Capital School of Business & Management C.I.C.

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

October 2013

Key findings about Capital School of Business & Management C.I.C.

As a result of its Review for Educational Oversight carried out in October 2013, the QAA review team (the team) considers that there can be **confidence** in how the provider manages its stated responsibilities for the standards of the programmes it offers on behalf of the Chartered Institute of Management Accountants, the Chartered Management Institute, the Confederation of Tourism and Hospitality, the London Centre of Marketing and Pearson.

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 organisations.

The team considers that reliance **cannot** be placed on the information that the provider produces for its intended audiences about the learning opportunities it offers.

Good practice

The team did not identify any areas of **good practice**.

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:

- review the terms of reference of all committees and ensure that responsibilities are clear, outcomes are fully recorded, and actions are regularly monitored (paragraph 1.4)
- establish a more rigorous process for regular monitoring and review at programme and institutional level, with clearly defined responsibilities and actions (paragraph 1.5)
- make the process for collecting, analysing and evaluating data on student performance more robust, coherent and consistent (paragraph 1.6)
- implement a more consistent process for internal verification (paragraph 1.10)
- systematically address areas of poor performance at unit level to improve student achievement (paragraph 1.12)
- establish comprehensive admissions procedures and criteria to ensure that students are enrolled on programmes at an appropriate level (paragraph 2.9)
- produce programme specifications for all programmes in line with the expectations of the Quality Code and awarding organisations' requirements (paragraph 3.4)
- undertake an immediate review of all published information to ensure that it is trustworthy, consistent and current (paragraph 3.6)
- develop and immediately implement systematic procedures to ensure that published information is clear, accurate, and fit for purpose (paragraph 3.9).

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

- clarify the roles and responsibilities of the Academic Director and Head of Quality Assurance (paragraph 1.2).

About this report

This report presents the findings of the [Review for Educational Oversight](1) (REO) conducted by [QAA](1) at Capital School of Business & Management C.I.C. (the School) which is a privately funded provider of higher education. The purpose of the review is to provide public information about how the provider discharges its stated responsibilities for the management and delivery of academic standards and the quality of learning opportunities available to students. The review applies to programmes of study that the provider delivers on behalf of the Chartered Institute of Management Accountants, the Chartered Management Institute, the Confederation of Tourism and Hospitality, the London Centre of Marketing, and Pearson. The review was carried out by Mr Kevin Burnside, Mrs Patricia Millner, Dr Hayley Randle (reviewers) and Mr Simon Ives (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 documentation supplied by the School, its awarding organisations, and meetings with staff and students.

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

- the Qualifications and Curriculum Framework (QCF)
- the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (the 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](#).

At the time of the initial REO in 2012, there were no higher education students enrolled at the School, and it was operating on a site at Heathrow. Since then the School has moved to Wembley and has seen an increase in student numbers. Due to significant changes in circumstances at the School, including the enrolment of students, a full review was required.

At the time of the current review 119 students were enrolled on 10 higher education programmes in partnership with five awarding organisations. A new student intake was awaiting enrolment at the time of the review in October 2013.

The review took account of the outcomes of the previous review visits. The School was subject to an annual monitoring visit in February 2013 and was deemed to have made acceptable progress against the action plan from the 2012 review report.

At the time of the review, the provider offered the following higher education programmes, listed beneath their awarding organisations:

Chartered Institute of Management Accountants
- Certificate in Business Accounting
- Certificate in Business Accounting - Operational Level
- Masters Gateway Assessment

Confederation of Tourism and Hospitality
- Postgraduate Diploma in Hospitality and Tourism Management

---

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

London Centre of Marketing
- Diploma in Business Management and Marketing (integrated)

Pearson
- Higher National Diploma/Certificate in Business
- Higher National Certificate/Diploma in Computing and Systems Development
- Higher National Diploma in Hospitality Management
- Higher National Certificate/Diploma in Health and Social Care
- Extended Diploma in Strategic Management and Leadership

The provider's stated responsibilities

The School takes account of the external reference points provided by the awarding organisations, along with the Quality Code. The School is responsible for the recruitment and admission of students; programme delivery, elements of assessment and internal moderation; the quality of teaching and learning; the provision of appropriate staffing and physical resources; application of the awarding organisations' standards; regular internal monitoring of quality; and compliance with the awarding organisations' requirements for annual evaluation and review.

