



# **London Campuses of UK Universities**

**Overview report of a thematic enquiry  
by the Quality Assurance Agency  
for Higher Education**

**December 2014**

# Contents

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>About this report</b> .....   | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>Executive summary</b> .....   | <b>2</b>  |
| Features of good practice .....  | 2         |
| Areas of potential risk.....   | 2         |
| Follow up action.....  | 2         |
| <b>Methodology</b> .....   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Overview of provision at the London campuses</b> .....                      | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>Findings: Set-up and operation</b> .....                                    | <b>5</b>  |
| Establishing the London campuses.....  | 5         |
| Making the London campuses work .....  | 7         |
| <b>Findings: Academic standards and quality of programmes</b> .....            | <b>9</b>  |
| Approval and validation.....   | 9         |
| Annual monitoring and review .....   | 9         |
| Assessment and external examining.....   | 10        |
| Progression and achievement data .....   | 10        |
| <b>Findings: Information on higher education provision</b> .....               | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Conclusion</b> .....  | <b>12</b> |
| Positive features identified by the thematic analysis.....                     | 12        |
| Areas of potential risk identified by the thematic analysis .....              | 12        |
| The management of disagreements with partner organisations .....               | 12        |
| Use of teaching staff not employed by the university .....                     | 13        |
| Insufficient checks on student entry qualifications .....                      | 13        |
| Use of agents for recruiting students .....                                    | 13        |
| Systems vulnerable to academic malpractice .....                               | 13        |
| Differing progression and achievement outcomes for London-based students ..... | 13        |
| Limitations on space and other resources .....                                 | 13        |
| Reliance on part-time staff.....   | 13        |
| Different campus experience .....  | 13        |
| Incomplete or inadequate published information .....                           | 14        |
| Actions and outlook for the future.....  | 14        |
| <b>Appendix 1: List of universities</b> .....                                  | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Appendix 2: About QAA</b> .....   | <b>16</b> |

## About this report

This is a report of a thematic enquiry into the quality and standards of higher education at the London campuses of universities located in other parts of the UK. A London Campus is defined as a campus or other premises from which a degree-awarding body, whose 'home' base is elsewhere, operates. The definition excludes home campuses of London-based degree-awarding bodies.

Most of the London campuses were established between 2009 and 2014. The main reason was to increase the recruitment of international students who would be more attracted to London than to the home campus. Student numbers on these campuses range from under 100 to over 2000, with the average being 652 students. Of the 13 campuses, one has been closed recently by the home university, and two only started to recruit in September 2014.

The London campuses offer mainly postgraduate programmes in business, management, accountancy, tourism, law and computing.

In the academic year 2013-14 the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) conducted a thematic enquiry to look at the management of higher education offered by the London campuses. This was undertaken in response to the recent increase in the number of international students studying at London campuses and concerns raised about the academic management of some of these campuses.<sup>1</sup>

The thematic enquiry is designed to provide public assurance that individual universities are managing their responsibilities effectively as awarding institutions and to provide reassurance that the quality of provision, including arrangements for staffing, recruitment practices, learning resources, quality assurance arrangements and support and guidance for students is secure. The thematic findings discussed in this report (page 5 onwards) are intended to help support the continuing management of academic quality and standards.

In addition to its supportive function, the thematic enquiry has identified a number of areas of potential risk, as well as some positive features. These are set out in the conclusion.

---

<sup>1</sup> These concerns were reflected in a ministerial statement, published in June 2014, which highlighted a number of issues concerning the recruitment of international students, including the role of London campuses.

## Executive summary

In most cases universities appear to have carefully considered the implications when making the decisions to set up London campuses. The establishment of the campuses was generally thorough, with universities giving careful consideration to the approval processes and setting up management teams in London.

Five of the campuses have partnerships with private organisations, and universities have contingency plans to ensure that students are able to continue with their studies should the partner organisations experience problems or closure.

Universities have sought to manage their London campuses on the basis that they are not separate legal entities in terms of governance and operations. In all but one case programmes offered in London are also available at the main campus.

