



# **Centre for Teaching in Management Ltd**

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

March 2014

## Key findings about Centre for Teaching in Management Ltd

As a result of its Review for Educational Oversight carried out in March 2014, the QAA review team (the team) considers that there can be **confidence** in how the provider manages its stated responsibilities for the standards of the programmes it offers on behalf of the Chartered Management Institute (CMI).

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 this awarding organisation.

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

## 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:

- embed the expectations of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education in its policies and procedures (paragraph 1.3)
- continue to use effectively its tracking procedures to fully account for all students enrolled on its programmes (paragraph 1.6)
- enforce fully its policy to ensure that the information it publishes is accurate, up to date and fit for purpose (paragraph 3.3).

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

- evaluate the effectiveness of its new management and committee structures (paragraph 1.2)
- implement and evaluate the planned staff training on the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (paragraph 1.4)
- implement and evaluate the effectiveness of its new quality assurance processes (paragraph 1.5)
- employ methods to enable students to meet the vocational requirements of the awarding organisation (paragraph 2.3)
- embed the sharing of good practice in staff observations (paragraph 2.7).

## About this report

This report presents the findings of the [Review for Educational Oversight](#)<sup>1</sup> (REO) conducted by [QAA](#) at the Centre for Teaching in Management Ltd (the Centre), which is a privately funded provider of higher education. The purpose of the review is to provide public information about how the provider discharges its stated responsibilities for the management and delivery of academic standards and the quality of learning opportunities available to students. The review applies to programmes of study that the provider delivers on behalf of the Chartered Management Institute (CMI). The review was carried out by Dr Hayley Randle, Ms Brenda Eade (reviewers) and Mr Christopher Mabika (Coordinator).

The review team conducted the initial review in March 2014 and returned to the Centre for a second visit in May 2014, to review further the management of information about learning opportunities. The review team conducted the review in agreement with the provider and in accordance with the [Review for Educational Oversight: Handbook](#).<sup>2</sup> Evidence in support of the review included policy and operational documents provided by the Centre, course details and reports of visits from CMI, meetings with staff and students, and reports of reviews by QAA.

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

- the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (Quality Code)
- subject benchmark statements
- *The framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland* (FHEQ)
- the Qualifications and Credit Framework (QCF)
- National Occupational Standards for Management and Leadership.

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 occupies a single site in Birmingham city centre. It was incorporated in 2009. The Centre offers qualifications in business and management to international students, and has plans to recruit students local to the West Midlands region and from the European Union.

At the time of the second review visit in May 2014, the provider had 42 students, all enrolled on CMI programmes with student numbers in brackets:

### Chartered Management Institute (CMI)

- CMI level 7 Diploma in Strategic Management and Leadership (QCF) (12)
- CMI level 6 Diploma in Management and Leadership (QCF) (14)
- CMI level 5 Diploma in Management and Leadership (QCF) (16)

## The provider's stated responsibilities

The Centre is responsible for student recruitment, selection and admission, and for monitoring admissions, retention and completion. CMI provides the content of the curriculum and the Centre's tutors prepare lesson plans and schemes of work and deliver the curriculum. The Centre has opted to use the assessment briefs that CMI provides but retains

---

<sup>1</sup> [www.qaa.ac.uk/educational-oversight](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/educational-oversight)

<sup>2</sup> [www.qaa.ac.uk/publications/information-and-guidance/publication?PubID=2669](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/publications/information-and-guidance/publication?PubID=2669)

the responsibilities for marking, internally verifying, and providing feedback on student work. The Centre collects, analyses and responds to feedback from students.

CMI and the Centre share responsibility for annual monitoring reviews, quality reviews of the higher education provision, providing library resources and student appeals.

The Centre also assumes responsibility for the recruitment and appraisal of staff, and provides staff with higher education subject updating and scholarly activity. Both the Centre and CMI provide and develop staff teaching and assessment skills.

## Recent developments

At the beginning of March 2014, the Centre appointed a new Principal and introduced new management and committee structures to reflect the reduction in size of its current provision. The proprietor handed over the position of Welfare Officer to the Marketing and Administration Manager and no longer has direct involvement in the Centre's management. The Centre created the position of Director of Quality Assurance, which is occupied by a part-time member of staff.