Recent developments

The School's strategic direction outlined in the Strategic Plan 2011-14 has recently changed with the intention to focus on the recruitment of home and EU students. The School's mission statement 'to be the college of choice by putting skills and learning at the heart of everything we do' remains the same. The School's intention is to deliver programmes from level 1 to level 8 on the QCF and intends to make an application for government capital funding to deliver lower-level programmes.

Students' contribution to the review

Students studying on programmes at the School were invited to present a submission to the review team. With assistance from the School, eight students, lead by the chair of the student committee, produced a short video of a meeting they held to discuss the quality of their learning experience. This provided a helpful starting point for the team. Students met reviewers at the preparatory meeting and during the review visit. The team found their views helpful in informing their discussions and in gaining a clear picture of the student learning experience.

Detailed findings about Capital School of Business & Management C.I.C.

1 Academic standards

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

1.1 The School has an appropriate management structure which oversees the maintenance of academic standards and quality. The Senior Leadership Team provides relevant supervision and support for academic standards and the quality of provision. The Managing Director, along with the Principal and Chief Executive, control the strategic direction. The Principal takes full responsibility for all decision making, in setting policy, and managing the School's associated administration, including staff appointments and student admissions. The School is clear about the responsibilities it has for its awarding organisations for recruitment, assessment and student support. Management functions are divided into two distinct academic and operational areas. The General Manager leads on operational affairs, while the Academic Director oversees educational matters and teaching staff, both reporting to the Principal. This structure provides a workable framework for day-to-day management, although the School recognises the need for more effective communication between the two areas.

1.2 The recently appointed full-time Head of Quality Assurance incorporates the role of Senior Registrar. This post has the potential to underpin the quality assurance procedures, and ensure that assessment, internal verification processes and teaching observations are fully embedded. However, there is significant overlap of responsibilities with the role of the Academic Director, particularly regarding management of staff performance and development, and internal verification. It would be **desirable** for the School to clarify the roles and responsibilities of the Academic Director and Head of Quality Assurance.

1.3 The organisational committee structure for managing academic standards is not clear. Responsibilities overlap, are poorly articulated, and terminology is inconsistent. Following the review in 2012 the School redesigned its committee structure as part of the action plan. The School further amended this model prior to the review visit and the structures have not had time to become embedded or prove their effectiveness. Four academic committees are currently operational: the Academic Committee; the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee; the Assessment Committee and the Course Review Board. However, there is confusion in documentation, and among staff, about committee titles, a lack of clarity about their individual responsibilities, and terms of reference which often overlap considerably.

1.4 The committee structure diagram shows a hierarchical structure, with Academic Board as the senior deliberative body. In practice, this is a weekly staff meeting, which deals routinely with current issues and short-term planning. The Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee, chaired by the Head of Quality Assurance, provides a more strategic role in developing and monitoring policies, programme approvals, admissions and teaching standards. The newly-established Assessment Committee, although appropriately constituted, has not yet met, as the School has yet to have a cohort of students going through to the final examinations for Pearson programmes. The Course Review Board meets four times each year to review and evaluate all programmes using key performance indicators. However, minutes of meetings are generally lacking in detail and action planning is limited. It is **advisable** for the School to review the terms of reference of all committees and ensure that responsibilities are clear, outcomes are fully recorded, and actions are regularly monitored.

1.5   The annual monitoring and review process is complex and poorly articulated. A full cycle of annual monitoring and review has not yet been completed as anticipated in the 2012 action plan. A number of useful elements are currently being developed, but these could be used in a more systematic manner. Terminology is often inconsistent. Currently a self-assessment template is completed by the Academic Director, and an operational report is compiled by the General Manager. These reports are collated by the Principal to inform an overarching Quality Assurance Annual Review, currently at draft stage. Although there is evidence of some detailed commentaries there is no clear narrative to explain the process, or show how each element is connected. There is little evidence of a coherent review process, and there is no evidence of specific and time-based action planning. It is **advisable** for the School to establish a more rigorous process for regular monitoring and reviewing at programme and institutional level, with clearly defined responsibilities and actions.

1.6   The School has started to collect retention and achievement data using a range of newly-developed management systems, in line with the 2012 action plan. However, data are presented inconsistently and it is unclear how student progress is tracked or how pass rates are derived. There is little use or analysis of the data currently produced. Minutes from committees, and the draft institutional annual review, do not provide evidence that student retention, progression, assignment grades and examination results are effectively scrutinised. It is **advisable** for the School to make the process for collecting, analysing and evaluating data on student performance more robust, coherent and consistent.

