



**Bellerbys Educational Services Ltd,  
Keele University International  
Study Centre**

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

June 2014

## Key findings about Bellerbys Educational Services Ltd, Keele University International Study Centre

The QAA review team (the team) formed the following judgements about Bellerbys Educational Services Ltd, Keele University International Study Centre:

The team has **limited confidence** in the provider's management of its responsibilities for the academic standards of the awards it offers through its embedded college provision.

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

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

### Good practice

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

- the high level of academic and pastoral support provided for students which enables them to be integrated into the University community (paragraph 2.9)
- teaching staff are well supported and given a wide range of opportunities for pedagogical development (paragraph 2.10).

### Recommendations

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

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

- ensure that all Academic Progress Reports for students are accurate and complete, and that systems are in place to manage these reports securely and consistently (paragraph 1.11).

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

- strengthen the use of reporting mechanisms so that Bellerbys Educational Services Ltd is made aware, in a timely fashion, of standards and quality issues in KUISC (paragraph 1.4)
- ensure that Module Assessment Boards are fully, accurately and clearly minuted (paragraph 1.6)
- review the use of terms which define student achievement, and ensure that they are used and explained clearly and consistently in all appropriate documentation (paragraph 1.7)
- clarify regulations concerning termination of study and ensure that they are accessible to staff and students (paragraph 1.8)
- include opportunities for progression to the first year of programmes at the University in published information for the benefit of prospective students (paragraph 3.2).

## About this report

This report presents the findings of the [Embedded College Review for Educational Oversight](#)<sup>1</sup> (ECREO) conducted by [QAA](#) at Bellerbys Education Services Ltd, Keele University International Study Centre (KUISC). 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 at KUISC. The review was carried out by Dr Sylvia Hargreaves and Professor Alan Jago (Reviewers) and Mr Alan Hunt (QAA Officer).

The review team conducted the review in agreement with the provider and in accordance with the [Embedded College Review for Educational Oversight: Handbook](#).<sup>2</sup> Evidence in support of the review included documentation supplied by Bellerbys Education Services Ltd (BES) and KUISC, and meetings with staff, students, and employers. Following an initial visit on 19 February 2014, the team returned to KUISC for a second visit on 19 June 2014.

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

- the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (Quality Code).

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

KUISC was established by agreement between BES and the University of Keele in a 'heads of agreement' signed in 2009, followed by a full inter-institutional agreement dated January 2010. The first cohort of students was admitted in September 2009. The original agreement has recently been reviewed and subsequently renewed for a further period to August 2023.

KUISC delivers programmes approved by BES which prepare international students for undergraduate and postgraduate study. There are currently 155 registered students.

At the time of the review KUISC offered the following higher education programmes:

- International Year 1 (Business and Management, Media, Computing, International Relations and Politics)
- Pre-Master's (Business and Management, Computing, Physiotherapy).

## The provider's stated responsibilities

The provider has responsibility for the academic standards and quality of the programmes listed above. It is supported in this by the University of Keele (the University), which applies the quality assurance mechanisms set out in the Quality Handbook, agreed between the University and KUISC, to assure itself that the programmes provide students with an appropriate foundation to succeed in their destination programmes at the University.

KUISC's submission for the review lists specific areas of operational responsibility that are shared between the University and KUISC, including curriculum development, management of assessment boards and staff development, and other areas, such as student recruitment and setting assessments, which are the responsibility of BES and KUISC.

---

<sup>1</sup> [www.qaa.ac.uk/en/ReviewsAndReports/Pages/Educational-Oversight-.aspx](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/ReviewsAndReports/Pages/Educational-Oversight-.aspx)

<sup>2</sup> [www.qaa.ac.uk/en/Publications/Documents/Embedded-College-Handbook.pdf](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/Publications/Documents/Embedded-College-Handbook.pdf)

## **Recent developments**

KUISC has recently moved to refurbished specialised facilities in the University of Keele Management Centre.

A new contract between the University of Keele and BES was signed on 10 December 2013 and took effect on completion.

## **Students' contribution to the review**

Students studying on higher education programmes at the provider were invited to present a submission to the review team. The student submission provided for the review comprised a collection of extracts from four student journals. At the review visit, students explained that the journals, which students are required to keep on a continuing basis, are discussed with tutors weekly and submitted for review at the end of each term. Students said that they had not been involved in selecting the extracts submitted for the review, had not seen the submission and were not aware that the journals had been drawn on in this way. Senior staff reported that the journal extracts forming the submission had been randomly selected.