## Features of good practice

All universities have been diligent in their approval and validation processes and conscientious and thorough in their annual monitoring and review. Where internal reviews have taken place these have been evaluative enabling the universities and the campuses to identify potential problems and address them appropriately. The reviewers also found that annual monitoring and internal review processes have been comprehensive and objective. In one case the use of *Chapter B2: Admissions* of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (the Quality Code) to check that admissions processes were working effectively was considered good practice.

## Areas of potential risk

The QAA reviewers identified a number of areas of potential risk to the management of quality and standards. While the reviewers recognised that individual institutions had the capacity to identify and address areas for improvement, they also cited a number of issues for consideration:

- the management of disagreements with partner organisations
- use of teaching staff not directly employed by the university
- insufficient checks on student entry qualifications
- use of agents for recruiting students
- systems vulnerable to academic malpractice
- differing progression and achievement outcomes for London-based students
- limitations on space and other resources
- reliance on part-time staff
- different campus experience
- incomplete or inadequate published information.

## Follow up action

Where problems have been identified universities are taking steps to address them and to safeguard appropriate learning experiences for students. QAA will monitor progress through action plans and at the institution's next QAA review.

## Methodology

The enquiry comprised four stages:

- an initial assessment of public information about the London campuses
- a survey of UK degree-awarding bodies with London campuses to find out about quality assurance arrangements and management of the student experience
- analysis of relevant documentation leading to a report on current practice for each institution
- any subsequent follow-up enquiries.

The assessment of public information identified 13 UK universities with operational London campuses and ascertained the range of information about these campuses that was publicly available.

The subsequent analysis drew upon a wide range of documentation based on a standard information set provided by each university. Particular focus was placed on the universities' procedures for managing their London campuses.

The enquiry explored a number of themes relevant to the management of academic standards, academic quality and the quality of published information. The reviewers were particularly interested in finding out about: the effectiveness of operating models; staff recruitment and development; admissions processes; the use of agents for student recruitment; assessment arrangements; student progression and achievement; learning resources, including spaces for teaching and learning; comparability of the student experience; and information for students about the London campuses.

Their findings on these themes are summed up in the main sections of this report, under the following headings and subheadings.

### **Set-up and operation**

- Establishing the London campuses
- Making the London campus work

### **Academic standards and quality of programmes**

- Approval and validation
- Annual monitoring and review
- Assessment and external examining
- Progression and achievement data

### **Information on higher education provision**

QAA conducted the thematic enquiry between July and September 2014.

If the enquiry identified any specific issues or matters of concern QAA reserved the right to investigate further under the terms of its Concerns scheme. In the event no separate Concerns Inquiries were initiated.

## Overview of provision at the London campuses

The 13 universities that have London campuses are shown in the table below and in Appendix 1. Most of the campuses were established between 2009 and 2014. The longest established opened in 1999 for teacher education. Two campuses, due to open to students in September 2014, had no students at the time of this enquiry. One that opened in 2010 was subsequently closed in January 2014.

In the academic year 2013-14 there were 8,484 students with the largest campus having 2,328 students and the smallest 288.

The London campuses offer mainly postgraduate programmes with two offering PhD opportunities. The most common programmes are in the fields of accountancy, business, tourism and management, some having an international focus. Other areas include teacher education, law and computing. More recently, there have been proposals to develop courses in public health, architecture, forensic psychology and Irish studies.

All 13 universities were included in the thematic enquiry and all have provided written responses to the QAA reviewers' findings.

| University                               | Date when London campus established          | Links with private organisations                              | Student numbers, 2013-14 |
|--|--|---|--------------------------|
| Anglia Ruskin University                 | 2007   | Incorporating the London College of Accountancy Ltd           | 1,422                    |
| Bangor University                        | 2011   |   | 93                       |
| Coventry University                      | 2009   |   | 831                      |
| University of Cumbria                    | 1999 (originally as St Martin's College)     |   | 288                      |
| University of East Anglia                | 2010 (withdrew January 2014)                 | INTO University Partnerships                                  | 323                      |
| Glasgow Caledonian University            | 2010   |   | 226                      |
| Glyndŵr University                       | 2011   | London School of Management Sciences                          | 2,008                    |
| University of Liverpool                  | 2013   |   | 22                       |
| Northumbria University                   | 2014 (first intake)                          | QA Executive Education  | 0                        |
| University of South Wales                | 2014 (first intake)                          | Docklands Academy, London                                     | 0                        |
| University of Sunderland                 | 2012   | Ethames Graduate School                                       | 2,328                    |
| University of Ulster                     | 2011   | QA Business School  | 797                      |
| University of Wales: Trinity Saint David | 2005 (as University of Wales, Lampeter) 2012 | CTL with University of Wales, Lampeter (terminated late 2011) | 434                      |
| <b>Total students</b>                    |  |   | <b>8,484</b>             |

