



Higher Education Review (Embedded Colleges) of CEG UFP Ltd ONCAMPUS

March 2018

Contents

About this review	1
Key findings.....	2
Judgements	2
Recommendations	2
Affirmation of action being taken	2
Financial sustainability, management and governance	2
About the provider	3
Explanation of findings.....	4
1 Judgement: The maintenance of the academic standards of awards offered by the provider and/or on behalf of degree-awarding bodies and/or other awarding organisations.....	4
2 Judgement: The quality of student learning opportunities.....	19
3 Judgement: The quality of the information about learning opportunities	38
4 Judgement: The enhancement of student learning opportunities.....	42
Glossary.....	45

About this review

This is a report of a Higher Education Review (Embedded Colleges) conducted by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) at CEG UFP Ltd ONCAMPUS (ONCAMPUS). The review took place from 6 April to 9 March 2018 and was conducted by a team of six reviewers, as follows:

- Emeritus Professor Brian Anderton
- Dr Sylvia Hargreaves
- Professor Alan Jago
- Professor Graham Romp
- Professor Gaynor Taylor
- Dr Carol Vielba.

The main purpose of the review was to investigate the higher education provision and to make judgements as to whether or not academic standards and quality meet UK expectations. These expectations are the statements in the [UK Quality Code for Higher Education](#) (the Quality Code)¹ setting out what all UK higher education providers expect of themselves and of each other, and what the general public can therefore expect of them.

In Higher Education Review (Embedded Colleges) the QAA review team:

- makes judgements on
 - the setting and maintenance of academic standards
 - the quality of student learning opportunities
 - the information provided about higher education provision
 - the enhancement of student learning opportunities
- makes recommendations
- identifies features of good practice
- affirms action that the provider is taking or plans to take.

A check is also made on the provider's financial sustainability, management and governance (FSMG) with the aim of giving students reasonable confidence that they should not be at risk of being unable to complete their course as a result of financial failure.

The QAA website gives more information [about QAA](#)² and explains the method for [Higher Education Review \(Embedded Colleges\)](#).³ For an explanation of terms see the glossary at the end of this report.

¹ The UK Quality Code for Higher Education is published at: www.qaa.ac.uk/quality-code.

² QAA website: www.qaa.ac.uk.

³ Higher Education Review (Embedded Colleges): www.qaa.ac.uk/reviews-and-reports/how-we-review-higher-education.

Key findings

Judgements

The QAA review team formed the following judgements about the higher education provision.

- The setting and/or maintenance of the academic standards of awards offered by itself and/or on behalf of degree-awarding bodies and/or other awarding organisations **meets** UK expectations.
- The quality of student learning opportunities **meets** UK expectations.
- The quality of the information about learning opportunities is **meets** UK expectations.
- The enhancement of student learning opportunities is **meets** UK expectations.

Recommendations

The QAA review team makes the following **recommendations**.

By September 2018:

- Ensure that programme learning outcomes are on the Masters Foundation Programme (MFP) align with the relevant level of the FHEQ (Expectation A1).
- Ensure that the periodic programme review (PPR) process includes appropriate subject-specific externality (Expectations A3.1, A3.4 and B1).
- Establish policies and procedures for complaints and appeals concerning admissions processes and decisions, and make these publicly available (Expectation B2).
- Ensure that procedures for appointing external examiners are formally documented and that external examiners are appointed in a timely fashion (Expectation B7).
- Ensure that procedures for responding to external examiner reports are fully adhered to (Expectation B7).
- Ensure that marked examination scripts are made available to students who are considering making an appeal under the ONCAMPUS process and that this is written into the process (Expectation B9).
- Ensure that centrally produced public information is customised accurately so that it is fully applicable to each centre (Expectation C).

Affirmation of action being taken

The QAA review team **affirms** the following action already being taken to make academic standards secure and/or improve the educational provision offered to students:

- the improvements being made to systems for student data analysis (Expectation B8).

Financial sustainability, management and governance

The financial sustainability, management and governance check has been satisfactorily completed.