At the visit, the review team met five students of various nationalities, all of whom commenced the International Year 1 programme in September 2013.

## Detailed findings about Bellerbys Educational Services Ltd, Keele University International Study Centre

### 1 Academic standards

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

1.1 A new contract between BES and the University was signed in December 2013 and took effect on completion for a term expiring in August 2023, with five-yearly formal reviews. The original agreement between BES and the University, which was due to expire in July 2014, provided for the University to undertake a partnership re-recognition process in 2013. This process has been completed and, in response to its recommendations, KUISC has, in consultation with the University, changed the degree progression requirements and aligned marking schemes with those of the University (see also paragraph 1.5).

1.2 The University's re-recognition incorporated the endorsement of BES's own re-approval of KUISC programmes. The re-approval event, chaired by the Head of Centre from another BES International Study Centre, included an external academic panel member, whose extensive and detailed comments were appropriately considered. Senior managers indicate that the BES approval process is still under review and development.

1.3 Programme monitoring is undertaken on a continuing basis by the Centre Management Group, which meets monthly and reviews progress on KUISC's rolling action plan. The action plan feeds into the annual monitoring process through the Head of Centre's Annual Monitoring Report, which is submitted to BES and the University and considered by the Joint Board of Studies. The most recent report reviews the items specified in KUISC's Quality Handbook, including achievement and progression data and student and external examiner feedback, as well as actions completed from the previous year, areas of good practice and actions required.

1.4 However, monitoring processes are not operating effectively as mechanisms for reporting upwards to BES issues of a serious nature arising at KUISC during the course of the year. BES was not aware that inaccurate Academic Progress Reports had been issued to students by KUISC (see also paragraphs 1.10 and 1.11) and was unaware of the errors that had been made and which came to light during the course of the review. It is **advisable** for KUISC to strengthen the use of reporting mechanisms so that BES is made aware, in a timely fashion, of standards and quality issues in KUISC.

#### How effectively does KUISC manage the assessment of students?

1.5 Procedures for setting and marking assessments are working effectively and in accordance with KUISC procedures. Senior managers said that concerns raised by one external examiner about lack of systematic and rigorous second marking were being addressed. Revised progression requirements to the University's undergraduate degree programmes, agreed between KUISC and the University, were introduced at the beginning of the current academic year. Completing International Year 1 students must now achieve a minimum mark of 40 per cent (formerly 65 per cent on a different marking scale) in all modules except English language, to progress to undergraduate year two, and 30 per cent (formerly 45 per cent on a different marking scale) to progress to undergraduate year one. Alongside this development, the University's generic grade criteria were formally adopted by KUISC and are now being applied in the assessment process, in articulation with module learning outcomes and assignment-based marking criteria. Staff have received appropriate

development in relation to these significant changes and students are clear about the current provisions.

1.6 Module Assessment Board minutes are incomplete and unclear. The role titles of attendees and those offering apologies are not reported and recorded decisions do not cover all students under consideration but relate only to 'students of concern'. A set of recent minutes is inaccurate as to the meeting date and contains a confusingly drafted statement concerning post-board administrative procedures. It is **advisable** for KUISC to ensure that Module Assessment Boards are fully, accurately and clearly minuted.

1.7 When asked about pass grades, senior managers described 'passing' as 'a difficult term where students can't progress'. Different terms are used when 'every assessment has been sat, and in order to make a distinction between progression and completion without progression'. However, the terminology is not applied consistently: usage differs between the KUISC website and offer letters to students, and KUISC assessment regulations and Module Assessment Board minutes, which refer to 'pass' and 'fail'. The KUISC Quality Handbook refers to 'passing' modules at level 3 with a minimum mark of 40 and modules at level 4 with a minimum mark of 30, but also refers to students who have 'failed a module at a mark below 40'. It is **advisable** for KUISC to review the use of terms which define student achievement, and ensure that they are used and explained clearly and consistently in all appropriate documentation.

