to regularly review the effectiveness of student engagement. The College is working with the University to regularly review student engagement, provide training for student representatives and further develop representation on key committees. The review team **affirms** the plans in place to undertake a regular review of student engagement, provide training for student representatives and further develop representation on key committees.

2.34 Students are well represented and their views considered, although further work is being undertaken to ensure that students are more engaged. The team concludes, therefore, that Expectation B5 is met and that the risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B6): Higher education providers ensure that students have appropriate opportunities to show they have achieved the intended learning outcomes for the award of a qualification or credit.

Quality Code, Chapter B6: Assessment of students and accreditation of prior learning

Findings

2.35 Assessment information for each programme is communicated to students in module and programme handbooks. Individual module guides contain clear descriptions of assessments. Assignment briefs provide detailed and specific expectations. Regulations for the conduct and invigilation of examinations are available on the VLE, and students are made aware of the consequences of academic misconduct. The College's processes enable it to meet the Expectation in *Chapter B6: Assessment of students and accreditation of prior learning* of the Quality Code.

2.36 The review team met senior staff, academic staff, and students. The team also reviewed programme specifications, module handbooks, assessment briefs, external examiners' reports, programme handbooks, the University's assessment policies, and minutes from student meetings.

2.37 There is an appropriate range of assessment practices across each programme. Students whom the team met confirmed that they understand assessment expectations. Assessment timings, format and marking schemes are clear and well explained by staff. These are effectively communicated through programme specifications and in module handbooks. Students state that assessment briefs are clear and understandable, and that their quality had improved. Students are positive about the range and variety of assessments. The assessment tasks used in individual modules are considered and amended through the annual module review process, following discussion by teaching staff at the academic programme team meetings.

2.38 The final grades for modules are approved by the Examination Board. There is full consideration of the grades achieved in coursework and examinations. Assessments are moderated according to the University's policy. Teaching staff confirmed that the internal verification process operates as stated in the policy with independence and appropriate sampling of students' assessed work. The team saw examples of an assessment schedule, assignment briefs, internal verification plan and feedback to students. External examiners provide relevant external oversight of the assessment process, and are required to give guidance on, report and approve the assessment strategy for each programme.

2.39 Students receive feedback on their work in a standardised format. The College's policy states that feedback on assessed work will normally be within three weeks. Examples of feedback considered by the review team show that the standardised feedback form is used effectively. Assessment feedback clearly links student performance to learning outcomes, provides sound guidance and identifies areas for improvement. Students' performance is monitored by their personal tutor and discussed during regular progress meetings. Overall, students praised the timeliness and quality of the feedback provided. Students are aware of opportunities to collect both written and verbal feedback on assessment.

2.40 From the evidence provided it was unclear how staff are trained in assessment. This has been highlighted as an area for development, and the College is arranging for staff to attend University development sessions on assessment practice. Reports from the external examiner raise issues about the consistency of the internal moderation process,

feedback and over-generous marking and grading of students' assessments. The College has responded to these concerns by further embedding the moderation process, using grading criteria and standardised feedback sheets, in close mentoring of new staff and associate lecturers to ensure consistency. The review team **affirms** the College's stated intention to introduce further staff development to support assessment practice in these areas.

2.41 The team concludes that, on the basis of the evidence provided and in affirming the planned staff development to support assessment practice, Expectation B6 is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B7): Higher education providers make scrupulous use of external examiners.

Quality Code, Chapter B7: External examining

Findings

2.42 External examiners are appointed by the College's awarding body. Because of the newness of the provision, a single examiner, covering all three programmes of study, was nominated and appointed by the University. However, future nominations will be made to the University by the programme teams. The University sets out a person specification and conflict of interest exclusions in their regulations. The external examiner is inducted both at the University and during a visit to the College. In principle, the College's approach meets the Expectation in *Chapter B7: External examining*.

2.43 The team scrutinised external examiner reports, looked at relevant policies on the induction of examiners, minutes of relevant committees and correspondence, and met staff.

2.44 The University sets policies and procedures for validating assessment strategies, regulations, recording and communicating assessment decisions and the management and oversight of Examination Boards. External examiners are present at Examination Boards.

2.45 Reports from the external examiner are made available to staff on the academic network and are discussed at course team meetings. Responses are prepared by the Head of Academic Department, and appropriate and detailed action plans have been developed. The College has yet to go through a complete programme cycle and no students have currently graduated. The two external examiner's reports received so far have not used the required template despite considerable effort by the College and the University to elicit feedback in this standardised format. Useful feedback has, however, been provided on individual modules. Reports have not so far provided an overarching evaluation of each programme of study. This has reduced the effectiveness of the feedback received by the College. The review team **affirms** the steps the College is taking to ensure that external examiner reports provide comprehensive information and an overview of the standards and quality of each programme.

