British Institute of Technology and E-commerce Ltd

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

February 2014

Key findings about British Institute of Technology and E-commerce Ltd

As a result of its Review for Educational Oversight carried out in February 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 ATHE Ltd, the Chartered Management Institute, Pearson, the University of East London, Staffordshire University and the University of Wales.

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

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

Good practice

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

- the clear and rigorous teaching observations which effectively inform staff development priorities and enhance the quality of learning (paragraph 2.5)
- the range and take-up of staff development opportunities which effectively support teaching and learning (paragraph 2.11).

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:

- introduce separate programme committees for each programme (paragraph 1.4)
- complete the mapping of its policies and procedures against the Quality Code in accordance with its published plan (paragraph 2.4)
- improve the methods of identifying additional learning support needs (paragraph 2.8)
- review the use of student data to support programme management, student progression and achievement (paragraph 2.10)
- ensure that programme specifications are published in all handbooks and on the virtual learning environment (paragraph 3.2).

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

- develop an overarching report on the management of academic standards and quality based on annual monitoring (paragraph 1.5)
- review all job descriptions to reflect the full range of post-holder responsibilities (paragraph 2.2)
- develop a process for the review of student support services to monitor effectiveness and support enhancements (paragraph 2.9)
- specify minimum module content for the virtual learning environment (paragraph 2.13)
- increase the use of the document management systems (paragraph 3.4).

About this report

This report presents the findings of the [Review for Educational Oversight](#)[1] (REO) conducted by [QAA](#) at the British Institute of Technology and E-commerce Ltd (the Institute), 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 ATHE Ltd, Chartered Management Institute, Pearson, the University of East London, Staffordshire University and the University of Wales. The review was carried out by Mr Peter Hymans, Mrs Jenny Steer, Ms Deborah Trayhurn (reviewers) and Mrs Mandy Hobart (coordinator).

The review team conducted the review in agreement with the provider and in accordance with the *[Review for Educational Oversight: Handbook](#)*.[2] Evidence in support of the review included Memoranda of Agreement, policies and procedures, annual monitoring reports, minutes of meetings and external examiner reports, meetings with staff and students, and reports of reviews by QAA.

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

- the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (Quality Code)
- the Credit and Qualifications Framework.

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

The Institute was founded in 1999 by the current Chief Executive Officer. It has a main campus in Stratford in the London Borough of Newham, a central London campus in Oxford Street and a third campus, Shrubland Hall in Suffolk, offering executive training courses. At the time of the review, the Institute had 3,836 registered students, of whom 3,662 were studying on higher-level programmes. The Institute offers provision in business and management, finance, computing, fashion, electrical and electronic engineering and hospitality and tourism.

The Institute's mission is to 'create fusion of education, research and consultancy to advance knowledge and skills in response to the ever-changing and challenging business environment'. The higher education offered is intended to meet the demands of industry, support students in the development of their careers, and facilitate progression to postgraduate degrees.

At the time of the review, the provider offered the following higher education programmes, listed beneath their awarding bodies and organisations, with the student headcount in brackets:

ATHE Ltd
- Level 6 Diploma in Management (80)
- Level 7 Diploma in Health and Social Care (23)

Chartered Management Institute (CMI)
- Level 8 Diploma in Strategic Direction and Leadership (219)

---

[1] www.qaa.ac.uk/educational-oversight
[2] www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Pages/REO-designated-providers-handbook-13.aspx

Pearson
- HNC Business (62)
- HND Business (2,254)
- HNC Computing and Systems Development (18)
- HND Fashion and Textiles (299)
- Level 7 Extended Diploma in Strategic Management and Leadership (138)

University of East London
- BSc Technology and E-commerce (76)
- MSc Network Technology (8)

Staffordshire University
- BA (Hons) Accounting and Finance (0)
- BA (Hons) Business Management (82)
- BSc (Hons) Computing (10)
- BEng (Hons) Electronic & Electrical Engineering (0)
- BSc (Hons) Networking and Mobile Technologies (0)
- LLM International Business Law (15)
- MSc Accounting (0)
- MSc Electronic and Communication Engineering (0)
- MBA Banking & Finance (0)
- MA Hospitality and Tourism Management (7)
- MSc Information Technology (11)
- MBA Strategic Management and Leadership (89)

University of Wales
- MBA Banking and Finance (43)
- MBA Executive (196)
- MSc Fashion Technology (5)
- MA and Tourism Management (2)
- MSc Security Technology (25).