## Findings: Set-up and operation

### Establishing the London campuses

1 The majority of campuses are well founded and effectively managed. Establishing a London campus can be an expensive and complex process and requires adequate resourcing, both financial and human, not only in managing the campus but in the necessary advance planning. The process becomes even more complex when universities allow student numbers and programmes to increase in a learning environment that is untested and recently established. There are also implications for resources at the main campus. In all cases, London campuses were established with the approval of the relevant senior body in the universities, such as the board of governors and councils. Support from home campus departments and faculties was crucial to the processes.

2 Some universities were able to draw on the experience of establishing regional or local campuses near the main campus. Universities set up project/steering/implementation groups to plan the establishment of their London campuses, some using risk management techniques, with a risk register, to do so. In some cases market research or external representation from another university was used in the planning.

3 Financial and legal due diligence were undertaken prior to signing agreements. Universities followed standard approval procedures in determining whether the facilities and learning/teaching spaces would appropriately support programme delivery. A feature of establishing the campuses has been the relatively short time span between the initiative being started and the first intake of students. There are potential risks here in terms of the pressure on learning resources, especially when a significant increase in student numbers is planned.

4 The main rationale for establishing the campuses was to facilitate the recruitment of international students, although some campuses recruit home and EU students (one recruits only home students). Other motivations included building on the high reputations of programmes at the main campus in, for example, business and the status of London as a financial centre, making it an appropriate location to deliver business, management and accountancy programmes. In most cases, the plan to establish a London campus formed part of a wider strategy based on key strategic principles. For example, one university was motivated by the aims of diversifying its academic offer, replicating the character of its student experience and building on its subject reputation.

5 There are several types of operational model for the campuses, including:

- a franchised-based collaborative partnership
- a wholly owned subsidiary of the university with articles of association defining the powers and responsibilities of the company
- partnerships with private education organisations for delivering of franchised programmes as a joint venture
- development through previously established agreements with private organisations
- rental agreements with property companies.

In one instance there remains some ambiguity regarding the legal status of the London campus. Reviewers considered that there could be potential risks especially when there are disagreements with the private organisations (as has happened). There are also implications for the management of quality and standards especially when teaching staff are not employed by the universities. *Chapter B10: Managing Higher Education with Others* of the Quality Code states that 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.

6 Universities have set up management teams in London to run their operations. There was evidence of academic and administrative staff training being provided for London staff. Programmes were generally delivered by a combination of main campus staff and local staff. Resources, student support, the management of student data, recruitment and admissions were all included in the planning process.

7 Usually academic staff are on locally determined pay and conditions and are responsible to departments on the main campus. Most teaching staff are on part-time or flexible contracts, with one university explaining that this allows the campus to respond to fluctuations in international student recruitment. Another university identified the need for a more sustainable and consistent basis for staffing. Universities had to consider carefully the delivery model for their programmes, some having multiple intakes each year and different start dates from the main campuses. There are some potential risks with this mode of delivery, for example in tracking student progress. There is also a potential risk in employing mainly part-time staff, especially in relation to student support and guidance.

8 An important consideration in establishing the campuses is the potential risk to students of the project failing, with students not being able to complete their studies, or being left in learning environments that are not fit for purpose. The reviewers looked carefully at universities' contingency arrangements for ensuring that students could continue their studies. Where these were in evidence, the universities stated that they would not withdraw from London without allowing all students to complete by transferring to the main campus or continuing in London. They would put in place arrangements to continue to deliver the programmes in London and would only transfer students to an alternative programme, or to the same programme delivered at the main campus, with full consent of the students concerned. One university that did close its London campus informed all students of the decision and gave them the choice between transferring to the main campus or continuing to be taught in London.