About the provider

ONCAMPUS centres are based on UK and European university campuses to work in partnership with universities with guaranteed progression routes. ONCAMPUS (part of Cambridge Education Group) was set up in 2008, initially comprising centres at Coventry University, University of Central Lancashire, and London South Bank University. In September 2010, a centre was established at Birkbeck College (part of the University of London) (ONCAMPUS London), operating on a hub and spoke model, with six University of London college partners - Birkbeck; Royal Holloway; Goldsmiths; Queen Mary; the Courtauld Institute of Art; and the Royal Veterinary College. Several university departments within Birkbeck College, University of London offer guaranteed progression based on specific criteria. International students on the ONCAMPUS London programmes of study also have the opportunity to apply to other London and UK universities elsewhere through UCAS, which is where the Centre differs to the other centres (colloquially known as the 'Moderns'). Another 'Modern' centre was established in 2011 at the University of Sunderland. The University of Hull centre admitted students in January 2016. ONCAMPUS opened a new centre in September 2017 with the University of Reading.

ONCAMPUS continues to face ever-changing challenges with regard to government policy on the recruitment of international students, a concern shared with their university partners.

In previous years ONCAMPUS enhanced the rigour of the English language testing by bringing in the externally examined UCLan Test of English Language Level (TELL), alongside the centres that utilise IELTS. This enabled them to implement standardised learning outcomes across all centres and ensured consistency in tutors' knowledge, teaching and formative assessment of required language levels. Despite these enhancements, however, this approach to testing brought direct conflict with other routes into degree programmes (for example many university pre-sessionals include a substantial coursework element), and ONCAMPUS unable to fully meet their commitments to the QAA Quality Code, particularly concerning sections B3 and B6 with regard to providing effective feedback on assessment. The decision was therefore taken to introduce an ONCAMPUS English exam, known as OCTOE (ONCAMPUS Test of English), which replaces TELL. This new exam has been designed by the Head of English after consultation with centre staff and university partners, and measures the four skills of listening, reading, writing and speaking. Students who take OCTOE must also pass an academic writing module, designed to gradually build students' confidence and skills in composing longer, more detailed academic texts.

There are 1758 students in the seven embedded centres.

The embedded centres within the network undergoing review were:

- ONCAMPUS Coventry University
- ONCAMPUS University of Hull
- ONCAMPUS London
- ONCAMPUS University of Reading
- ONCAMPUS London South Bank University
- ONCAMPUS University of Sunderland
- ONCAMPUS University of Central Lancashire.

CEG underwent a review by QAA in 2014. The annual monitoring report in 2016 noted that the three good practices had been developed and the five advisable recommendations had been progressed.

Explanation of findings

This section explains the review findings in greater detail.

1 Judgement: The maintenance of the academic standards of awards offered by the provider and/or on behalf of degree-awarding bodies and/or other awarding organisations

Expectation (A1): In order to secure threshold academic standards, degree-awarding bodies:

a) ensure that the requirements of *The Framework for Higher Education Qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FHEQ)* are met by:

- positioning their qualifications at the appropriate level of the relevant framework for higher education qualifications
- ensuring that programme learning outcomes align with the relevant qualification descriptor in the relevant framework for higher education qualifications
- naming qualifications in accordance with the titling conventions specified in the frameworks for higher education qualifications
- awarding qualifications to mark the achievement of positively defined programme learning outcomes

b) consider and take account of QAA's guidance on qualification characteristics

c) where they award UK credit, assign credit values and design programmes that align with the specifications of the relevant national credit framework

d) consider and take account of relevant Subject Benchmark Statements.