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

1.7   The School has extensively mapped its policies against the Quality Code and plans to use the Indicators in developing its policies and procedures. Academic and support staff have a high level of awareness of the Quality Code and staff development has been provided. Extensive work has been carried out to map in detail the indicators contained in the various chapters of Part B: 'Assuring and enhancing academic quality' with the School's own policies. For example, the Learning and Teaching Policy is very closely based on *Chapter B3: Learning and teaching.* The School plans to use the indicators as its framework for quality assurance in the next round of review, particularly *Chapter B8: Programme monitoring and review.*

1.8   The School takes appropriate account of other external reference points, such as those of the awarding organisations. It undergoes regular re-accreditation by its awarding organisations and has fulfilled the necessary criteria to retain its certification. Academic levels and requirements for each programme are well understood by staff. New staff, many of whom also teach elsewhere, are mentored and supported by the Academic Director to ensure they are fully aware of the level of teaching and learning required for each unit.

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

1.9   The School understands its varying responsibilities for setting and marking assignments for the different awarding organisations, and staff are fully conversant with the requirements. While some students have taken externally marked examinations, no students have been through the full process of external moderation or examination. The School has actively responded to a report from the Pearson external examiner for HNC/D Business. This sampling considered a limited number of assignments for the first cohort of students. While the external examiner was in agreement with the level of internal marking, no students had successfully completed any full units, and overall achievement was poor. As a result, the School has implemented an enhancement programme to support the development of academic skills. This has improved student pass rates, though they remain low.

1.10   The School has devised an internal verification policy overseen by the Academic Director and Head of Quality Assurance. Currently, however, the processes are not consistent or fully embedded. The information on internal verification in the Tutor Handbook is out of date and different recording templates exist. The Head of Quality Assurance is in the process of developing improved methods and documentation. It is **advisable** for the School to implement a more consistent process for internal verification.

1.11   Although the examiner's report confirms that staff are assessing at the correct level, a number of serious shortcomings in the School's processes for managing the assessment procedures were identified, with five essential recommendations. The School took prompt action. For example, written assignments are now submitted electronically with a suitable declaration of integrity. Pass rates on other Pearson programmes, such as HNC/D Computing and Systems Development, HNC/D Health and Social Care and HNC/D Hospitality Management, appear to be improving, although data collection and analysis is currently being developed.

1.12   For programmes examined and marked by the awarding organisations, results are generally poor. There are a number of units where students have not sat the examination or, in the case of Pearson programmes, submitted any work. Student retention is low on most programmes. Although senior managers and staff are fully aware of the problems, and an enhancements programme has been put in place, further work needs to be done to provide effective remedial action. It is **advisable** for the School to systematically address areas of poor performance at unit level to improve student achievement.

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

---

2   Quality of learning opportunities

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

2.1   The School's responsibilities for managing and enhancing the quality of learning opportunities reflect those in paragraphs 1.1 to 1.6. The management structure is generally effective in ensuring that appropriate learning opportunities are in place. The Tutor Handbook provides a comprehensive guide for staff and includes a suite of policies and processes which underpin the management of learning opportunities, including teaching observation, complaints and appeals, and assessment verification. Senior managers confirm that some of the information is out of date and is currently being revised.

2.2   Additionally, all staff are issued with The Learning and Teaching Code of Conduct, which staff consider useful. This places substantial emphasis on the quality of learning opportunities, specifically the learning environment and the provision of student support, using a set of nine indicators of sound practice. An extensive range of supplementary policies and procedures support the development of an appropriate level of professional practice among staff and students.

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

2.3   The School's use of external reference points reflects those in paragraphs 1.7 to 1.8. The School is making effective use of external reference points to manage learning opportunities, and is making significant progress in mapping its quality assurance policies

and processes against the relevant chapters of the Quality Code. However, many of the policies and procedures have yet to be tested and fully embedded.

2.4   Staff show an understanding of *The framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland* (FHEQ) and QCF which are used in the design of teaching and learning strategies and materials. Students have a clear understanding of the required academic levels in delivery and assessment, and find their studies appropriately challenging. Many staff have received training on the Quality Code and are using it appropriately to inform their practice. The higher education provision is subject to scrutiny against external reference points by professional organisations.

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

2.5   The School's teaching and learning handbooks and policies are used extensively to underpin the teaching and learning strategy. Regular programme-level discussions take place at weekly academic team meetings where teaching and learning are discussed. Comprehensive schemes of work and lesson plans are produced using a standard template for each taught session. They are applied effectively to ensure that learning outcomes are covered.