9 Reviewers expressed concern about how one university had established its London campus. Following detailed preparatory work the university took over existing London provision from a private organisation, retaining that organisation's services for international marketing and recruitment. It engaged in a process of rapid expansion which saw student numbers increase rapidly in the first two years of operation. The QAA reviewers concluded that the university had underestimated the complexity and cost of establishing a remote campus and that the enterprise was in consequence underfunded and inadequately managed.

10 In another case the use of temporary premises, with limited teaching, social and catering spaces, led to some confusion over the start date of the academic programme, resulting in some students arriving after the induction period. Some of the learning resources were inadequate and student feedback was largely negative. In this case, the university has responded quickly and moved to new premises. It is planning a library to replicate the main campus library, refurbished to provide a learning environment consistent with that at the home institution.



## Making the London campuses work

11 The reviewers examined key documents demonstrating how universities planned to operate their London campuses. These included minutes of planning meetings, academic boards, and governing bodies and reports of audits/reviews undertaken by the universities.

12 The London campuses are at various stages of development. Two have enrolled students for the first time in 2014-15. Some have a single cohort and others have been longer established. There are variations in the operational models ranging from a campus operating as a Learning Centre owned by a university company to one where the campus had already been established by the private partner and had its own management systems and facilities. One university changed the status of its London campus to an academic division of the home university. At another campus reviewers noted that there remains a degree of uncertainty about the facilities and arrangements for students entering in September 2014.

13 Universities have sought to manage their London campuses on the basis that they are not separate entities legally, or in terms of governance, or for operational procedures. General university policies and procedures apply. These cover recruitment, admissions, induction, learning and teaching, student support, assessment, external examining, and student representation. The senior staff at the campuses are responsible to senior management at the main campus, typically the Pro-Vice Chancellor (Learning and Teaching). University academic boards retain responsibility for academic standards and quality. The universities provided clear evidence that there is robust and regular oversight of the operations of their London campuses at a senior level.

14 Day-to-day operational matters are overseen by management groups at the campuses. These appear under various titles including Campus Executive Team and the London Operations Team, with a board of directors. There are operation manuals for most of the campuses, adapted from those for the main campus. In one case the manual had not yet been completed. In other cases, detailed work on strengthening the management of the campus is ongoing.

15 Regular contact with the main campus is maintained to ensure that the campuses operate within an infrastructure that mirrors established processes. Members of the management at the London campuses attend key committees at the main campus although, in one case, evidence of this was not clear.

16 Admissions processes for the London campuses are normally guided by the principles that operate for the main campus. In the better admission systems, applications are made through the university's online application system with appropriate checks made on academic and English language qualifications. Final decisions are made by the admissions team and the relevant academic department. In one case staff from the registry travel to London to check on visas and certificates. For a teacher education programme, applicants must meet the Initial Teacher Education (ITE) requirements. One university has delegated admissions to staff at its London campus following appropriate training.

17 Application processes have been developed to ensure ongoing compliance with Tier 4 regulations, including checking Confirmation of Acceptance for Studies (CAS) letters. Application processes are regularly reviewed to ensure compliance with changes to UK Visa and Immigration Service guidance. To ensure that admissions processes are equitable between the main and London campuses, there are internal audits of the decisions. One university mapped its admissions processes in detail against *Chapter B2: Admissions* of the Quality Code.

18 Reviewers identified problems and potential risks in relation to admission processes. In one case the university placed recruitment in the hands of a private organisation which subcontracted to agents in different countries and led to a lack of control on admissions. At another campus, students were admitted when not appropriately qualified for their programmes. International qualifications were not aligned with UK qualifications; and students were accepted from a private UK organisation whose Home Office licence had been revoked. Also, the applications provided no evidence of relevant attainment, nor had they been translated into English. One campus had to provide emergency pre-registration language teaching to remedy the students' lack of appropriate qualifications. Another has relied on two major recruitment providers, but owing to concerns about the poor quality of some applications has terminated an agreement with one agency and is now moving towards developing its own online student recruitment and agent management system.