Quality Code, Chapter A1: UK and European Reference Points for Academic Standards

Findings

1.1 ONCAMPUS offers three standard programmes across its centres: a Undergraduate Foundation Programme (UFP), an International Year One (IY1) Business programme and a Master's Foundation Programme (MFP). The quality assurance of these standard programmes is managed centrally by ONCAMPUS through its Academic Board. ONCAMPUS also delivers specific International Year 1 (IY1) programmes at some of its centres, such as its IY1 Engineering programme at ONCAMPUS Hull. Other than additional English language provision these specific IY1 programmes replicate those offered by the relevant partner university which has overall responsibility for academic standards. Programmes are approved by university partners to facilitate student progression upon successful completion to the next level.

1.2 ONCAMPUS programmes are aligned against a range of external benchmarks, including the Quality Code, Subject Benchmark Statements, and the Northern Ireland Credit Accumulation and Transfer System (NICATS) level descriptors for level 3 programmes, and

the FHEQ for higher level programmes. ONCAMPUS programmes are non-credit bearing with stated credit values used as a means to equate notional learning hours to programmes and modules. All programmes are required to have a definitive programme specification that detail aims, programme level learning outcomes, programme structure and entry requirements.

1.3 The review team found that the policies, processes and procedures in place at ONCAMPUS would allow this Expectation to be met.

1.4 The review team examined the effectiveness of these policies, processes and procedures by reviewing the Academic Quality Assurance Manual and approval documentation, including programme and module specifications. The team also held meetings with senior staff responsible for academic standards.

1.5 The documentation examined by that the review team examined demonstrates that ONCAMPUS adheres to the policies and procedures to ensure programmes are aligned at the appropriate level.

1.6 Documentation examined by the review team confirms that programmes are aligned against a range of external benchmarks, including the UK Quality Code, the Northern Ireland Credit Accumulation and Transfer System (NICATS) level descriptors for level 3 programmes, and the FHEQ for higher level programmes. Though programmes do not constitute whole degrees appropriate use is made of Subject Benchmark Statements to inform programme design and approval. There are programme specifications for each ONCAMPUS programmes, and while these do not explicitly reference the external reference points used to position the programme, they articulate all the information required by ONCAMPUS. Programme titles conform with naming conventions.

1.7 For the MFP there are two programme specifications one for the level 6 single term version and one for the level 5 two or three term version. The MFP programme specifications state that students entering either version of the programme must have a level 6 qualification, or equivalent work experience, and they detail the modules that must be taken at the required level. However, the two programme specifications have identical programme learning outcomes and it is unclear how each aligns with the corresponding level of the FHEQ as the underlying modules correspond to different levels. For this reason the team recommends that ONCAMPUS ensure that programme learning outcomes on the MFP align with the relevant level of the FHEQ.

1.8 The review team concludes that ONCAMPUS effectively aligns its programmes with relevant external reference points to ensure that appropriate academic standards are set and maintained. The review team concludes that Expectation is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (A2.1): In order to secure their academic standards, degree-awarding bodies establish transparent and comprehensive academic frameworks and regulations to govern how they award academic credit and qualifications.

Quality Code, Chapter A2: Degree-Awarding Bodies' Reference Points for Academic Standards

Findings

1.9 All students follow a centrally developed and approved curriculum for each of the ONCAMPUS programmes: Undergraduate Foundation Programme (UFP), Masters Foundation Programme (MFP) and International Year One (IY1). The curriculum is standard in all ONCAMPUS centres. The only local-level variation is that individual centres can choose which subjects/programmes to offer, in order to match the requirements of their partner university. The exception to this is the Hull Centre which has developed a bespoke IY1 Engineering programme in partnership with its university partner.

1.10 ONCAMPUS is wholly responsible for the academic standards of the programmes it offers. Its university partners have no responsibility for academic standards on these programmes. The agreements ONCAMPUS has with its university partners are that students from the ONCAMPUS programme who achieve at or above a predetermined level in their academic subjects and English language are guaranteed progression to specified programmes at the respective university.