1.8 Senior managers stated that Module Assessment Boards do not have the power to withdraw students from a course, but that students with failed modules can be counselled, with a view to them voluntarily leaving the programme. However, the minutes of a recent Module Assessment Board record that 'Any students who fail all modules may be withdrawn from the course' and that a particular student with two failed modules, poor attendance and poor academic performance 'will be withdrawn from the course'. A KUISC leakage analysis, covering the 2012-13 academic year, refers to 12 students who had left due to poor academic performance and later to the same students 'who were terminated due to poor academic performance'. It is **advisable** for KUISC to clarify regulations concerning termination of study and ensure that they are accessible to staff and students.

1.9 At the visit, senior managers described the procedure that had been applied in investigating and determining a recent case of student academic misconduct. Although this description did not align with KUISC procedures in cases of academic impropriety, the review team saw correspondence from the Head of Centre to a student, concerning another recent case of plagiarism, which confirms that that investigation was carried out in accordance with KUISC regulations. The monitoring team was told that there is currently no BES-level monitoring of the incidence of academic misconduct and that a review of processes is being initiated centrally.

1.10 Students receive termly Academic Progress Reports. These bear Study Group and University logos and set out grades achieved, subjects requiring resits and grade thresholds for progression to the University. Inaccurate Academic Progress Reports had been issued to students. A sample International Year 1 Academic Progress Report for term one in 2013-14 seen by the monitoring team is unsigned and undated and sets out incorrect progression thresholds. KUISC had issued corrected Academic Progress Reports to students, but a sample of these contain further, different inaccuracies. KUISC acknowledged that other Academic Progress Reports were inaccurate.

1.11 KUISC stores the original, inaccurate Academic Progress Reports on its electronic administrative system, albeit on a separate drive. This creates a high risk of error in communicating information to students and, ultimately, to stakeholders. Senior managers stated that BES was moving towards taking central control in this area, through the

introduction of a specialist application during 2014 to drive standardisation. Currently, International Study Centres use different systems and BES has no overview. It is **essential** for KUISC to ensure that all Academic Progress Reports for students are accurate and complete, and that systems are in place to manage these reports securely and consistently.

### **How effectively are UK external reference points used in the management of academic standards?**

1.12 The BES Head of Quality is actively monitoring and supporting work in progress at KUISC on the mapping of its provision to the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (Quality Code), and indicated satisfaction with current progress at KUISC. The Head of Centre learns about developments regarding the Quality Code through QAA News and also BES communications. KUISC teaching staff have received briefings on the Quality Code and offered examples of its impact on the development of practice at KUISC with respect to peer observation and improved assessment documentation, in particular the standard template now being used for providing feedback students.

1.13 BES recognises the need, across the network of International Study Centres, for a minimum level of expectation for quality assurance aligned with the provisions of the Quality Code, and work is in progress on the production of a provider quality handbook.

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

1.14 KUISC uses external examining effectively and in accordance with its documented procedures. The University appoints external examiners to KUISC programmes exclusively. The Quality Handbook sets out their role, which is governed by the University's code of practice on external examining, and the processes for reporting and responding to external examiner reports.

1.15 Assessment briefs are sent to the external examiners for comment. External examiners attend programme assessment boards and report to the University using the University's reporting template. The reports are copied to KUISC and are seen by staff, who contribute to the response written by the Head of Centre. The responses are considered for approval through University processes before being despatched by the Head of Centre to the external examiners. External examiners were generally satisfied that their comments were appropriately addressed.

1.16 KUISC staff and students have access to external examiners' reports, and responses to them, through the University's virtual learning environment (VLE).

### **How effectively does KUISC use statistical information to monitor and assure academic standards?**

1.17 KUISC uses statistical information regarding admissions, withdrawals, progression within the programme, completion, progression to the University and student achievement at the University. It gathers, analyses and reports this data through various International Study Centre, International Study Centre/higher education institution and Study Group/higher education institution mechanisms, including the annual monitoring process and the deliberations of Steering Group and the Joint Board of Studies.

1.18 KUISC has taken a series of remedial actions, over an extended period, in response to data on the initial poor performance of students progressing to University undergraduate degree programmes, particularly to year one. KUISC identified this issue

through data analysis in link tutor reports, and considered it in detail at the Joint Board of Studies.

1.19 KUISC has put in place enhanced academic support for students on examination technique, referencing and the use of anti-plagiarism software. Modules have been reviewed to ensure effective alignment with University modules and feedback to students improved and extended to include generalised feedback on the VLE. The progression requirement for entry to undergraduate year one at the University has been raised (see paragraph 1.7). KUISC has continued to monitor the impact of these measures and reported perceptible improvements to student performance at the University in 2012-13.