## Findings: Academic standards and quality of programmes

19 Given that many of the campuses are relatively new most of the systems for managing standards and quality are recent, with two as yet untested. However, arrangements are generally the same as for the main campuses. Terms of reference for the home universities' committees and boards include references to the London campuses. Staff from the London campuses are members of quality assurance committees at the main campuses. All universities publish clear guidance in their quality handbooks. Students have the opportunity to engage with quality processes. There are clear lines of responsibility between programme staff at the London campuses and departments, faculties or schools on the main campus.

### Approval and validation

20 In most cases the programmes offered on the London campuses are the same as those available on the main campus. However, an important consideration is the extent to which approval and validation processes have taken account of different circumstances on the London campuses. This is significant in relation to learning resources, teaching and learning spaces, and the expectation that learning experiences are comparable with those offered on the main campus. While programme content is similar, students may understand a 'similar experience' to extend to a well stocked library, social spaces and some form of campus life. There is a potential risk to student learning where a genuinely similar experience cannot be replicated.

21 Universities used their own standard procedures for programme approval and validation. Programme specifications were adapted for the London campuses. Approval and validation panels included both internal and external members. Documents supplied to reviewers demonstrated appropriate externality and appropriate attention given to learning outcomes, assessment, learning and teaching, and sharing of good practice. Universities aim to ensure parity of the learning experience across their campuses. Documentation indicates that approval processes take account of external reference points, notably the Quality Code and requirements of professional bodies, though at one university, programme specifications were not adapted for the London campus, meaning that the approval process was not fully aligned with the expectation *Chapter B1: Programme Design and Approval of the Quality Code*.

### Annual monitoring and review

22 Annual and periodic reviews generally include London campuses with the reports including evaluations of admissions and recruitment, learning resources, student progression and achievement, and responses to external examiners' reports including student comments and action plans. Reviews are comprehensive and indicate areas for improvement, supported by action plans. Where there was evidence of student evaluations, students were positive about the quality of teaching. Some campuses are more advanced than others in engaging students in the management of standards and quality, but work on this is ongoing. One university stated that new guidelines will be developed for the annual monitoring and review of its branch campus by September 2014. Reports are evaluative, objective and thorough, and have certainly helped the universities and campuses to identify and address any problems or areas for improvement.

## Assessment and external examining

23 External examiners' reports are reviewed at school and institutional levels. Examination results for both London and home campuses are considered at the same examination boards. Examiners receive training and are kept informed of developments at the London campuses. External examiners' reports are expected to address comparability of standards between the home and London campus. For example, at one London campus four of the five external examiners for the MBA programme were involved in reviewing the programme. There is a potential risk when it is not clear that external examiners are able to comment on student work at both the London and main campus. In relation to one university, an external examiner pointed to discrepancies in marking between its home and London campuses. There was an instance at one campus of examinations being conducted without a university presence. At another campus examination scripts showed evidence of plagiarism. There is potential risk of cheating and plagiarism when supervision of exams is weak and plagiarism checks are not applied.

## Progression and achievement data

24 The reliability of progression data for London campuses is affected by the fact that some have more than one annual intake which can make comparisons difficult. One university has developed a single database that allows comparisons of progression and achievement between its campuses. Another has developed a revised dataset for the London campus. Reviewers had concerns about:

- lower completion rates of London campus students, with one particular undergraduate programme having completion rates of 63 and 58 per cent in 2012 and 2013 respectively
- lower levels of performance and achievement compared with the main campus
- below-standard achievement identified by external examiners at one campus, with a withdrawal rate for one postgraduate programme of 31.8 per cent
- considerable variation across programmes and cohorts
- instances of incomplete and erroneous data.

25 Universities are aware that the attainment and completion rates of students on their London campuses may not match those of their counterparts on the main campuses. This they generally attribute to the admission of students with lower entry qualifications than on comparable programme at the home institution, though there is some evidence that the quality of learning resources and support is a contributory factor. In some cases, study skills sessions have improved the completion rates. Universities need to ensure that clear and reliable management information is used to compare student outcomes on their main and London campuses and should provide robust analyses to explain these differences to avoid potential risks to standards and quality.