1.11 ONCAMPUS has an established academic governance structure in place through which it discharges its responsibility for academic standards. Its senior academic committee is Academic Board (AB), chaired by the Chief Academic Officer, and with membership drawn from senior staff with ONCAMPUS-level responsibilities and Heads of the ONCAMPUS centres through which programmes are delivered. The role of the Academic Board is supplemented by the recently created Quality Assurance Committee (QAC), also chaired by the Chief Academic Officer, which is responsible to the Board for the ONCAMPUS academic quality assurance framework, and the policies and procedures necessary to maintain academic standards. Also reporting to Academic Board are the Programme Committees for the three programmes which are responsible for assuring and enhancing the quality of the student learning experience at programme level, and which include student representation from each ONCAMPUS centre. Also reporting to Academic Board is the Learning and Teaching Committee (L&TC). Academic Board approves programmes to be delivered once they have been through the ONCAMPUS programme approval or re-approval process, and any conditions set through this process have been satisfied.

1.12 ONCAMPUS has a Quality Assurance Manual which was first introduced in 2012 and has been subject to a number of subsequent revisions, with the latest version updated in September 2017. This provides the framework through which ONCAMPUS manages and maintains the academic standards of its programmes. The Quality Assurance Manual lays down the procedures that are followed for programme development and approval, and programme annual monitoring and periodic review. It also contains the ONCAMPUS assessment policies and procedures, including the use of external examiners. The last monitoring visit (2016) noted the Quality Assurance Manual had been updated in September 2015, that it was now fully mapped against the Quality Code, and that it had been made available to staff in hardcopy and electronic formats, this continues to be the case.

1.13 The structure which ONCAMPUS has put in place is well established and, with the exception of the new QAC, has been reviewed on previous occasions. It continues to have the potential to ensure this Expectation is fully met.

1.14 The review team evaluated the frameworks and regulations ONCAMPUS has put in place to secure academic standards and their operation in practice through the examination of documentation which articulates them, through consideration of the minutes of the key quality committees, and through meetings with staff at both ONCAMPUS centrally and in its centres to discuss how they are used.

1.15 The review team found that the policies, processes and procedures in place at ONCAMPUS would allow this Expectation to be met.

1.16 The roles and responsibilities of the Academic Board and its subsidiary quality committees are clearly articulated in their terms of reference. The QAC is a new addition to the academic governance framework, and the review team sought to understand its purpose and how it fitted into the established framework. Senior staff explained that the agenda for AB had become over-long. QAC would undertake detailed scrutiny and oversight of key processes related to the management of academic standards, notably academic monitoring, programme approval and review, and make recommendations to Academic Board which had ultimate responsibility. Although, at the time of the review, QAC had only met on two occasions, there was evidence of this role operating in practice. QAC had considered the Annual Monitoring Reports submitted by each centre together with the peer-review comments. As well as noting centres had now to adjust their reports in line with the peer reviewer comments, discussion focused on evaluation of the new annual monitoring process and ways it might be enhanced. The review team examined a series of AB minutes for 2016-17. These showed discussion and where appropriate approvals relating to a wide range of matters with a direct bearing on the management and maintenance of academic standards. Included in these were consideration of external examiner reports and the approval of the appointment of new external examiners; approval of the outcomes of the periodic programme review of IY1 and MFP; approval of modifications to the assessment regulations; approval of proposals to modify the programme approval policy; consideration of requests for programme amendments emanating from individual centres; approval of centre formative assessment strategies; and critical examination of proposals for articulation arrangements with other providers as admission routes into ONCAMPUS programmes.

1.17 In relation to programme approval, ONCAMPUS has established procedures for separate consideration of the business development case and the academic case for new programmes. In principle, all new programmes must start by undergoing the NPD (new programme development) process which is instigated by ONCAMPUS sales and marketing. Successful NPD proposals should then go to Academic Board for academic authorisation for a programme team to develop the new programme, though senior staff recognised there may sometimes be overlap of the two processes. ONCAMPUS programmes do not lead to any award nor do they carry academic credit. Programme specifications make reference to credit, but only as a metric for indicating work and assessment loadings for students. In designing its programmes ONCAMPUS makes use of the NICATS/NQF standards for level 3 and the FHEQ for levels 4-6, to ensure its programmes are pitched at the appropriate standard. This level is reflected in individual module specifications within the programme specification. However, the sole objective of ONCAMPUS programmes is to prepare students for entry to their chosen university and university degree programme. Their fitness for purpose is primarily measured by ONCAMPUS in terms of each University partner's willingness to accept successful completion of their programmes for progression to the University. English language is assessed internally in all centres (except ONCAMPUS London which currently relies on the International English Language Testing System) through the OCTOE examinations which have been mapped against the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR).