The review team has **limited confidence** in the provider's management of its responsibilities for the standards of the awards it offers through embedded college provision.

## 2 Quality of learning opportunities

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

2.1 The agreement between BES and the University commits the former to providing the infrastructure resources required for teaching and learning and the arrangements for supporting students, and the latter to providing these resources. KUISC students have the same access to resources as the University's own students: they can use the University's library and information technology facilities, including the VLE, and the support services, and they all have a University card and membership of the Students' Union. Students confirm they have full access to all learning and support facilities of the University. Most teaching takes place in purpose-built accommodation provided by the University for the exclusive use of KUISC students and staff, but students occasionally visit other teaching areas in the University.

2.2 Senior managers of KUISC hold monthly Centre Management meetings which regularly review the quality of learning opportunities, taking account of student feedback. Analysis of feedback from students, and from teaching staff and link tutors, also informs both the Internal Action Plan and the Annual Monitoring Report.

### How effectively are external reference points used in the management and enhancement of learning opportunities?

2.3 Regular meetings across BES's networks of Heads of Centre and Heads of English ensure that senior staff are kept informed of developments in the sector and across the network in relation to the management and enhancement of learning opportunities. The roles of external examiners, and the presence of external panel members in programme reviews, reinforce the use of external reference points.

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

2.4 Teaching observation is the primary way in which KUISC assures itself about the quality of teaching and learning. The relevant line manager observes teaching on an annual basis. Student feedback is also an important mechanism for ensuring that the quality of teaching is being maintained. The Head of Centre considers any negative feedback about individual teachers and takes any necessary action. An annual staff appraisal meeting for all

staff generates an appraisal report and agreed action plan. In addition, staff at KUISC have set up a peer observation system, and staff find this both supportive and valuable.

### **How effectively does KUISC make use of student feedback to assure and enhance the quality of learning opportunities?**

2.5 KUISC makes use of standard questionnaires administered at the end of induction, and also at the end of each term for the modules taught during the term. Results are analysed within the centre, discussed at the monthly management meetings, and incorporated into the Annual Monitoring Report. Students meet every week with their personal tutor (see paragraph 2.9), and this is also a very effective mechanism for eliciting student feedback.

2.6 KUISC operates a student representation system, with students drawn from each tutor group. The Head of Centre briefs students who volunteer to be representatives. They meet with KUISC staff at regular intervals on the Centre Board. In addition they use their weekly tutorials (paragraph 2.9) to gather comments and complaints from their fellow students. Students are generally positive about KUISC's responsiveness to issues they had raised.

### **How effectively does KUISC assure itself that students are supported effectively?**

2.7 Pre-arrival information for students covers a range of important matters including accommodation, finance, term dates, advice on Home Office procedures and getting to KUISC. An induction programme for new students includes not only programme requirements but also an introduction to the University, orientation to the campus, and immigration and health care matters. Students view this as a good introduction to KUISC and the programmes.

2.8 Students receive a Student Handbook which is available online and in hard copy. It contains detailed information about conduct, assessment, and progression to the University. Students confirm that the documentation with which they are provided is clear, accurate and helpful.

2.9 KUISC operates a personal tutor system and students have tutorials on a weekly basis. Personal tutors are available additionally for one-to-one sessions and students can contact them by email. Students confirmed that these arrangements are in place, and were positive about the level of support they received. Personal tutorials are one of the main ways in which support and guidance on matters such as academic progress, and advice on such things as complaints and appeals is given. Students also appreciate the support and advice given by individual teachers and office staff. The University also supports KUISC students, who visit University departments and have briefings from subject staff. They attend events organised by the University's International Recruitment and Development Office, whose staff make presentations to them. The high level of academic and pastoral support provided for students which enables them to be integrated into the University community is **good practice**.

### **How effective are KUISC's arrangements for staff development to maintain and/or enhance the quality of learning opportunities?**

2.10 KUISC employs a combination of full-time, part-time and sessional staff to deliver its programmes. There is an induction process for new staff, and an appraisal system which incorporates teaching observation. Staff development arrangements are discussed at appraisal meetings. There are a number of strands to staff development at KUISC.