2.46 The review team heard from students that they are aware of the role of external examiners, and that their reports are made available to them on the VLE, although there was no evidence of discussion of reports with students.

2.47 Overall, the College is taking steps to ensure that external examiner reports provide comprehensive feedback. Staff are using reports effectively to plan improvements to the provision. The team concludes that the College meets Expectation B7 and that the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B8): Higher education providers have effective procedures in place to routinely monitor and periodically review programmes.

Quality Code, Chapter B8: Programme monitoring and review

Findings

2.48 The recently developed Quality Assurance Manual provides broad guidance on annual review and self-evaluation processes. The College relies primarily on the Strategic University Review and Evaluation Report to inform its institutional oversight. However, while this report provides some useful oversight for the College, it does not provide detailed evaluation of individual programme performance. The College stated that in 2013-14 it intended the self-evaluation document provided for the current review to act as the annual institutional report. The College has embryonic processes designed to meet the Expectation in *Chapter B8: Programme monitoring and review* of the Quality Code.

2.49 In testing the College's approaches, the review team met senior staff, academic staff and students. In addition, it considered the Quality Assurance Manual, minutes of the Academic Quality Committee and other team meetings.

2.50 The remit of the College's Academic Quality Committee includes strategic oversight of standards and quality, and oversight of the institutional self-evaluation process. However, this Committee has only recently been formed as a key part of the institutional management process. It has had limited opportunity to demonstrate an effective role as the key deliberative body, although the team considers that it has the potential to do this. The Academic Quality Committee needs to further develop its terms of reference to ensure that annual monitoring and review processes are consistently and effectively undertaken. This matter is addressed in the recommendation under Expectation A4 for the College to further develop its quality assurance structures and processes.

2.51 Programme teams currently discuss performance in staff meetings but there is a lack of a formal and systematic approach to overall programme monitoring and review. At programme level, review meetings evaluate each module annually and make a detailed consideration of student progress, attendance, achievement and engagement. Students currently provide feedback through the Student Council. The Head of Academic Department produces the Annual Academic Report and takes emerging issues and actions for consideration at senior management meetings. It is partially through this process that areas for enhancement are identified.

2.52 The review team **recommends** that, by October 2014, the College introduce and embed a systematic process for annual review and monitoring at programme and institutional level to provide a robust process with clear responsibilities and action planning. This is in line with the recommendations made under Expectation A4.

2.53 Overall, the review team concludes that the College does not meet Expectation B8 and that the associated level of risk is moderate. This is because the College has yet to fully develop and embed effective processes to periodically review and monitor programmes.

Expectation: Not met

Level of risk: Moderate

Expectation (B9): Higher education providers have fair, effective and timely procedures for handling students' complaints and academic appeals.

Quality Code, Chapter B9: Academic complaints and student appeals

Findings

2.54 During the induction period, students are made aware by staff, and through their handbooks, how they can access the procedures and processes for complaints and appeals. Students whom the team met confirm that they are aware of what to do if they have a complaint or appeal, and understand the systems. They confirm that they can make a complaint or appeal without being disadvantaged. Clear information is also available on the VLE. The College follows the procedures for complaints and appeals established by the University, which has overall responsibility. The College's policies and procedures meet the Expectation in *Chapter B9: Academic complaints and student appeals* of the Quality Code.

2.55 The review team looked at relevant policies and procedures and had discussions with academic and support staff and meetings with students.

2.56 All complaints are initially logged by the College's student services team, which guides students to relevant members of staff in an initial attempt to address the problem. The student support team is aware of the processes, and is confident they could guide students appropriately. Initially, the College attempts to address concerns raised through its own processes before referring students to the University. At present no complaints or appeals have gone through this process. The College's Student Council evaluates the procedures for complaints and appeals annually to ensure that they are relevant and fair. The Academic Quality Committee receives reports on complaints and appeals and tracks issues raised.

2.57 The team concludes that the College meets Expectation B9 and that the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B10): Degree-awarding bodies take ultimate responsibility for academic standards and the quality of learning opportunities, irrespective of where these are delivered or who provides them. Arrangements for delivering learning opportunities with organisations other than the degree-awarding body are implemented securely and managed effectively.