1.18 The Quality Assurance Manual contains the framework and regulations that govern the assessment process. This includes the setting of assessments, the role of external

examiners in approving assessments, procedures for marking, moderation and standardisation of marking between centres, the conduct of assessment boards and the role of external examiners in moderating academic standards in relation to assessments. The Manual is mapped against the relevant sections of the Quality Code relating to assessment and external examining, and it is made available electronically to all staff and to students. The Quality Assurance Manual is supported by an on-line training programme which was trialled with senior staff, and then rolled-out to all ONCAMPUS staff in 2017.

1.19 ONCAMPUS has established a robust academic governance framework that operates effectively. Although relatively recent in inception, the new QAC has the potential to enhance the effectiveness of the framework. Through its documented quality assurance procedures, ONCAMPUS is able to ensure consistency in the maintenance of academic standards across its network of centres. The Expectation is therefore met with a low level of risk.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (A2.2): Degree-awarding bodies maintain a definitive record of each programme and qualification that they approve (and of subsequent changes to it) which constitutes the reference point for delivery and assessment of the programme, its monitoring and review, and for the provision of records of study to students and alumni.

Quality Code, Chapter A2: Degree-Awarding Bodies' Reference Points for Academic Standards

Findings

1.20 The definitive record that ONCAMPUS maintains for each of its programmes is the programme specification. ONCAMPUS has a standard programme specification template, which follows guidance provided by QAA. It includes a statement of programme-level aims and learning outcomes, the programme structure and module specifications. The latter incorporate intended learning outcomes (subject-based and generic), module content, teaching approach and assessment strategy.

1.21 Programme development teams are responsible for drawing up the programme specification and accompanying module specifications. The programme specification forms the basis for external scrutiny of the programme, and for formal approval by Academic Board. Programmes are now subject to an ONCAMPUS process of PPR. As part of this process, there is an expectation that the programme specification will be reviewed and changes made, subject to approval by Academic Board. There is also a process whereby modules may be modified or new modules added to a programme outside periodic review. The process for this is articulated in the Quality Assurance Handbook. A Module Proposal/Amendment Form is completed and a new module specification drawn up normally by the subject leader, given consideration by the relevant Programme Committee as to its fit and suitability within the programme and finally considered and, if the change is acceptable, approved by Academic Board.

1.22 ONCAMPUS uses its standard programme specification as the definitive record of its programmes. It has established procedures for making changes to the programme specification through PPR and through a procedure for making minor modifications between periodic reviews. All changes to the programme specification are subject to consideration and approval by Academic Board. Implementation of these procedures should ensure the Expectation is met.

1.23 The review team tested whether the expectation was met in practice primarily by examination of documentation, notably the Quality Assurance Handbook and the programme specifications themselves. It also examined the minutes of Academic Board and Programme Boards, and asked staff and students about the accessibility of programme documentation.

1.24 The review team found that the policies, processes and procedures in place at ONCAMPUS would allow this Expectation to be met.

1.25 The ONCAMPUS programme specifications are six in number: UFP, MUFP (Medicine Undergraduate Foundation Programme), IY1 Business, IY1 Engineering (Hull), MFP (one term) and MFP (two and three terms). In all cases the structure and content of these programme specifications are in alignment with the requirements laid out in the Expectation. Each programme specification articulates the intended learning outcomes and attributes of the programme as a whole. The programme specifications contain the definitive statement of which modules make up the programme, together with statements for each module of the intended learning outcomes, indicative content and structure, and the assessment scheme. There is a statement for the programme as a whole and for each

module of the level of study, benchmarked against the NQF or FHEQ as appropriate. There is an anomaly in that the one-term MFP and its constituent modules are declared to be at Level 6, whereas the two/three-Term MFP is declared to be Level 5 (see section A1). ONCAMPUS programmes are not credit bearing, but module specifications usually include a statement of credit purely as a metric for evaluating workload. Similarly, Subject Benchmarks Statements do not fit the nature of its programmes, but ONCAMPUS makes use of them as a general guide for development of the academic aspects of its curricula.