2.6   The School operates an internal verification process through which assessment briefs and assessment decisions are subject to academic scrutiny, although this is not always consistently undertaken. Following developmental feedback from the external examiner and a report from an awarding organisation, this process has recently been enhanced. Students confirm that the clarity of assignment briefs has recently improved and they are provided with full assessment criteria. Students commented that assessment feedback is now timely, the quality has improved significantly, and that they are provided with guidance on how to improve their academic skills.

2.7   The School undertakes regular formal teaching observations by managers linked to the staff appraisal process. Teaching staff also make peer observations of each others' practice. Outcomes are comprehensively documented and there is good observation feedback. Good practice is noted by the Head of Quality Assurance, who shares this at the weekly staff meetings.

2.8   Students spoke positively about the quality of current teaching staff, the range and variety of teaching methods employed and the support they receive. Student views inform teaching approaches and are obtained through questionnaires and meetings with staff. There have been regular changes in teaching staff, and this rapid turnover has had a detrimental impact on the student experience. In response, the School has implemented a staff recruitment policy based on applicants' professional and practitioner status. All new staff receive an induction pack with information on policies and procedures along with the Tutor Handbook, and are allocated a mentor. The external examiner's report and students' feedback confirm that the employment of staff who are also practitioners in industry is beneficial in ensuring currency of teaching.

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

2.9   A robust system of student support is in place both addressing pastoral concerns and enabling academic development. The College recruits students from a wide range of backgrounds and experience. Students undergo an interview process with an admissions panel as part of the recruitment process, which they find challenging. However, the School acknowledges that at induction students have often been found to be well below the standard of English required for higher education. Minimum entry requirements are not

defined in the Prospectus or on the website. The School has recently introduced a more extensive process of initial diagnostic testing, so that students' academic levels can be clearly determined and additional support provided if required. The poor retention and achievement rates demonstrate that the application and interview processes need to be more robust, to ensure that students have reached a standard appropriate for embarking on higher-level programmes. It is **advisable** for the School to establish comprehensive admissions procedures and criteria, to ensure that students are enrolled on programmes at an appropriate level.

2.10   The School has four annual cohort entry points, and students are enrolled on a comprehensive induction programme. Students are provided with full information on aspects of learning, teaching, assessment and support, along with matters related to their welfare. Induction also covers external activity, including work placements and taking additional professional qualifications such as health and safety. Staff identify specific academic and language support where these have not already been declared on application or at enrolment. Enrolled students who are not considered to be able to perform at the appropriate academic level are required to enrol on an enhancements programme which allows them to develop academic skills for study at level 4.

2.11   Students receive support through their personal tutor, who provides regular help and academic performance review. The tutorial system is used effectively and comprehensive tutorial records inform the development of an individual learner programme. This encourages students to be actively engaged in independent learning and in setting their own educational goals. Students report that the recent appointment of a student welfare officer, who supervises individual development planning, has had a positive impact on student performance. The School has clear mechanisms for regularly monitoring students' attendance, and emphasis is placed on dress code and a rigid disciplinary process.

2.12   Student feedback is obtained in a number of ways, both formally and informally. Student representatives have regular meetings with staff and senior managers and through the Student Council. End-of-module questionnaires provide evaluations of the teaching and learning and are used to inform changes to the curriculum. Students were unaware of having a formal role at meetings of the Course Review Board. Student feedback is considered at weekly academic team meetings.

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

2.13   The staff induction and mentoring policy provides support and guidance to new staff, aids integration into the School, and identifies staff development and training needs. Following the recent regular changes in teaching staff, and the difficulties in finding appropriately qualified teachers, senior managers understand the need to embed the induction as a more formal process and to provide more staff development for those appointed.

2.14   The Staff Development Policy sets out expectations of staff, and the School's commitment to provide support and development opportunities. Staff development requirements are informed by the annual self-evaluation process. Peer review of lessons and formal teaching observations provide detailed feedback to tutors and identify staff development needs. The School is committed to ensuring that all staff have an appropriate teaching qualification. Staff are regularly supported on programmes such as Preparing to Teach in the Lifelong Learning Sector (PTTLS) and Diploma in Teaching in the Lifelong Learning Sector (DTTLS). There is evidence of appropriate and substantial internal and external staff training and continuing professional development undertaken by staff.