Quality Code, Chapter B10: Managing higher education provision with others

Findings

2.58 The College does not currently deliver learning opportunities with other organisations. However, it is committed to extending work placement and experience both as a provider and as an employer. The increased provision for work-based learning at levels 4 to 6 is part of the College strategy to embed employability skills in the College. The College has appropriate mechanisms in place to meet Expectation of *Chapter B10: Managing higher education provision with others* of the Quality Code.

2.59 All work placement activity is undertaken through the complementary curriculum. No academic credit is provided for any of the activities undertaken. However, students spoke highly of the potential activities and variety and quality of placements offered. Students stated that they are happy that engagement with the complementary curriculum is discretionary, based on attendance and commitment.

2.60 The team finds that the College fulfils its responsibilities for managing student work experience and placements and actively manages the oversight structures for placement learning. When arranging placements, the College ensures that health and safety standards are met, job descriptions are prepared for the students, expectations are made clear, and students gain useful experience.

2.61 The team considers that there are effective mechanisms in place, Expectation B10 is met, and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B11): Research degrees are awarded in a research environment that provides secure academic standards for doing research and learning about research approaches, methods, procedures and protocols. This environment offers students quality of opportunities and the support they need to achieve successful academic, personal and professional outcomes from their research degrees.

Quality Code, *Chapter B11: Research degrees*

Findings

2.62 The College does not offer research degrees, therefore this Expectation is not applicable.

Quality of student learning opportunities: Summary of findings

2.63 In reaching its judgement, the review team matched its findings against the criteria specified in Annex 2 of the published Handbook. There are two examples of good practice in Expectation B4: the effective and well embedded pastoral support provided for students; and the impressive programme of guest speakers and high-profile links with professional football business.

2.64 For the two Expectations not met, Expectations B1 and B8, the team concludes that the level of risk is moderate. This is because although informal systems at the College are in place, it is recommended to introduce a formal internal process for the design and approval of programmes, and to introduce and embed a systematic process for annual review at programme and institutional level. The College is aware that, with the planned expansion of provision, and increase in student numbers, work needs to take place to further embed policies and procedures to support the quality of learning opportunities. These comments are supported by the recommendation identified in Expectation A4 to further develop and implement its quality assurance structures and policies, clarify responsibilities and identify clear reporting lines and actions.

2.65 The team also affirms the actions taken by the College under Expectation B3 to develop a more strategic approach to staff development; under Expectation B5 to undertake a regular review of student engagement, provide training for student representatives and further develop representation on key committees; and under Expectation B7 to ensure that external examiner reports provide comprehensive information and an overview of the standards and quality of each programme.

2.66 Overall, the team concludes that the quality of student learning opportunities **meets** UK expectations.

3 Judgement: Quality of the information produced about its provision

Expectation (C): UK higher education providers produce information for their intended audiences about the higher education they offer that is fit-for-purpose, accessible and trustworthy.

Quality Code, Part C: Information about higher education provision

Findings

3.1 The College provides information for prospective students through the prospectus, website and at interviews and open days. The College's strategic vision and mission are made available to students and other stakeholders, and communicated effectively through its brand and published information. The team reviewed a wide range of published information and material provided in hard copy and electronically.

3.2 The review team tested that information is trustworthy and fit-for-purpose by scrutinising a wide range of information published in hard copy and electronically on the website and VLE. Additionally, the team spoke with students and staff.

3.3 The College works closely with its awarding body to ensure that all information is clear and accurate and conforms to the protocols agreed with the University. In accordance with its partnership agreement, the College is responsible for publishing information relating to publicity and marketing, the higher education prospectus, programme specifications, student support materials, programme handbooks, module information, and teaching and learning guidance. In addition, the College publishes a range of other policy and strategy statements, as well as various guidance materials relating to provision for the use of staff and students. The College's framework for quality assurance is outlined in the Quality Assurance Manual and supplemented by the awarding body policies and procedures.

3.4 The prospectus is considered by the College to be the most significant published material with the greatest publicity impact. The website and prospectus include information on programmes, the College, and information for applicants on how to apply through UCAS. Communication to applicants and students is also through direct mail, email and social media. The information provided highlights the academic qualities of the programme, the learning environment, the support available, funding requirements, connections with industry, and the relationship with the awarding body.

3.5 All information for students while they study is readily available on the College's VLE MyUCFB, the College website, through programme specifications, student handbooks, module specifications, and through face-to-face discussions with the student support team. Students are also directed to relevant policies on the University website.