In its agreement with the University of Wales (the University), the Centre could recruit students onto the University programmes until January 2014. As the only students enrolled on these programmes completed their studies in January 2013, validation with the University ended in January 2014. The Centre acquired approval to run CMI programmes in May 2013.

The Centre had its initial review with QAA in September 2012 and an annual monitoring review in September 2013, the result of which triggered the full review conducted in March 2014. Management stated that the management and academic committee structures and Centre policies in use at both the September 2012 review and the September 2013 monitoring visit reflected the requirements of the University. In February 2014, the Centre stopped using its action plan and instituted new structures and policies that are relevant to the requirements of CMI and effectively support the Centre's current activities. The Centre was therefore yet to fully implement and evaluate these new structures and policies at the time of the March 2014 review. In particular, the Centre still had to enforce the new mechanism for checking that information it produces about learning opportunities and makes available to students is reliable and fit for purpose as it still had policies and documentation pertaining to the University of Wales and pre-arrival information relating to settling in Nottingham and not Birmingham. It also still had to make full and effective use of its tracking system for students. The team therefore conducted a second review visit to the Centre in May 2014.

Although the number of students had more than doubled at the time of the second visit, the Centre could not register any new students with CMI until the awarding organisation had carried out an annual health check. The Centre's application for accreditation with Pearson is yet to be finalised.

## Students' contribution to the review

Students studying on higher education programmes were invited to present a submission to the review team. The Centre supported the students in preparing their submission through allowing them time and access to resources. Students representing each of the three programmes, including members of the Student-Staff Committee, met the review team. Some students attended the preparatory meeting as well as the meetings with the review team at the first and second visits. Students who met the review team freely offered their opinions and participated actively in discussions. Their contributions were valuable to the review process.

## Detailed findings about Centre for Teaching in Management Ltd

### 1 Academic standards

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

1.1 In the new management structure, the Principal has the ultimate responsibility for the management of academic standards. As the current Principal is new to the post, the Director of Quality Assurance assumes some of the Principal's responsibilities, including chairing the Teaching and Management committees. The Centre Manager assumes an operational role in the management of academic standards, reporting directly to the Principal. The Centre Manager effectively advises and supports other members of the teaching staff to ensure the maintenance of standards and awareness of the requirements of CMI.

1.2 The committee structure effectively supports the oversight of academic standards, with clear terms of reference. Members of the teaching staff make up the Teaching Committee, which is responsible for monitoring admissions and recruitment, teaching, learning and assessment, and student progress. The Teaching Committee also advises on new programmes and teaching initiatives, and acts as an academic board to endorse the submission of student work for external verification. The Management Committee includes the Principal, the Director of Quality Assurance, the Centre Manager and the Marketing Manager, and is responsible for setting the strategic objectives of the Centre. The Centre also has a Student-Staff Committee comprising student representatives from each programme and members of staff, which the Welfare Officer chairs. Both the Teaching and Management committees meet a minimum of once every month. The Student-Staff Committee meets once per term. The committees produce brief minutes of their meetings, with clear actions. However, the management and committee structures have not been in place long enough to allow a full evaluation of their effectiveness. It would be **desirable** for the Centre to evaluate the effectiveness of its new management and committee structures.

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

1.3 Although the Centre has recently updated its policies and procedures, these do not refer to the expectations of the Quality Code. The Centre effectively uses CMI as its main external reference point. CMI uses the National Occupational Standards for Management and Leadership, to design its programmes. It is **advisable** that the Centre embed the expectations of the Quality Code in its policies and procedures.

1.4 Both teaching staff and management understand the requirements of CMI and tutors link their teaching to the relevant external reference points. All teaching staff are professional members of CMI, which gives them access to its resources. They also have experience of working with the Quality Code through their engagements with other organisations. The Centre conducted a workshop scheduled workshop on Chapter B6: *Assessment of students and the recognition of prior learning* in April 2014 and plans to provide regular staff training on other aspects of the Quality Code. It would be **desirable** for the Centre to implement and evaluate the planned staff training on the Quality Code.