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

2.15   The learning resources provided are adequate for the current provision and number of students, although the School acknowledges the need for further improvement and expansion. The provision of a professional environment, which is also safe and accessible, in which students can reach their full potential, is integral to the School's ethos. Seminar rooms are well appointed and equipped with current technology, including computers, large screen displays and projectors. There is a small library and students also have good access to a range of nearby public libraries. Students commented that managers are responsive to their requests for new library resources. The Pearson external examiner's report, together with accreditation reports from other awarding organisations, confirm that the teaching environment is of an appropriately high standard.

2.16   Students are positive about the developing use of the virtual learning environment which provides remote access to key study materials. The virtual learning environment is currently used primarily as a repository of information, but further staff development is being undertaken to develop this as an interactive teaching tool.

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

---

3   Information about learning opportunities

How effectively does the School communicate information about learning opportunities to students and other stakeholders?

3.1   The College publishes a wide range of information for potential and current students, staff and other stakeholders. This includes the Prospectus, staff and student handbooks, information related to awarding organisations' policies, complaints and appeal procedures, assessment policies, an induction pack and quality procedures. Materials are produced in hard copy and are also available electronically.

3.2   Information provided to students in induction packs is generally accurate and useful to students and includes programme handbooks, timetables, the Student Charter and information relating to finance and welfare. This information gives students a sound understanding of their programme of study.

3.3   Handbooks are issued by the School to students at induction and made available electronically through the virtual learning environment. Awarding organisations' programme handbooks are also provided. School programme handbooks provide information on programme design, unit and module specifications and programme structures, assessment methods and procedures, course grading and administration, and complaints and appeals procedures. Handbooks also provide guidance on plagiarism and explain student representation and feedback mechanisms. Students confirmed that they knew where and how to access this information. Published information about the availability of pastoral support, support towards placement employment and careers guidance is limited. However, students stated they were aware that these services were available and knew how to access them.

3.4   The programme information published in programme handbooks is provided by the awarding organisations but is generally limited to module and unit specifications. Full programme specifications, which contextualise awarding organisation information for delivery at the School and which are made available to students, are not consistently provided. It is **advisable** for the School to produce programme specifications for all programmes in line with the expectations of the Quality Code and awarding organisations' requirements.

3.5   The School's website provides limited and, in places, potentially misleading information for students. At the time of the review, programme titles and awarding organisation information was not clear. The website misleadingly states that students could achieve chartered membership of professional bodies. Immediately subsequent to the review visit the School's website was closed for redevelopment.

3.6   The School's Prospectus, provided both electronically and in hard copy for the review, uses the logos of many multinational companies and international organisations in a manner that suggests the School has links with these bodies. The School accepts that written authorisation for the use of these logos is required, but was unable to provide evidence that this had been obtained. Programme information in the Prospectus is potentially misleading, with the School offering guaranteed progression onto the final year of a wide range of degree programmes after 18 months study, and a guaranteed job within six months of graduation. At the time of the visit, the Prospectus was withdrawn. It is **advisable** for the School to undertake an immediate review of all published information to ensure that it is trustworthy, consistent and current.

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

3.7   The School publishes a variety of information, some of which is inaccurate, conflicting, out of date, or incomplete. Responsibility for the accuracy of information about programmes and modules and broader public information is identified within a responsibilities checklist. Information is made available to prospective and existing students through the website, the virtual learning environment, the Prospectus, promotional flyers, publicity material and programme handbooks. Responsibility for the accuracy of public information published in the Prospectus, marketing materials, programme handbooks and on the website lies with the School Operations Committee, and is overseen by the General Manager.

3.8   The School has an established Communications Management Policy. This sets out how information is communicated both within the School and to external stakeholders, and how published information is controlled and authorised for publication. However, the policy fails to detail effective procedures to ensure the consistency and accuracy of information made publicly available by the School.

3.9   Published information about course availability, programme structures, facilities and resources, and levels of student achievement necessary for subsequent progression to degree programmes is potentially misleading. There is a lack of clarity on the website and in the Prospectus about the qualifications students will receive on completion, with no specific reference made to level or, in the case of Pearson programmes, the awarding organisation. The Prospectus states that students enrolling on level 4 and 5 programmes would be studying for degrees at the College, whereas in fact they are studying for HNC/D or externally accredited subdegree qualifications. The Communications Management Policy was generally found to be ineffective in ensuring that all published information was accurate. It is **advisable** for the School to develop and immediately implement systematic procedures to ensure that published information is clear, accurate, and fit for purpose.