The provider's stated responsibilities

The Institute is responsible for the management of marketing, recruitment, admission
assessment and internal verification for all its provision. All partner universities and awarding
organisations retain final responsibility for the academic standards of their awards.
Annual monitoring reports are produced to meet the requirements of partner universities and
to provide a clear overview for programme leaders and senior managers. Reports are
produced for awarding organisations to demonstrate appropriate management of provision
and compliance with documentary requirements. In practice, the relationships with the
University of Wales and the University of East London are being phased out under agreed
exit arrangements.

Recent developments

A new partnership has been developed with Staffordshire University and provision validated
by the University of Wales and the University of East London is being phased out in line with
the partnership agreements. In September 2013, the Institute received approval from the
Department of Business, Innovation and Skills to register with the Student Loans Company
for its three higher national certificate and diploma programmes. This has had a significant
impact on student numbers, resulting in around 2,500 additional registrations in the
autumn term.

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 results of recent surveys and forums collated by a group of student leaders and class representatives were summarised in the student written submission which the team found very informative. The coordinator met students as part of the preparatory visit, and the team met students during the review visit.

Detailed findings about the British Institute of Technology and E-commerce

1   Academic standards

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

1.1   The Institute has clear mechanisms for the management of its responsibilities for academic standards as delegated by its six awarding bodies and organisations. The Institute is developing a single validation relationship with Staffordshire University. The management of the Institute is led by the Chief Executive who chairs the Executive Committee. The Academic Board, chaired by the Principal, maintains oversight of academic standards and quality.

1.2   The Institute has a systematic and effective governance and committee structure. The Academic Board, which reports directly to the Executive Committee and through it to the Council, has prime responsibility for determining academic strategy and the oversight of academic standards and the quality of learning opportunities. The Academic Board, which includes student representation, receives reports from the Learning and Quality Committee, including an overview of external examiner reports and action plans. The Learning and Quality Committee focuses on the operational management of academic standards including assessment and the student experience. It also oversees programme approval and review and annual monitoring.

1.3   Academic standards are managed well at programme and subject level by the Associate Deans and programme leaders. Programme leaders line-manage module leaders and other teaching staff, and are responsible for their appraisal, the mentoring of new staff, and the observation of teaching. Assessments set by module leaders are internally verified and externally moderated to ensure that they are at the required level and cover the learning outcomes. Programme staff and student representatives meet together in programme committees, and student feedback clearly informs the monitoring of standards and quality. Meetings are well documented and actions followed up.

1.4   Programme committees review the academic standards of programmes grouped by awarding body for university-validated provision which, in the case of programmes validated by Staffordshire University, represents a significant range and variety. The Professional Programmes Committee considers all the non-university awards regardless of subject and level, including the higher national certificates and diplomas. Currently over 68 per cent of students enrolled at the Institute are studying on higher national programmes which fall under this general grouping of provision. There is little differentiated commentary for individual programmes, other than the University of East London provision. Separate programme boards consider student results, progression and awards. It is **advisable** for the Institute to introduce separate programme committees for each programme to ensure clear management of academic standards in all areas.

1.5   The comprehensive Academic Standards and Quality Assurance Handbook is designed for all staff, but is particularly relevant to teachers and those closely involved in the management of academic programmes. While this document is a valuable guide, the 2013-14 version continues to reference the Academic Infrastructure and requires updating. Annual monitoring reports are produced by each team in compliance with the General Manual of Regulations and in accordance with awarding body requirements, though formats and content vary. The Institute confirmed that it plans to introduce a common annual report template based on the Staffordshire University model. Reports are considered by the

Learning and Quality Committee and action plans agreed. No institution report is currently produced to provide an overview of the management of academic standards. It would be **desirable** for the Institute to develop an overarching report on the management of academic standards and quality based on annual monitoring evidence.