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

1.5 The Centre has instituted new quality assurance processes. These include assessment and verification processes and a planned internal annual programme monitoring review which will be based on a higher education quality cycle. Tutors double mark and internally verify each other's work before the Centre submits the assessments to CMI for external verification. The annual monitoring review will include preparing a response to reports from CMI and evaluating the effectiveness of the processes for managing standards in relation to moderation and examining. It will also consider the outcomes of teaching observations, staff appraisals, policy reviews, student evaluation, feedback and student retention, achievement and progression data. CMI's Approved Centre Visit Report of January 2014 confirms that the Centre's policies and systems meet CMI's requirements. However, the Centre has not used any of these policies or systems long enough to evaluate their effectiveness. For example, some students were yet to submit their assessments at the time of the second visit. In addition, since the Centre can only complete a full version of its first quality cycle in January 2015, it will complete a truncated version in September 2014. It would be **desirable** for the Centre to implement and evaluate the effectiveness of its new quality assurance processes.

1.6 The Centre developed a tracking system to monitor the progress of students from their admission to the end of their course using individual learning plans, which it now uses effectively. The Centre had its first intake of students to study on CMI programmes in September 2013 and, at the time of the QAA annual monitoring visit five students were enrolled on the CMI programmes. During the March 2014 review visit, the Centre's records showed that all its current students had enrolled in January 2014. The Centre could not account for, or show the progress of the five students studying at the Centre in September 2013, which the monitoring report noted. At the time of the second visit in May 2014 the Centre produced a tracking sheet showing full details of the 42 students now enrolled on its courses. The tracking sheets contain data that confirms the details in the student enrolment files. However, the Centre has not used the tracking sheets sufficiently to show the effectiveness of their long-term use. It is **advisable** that the Centre continue to use effectively its tracking procedures to fully account for all students enrolled on its programmes.

1.7 The changes made in February 2014 adequately address the concerns raised during the September 2013 monitoring visit, on the Centre's progress in implementing the September 2012 action plan. The new academic committee structure shows clear lines of reporting and terms of reference and the committees now record and follow up on actions (see also paragraph 1.2). The revised quality assurance systems described in paragraph 1.5 ensure that tutors assess the intended outcomes at the appropriate level when marking and internally verifying student work, and students receive sufficient feedback. Centre management, staff and students confirmed that the new tracking system allows the Centre to identify and devise action plans to meet student needs. However, the Centre did not map its new policies against the Quality Code and does not have formal arrangements for its academic staff to share good practice.

1.8 The Centre is committed to the management of academic standards. Members of senior management play key roles, with the support of teaching staff, who understand the needs of CMI, and new committees that have clear terms of reference. New policies and quality assurance processes provide clear guidelines on all the Centre's academic activities, including internal verification, annual monitoring and tracking student progress. The Centre still needs to embed further the Quality Code in its policies and procedures, to monitor carefully student progression, and to review regularly the effectiveness of its management procedures.

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 organisation.

## 2 Quality of learning opportunities

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

2.1 As in the management of academic standards described in paragraphs 1.1, 1.2 and 1.5, the Centre is yet to fully assess the effectiveness of its revised management and committee structures, and policies for managing and enhancing the quality of learning opportunities. The Principal has the ultimate responsibility for the management and enhancement of the quality of learning opportunities. The Teaching Committee considers the outcomes from meetings of the Student-Staff Committee, which are then considered by the Management Committee if they require a commitment of resources.

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

2.2 Paragraphs 1.3 and 1.4 also apply to the Centre's use of external reference points to manage and enhance learning opportunities.

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

2.3 A comprehensive Learning and Teaching Policy underpins the delivery of teaching at the Centre. Teaching staff deliver across a range of levels and produce teaching, learning and assessment materials, which enable students to fulfil the requirements of the CMI programmes. Students demonstrate a clear appreciation of the required academic levels and find their studies appropriately challenging. Moreover, CMI sets entry requirements, which the Centre effectively follows through the implementation of its admissions policy. This means that, at the start of their course, the learners have the relevant work experience to undertake the awarding organisation's vocationally based programmes. However, owing to Tier 4 visa restrictions, students at the Centre cannot undertake voluntary or paid work to allow them to continue to relate theory to practice. It would be **desirable** for the Centre to employ methods to enable students to meet the vocational requirements of the awarding organisation.