3.10   In response to the advisable recommendation in the 2012 action plan the School has made progress by regularly reviewing its policies and implementing an effective system of version control for all published documents. The Communications Management Policy in particular has established a process which provides guidance on version control for documentation. This was generally found to have been followed and be effective. However, there are instances where revision dates have expired and the process is not yet systematic.

The team concludes that reliance **cannot** be placed on the information that the provider produces for its intended audiences about the learning opportunities it offers.

Action plan[3]

12

Capital School of Business & Management C.I.C. action plan relating to the Review for Educational Oversight of October 2013						
Advisable	**Intended outcomes**	**Actions to be taken to achieve intended outcomes**	**Target date(s)**	**Action by**	**Reported to**	**Evaluation (process or evidence)**
The team considers that it is **advisable** for the School to:						
• review the terms of reference of all committees and ensure that responsibilities are clear, outcomes are fully recorded, and actions are regularly monitored (paragraph 1.4)	Simplified and workable terms of reference for all committees Have in existence committees that reflect the need of the organisation Well defined roles and terms of reference for each post holder and committee Quarterly reviews for the previous semester Quarterly review of the upcoming semester	Detailed review of workability and applicability Reconfiguration to be communicated to all staff members and students by email and intranet Committee structure publicised in various forms in various locations Students and staff induction to incorporate the role of key personnel and committees including the key dates	March 2014 Thereafter continuation every quarter	Quality Assurance Committee, General Manager, Student Welfare Officer Registrar, Academic Registrar, student representatives and Student Chairperson	Principal and Chief Executive Officer Academic Committee	Committee and general staff meeting minutes Production of new terms of reference Staff training and staff induction Admin instruction/ procedure records Introduction of 'post' and committee specific

---

[3] The School 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 School's awarding organisations.

		Specific capacity to record, track and review all minutes and outcomes that can be made available in hard copy Electronic notification for follow-up action by date that can be made available in hard copy The production of a standard set of minutes to cover the terms of reference and the oversight needed, derived from, and as instructed by, the ordinances of the School and reconfiguration The production and publication of a pictorial organogram that illustrates clearly the responsibilities and reporting lines for each committee entered and incorporated into both staff and student induction			responsibilities for student induction programme Printable and electronic available reviews: committee meeting minutes Task deadline notification via electronic means and electronic copies of the notification of overrun on deadlines Staff meeting minutes, senior management team meeting minutes, Academic Committee minutes and Course Review Board minutes

						Electronic system in use
• Establish a more rigorous process for regular monitoring and review at programme and institutional level, with clearly defined responsibilities and actions (paragraph 1.5)	Secure the use of external participation at key stages for the review of programmes to provide confidence that the standards and quality of the programmes are appropriate The School will draw upon qualitative and quantitative information in programme monitoring and programme review at two stages for each semester or intake and building on the UK Quality Code for Higher Education, *Chapter B8: Programme monitoring and review* This undertaken by: Looking at information available for the semester and/or intake going forward Information made available by the previous semester and/or intake This to include data on:	Implementation of the quarterly periodic review Adjustment of current policy to incorporate specific feedback from students at a level commensurate with the process of monitoring to ensure it is effective and not burdensome Student representative attending meetings; with various committees (disclosure of sensitive data to be excluded) Course Review Board meeting held at the end of every semester and or intake (plus five weeks) to include analysis of information collected to date Academic Committee to convene five weeks	November 2013 thereafter: Academic Committee four times a year Course review Board four times a year	Chairperson of the Academic Committee, Chairperson of the Course Review Board, Head of Quality Assurance, Quality Assurance Committee, Tutors, Student Committee, Student Chairperson and Registrar	Chief Executive Officer, Principal, Senior manage-ment team, Academic Committee and Student Committee	Standardisa-tion of data acquisition through the formalisation of quarterly reports Minutes for each committee/ general meeting of the presentation and review of the statistical data for the programmes External report and action plan where necessary Publication in soft copy of the mandatory monitoring

	a)student progression and achievement per intake, b) information made available and reported to external bodies for those intakes for programmes. c) reports from external examiners, and/or other comparative data on achievement levels d) feedback from students and staff e) success rates f) assessment records	prior to the start of the next semester and or intake to set out the conditions for the coming period				
• Make the process for collecting, analysing and evaluating data on student performance more robust, coherent and consistent (paragraph 1.6)	Completion of College Management System which enables collection, analysis and evaluation of student performance	Termly data prepared by Registrar Student Management system re-programmed/ codified to accommodate specific parameters required for reporting purposes in order to accommodate external stakeholder requirements Academic Committee and Course Review Board to incorporate the evaluation into the standing meetings each quarter	April 2014 to be implemented by July 2014	Principal, Registrar and Information Technology department	Chief Executive Officer, Principal, Senior manage-ment team Academic Committee and Student Committee	Student data analysis data returns (immediately available at any given time) Student data information provided by tutors via College online resources Minutes of meetings of senior management team Minutes of