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

1.6 Constructive use of the Quality Code has been made in preparing for the validation of new degree programmes by Staffordshire University. Qualifications have been referenced to subject benchmarks and reflect the expectations of *Chapter B1: Programme design, development and approval* of the Quality Code. The Staffordshire University Graduate Model had been adopted by the Institute, with its focus on employability, entrepreneurship and enterprise. This is reflected in the Staffordshire programme specifications and the HNDs which include employability modules. The Institute has also undertaken clear mapping of the HNDs against the core curriculum content of the corresponding degree programmes, including reference to subject benchmarks, to allow articulated progression from level 5 to level 6.

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

1.7 External moderation is effectively used to assure the academic standards of programmes. Under the partnership agreements, the awarding bodies and organisations are responsible for approving the Institute's assignments and assessment strategy. Assessments are marked and internally moderated by the teaching staff and externally moderated by the awarding bodies and organisations. The Learning and Quality Committee and Academic Board monitor student assessment and the outcomes of moderation and areas for improvement, which in turn inform staff development priorities. For example, in response to feedback from external examiners and internal moderation, sessions have been run on plagiarism reduction strategies and level descriptors. External examiner reports provide evidence of resulting improvements.

1.8 External examiners' reports are scrutinised and are effective in informing the management of academic standards. External examiners submit reports to the awarding body or directly to the Institute, according to the awarding body's or organisation's regulations. Reports are received by the Academic Registrar who produces a summary for the Learning and Quality Committee. Programme leaders complete action plans in response to recommendations and identified good practice. Responses to external examiners' reports are monitored by programme committees, and actions in response to reports formally evaluated through annual monitoring reports. An overview report prepared by the Academic Registrar and presented to the Learning and Quality Committee and Academic Board ensures that senior managers review and identify progress on academic management issues.

1.9 The Institute has clear mechanisms for the management of its responsibilities for academic standards. The various committees ensure that external examiners' reports are scrutinised and that appropriate actions are taken. While overall standards are managed in accordance with the requirements of awarding bodies, the introduction of programme committees for individual programmes would support clearer reporting and the monitoring of improvements. The introduction of a common template for annual monitoring reports and an overarching institution report will support consistency of management across all provision.

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

2   Quality of learning opportunities

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

2.1   Within the terms of its agreements with its awarding bodies and organisations the Institute has satisfactory mechanisms for managing its delegated responsibilities. The responsibility for the management and oversight of the quality of learning opportunities lies with the Academic Board and its subcommittee, the Learning and Quality Committee. The management and enhancement of the quality of learning opportunities are considered in detail at committee meetings, and actions generated are monitored. Standardised agendas ensure that meetings consistently address the quality of learning. The quality and enhancement of individual programmes are monitored and reviewed through programme committees in accordance with the procedure of the relevant awarding body or organisation. For non-validated awards, including higher national certificates and diplomas, the Institute holds a joint programme committee meeting as outlined in paragraph 1.4.

2.2   The Institute's arrangements for the management of the quality and enhancement of learning opportunities are the same as those for the management of academic standards as set out in paragraphs 1.2 and 1.3. Programme leaders and Associate Deans are responsible for monitoring the quality of teaching and learning. Job descriptions, however, do not currently reflect all post-holder responsibilities. Only that of the module leader specifies responsibilities for the management of standards, quality and student support, while similar duties lie with Associate Deans and programme leaders. It would be **desirable** for the Institute to review all job descriptions to reflect the full range of post-holder responsibilities, including those for the management and enhancement of the quality of learning opportunities.