3.6 Students are positive about the information provided to them before they apply and during their studies. They confirm that material comprehensively covers what they need to know and provides them with ready access to relevant information. They consider handbook information to be comprehensive and helpful. A Student Charter has recently been developed with the Students' Union and Student Council, and will be reviewed annually. Students are introduced to the Charter during their induction. External examiner reports are available to students on MyUCFB.

3.7 As no students have graduated yet, it was not possible to evidence what information they are provided with after graduating, and the College has yet to take part in the National Student Survey.

3.8 Course information is developed at programme level. Following checking and correction by the marketing team, and if appropriate the University, it is ultimately signed off for publication by the Provost. External information, such as the prospectus, is developed in consultation with the academic staff. This document is then sent to the College Provost for approval before being sent to the University for ratification. Although this process is largely informal, staff are aware of the procedures and consider that they are working effectively. However, the team was supplied with marketing information that included a range of new programmes for delivery in autumn 2014 in Burnley and at the new Wembley campus. Not all the information published initially made it clear that programmes were under development, and still subject to validation. On realisation of this, the College worked with the University to ensure that an addendum was provided giving the current validation status.

3.9 The review team **recommends** that, by September 2014, the College comprehensively document the processes and procedures for ensuring that information is checked for accuracy and reliability and signed off by relevant stakeholders before publication.

3.10 Overall, the team therefore concludes that the information published is accessible, trustworthy and fit-for-purpose, but that the process for checking and assuring accuracy should be more clearly articulated and formalised. The College meets Expectation C and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Quality of the information produced about its provision: Summary of findings

3.11 In reaching its positive judgement, the review team matched its findings against the criteria specified in Annex two of the published handbook. The Expectation for this judgement area is met and the associated level of risk is low. However, although information published is fit-for-purpose and trustworthy, the review team considers that the processes could be more robust. Accordingly, there is one overarching recommendation for the College to document comprehensively the processes and procedures for ensuring that information is checked for accuracy and reliability and signed off by relevant stakeholders before publication. The review team therefore concludes that the quality of the information produced about its higher education provision **meets** UK expectations.

4 Judgement: Enhancement of student learning opportunities

Expectation (Enhancement): Deliberate steps are being taken at provider level to improve the quality of students' learning opportunities.

Findings

4.1 The College pointed to a variety of ways in which quality enhancement is undertaken. These include: regular student feedback surveys, module review reports, programme team meetings, and matters emerging through the annual monitoring process. At an institutional level the Academic Quality Committee (AQC) is intended to play a key role in enhancement. However, this process is at an embryonic stage and the Committee has only recently started to meet regularly. The AQC receives module review reports and other monitoring reports, and is attended by the Chair of the Student Council and chairs of programme team meetings. The AQC receives regular reports on issues and good practice emerging from these internal review activities. The review team also heard that the recent developments in the College's quality assurance processes had heightened institutional awareness of the need for a more explicit process for improving the quality of students' learning opportunities. The College created a Quality Improvement Action Plan 2013-14 in preparation for the current review and intends to take enhancement themes forward in developing its strategy. There are currently a number of enhancement initiatives across the College which are gradually being drawn together.

4.2 The review team considered a number of documents, including the self-evaluation document, the Strategic University Review and Evaluation Report, the Annual Academic Report, module review reports, committee minutes, and annual monitoring reports. The team also discussed enhancement in meetings with the Provost, senior and academic staff, employers, students, and student representatives.

4.3 The College's approach to enhancement is distinctive because of the close involvement of sector-leading professionals in the development of its employment-focused ethos. Employability is embedded as a key part of the core curriculum. Influential figures from the football business and others sports industries are represented on the College's Advisory Board. This provides advice and guidance on strategic developments. Members of the Advisory Board offer comments on the development of new programmes, and have a keen interest in the students' learning experience. Members of the Advisory Board meet regularly with students, staff and the senior management team, and use their external connections to champion the ethos of the College. This is **good practice**.

4.4 Considerable evidence was supplied showing that student issues at a local level are identified and addressed. The quality improvement plan produced for the review also contains actions that could be regarded as institutional quality enhancements. However, at an institutional level there is a limited strategic process for identifying and sharing good practice for dissemination across the institution, and this needs further embedding. The review team **recommends** that, by December 2014, the College develop an explicit process for strategic oversight of quality enhancement and for identifying areas of good practice for dissemination.