general staff meetings

Records for previous reports and the evolution of the software programme

						general staff meetings Records for previous reports and the evolution of the software programme
• implement a more consistent process for internal verification (paragraph 1.10)	Engagement of an external/independent professional verifier Audit of current practice Incorporate each particular awarding organisations requirement for verification into the Assessment Code of Practice for the School Align the School's Assessment Code of Practice to that of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education, *Chapter B6: Assessment of students and the recognition of prior learning* and *Chapter A6: Assessment of achievement of learning outcomes* Benchmarked against other similar awarding	External review to produce a report of action plan if needed Categorisation of assessment type and the procedural action set out in an administrative instruction that sets out who does what, when and how Categorise the templates to be used in the assessment process, identifying whether the awarding organisation has a requirement or the use of own resources are required Mandated time frame that is required for that assessment	February 2014 Thereafter every 13 week cycle	Head of Quality Assurance, Registrar, external verifier, external verifiers from awarding organisation visits, tutors, Academic Registrar and Academic Assistant Registrar	Principal, senior management team, Academic Committee, awarding organisations and external verifiers	Independent verifier report/action plan External verifier reports from awarding organisations Templates documents that set out the assessment verification Admin Instruction for assessments Internal verifier reports Sampling plans and student

	bodies in order to show consistency in the verification process	Auditable trail by specific timeline dates, which ensure that both academic teaching staff and academic registry staff follow policy and the subsequent administration instructions on internal verification and there are sanctions for non-compliance Staff training both in house and externally on the procedures peculiar to the awarding organisation assessment and the verification process External assessment verification will be implemented where possible				tracking logs Feedback from students on assessment format
• Systematically address areas of poor performance at unit level to improve student achievement (paragraph 1.12)	The continuation and further development of the enhancement schemes Self-study schemes which are timetabled as mandatory for each programme irrespective of	Regular monitoring of formative assessments and tracking progress of students Record of achievements to be	23 April 2014 Thereafter every 13 week cycle in line with the assessment policy and	Academic Director, tutors and Student Committee	Principal, Quality Assurance Committee, Academic Committee, Student Committee,	The results of students at assessments Formative and summative test results

	level of learner Initiate a mechanism to monitor and compare student achievement and academic standards over time Induction assessments to capture raw data Continued review of staff and student induction on assessment	maintained and reviewed quarterly by the nominated committee or post holder	administration instruction		Head of Admissions, Student Welfare Officer and Head of Discipline	Student feedback Staff feedback and student induction test Minutes of committee and general staff review(s) and recommendations on past data Material information on the feedback loop into assessment tasks to improve their performance in the next assessment
• Establish comprehensive admissions procedures and criteria to ensure that students are enrolled on programmes at an appropriate level	Streamline the admissions procedure for all programmes Remove the step down entry requirement and set out one single set of entry requirements for each programme at each level All aspects of admission,	Collation of all material that relates to pre-entry and admission Review and merge material into two distinctly identifiable policies that incorporates the	30 April 2014 To be reviewed every semester and/or intake	Principal, General Manager, Head of Quality Assurance, Registrar, tutors, Academic Registrar, Student	Chief Executive Officer, senior management team, Academic Committee, General Manager	Amended admissions policy Publicised administration instruction Staff training minutes

| (paragraph 2.9) | from initial enquiry to rolling registration, collated into one single document to be called/referred to as, 'CSBM's Recruitment of Students and its Admin Instruction'

Transparent entry requirements, both academic and non-academic, are to underpin judgements made during the selection process for entry | Quality Code, *Chapter B2: Recruitment, selection and admission to higher education*

1. Pre-admission
2. Enrolment

Completion of the Admin Instruction and ancillary material associated to it | | Committee, Student Chairperson and awarding organisation | and awarding organisation Quality Manger | Academic Committee minutes

Material produced for approval

Various softcopy lists for admissions

Electronic workflows

Removal of all material relating to awarding organisation requirements on any publically available material