2.3   Students are actively engaged in the review and enhancement of the quality of learning opportunities. A Student President and Vice President have been recently elected and will represent the student body on the Academic Board, and have direct access to the Chief Executive Officer and the Principal. While students are not represented on the Learning and Quality Committee, they are represented at programme committee meetings to ensure their voice informs the review of programme delivery. Students complete end-of-module surveys which include questions on the delivery of their programmes, the quality of teaching and the provision of student support. A summary of student surveys produced by the Academic Registrar is discussed by the Learning and Quality Committee and Academic Board. Programme committees also review student feedback and include points for improvement in action plans.

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

2.4   Engagement with the Quality Code is underdeveloped. The Academic Standards and Quality Assurance Handbook references the former Academic Infrastructure as do a number of policies and procedures. Although there has been some consideration of *Part C: Information about higher education provision* of the Quality Code in the production of public information, the Institute has yet to complete a planned exercise to map its policies and procedures against the Quality Code. It is **advisable** for the Institute to complete the

mapping of its policies and procedures against the Quality Code in accordance with its
published plan.

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

2.5   The Institute has an appropriate Learning and Teaching Enhancement Strategy
which sets out the expectations for teaching, the review of programme delivery, and the
development of graduate skills. Staff report that they are aware of the strategy and that their
practice is informed by it. The Institute also has rigorous arrangements for checking that the
quality of teaching and learning is maintained and enhanced. The procedure for the
observation of teaching is set out in the Academic Standards and Quality Enhancement
Handbook and the Observation of Teaching Procedure, which requires all lecturers to be
observed once a semester by a programme leader. The teaching observation reports are
clear and detailed and include constructive comments that are followed up at the next
observation. The collated outcomes are reviewed by the Learning and Quality Committee
and inform staff development priorities. The clear and rigorous teaching observations which
effectively inform staff development priorities and enhance the quality of learning are
good practice.

2.6   The Institute makes effective use of the student voice. The Institute uses the
information from student surveys to review its teaching and learning strategy, identify and
disseminate good practice and inform staff development needs. Students confirm that they
are satisfied with the quality of teaching.

2.7   The Institute has a clear procedure for the appointment of qualified teaching staff.
The Staff Handbook details the induction and mentoring process for new teaching staff and
the way in which their performance is monitored. Staff confirmed that new lecturers are
supported and mentored effectively.

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

2.8   Support for students at the Institute is satisfactory. All students are allocated a
personal tutor on enrolment and students confirm that tutors are accessible, although no
scheduled meetings are timetabled. A thorough induction programme ensures that students
are familiar with the Institute, its staff and procedures. The Institute does not, however,
include any diagnostic testing for the identification of learning support needs such as
dyslexia or academic English. The Institute reports that only one of their students
self-identified with dyslexia, and while support was provided, this was late in the student's
programme. As the number of students increases, and a widening participation approach to
recruitment is put in place, it is **advisable** for the Institute to improve the methods of
identifying additional learning support needs.

2.9   The Student Welfare Officer has a wide remit for student support and engagement,
including advice on welfare and pastoral matters. Issues relating to student support are
routinely considered at all levels within the committee structure. The Institute does not,
however, have any formal mechanism for the review of its student services, and evidence of
tracking of enquiries and broader information needs is at a basic level. The use of data to
inform the provision of student support is underdeveloped. It would be **desirable** for the
Institute to develop a process for the review of student support services to monitor
effectiveness and support enhancements.

2.10   There is limited use of data to inform the review and enhancement of student
learning. The minutes of programme committee meetings do not reflect consideration of
cohort-based data-sets including retention, achievement and progression data. While results

are reviewed and confirmed by Progression and Exam Boards, this does not transparently feed into programme management, or serve to identify and address potential teaching and learning issues. It is **advisable** for the Institute to review the use of student data to support programme management, student progression and achievement.

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

2.11   The Institute provides extensive opportunities for staff development which enhances the quality of learning provision. The Staff Handbook gives detailed guidance on appraisal and staff development. In partnership with Staffordshire University, an annual programme of staff development events has been arranged, which takes place both at the University and at the Institute. The programme of staff development is informed by consideration of student feedback, teaching observations and sector priorities. Sessions are available for full and part-time staff, and attendance is monitored and encouraged. Staff report that they are aware of the opportunities available and take part in them. The range and take-up of staff development opportunities which effectively support teaching and learning is **good practice**.