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

2.4 The Centre provides information and deploys staff resources that enable its students to achieve their study goals. Students confirmed that the information the Centre provides is sufficient and the resources are adequate for their needs. The Centre's Learner Guidance Policy seeks to help students realise their learning potential. Two lecturers provide academic and personal tutorial support and, together with the Student Welfare Officer, offer pastoral support. In future, the Centre intends to fill the positions of Director of Studies and Programme Manager to add to the current staff resources. Students receive assignment briefs in the first week of each module and the teaching staff support them with these in class and throughout the module.

2.5 The Centre identifies student learning support needs such as literacy and strategies to improve their verbal and written communication skills using the initial assessments students undergo during induction, which it records on the new individual learning plans and

support sheets. The Centre uses this information to allocate appropriate learning resources, including personal and additional academic tutorial support. Programme tutors continue to monitor any further support needs throughout the course and record and track student progress using the new tracking sheets. Although the Centre had only assessed draft submissions at the time of the review, students reported that the individual learning plan system is working well in supporting them with their personal and skills development through target setting. A strict Student Attendance Policy augments the completion and revision of individual learning plans.

2.6 The Centre has an effective student feedback system in place. The Student Feedback Policy outlines the ways in which students can provide feedback on their course, including through student representatives and the Student-Staff Committee which discusses the actions to be taken on the student feedback. The Centre has a number of other ways through which it can capture student feedback, including induction feedback, planned end-of-lecture and seminar review periods, end-of-module feedback forms, the use of suggestion and complaint boxes at reception and through the Student Welfare Officer.

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

2.7 The Centre effectively develops its staff in order to improve student learning opportunities, and it recognises staff as its most valuable resource. It recruits its staff primarily based on their subject expertise. At the induction stage, the Centre identifies key work objectives, as well as training and staff development needs. It has introduced a teaching observation process formally linked to the staff appraisal process. The Director of Quality Assurance has observed some teaching since the Centre introduced its new policies in February 2014, which show how the Centre uses staff observations to identify staff development needs. The Centre has also recently introduced the Capability Procedure that links with the teaching observations to address any shortfalls in delivery. The Centre's Staff Development Policy focuses on both personal and professional development. Some staff have undertaken dedicated CMI training and both lecturers are undertaking higher-level studies within business management and training. The obligation for all staff members to act in accordance with various conduct-based policies such as Equality and Diversity, Environmental Consideration and Equal Opportunities has a positive impact on student learning. However, the Centre has not progressed peer reviews in line with the action plan from the September 2012 review, and does not have a system to provide opportunities for staff to formally share good practice, which peer reviews would create. It would be **desirable** for the Centre to embed the sharing of good practice in staff observations.

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

2.8 Physical resources at the Centre are appropriate with a suitably equipped and well-managed working environment, including a library which both staff and students confirmed has adequate resources, lecture and seminar rooms and quiet study areas. The Centre has an effective procedure for dealing with requests for additional resources through the Centre Manager and the Management Committee. Once they register with CMI, students can also use its additional learning materials. Students have access to computers and wireless connectivity throughout the Centre. The Centre uses extensive email communication with its students when students have specific questions pertaining to their academic work.

2.9 As in paragraph 1.7, although the Centre did not work directly with the action plan to address the concerns raised during the September 2013 review, the new structures and the



policies that the Centre introduced in February 2014 adequately address them. This includes the new Learning and Teaching Policy, which, as discussed in paragraph 2.3, allows tutors to use a variety of approaches, which the students appreciate. Although it is too early in its quality cycle, the draft submissions of student work that the Centre had assessed by the time of the current review showed that students receive sufficient feedback on their work. However, due to restrictions placed on Tier 4 visas, students cannot undertake any work in the UK and the Centre is still required to identify alternative means to continue to support its students with the vocational aspects of the CMI courses (see also paragraph 2.3). There is no provision in the new policies for peer reviews, which could serve as a platform for tutors to share good practice.