## Findings: Information on higher education provision

26 The Expectation of *Part C: Information about Higher Education Provision* of the Quality Code is that 'higher education providers produce information for their intended audiences about the learning opportunities they offer that is fit for purpose, accessible and trustworthy'. *Part C* also states that providers should make available information that helps students select their programmes with an understanding of the academic environment in which they will study, which has particular relevance for the London campuses. The reviewers scrutinised a range of material including information on websites, prospectuses, student handbooks and marketing materials about the London campuses. They also looked at universities' processes for ensuring that this information is accurate, and accessible to potential students.

27 All the providers produced information specifically written for their London campuses. In many cases this is extensive and well presented. The universities aim to offer London students the same quality of information that students on the main campuses receive. For example, there are dedicated websites, handbooks and prospectus information explicitly referring to the London campuses, including information about admissions, induction, learning and teaching, assessment, student support, and complaints and appeals procedures. There are also references to accommodation and living in London.

28 Procedures for checking, approving and signing off information are the same as those practised on the main campus. Usually this involves academic staff working with marketing departments. Some universities involve group legal services and editorial boards. Staff at the London campuses are closely involved in checking the information through, for example, a London Centre steering group or Centre managers. Two providers included a thorough analysis of information provided to students as part of an extensive review of their London campus. In both cases issues were identified that needed to be addressed, for example, out of date information or misleading information that could raise false expectations. In some cases, students are involved in evaluating information about their learning opportunities.

29 The reviewers identified a number of issues for further consideration. There are potential risks when information for students about the learning environment and resources on the London campuses is not accurate, complete and/or fit for purpose. The reviewers identified the following examples:

- ambiguity in one instance regarding the naming of the London provision, where it was branded both as a private college and as a campus of the university and was referred to elsewhere as being validated by the university
- minimal information about its London campus on one university's website, and a video that makes reference to accommodation no longer used
- complaints from students that the information on the website was inaccurate about the length of the programmes (in this case the university has decided to monitor information on a more regular basis)
- concerns identified in the university's own review about raising inappropriate expectations
- information that does not make clear to students that the London campus has yet to admit students and that teaching and learning spaces are shared with a private catering college; uncertainty about the origins of photographs of a classroom and the library
- little mention by one university of how it checks the information used by agents in recruiting students including claims about an experience comparable to that available on the main campus.

## Conclusion

The thematic enquiry found that the London campuses are generally well managed. Universities have devoted considerable time and resources to establishing their London campuses and have given careful thought to the logistics. In most cases the opening of a London campus has formed part of a wider developmental strategy, particularly with reference to recruiting international students to postgraduate programmes.

Universities have appointed experienced management teams in London and communicate effectively with them. Approval and validation processes are thorough, give consideration to the context of the London campuses, and take account of external reference points, notably the Quality Code. Due consideration has been given to ensuring that students will be able to continue with their studies should a campus be closed.

In most cases admissions processes are well managed and are based on the procedures at the main campuses. Student support systems and approaches to teaching and learning are well organised. While the QAA reviewers identified problems with assessment processes in two London campuses, universities generally conduct the assessment of their London students in a rigorous manner. External examiners are used across the main and London campuses to ensure comparability of standards.

Universities are aware that students on the London campuses do not tend to perform as well as their counterparts on the main campuses, and they are taking action to address this issue. Where annual reviews and monitoring have been conducted, these have been thorough and open, with clear action plans to remedy any issues. The level of student engagement in quality management is more advanced in some campuses than in others.

The reviewers identified some areas requiring improvement with regard to the information available to students on the London campuses. In general, however, the processes for checking and signing off information are thorough and are based on the same procedures as those for the main campus.

### Positive features identified by the thematic analysis

The reviewers identified the following positive features:

- one University made full use of *Chapter B2: Admissions* of the Quality Code to check that its admissions processes were working effectively (paragraph 17)
- the thorough and evaluative annual reviews and audits used to monitor the standards and quality of the London campuses (paragraph 22).