4.5 The review team concludes that although the strategic approach to enhancement needs further development and embedding, the College is taking deliberate steps to improve the quality of students' learning opportunities, and that the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Enhancement of student learning opportunities: Summary of findings

4.6 In reaching its judgement, the review team matched its findings against the criteria specified. The team considers the Expectation to have been met, based on the level to which the College has introduced and integrated a set of initiatives to enhance the quality of students' learning opportunities. However, the College's approach to the monitoring and review of enhancement activity is at an emerging stage, and enhancement is driven informally rather than systematically embedded. There is one recommendation for the College to develop an explicit process for strategic oversight of quality enhancement and for identifying areas of good practice for dissemination.

4.7 Therefore, the team concludes that the enhancement of student learning opportunities **meets** UK expectations.

5 Commentary on the Theme: Student Employability

Findings

- 5.1 All programmes embed employability skills throughout the curriculum. Visiting professionals and guest speakers contribute valuable expertise, and most staff have extensive and effective links with employers. The College uses employment-based project work, and the external examiner's report encourages the College to build on this further.
- 5.2 The complementary curriculum draws a wide range of high-profile professionals from relevant contexts to introduce guest lectures and presentations. This offers a unique opportunity for students to begin to build the professional networks that will help them into employment, and is a key part of the College's distinctive character and ethos, recognised as such by all stakeholders.
- 5.3 The College, being based at Burnley Football Club, Turf Moor, is embedded within the professional football environment. This offers an excellent opportunity to engage learning with practice. Work-related internship opportunities support student employability. Although these are not within the validated curriculum, placements are highly valued by students.
- 5.4 In its meetings with students and employers, the team heard that students are well prepared for employment in a growing industry. Some students already have an offer of employment prior to graduation, while others are developing business ideas while still studying and are supported in this.
- 5.5 Through the complementary curriculum, the College offers formal careers advice sessions to support student employability. Employability is also a key element of the University's Teaching and Learning Strategy to which the College adheres. This supports a curriculum that includes work-related learning. Each student's personal development plan is intended to support the understanding of skills and attributes useful to gaining employment.

Glossary

This glossary is a quick-reference guide to terms in this report that may be unfamiliar to some readers. Definitions of key operational terms are also given on pages 27 to 29 of the [Higher Education Review handbook](#).

If you require formal definitions of other terms please refer to the section on assuring standards and quality: www.qaa.ac.uk/assuringstandardsandquality.

User-friendly explanations of a wide range of terms can be found in the longer **Glossary** on the QAA website: www.qaa.ac.uk/aboutus/glossary.

Academic standards

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

Award

A qualification, or academic credit, conferred in formal recognition that a student has achieved the intended **learning outcomes** and passed the assessments required to meet the academic standards set for a **programme** or unit of study.

Blended learning

Learning delivered by a number of different methods, usually including face-to-face and e-learning (see **technology enhanced or enabled learning**).

Credit(s)

A means of quantifying and recognising learning, used by most institutions that provide higher education **programmes of study**, expressed as numbers of credits at a specific level.

Degree-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 (in response to applications for taught degree awarding powers, research degree awarding powers or university title).

Distance learning

A course of study that does not involve face-to-face contact between students and tutors but instead uses technology such as the internet, intranets, broadcast media, CD-ROM and video, or traditional methods of correspondence - learning 'at a distance'. See also **blended learning**.

Dual award or double award

The granting of separate awards (and certificates) for the same **programme** by two **degree-awarding bodies** who have jointly delivered the programme of study leading to them. See also **multiple award**.

e-learning

See **technology enhanced or enabled learning**

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 our review processes.

Expectations

Statements in the **Quality Code** that set out what all UK higher education providers expect of themselves and each other, and what the general public can therefore expect of them.

Flexible and distributed learning A programme or module that does not require the student to attend classes or events at particular times and locations. See also **distance learning**.

Framework

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

Framework for higher education qualifications

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

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 audit and review processes.

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.

Multiple awards

An arrangement where three or more **degree-awarding bodies** together provide a single jointly delivered **programme** (or programmes) leading to a separate **award** (and separate certification) of each awarding body. The arrangement is the same as for **dual/double awards**, but with three or more awarding bodies being involved.

Operational definition

A formal definition of a term, establishing exactly what QAA means when using it in reviews and reports.

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.

Public information

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

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.

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.

Technology enhanced or enabled learning (or e-learning)

Learning that is delivered or supported through the use of technology.

Threshold academic standard

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** and **subject benchmark statements**.

Virtual learning environment (VLE)

An intranet or password-only interactive website (also referred to as a platform or user interface) giving access to **learning opportunities** electronically. These might include such resources as course handbooks, information and reading lists; blogs, message boards and forums; recorded lectures; and/or facilities for online seminars (webinars).

Widening participation

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

QAA848 - R3950 - Jul 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