2.10 As in the management of academic standards, the Centre has effective structures for the management and enhancement of learning opportunities available to students. It has instituted policies, and deploys and continuously assesses the adequacy of both staff and physical resources to maintain its support for students.

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 communicates effectively information about learning opportunities to students and other stakeholders. After the initial review visit in March 2014, the Centre made a decision to make information for students available predominantly in electronic format, following the launch of its new website and the associated student portal. The Centre effectively uses the website to disseminate the information it publishes for its students. The management team stated that the Centre employs the website as an accessible repository for information for students and staff. Students and staff indicated that the website was their main source of information. Students said the information was useful to them prior to joining the Centre and, once enrolled, they use it to obtain the Centre's policies, programmes and higher education study materials. The Centre has built a student portal to enable students to check information about their programmes and to submit work electronically. Although the portal is still in the early stages of development, students have received it well and confirmed that they received sufficient orientation to both the new website and the portal. The Centre indicated that it plans to use the portal more extensively to provide information about specific modules and to enable students to communicate with their tutors and peers.

3.2 On enrolment, students receive a comprehensive induction pack containing the induction check sheet, the Centre student handbook, CMI programme specifications and handbook, and the Assessment Policy and Guidance. The CMI programme handbook contains extensive information on programme design, module specifications and programme structures, assessment methods and procedures, course grading and administration, and complaints and appeals procedures. Students also complete a feedback form to assess the support gained through the induction process. Staff stated that the Centre plans to make CMI monitoring reports publicly available to students in future. Students can also access information provided on the Centre noticeboard.

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

3.3 Since the initial review visit in March 2014, the Centre has addressed concerns raised by the team over the arrangements for checking the currency and relevance of the information it publishes about its learning opportunities. It was clear at the second visit that the College is now using its new procedures for assuring itself that information about learning opportunities is fit for purpose, with clear review dates published on all Centre policies. However, the Centre still needs to enforce these policies fully as it still displayed a banner relating to enrolment onto University of Wales courses and the pre-arrival information still contained references to Nottingham rather than Birmingham. In the new checking mechanisms, the Principal has overall responsibility to check and approve both printed and electronic information, and uses a detailed list to check that new information is accurate and complete. The Marketing Manager produces information about programmes. The Centre has appointed a Web Manager, who reports to the Marketing Manager, to update and review the website. The quality cycle will provide a calendar for checking the accuracy and currency of information. It is **advisable** that the Centre enforce fully its policy to ensure that the information it publishes is accurate, up to date and fit for purpose.

3.4 The Centre provides clear information about learning opportunities available to its students. It places the responsibility for authorising its information at the highest level, with an appropriate system now in place for checking that it is fit for purpose, accessible and trustworthy. The Centre has now made changes to the website to ensure that it contains accurate information and has introduced a student portal, which is proving effective for students to access information about their course.

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 plan<sup>3</sup>

Centre for Teaching in Management Ltd action plan relating to the Review for Educational Oversight of March 2014						
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 <b>advisable</b> for the Centre to:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>embed the expectations of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education in its policies and procedures (paragraph 1.3)</li> </ul>	All academic policies contain reference to expectations of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (the Quality Code)	Identify those expectations that apply to non-degree awarding organisations: identify all expectations that are relevant to the Centre	September 2014	Director of Quality	Principal	Academic policies.
		Identify the expectations with which the Centre complies, with supporting evidence	September 2014	Committee chairs		Minutes of the Quality Improvement Programme meetings
		Review and rewrite all relevant policies	December 2014	Director of Quality		Minutes of committee meetings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>continue to use effectively its tracking</li> </ul>	Academic progress of individual students and courses to be available on	Continue with the existing practice and review tracking	July 2014 ongoing	Director of Quality	Principal	Course quarterly review

<sup>3</sup> The Centre has been required to develop this action plan to address any recommendations arising from the review. QAA monitors progress against the action plan, in conjunction with the Centre's awarding organisation.