### Areas of potential risk identified by the thematic analysis

The reviewers identified the following points for consideration:

#### **The management of disagreements with partner organisations**

Some operational models involved partnerships with private organisations where disagreements have arisen. Universities should ensure that the partnership is secure and sustainable and a comprehensive due diligence process has been followed (paragraph 5).

### **Use of teaching staff not employed by the university**

There are potential risks to the management of standards and quality when teaching staff are not employed by the university. Universities should ensure that this risk can be mitigated by ensuring that staff are fully involved in the management of standards and quality at all levels (paragraph 7).

### **Insufficient checks on student entry qualifications**

Students should be appropriately qualified for admission to the programme. Universities should ensure that the risk of non-completion can be mitigated by ensuring that admissions processes thoroughly check students' suitability and that students have the appropriate entry qualifications, and that these are scrupulously checked to enable them to complete the programmes and perform as well as students on the main campus (paragraphs 15, 16, 24 and 25).

### **Use of agents for recruiting students**

The use of agents in recruiting students posed a potential risk. Universities should ensure that this can be mitigated by regular appraisals of agents' performance (paragraph 18).

### **Systems vulnerable to academic malpractice**

Universities need to be vigilant for instances of academic malpractice including cheating in exams and plagiarism. Universities should ensure that this risk can be mitigated by ensuring there are rigorous procedures for exam supervision and for eliminating plagiarism, especially when teaching staff are not employed by the university (paragraph 23).

### **Differing progression and achievement outcomes for London-based students**

In several cases the progression, achievement and completion rates are lower for London-based students than for those studying on the main campus. Universities should ensure that this risk is addressed by making use of comparative data, especially where there are multiple intakes in the year, to understand and respond to these differences (paragraphs 24 and 25).

### **Limitations on space and other resources**

Resource problems can arise when there are rapid increases in student numbers. Universities should ensure that this risk can be mitigated by ensuring provision of suitable learning resources and spaces before increasing recruitment (paragraphs 3, 8, 9, 10, 12 and 20).

### **Reliance on part-time staff**

Where there is a reliance on staff who are part-time or on flexible contracts it can have implications for student support. Universities should ensure that this risk can be mitigated by universities planning a more consistent and sustainable staffing base (paragraph 7).

### **Different campus experience**

It is difficult to replicate the facilities of the main campus at a London campus. Universities should ensure that this risk can be mitigated by ensuring that the learning experiences of students on the London campuses are comparable with those on the main campus (paragraphs 10, 20, 21, 23, 24, 27 and 29).

### **Incomplete or inadequate published information**

Information for students on the London campuses is not always complete and fit for purpose. Universities should ensure that this risk can be mitigated by ensuring that information for students about the London campuses, especially regarding resources, accommodation and comparisons with the main campus, is accurate and complete (paragraph 29).

### **Actions and outlook for the future**

Where problems have been identified universities are taking steps to address them and to ensure appropriate learning experiences for students. QAA will monitor their progress through action plans and at the institution's next Higher Education Review.

In order to disseminate the findings of the thematic enquiry more widely an event will be held in early 2015 which will support the development of good practice across the sector.



## **Appendix 1: List of universities**

The enquiry looked at campuses of 13 universities, as listed below.

Anglia Ruskin University

Bangor University

Coventry University

University of Cumbria

University of East Anglia

Glasgow Caledonian University

Glyndŵr University

University of Liverpool

Northumbria University

University of South Wales

University of Sunderland

University of Ulster

University of Wales Trinity Saint David

## Appendix 2: About QAA

The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) is the independent body entrusted with monitoring, and advising on, standards and quality in UK higher education. Our mission is to safeguard standards and improve the quality of UK higher education wherever it is delivered around the world.

We recognise the primary role of UK universities and colleges in maintaining academic standards and quality, and we respect their autonomy. We rely on their cooperation in carrying out our work, and in return provide advice and support. The UK Quality Code for Higher Education (Quality Code), which we published and maintain, contains definitive national reference points and practical guidance for higher education providers on maintaining academic standards and improving quality.

QAA978 - Dec 14

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

Tel: 01452 557 000

Email: [enquiries@qaa.ac.uk](mailto:enquiries@qaa.ac.uk)

Website: [www.qaa.ac.uk](http://www.qaa.ac.uk)

Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786