1.26 The review team asked to what extent individual centres might be permitted to make changes to module specifications and learning outcomes as laid down in the programme specifications. It was told that, where a module formed part of the programme specification, the centre proposing the change would have to follow the procedure laid down in the Quality Handbook (see above), and any changes to the programme specification would then apply to all centres that delivered the programme. A current example was cited whereby Coventry Centre is seeking to make changes to the learning outcomes of one of the marketing modules to meet the requirements of its University partner. This would have to follow due process and, if approved by Academic Board, would then apply in all centres that delivered the module.

1.27 The review team also asked how a centre would know which was the current definitive version of the programme and, where alumni students asked for details of the programme they had studied at an ONCAMPUS centre several years after leaving, how would ONCAMPUS know which programme specification these students had studied under. The team had noted some but not all of the programme specifications had a comprehensive system of version control. ONCAMPUS said it had introduced a version control system, and that was evident on the programme specifications where there had been a recent periodic review (UFP, IY1 Business and MFP), but acknowledged the process was not complete (MUFP and IY Engineering). It was their intention that all future programme specifications would be subject to the new version control system.

1.28 Programme specifications are published on the ONCAMPUS virtual learning environment (VLE), and are available to staff and students. In addition, the student Programme Handbook contains a summary of each programme. Students the review team met in all centres which were visited said they had clear and useful information made available to them about their overall programme, individual modules and how they would be assessed,

1.29 ONCAMPUS has a comprehensive programme specification template that meets the requirements laid out in the Expectation, which forms the basis for programme approval, and which constitutes the definitive record of its programmes. It has robust systems for modifying the programme specifications where necessary, and it has implemented an effective system of version control that will apply to all its programme specifications. The Expectation is met and the level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (A3.1): Degree-awarding bodies establish and consistently implement processes for the approval of taught programmes and research degrees that ensure that academic standards are set at a level which meets the UK threshold standard for the qualification and are in accordance with their own academic frameworks and regulations.

Quality Code, Chapter A3: Securing Academic Standards and an Outcomes-Based Approach to Academic Awards

Findings

1.30 All ONCAMPUS programmes and modules are subject to formal consideration and approval by Academic Board. The Academic Quality Assurance Manual details the procedures for programme approval but ONCAMPUS adopts the approval process specified by the partner university if required.

1.31 Proposed programmes are initially considered through the new programme development (NPD) process which considers the business case and resource requirements of the programme. Proposals accepted through the NPD process are submitted to Academic Board to oversee its development and approval. A programme development team produces the initial programme and module specifications in consultation with the relevant university partners. Academic Board then appoints an independent external academic adviser to comment on the proposed documents. Delivery of the programme cannot start until any conditions set by the external adviser, a university partner, or Academic Board have been met. Approval if granted is for five years at the end of which the programme is subject to periodic programme review and re-approval.

1.32 Proposed amendments to learning outcomes and assessment methods on standard ONCAMPUS programmes can only be approved following agreement from all relevant university partners and may require full re-approval.

1.33 The review team found that the policies, processes and procedures in place at ONCAMPUS would allow this Expectation to be met.