Events are organised within KUISC; most recently these have included discussions about progression arrangements and marking criteria. In addition staff take part in staff development opportunities provided by BES; these include the annual Teachers' Conference, which five staff attended when it was last held. Staff are also able to take part in staff development activities organised within the University. Staff confirm that they are notified of these opportunities through their membership of the University IT network. Overall, teaching staff are well supported and given a wide range of opportunities for pedagogical development, which is **good practice**.

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

2.11 From the evidence provided to the review team it is clear that the learning resources available to students at KUISC are adequate to enable them to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

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

## **3 Information about learning opportunities**

### **How effectively does KUISC communicate to students and other stakeholders about the higher education it provides?**

3.1 Students receive information about KUISC through agents and through the website and prospectuses. Most students met by the review team had been recruited through BES agents; generally they had found the information provided by agents to be helpful and accurate. They also used the website and prospectuses to gain additional information about KUISC, and they found these clear and easy to navigate.

3.2 Information about the progression arrangements to the University is generally clear. It is available in the prospectus, on the website and in the Student Handbook, and publicised in notices in KUISC. However, students said that the arrangements by which they can progress to year one of a relevant degree programme, if they do not succeed in meeting the requirements for progression to year two, were not notified to them until they entered KUISC. It is **advisable** for KUISC to include opportunities for progression to the first year of programmes at the University in published information for the benefit of prospective students.

3.3 Students confirm that they receive pre-arrival information, and also a Student Handbook. They also confirm that, in general, the information provided by KUISC was useful and effective.

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

3.4 All public information relevant to KUISC is produced by BES after first being approved by the University. Clear processes are in place for both printed and website content. Generally information is complete and accurate and the processes followed were fit for purpose.

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 through embedded colleges.

## Action plan

Bellerbys Educational Services Ltd, Keele University International Study Centre: action plan relating to Embedded College Review for Educational Oversight June 2014						
Good practice	Intended outcomes	Actions to be taken to achieve intended outcomes	Target date(s)	Action by	Reported to	Evaluation (process or evidence)
The review team identified the following areas of <b>good practice</b> that are worthy of wider dissemination at the provider:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the high level of academic and pastoral support provided for students which enables them to be integrated into the University community (paragraph 2.9)</li> </ul>	Build on previous good practice	Review with staff and students the effectiveness of current processes	31 August 2014	Head of Centre	All: Academic Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee via enhanced reporting structure	Reviewed by the Student Representative Group with recommendation made to the Course Committee and Joint Board of Studies via the Annual Monitoring Report
	Enhance current practice in order to further enhance the student experience	Review good practice across the network that could be adding value to KUISC	31 August 2014			
	Improvement in student retention rates	Identify good practice from within the University of Keele that can be brought into KUISC	31 August 2014	Head of Centre		

		Identify staff training needs around student support and develop a training plan	6 September 2014	Head of Centre		Monitoring Report  Impact on retention will be evaluated at Steering and Joint Board of Studies through a review of the key metrics
		Develop a student support and engagement action plan for implementation in the 2014-15 academic year	6 September 2014	Head of Centre		Course Committee also review the action plan and feed up into Joint Board of Studies via Annual Monitoring Report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>teaching staff are well supported and given a wide range of opportunities for pedagogical development (paragraph 2.10).</li> </ul>	<p>Consider support for staff taking further qualification and appropriate accreditations</p> <p>Enhance the level of pedagogic scholarly activity</p>	During staff appraisals individual discussions will take place on this subject	9 September 2014	Head of Centre	All: Academic Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee via enhanced reporting structure	All: Course Committee also review the action plan and feed up into the Joint Board of Studies via Annual Monitoring Report
		Where there are cost implications, budgetary requests will be made	October 2014	Head of Centre and Director and Principal		
		Encourage more research-informed teaching through the setting up of action learning sets around key	Set(s) set up by December 2014	Head of Centre/ Human Resources		

		<p>themes connected with teaching international students</p> <p>Review with staff during appraisals specific research interests</p> <p>Engage link tutors in discussion regarding curriculum development</p> <p>Continued Heads of English networking to cascade good practice into KUISC</p> <p>English action plan to be written</p> <p>Develop cascading of best practice across the centre, particularly between English and subject teachers</p>	<p>By September 2014</p> <p>By December 2014 (Joint Board of Studies)</p> <p>December 2014</p> <p>December 2014</p> <p>November 2014 and July 2015</p>	<p>Business Partner</p> <p>Head of Centre</p> <p>Head of Centre</p> <p>Head of Centre</p> <p>Head of English</p> <p>Head of Centre</p>		
	<p>Enhanced teaching and learning within the English curriculum</p> <p>Benefit from wider networking opportunities</p>	<p>Teachers to attend Teachers' Conference, with an additional brief to attend sessions decided by the centre staff</p>				