procedures to fully account for all students enrolled on its programmes (paragraph 1.6)	a continuous basis	statistics against students' individual learning plans monthly  Course reviews quarterly				Minutes of the teaching team meetings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>enforce fully its policy to ensure that the information it publishes is accurate, up to date and fit for purpose (paragraph 3.3).</li> </ul>	Accurate information available to all stakeholders	<p>Monthly review of the website and all information published to students to ensure the information remains accurate, relevant and fit for purpose</p> <p>Quarterly collection and evaluation of feedback from students and awarding bodies to ascertain fitness for purpose</p>	July 2014 ongoing	Marketing Manager	Principal	<p>Student feedback forms</p> <p>Awarding organisation health check reports</p> <p>Monthly reports</p>
<b>Desirable</b>	<b>Intended outcomes</b>	<b>Actions to be taken to achieve intended outcomes</b>	<b>Target date/s</b>	<b>Action by</b>	<b>Reported to</b>	<b>Evaluation (process or evidence)</b>
The team considers that it would be <b>desirable</b> for the Centre to:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>evaluate the effectiveness of its new management and committee structures (paragraph 1.2)</li> </ul>	Effectiveness of new systems	All minutes of meetings should record targets set, actions to be taken to achieve them and progress made towards meeting those targets	October 2014	Director of Quality	Principal	Minutes of committee meetings

		Review the self assessment of actions achieved against targets recorded in the Quality Improvement Programme				Minutes of the Quality Improvement Programme meetings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>implement and evaluate the planned staff training on the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (paragraph 1.4)</li> </ul>	The Centre has now implemented its planned training effectively	Training sessions for staff on the use of the Quality Code	July 2014	Quality Manager	Principal	Staff training and continuous professional development records  Staff training feedback forms
	The Centre will have a purpose designed training programme to address areas of non-compliance, based on the results of the actions to embed the expectations of the Quality Code	Draft programme Refer to committees Receive committee observations  Amend programme in line with these observations	October 2014	Quality Manager	Principal	Detailed training programme document  Minutes of committee meetings  Staff training and continuous professional development records  Staff training feedback

						forms
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>implement and evaluate the effectiveness of its new Quality Assurance processes (paragraph 1.5)</li> </ul>	Implementation and evaluation of the effectiveness of the new Quality Assurance procedures to allow timely identification of course performance and students at risk	<p>In course evaluation each term</p> <p>Review of teaching observations each term</p>	August 2014 ongoing	Director of Quality	Principal	<p>Student performance tracking records</p> <p>Annual monitoring reports</p> <p>Course performance records</p> <p>Individual learning plans for students</p> <p>Course review reports</p> <p>Staff observation records</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>employ methods to enable students to meet the vocational requirements of the awarding organisation (paragraph 2.3)</li> </ul>	<p>Investigate feasibility</p> <p>If not feasible transfer students to more suitable qualifications</p>	<p>Sample ten relevant local employers with the aim of assessing whether or not they would be prepared to offer a placement to the Centre's students</p> <p>Contact two alternative awarding bodies</p>	July 2014	Centre Manager	Director of Quality	<p>Student work placement records</p> <p>SMART plan for the transfer of students to appropriate programmes</p>

						Accreditation documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>embed the sharing of good practice in staff observations (paragraph 2.7).</li> </ul>	Identification and development of good practice	Revise teaching observations to include discussion, implementation and evaluation of progress in disseminating good practice	October 2014	Director of Quality	Principal	Observation reports  Staff evaluation sheets and continuous professional development records

## 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](http://www.qaa.ac.uk).

More detail about Review for Educational Oversight can be found at: [www.qaa.ac.uk/educational-oversight](http://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/about-us/glossary](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/about-us/glossary). Formal definitions of key terms can be found in the [Review for Educational Oversight: Handbook](#).<sup>4</sup>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

<sup>4</sup> [www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/REO-designated-providers-handbook-14](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/REO-designated-providers-handbook-14)

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

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

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

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

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

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

**quality** See **academic quality**.

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

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

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

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

#### QAA877 - R3928 - Aug 14

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

Tel 01452 557000  
Email [enquiries@qaa.ac.uk](mailto:enquiries@qaa.ac.uk)  
Web [www.qaa.ac.uk](http://www.qaa.ac.uk)

Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786