1.34 The standard ONCAMPUS programmes were initially developed and approved prior to its engagement with QAA, and under regulations that existed at that time. However, review and re-approval of the UFP was completed at the end of 2014-15, and the MFP and IY1 at the end of 2016-17 (see section A3.3). As the process for programme approval is largely the same as that of re-approval the review team tested whether this Expectation is met in practice by considering the effectiveness of these re-approval processes. The review team also considered documentation relating to the approval of the UFP Medics programme at ONCAMPUS UCLan, the IY1 in Engineering at ONCAMPUS Hull and the IY1 in Art and Design at ONCAMPUS Coventry in 2017. The team also held meetings with staff involved in the approval and re-approval of programmes.

1.35 The documentation for the approval and re-approval events examined by the review team met the requirements of ONCAMPUS.

1.36 The effectiveness of the ONCAMPUS review and re-approval processes is considered in section A3.3. The implementation of these processes supports the view that its approval processes allow ONCAMPUS to ensure that academic standards are set at a level that meets the UK thresholds for the qualification. In section A3.4 the review team recommends that ONCAMPUS ensure that its PPR process includes appropriate subject-specific externality. Given that the ONCAMPUS programme approval process is similar to its re-approval process this recommendation is relevant here.

1.37 The approval of the UFP Medics programme and IY1 programmes in Engineering and in Art and Design were undertaken in accordance with the policy and processes specified in the Academic Quality Assurance Manual. As these programmes had been previously approved through university processes, involving external engagement, ONCAMPUS approved its own delivery of these programme through a series of interactions with the university. The review team considers this level of externality to be appropriate but noted that while the approval of IY1 in Art and Design programme at ONCAMPUS Coventry was formally considered by the Academic Board there was no explicit minute of final approval by the Board.

1.38 The review team found that ONCAMPUS implements robust approval processes to ensure that its programmes are set at a level that meets the UK threshold standard for the qualification and are in accordance with their own academic frameworks and regulations. The review team therefore concludes that Expectation is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (A3.2): Degree-awarding bodies ensure that credit and qualifications are awarded only where:

- **the achievement of relevant learning outcomes (module learning outcomes in the case of credit and programme outcomes in the case of qualifications) has been demonstrated through assessment**
- **both UK threshold standards and their own academic standards have been satisfied.**

Quality Code, Chapter A3: Securing Academic Standards and an Outcomes-Based Approach to Academic Awards

Findings

1.39 Programme specifications, agreed at approval/review, include statements of both generic learning outcomes and, within module descriptions, subject specific outcomes.

A mapping of the generic learning outcomes to individual modules is also provided. Schemes of work for each module provide detail of the learning outcomes covered in individual sessions. Responsibility checklists show that assessments for the provider approved programmes are set by the provider. Academic Board has oversight of assessments whose design is 'led by' programme/pathway/subject leaders. External examiners are explicitly asked to check on coverage of learning outcomes in their reports.

1.40 The mapping of learning outcomes to modules, the design of assessments and its oversight by external examiners would allow the Expectation to be met.

1.41 The team examined documentation including the Quality Manual Programme Specifications, Schemes of work and external examiners' reports. Team members also spoke with a range of staff at individual centres who were involved in setting assessments.

1.42 Programme leaders, pathway leaders and subject leaders take responsibility for one or more modules and for the setting of assessments in these. The team was informed that setting assessments was an activity shared between staff teaching a module, but that overall responsibility lay with the relevant programme, pathway or subject leader. Assessments are scrutinised by external examiners who are required to comment explicitly in their written reports on the extent to which assessment methods test the programme learning outcomes. External examiners commented positively on this aspect. There had been an issue at the UCLan Centre in which MFP students had been set an assessment at the wrong level, this was picked up by both the newly appointed Head of Centre and the provider's Centre Audit and recovery measures put in place. The Head of Centre also explained that additional checks had been introduced to ensure such a situation was avoided in future.

1.43 The consistently positive comments of the external examiners and the detection of, and recovery from, the error at UCLan demonstrate that the Expectation is met and the associated risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (A3.3): Degree-awarding bodies ensure that processes for the monitoring and review of programmes are implemented which explicitly address whether the UK threshold academic standards are achieved and whether the academic standards required by the individual degree-awarding body are being maintained.