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

2.12   The Institute's learning resources support students in meeting their learning outcomes. There is a large library that offers students access to key texts. Students on technical and fashion programmes confirm that laboratory facilities and workshops are provided to meet their needs. In response to student requests, the library opening hours have now been extended.

2.13   The virtual learning environment (VLE) provides staff and students with an effective tool to support learning. Lecturers make available learning materials and assessment information which students confirm as clear and useful. Students value the online information and are aware that their individual usage of the VLE is monitored by staff. As yet full use is not being made of the facility for the online submission and marking of student work. While staff and students are provided with a guide to the VLE, minimum module content requirements for the VLE are not embedded and there are substantial differences in content. It would be **desirable** for the Institute to specify minimum module content for the VLE.

2.14   The Institute has appropriate strategies for the management of the quality of its learning opportunities. The committee structures provide oversight and ensure that feedback from students is acted on. The teaching observations inform staff development opportunities and promote the building of good practices. Job descriptions would benefit from being reviewed to clarify individual responsibilities. While the Institute has started to engage with the Quality Code, the mapping of policies and procedures is yet to be completed. The Institute should consider introducing systems to identify and support students with additional learning needs. Minimum module content for the VLE would support student access to resources.

> The review team has **confidence** that the Institute 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 Institute communicate information about learning opportunities to students and other stakeholders?

3.1   The Institute publishes a wide variety of clear information about its provision, industry-related links and broader collaborative partnerships. The information produced in both hardcopy and electronically clearly conveys to prospective students and other stakeholders both study opportunities and the broader range of the Institute's activities. The website has recently been re-designed and makes clear the opportunities for study, careers and Institute activities. A prospectus is available to download along with course descriptors and a range of policies and procedures. Information is also provided on the broader research engagement and community-based projects, including those with local schools. As yet little use is made of social media.

3.2   The Institute is responsible for the production of programme handbooks which provide key information to students. The Institute has a template for handbooks. However, in the case of the Pearson programmes, the template is not yet fully used. Handbooks for University-validated awards clearly communicate learning outcomes, modes of assessment and module structures. Appropriate programme specifications for validated provision are included in programme handbooks available to students through the VLE. Although the Institute has recently produced programme specifications for the Pearson programmes, these are not included in handbooks or available to students through the VLE. It is **advisable** for the Institute to ensure that programme specifications are published in all handbooks and on the VLE.

3.3   The VLE is used effectively to communicate with students. Students confirmed that the VLE helps them to locate information including handbooks, lecture notes, assignment briefs, examination timetables and tutor contact details. An increasing number of reports, policies and procedures are also being made available along with guidance on the use of anti-plagiarism software. The publication of the minutes of programme committee meetings enable students to understand how the Institute responds to specific issues raised.

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

3.4   The Institute's arrangements for the production of information are clearly communicated to staff. The responsibilities for the production, checking and authorisation of information are set out in the Public Information Policy. Module and programme leaders are responsible for the production and updating of assessment briefs and handbooks in line with the expectations of awarding bodies and organisations. All handbooks and information are coordinated by the Academic Registrar. The Principal confirms and signs off academic documentation. While information materials including policies and procedures are checked, there is limited evidence of implementation of version control procedures. The Public Information Policy provided to the team had been superseded by an updated version, and other policies and documentation lack dates or version indications. It would be **desirable** for the Institute to increase the use of the document management systems, including those for version control.