		Those who attend have a responsibility to both cascade and then track changes in practice	December 2014			
		Centre will implement the 'student persistence self-assessment', as outlined at the last Teachers' Conference	December 2014	Head of Centre		
	Maximise the opportunity to collaborate with or benefit from higher education institution initiatives	Establish the extent to which KUISC staff can engage in University of Keele organised staff development sessions	September 2014	Head of English		
		Through staff appraisal identify individual staff needs and interests	December 2014	Head of Centre		
		Direct staff explicitly to the relevant web pages where continuing professional development is publicised and follow up with them at appraisals later in the year		Head of English		

Essential	Intended outcomes	Actions to be taken to achieve intended outcomes	Target date(s)	Action by	Reported to	Evaluation (process or evidence)
The team considers that it is <b>essential</b> for the provider to:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ensure that all Academic Progress Reports for students are accurate and complete, and that systems are in place to manage these reports securely and consistently (paragraph 1.11).</li> </ul>	<p>That all Academic Progress Report templates and issued Academic Progress Reports are accurate and complete, and that robust systems are in place to manage these reports securely and consistently</p> <p>A clear accountability for the accuracy and completeness of academic progress reports and transcripts</p>	<p>Conduct a detailed review of existing academic progress report templates for all academic programmes to ensure they are correct against programme documents at KUISC</p> <p>Introduce a protocol across all International Study Centres that requires Heads of Centre to be responsible for accuracy of information for any student-facing progress report or transcript of results</p>	<p>10 August 2014</p> <p>10 August 2014</p>	<p>Acting Head of Centre</p> <p>Head of Quality</p>	<p>Director and Principal, ISCs UK and Europe; Regional Director</p> <p>Director and Principal, ISCs UK and Europe</p>	<p>KUISC June 2014 Finishers Academic Progress Reports Review; KUISC August 2014 Finishers Academic Progress Reports Review; Academic Progress Reports April/June/August; module spreadsheets</p> <p>International Study Centre Record of Results Management Policy; provider quality handbook</p>

	A data storage and retrieval system that is consistent across the KUISC network and with clear levels of personnel access and ownership	The production of an operational protocol for all centres requiring Heads of Centre to implement a process for transcript and Academic Progress Report control, with clear rules on access to databases, the management of existing documents and the removal or archiving of documents	10 August 2014	Head of Quality	Director and Principal, ISCs UK and Europe	International Study Centre Record of Results Management Policy; provider quality handbook
	Ensure rigour of progression outcomes of students; lessons learnt to enhance future process	Complete the review of the academic progress reports issued for the 2013-14 cohort to establish a full audit trail and to evaluate the remedial action taken, and confirm whether any student was disadvantaged by the Academic Progress Report issue and any action taken to address this	1 August 2014	Acting Head of Centre	Director and Principal, ISCs UK and Europe; Regional Director	KUISC June 2014 Finishers Academic Progress Reports Review; KUISC August 2014 Finishers Academic Progress Reports Review
	Progresso system in place and operational to ensure marks' validity and error-free record of results control	Implement Study Group student information management system Progresso at KUISC for the academic year 2014-15	10 August 2014	Director and Principal, ISCs UK and Europe	Academic Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee	Progresso implemented at KUISC; performance updates provided to Academic

						Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee through newly enhanced quality assurance reporting structure
<b>Advisable</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 is <b>advisable</b> for the provider to:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>strengthen the use of reporting mechanisms so that Bellerbys Educational Services Ltd is made aware, in a timely fashion, of standards and quality issues in KUISC (paragraph 1.4)</li> </ul>	BES overview of KUISC-level issues through a formal structure allowing for reporting and implementation	<p>Enhanced governance structure to be implemented with quarterly meetings providing a coherent framework of communication at local, regional and national levels</p> <p>This requires completion of the following: terms of reference for each committee, organogram, template agendas, minutes structure</p>	10 August 2014	Head of Quality	Director and Principal, ISCs UK and Europe	Reporting structure policy, provider quality handbook