Periodic review by Chief Executive Officer, senior management team, Academic Committee |

						and General Manager
						Feedback to applicants who have not been offered a place
• Produce programme specifications for all programmes in line with the expectations of the Quality Code and awarding organisations' requirements (paragraph 3.4)	Design and produce a single document that sets out the programme specification for each type of programme delivered, irrespective of whether the awarding organisation provides such material Produce programme specification based on the given information and instructions from each awarding organisation which incorporated the Quality Code, *Chapters A2, A3, B2, B4* and *B6* Produce an administration instruction, as a procedure, that will align itself with the Quality Code *Chapters A4* and *A5* and codes of good practice for the production and publication of public information	Creation and alignment of a user/student programme specification to the following Quality Code, *Chapters A2, A3, B2, B4, B6* and *Part C: Information about higher education provision* Creation of an administrative instruction setting out how and what will be classified as content for the programme specification based on both the awarding organisation requirement and that of the Quality Code	31 March 2014 Thereafter every semester and/or intake for review	Principal, Academic Committee, Head of Quality Assurance, General Manager, Registrar, Tutors, Academic Registrar, Student Committee, Student and awarding organisation's Quality Assurance Manager (nominee)	Senior manage-ment team, Academic Committee, Course Review Board and awarding organisa-tion's Quality Assurance Manager (nominee)	Production of the programme specification in both print and electronic form Staff training with respective awarding organisations Evidence of the review, scrutiny and approval of all material prior to publication by the Academic Committee, post publication by the Course Review Board and senior management team

						The audit and comparative standards of other providers Feedback from the end user in terms of usability and reference applicability External verification
• Undertake an immediate review of all published information to ensure that it is trustworthy, consistent and current (paragraph 3.6)	Conclude the review of all published information process Define the route and stages information is made available Cleary identify who is responsible for what information and refer the student to the respective location Remove all availability of hard copy printed information	Audits by Chief Executive Officer, senior management team and the Head of Quality	1 November 2013 Every intake	Principal, Course Review Board, Academic Committee, General Manager, Academic Director, Head of Quality Assurance, Registrar, Academic Registrar and Student Committee	Chief Executive Officer, senior manage-ment team, Academic Committee	Student and other feedback Senior management team and Quality Assurance Committee review by way of standing minutes External audit for benchmark and assurance
• Develop and immediately implement systematic	Upgrade and review the current procedure to ensure that published information in both print	Remove all publicly available information published on domain csbm.co.uk prior to	31 December 2013 Thereafter	General Manager, Academic Director, Head	Chief Executive Officer, senior	The amended regulations, ordinances, policies and

procedures to ensure that published information is clear, accurate, and fit for purpose (paragraph 3.9).	form and electronic is clear, accurate and in line with current policies, taking account of the Quality Code, *Chapter B3: Learning and teaching* Produce an evidence based audit trail from inception to publication to the Academic Committee and the Course Review Board for scrutiny before publication	November 2013 Bring forward the prototype website Destroy all printed material that remains on site that was in circulation until July 2013 Amend the organisations ordinances and regulations to include an annual review of Public Information policy and procedures Audits and reviews as directed by the organisation Ordinances overseen by Quality Head, General Manager, Head of Admissions and the Chief Executive Officer Amend Academic Committee and Course Review Board, terms of reference to include standing minutes to	ongoing every intake and/or semester	of Admissions, Registrar, Chief Executive Officer, Head of Discipline and Information Technology Manager	manage-ment team, Academic Committee and Course Review Board	procedures Records of minutes of meetings Record of approval process for the information Evidence of audits for the production and publication of material to ensure the mechanism is functioning as mandated Evidence of the review, scrutiny and approval of all material prior to publication by the Academic Committee, post publication by the Course Review Board and senior

						management team
		scrutinise any change in information classified as 'Public Information'				Student and other feedback on the information provided and its clarity and usefulness
Desirable	**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 **desirable** for the School to:						
• clarify the roles and responsibilities of the Academic Director and Head of Quality Assurance (paragraph 1.2).	Review the job specifications of both roles and adjust to set out clear line of responsibility Reduce to the minimum the use of committee names and the capacity they operate	Amend job specifications Amend terms of reference for committees Remove dormant committees Remove vacant posts	March 2014 Quarterly review thereafter	Human Resources and the Academic Committee	Chief Executive Officer and the senior manage-ment team	Quarterly Academic Committee meetings The production of new job specifications The production of Course Review Board minutes

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.

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

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

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

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**.