3.5   The Academic Board monitors the currency and completeness of programme handbooks and programme information, which students report as accurate and helpful. Policies have not been subject to systematic updating and, as mentioned in paragraph 2.4, are not referenced to the Quality Code. Students are able to provide feedback on the quality of information through evaluation of induction programmes, student surveys and through student representatives' feedback at programme committee meetings. The format

and content of website information is reviewed to ensure that information is current.
Programme handbooks are routinely considered for accuracy together with regular reviews
of admissions information and marketing materials. Staff are knowledgeable about the
processes of ensuring the accuracy of information and students confirmed that information
regarding courses and applications is accurate and helpful.

3.6   The Institute has clear procedures for the management of public information.
The student voice informs the review of information and the website and student handbooks
are regularly updated. However, not all handbooks contain the current programme
specifications. Consistent use of the document management systems would ensure that only
the most recent versions of documents are used.

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

Action plan[3]

British Institute of Technology and E-commerce Ltd action plan relating to the Review for Educational Oversight February 2014						
Good practice	Actions to be taken to achieve intended outcomes	Target date(s)	Action by	Intended outcomes	Reported to	Evaluation (process or evidence)
The review team identified the following areas of **good practice** that are worthy of wider dissemination within the Institute:						
• the clear and rigorous teaching observations which effectively inform staff development priorities and enhance the quality of learning (paragraph 2.5)	BITE seeks to improve the use of teaching observations for improving teaching techniques and teaching methodologies	February 2015	Academic Registrar, Quality Manager	Extend the quality of teaching through shared experience of observer and observee and continue to arrange staff development sessions based on the actions identified in the observation reports	Learning & Quality Committee Academic Board	Annual 360° review process tracking linking observations of teaching with staff development activities, including individual micro-teaching sessions linked to teaching observations 100% compliance for staff observations

---

[3] The Institute has been required to develop this action plan to follow up on good practice and address any recommendations arising from the review. QAA monitors progress against the action plan, in conjunction with the Institute's awarding bodies and organisations.

						Monitored by Annual Review (AMR)
• the range and take-up of staff development opportunities which effectively support teaching and learning (paragraph 2.11).	BITE will seek to introduce more evidence of cross-institutional staff development to provide BITE staff with a wider perspective on HE	February 2015	Academic Registrar, Associate Deans	A comprehensive list of staff development opportunities published to intranet, including sessions run by partners and third party agencies	Learning & Quality Committee Academic Board	Full attendance by categorised staff at staff development sessions Annual report on Staff Development Programme, including statistics on participation and cross-cutting observations on quality enhancement from 360° degree review
Advisable	**Actions to be taken to achieve intended outcomes**	**Target date(s)**	**Action by**	**Intended outcomes**	**Reported to**	**Evaluation (process or evidence)**
The team considers that it is **advisable** for the Institute to:						
• introduce separate programme committees for each	Use the existing Programme Committee Terms of Reference and extend to all programmes	August 2014	Academic Registrar	All programmes run at BITE (professional and academic)	Learning & Quality Committee Academic	Terms of Reference approved by Academic Board (May 2014)

programme (paragraph 1.4)				to have a Programme Committee	Board	Programme Committee minutes reviewed New section in Programme AMR to include Programme Committee annual review of performance
• complete the mapping of its policies and procedures against the Quality Code in accordance with its published plan (paragraph 2.4)	Deliver the Mapping Schedule	A1 Sept 2014 A2 Sept 2014 A3 Oct 2014 B1 April 2014 B2 May 2014 B3 June 2014 B4 Aug 2014 B5 Aug 2014 B6 Sept 2014 B7 October 2014 B8 Nov 2014 B9 Dec 2014 B10 June 2014 B11 March 2015 C February 2015	Principal	Complete list of audit compliance mappings as per Quality Code already provided to QAA for *Chapter B1*	Learning & Quality Committee Academic Board	Milestone Schedule approved by Academic Board (May 2014) Delivery of all milestones on timetable to schedule
• improve the methods of identifying additional learning support needs (paragraph 2.8)	Survey students and staff to identify learning support needs either through self-election or referral by tutor, including an area on the virtual learning environment (VLE) to	September 2014	Student Welfare Officer Principal/Student Welfare Officer	Report on range of learning support requirements identified through survey	Learning & Quality Committee	100% students and staff contacted 60% response rate Review data and