	Training for all Heads of Centre at KUISC, 11-12 August 2014	<p>The new structure will feed directly into the newly established UK Higher Education Enhancement, Quality and Compliance Board</p> <p>Protocol for escalation of urgent issues directly to BES to be produced and circulated</p>	10 August 2014	Head of Quality	Director and Principal, ISCs UK and Europe	Reporting structure policy, provider quality handbook, training event notes 11-12 August 2014
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ensure that Module Assessment Boards are fully, accurately and clearly minuted (paragraph 1.6)</li> </ul>	Ensure examination boards and other committees operate effectively (and all relevant staff are present to ensure high quality decision-making) and that the discussion and decisions are fully, accurately and clearly minuted	<p>Develop minimum standards in terms of the conduct of committee business (including examination boards), amend quoracy requirements and develop guidance on the minuting of meetings; arrange for training of all chairs and secretaries in relation to these new minimum standards</p> <p>New document produced for managing programme and module boards including best practice templates for production of minutes</p>	25 July 2014	Acting Head of Centre	Director and Principal, ISCs UK and Europe; Regional Director	Minutes from Module Assessment Boards, Programme Assessment Boards, KUISC

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>review the use of terms which define student achievement, and ensure that they are used and explained clearly and consistently in all appropriate documentation (paragraph 1.7)</li> </ul>	<p>Consistency across the network and clarity for students</p>	<p>Provider produces new glossary in liaison with the University of Keele on terminology relating to completion, pass, fail, success in relation to the progression rules operating at the KUISC</p>	10 August 2014	Acting Head of Centre	Director and Principal, ISCs UK and Europe; Regional Director	KUISC Glossary incorporated into Quality Handbook 2014-15
		<p>KUISC update of all documentation, including public facing, to ensure consistency with Glossary on terminology</p>	10 August 2014	Acting Head of Centre	Director and Principal, ISCs UK and Europe; Regional Director	KUISC Quality Handbook, Student Handbook, KUISC website, brochure
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>clarify regulations concerning termination of study and ensure that they are accessible to staff and students (paragraph 1.8)</li> </ul>	<p>Review and enhancement of current position</p>	<p>Full audit of rules concerning termination of study within the Internal Audit Plan; review and strengthen termination arrangements, which will be either in relation to academic performance, engagement with studies/attendance (with reference to Home Office requirements) and fitness to study</p> <p>These revised rules will identify key decision-making points and role/responsibilities of both KUISC staff and students</p>	10 July 2014	Acting Head of Centre	Director and Principal, ISCs UK and Europe; Regional Director	KUISC Quality Handbook, Student Handbook, Module Assessment Board minutes, Programme Assessment Board minutes

		Rules will be updated in KUISC documentation				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>include opportunities for progression to the first year of programmes at the University in published information for the benefit of prospective students (paragraph 3.2).</li> </ul>	Year one progression opportunities published for prospective students	<p>Website updated to provide this information to prospective students</p> <p>New 2015-16 brochure to include the same wording</p>		<p>Web and Mobile Performance Manager</p> <p>Acting Head of Centre</p>	<p>Acting Head of Centre</p> <p>Director and Principal, ISCs UK and Europe; Regional Director</p>	<p>KUISC website</p> <p>KUISC brochure 2015-16</p>

## About QAA

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

QAA's aims are to:

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

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

More information about the work of QAA is available at: [www.qaa.ac.uk](http://www.qaa.ac.uk).

More detail about Embedded College Review for Educational Oversight can be found at: [www.qaa.ac.uk/en/ReviewsAndReports/Pages/Educational-Oversight-.aspx](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/ReviewsAndReports/Pages/Educational-Oversight-.aspx).

## 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 *Embedded College Review for Educational Oversight: Handbook*<sup>3</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 standard**.

**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).

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

**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 audit and review processes.

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

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

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

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

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

---

<sup>3</sup> [www.qaa.ac.uk/en/Publications/Documents/Embedded-College-Handbook.pdf](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/Publications/Documents/Embedded-College-Handbook.pdf)

**partner higher education institution** A body with the authority to award academic qualifications located on the **framework for higher education qualifications**, such as diplomas or degrees.

**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 ECREO, 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').

**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.

**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.

**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 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 for higher education qualifications** and **subject benchmark statements**. See also **academic standards**.

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

#### QAA874 - R3924 - 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