curate particular resources for learner support such as www.brainhe.com			List of identified needs and appropriate solutions for learner support that can be offered to Institute students	publish report on outcome of survey and correlate to admissions data disclosures
Identify areas for staff training in recognising learner support requirements				Launch VLE Learner Support section
Review best practice methodology and draw up an appropriate procedure for early identification of learning support needs	December 2014		Distribute Learning Support Guide	Integrate findings into staff development programme
Identify local solutions for servicing the additional learning support required either within BITE or through referral centres	January 2015			Report list of needs and best practice options
				Review budget implications for Learner Support
				Report list of needs and solutions
				Report on update and disclosure rates as part of AMR process
				Review budget

						implications
• review the use of student data to support programme management, student progression and achievement (paragraph 2.10)	Programme cohort data, statistical analysis of results and trend analysis of progression to be compiled for each term as part of a mini programme review	September 2014	Associate Deans	Set up a standard set of achievement and progression statistical parameters for each programme from module performance data	Learning & Quality Committee

Academic Board | Mini programme reviews and data analysis for each awards board and a balanced scorecard summary analysis of metrics within the AMR |
• ensure that programme specifications are published in all handbooks and on the virtual learning environment (paragraph 3.2).	Each programme handbook to include programme specification and both published to VLE	June 2014	Quality Manager	All programme documents to conform	Learning & Quality Committee	100% compliance
Desirable	**Actions to be taken to achieve intended outcomes**	**Target date(s)**	**Action by**	**Intended outcomes**	**Reported to**	**Evaluation (process or evidence)**
The team considers that it would be **desirable** for the Institute to:						
• develop an overarching report on the management of academic	A comprehensive self-assessment of all AMRs as a single annual institutional AMR to produce a coherent	November 2014	Registrar	Annual Report of quality standards published	Learning & Quality Committee

Academic | Annual institutional self-assessment of performance and trends analysis of |

					Board	external
standards and quality based on annual monitoring (paragraph 1.5)	review of academic standards and compliance with the Quality Code				Executive Committee	examiner and audit reports to ensure validity and objectivity of self-assessment
• review all job descriptions to reflect the full range of post-holder responsibilities (paragraph 2.2)	Undertake a role analysis review of staff roles and responsibilities as part of the annual staff review and agree new role descriptions	December 2014	Principal/Head of HR	A revised set of job descriptions for all roles within the Institute	Academic Board Executive Committee All Staff Group	Review robustness of new job descriptions and any gap analysis at next performance review and in discussion with Investors in People (IIP) auditor
• develop a process for the review of student support services to monitor effectiveness and support enhancements (paragraph 2.9)	Review of student services in supporting the student experience	January 2015	Student Welfare Officer	A comprehensive review and survey of student welfare and voice within the Institute as an annual report on student services	Academic Board Executive Committee	Issue extended annual survey (September 2014), review survey and develop action plan Review trends and implications in annual report and resource implication going forward
• specify minimum module content for the virtual	Publish policy and procedures on minimum standards for curriculum	August 2014	Quality Manager	Minimum standards published and	Learning & Quality Committee	Minimum Content protocol (approved by

learning environment (paragraph 2.13)	held on VLE			communicated to staff	Academic Board	Academic Board May 2014) Review compliance across all programmes as section within AMR
• increase the use of the document management systems (paragraph 3.4).	Version control systems and document management policies and procedures introduced as per documentation shown to QAA	September 2014	Registrar	Every document produced and reviewed from April 2014 to have version control implemented	Learning & Quality Committee Academic Board Executive Group	100% compliance Review and audit comprehensive content list of all documents, current version and review date

About QAA

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

QAA's aims are to:

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

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

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

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

Glossary

This glossary explains terms used in this report. You can find a fuller glossary at:
www.qaa.ac.uk/aboutus/glossary. Formal definitions of key terms can be found in the
Review for Educational Oversight: Handbook.[4]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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.

---

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

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**.