Quality Code, *Chapter A3: Securing Academic Standards and an Outcomes-Based Approach to Academic Awards*

Findings

1.44 CEG monitors programmes monthly and reviews them both annually and on a five-year periodic cycle. In addition, the organisation undertakes regular audits of its centres. The details of CEG's monitoring and review systems are set out in the ONCAMPUS Academic Quality Assurance Manual. They are discussed further in Section B8 of this report.

1.45 Through these systems CEG assures itself of the standards of its provision incorporating analysis of statistical data on student performance; internal and external reflection on programme design and delivery; and the outcomes of internal audit.

1.46 The review team found that CEG's framework for monitoring and review of its provision is designed appropriately to meet the Expectation.

1.47 To test the effectiveness of CEG's policies and procedures for programme monitoring and review, the review team looked at policy documents and procedures; templates; the quality assurance manual; reports and documents generated during annual monitoring, PPR and Centre Audit; and committee terms of reference and minutes. The review team met senior staff responsible for monitoring and review.

1.48 Student progression and achievement is monitored across centres monthly. During regular centre audits the CEG team checks that programmes are delivered according to its expectations and that policies for assessment are implemented. Audit also looks at the recording of student performance and tracking of student progress. Most centres receive information from their partner universities about the achievements of their students after progression.

1.49 External examiners are appointed to all CEG programmes. They are required to report whether the standards set on the programme are appropriate and comment on the standards of student work and achievement. Annual subject reviews prepared by subject leaders reflect on student performance and the currency of the delivery of the module. Both sets of reports feed into annual monitoring.

1.50 The template for annual monitoring reviews requires reflection on the strengths, weaknesses and opportunities for enhancement of each programme delivered at each centre. Reports identify any identified threats to standards. Reflection is based on statistical data, feedback from staff, student, partner universities, external examiners and internal audit reports.

1.51 During periodic review academic staff take a longer term look at the design and delivery of a programme. Periodic review includes consideration of the standards that are set and achieved in the light of the programmes learning objectives as well as the currency of the curriculum. Periodic review includes commentary from an independent academic assessor.

1.52 These monitoring and review processes feed into Academic Board and its committees and, in the case of internal audit, into CEG Board. The review team found that the organisation's policies and processes for monitoring and review are implemented consistently and thoroughly, and through them CEG can ensure continued alignment with UK threshold standards.

1.53 The review team concludes that CEG's policies and processes for monitoring and review of its provision are effective in ensuring that Expectation A3.3 is met, and the associated risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (A3.4): In order to be transparent and publicly accountable, degree-awarding bodies use external and independent expertise at key stages of setting and maintaining academic standards to advise on whether:

- **UK threshold academic standards are set, delivered and achieved**
- **the academic standards of the degree-awarding body are appropriately set and maintained.**

Quality Code, Chapter A3: Securing Academic Standards and an Outcomes-Based Approach to Academic Awards

Findings

1.54 ONCAMPUS has clearly defined processes, described in its Quality Manual, for the approval of new programmes and for the re-approval of existing programmes. These processes include the appointment of external advisers to comment on both standards and quality. All programmes are expected to have external examiners and additional external examiners have been appointed to ensure that the workload in terms of scrutinising a representative selection of assignments from all centres remains achievable.

1.55 The use of external, independent expertise in approving and reviewing programmes and the continuing scrutiny of such programmes by independent external examiners would allow the Expectation to be met.

1.56 The team accessed the descriptions of approval and re-approval processes in the Quality Manual and also examined the documentation for the approval of MUFP and IY1 Art and Design in Coventry together with the re-approval of the UFP, IY1 and MFP programmes. They scrutinised external examiners reports, the External Examiners Handbook, and a list of current external examiners. Team members also discussed the choice of external and independent advisers with senior staff at the provider.

1.57 The Quality Manual describes the approval process and the Periodic Programme Review (re-approval) process. With respect to approval Academic Board is responsible for appointing an external reviewer and the manual states that 'The External Reviewer will generally not be a member of staff from any institutions with which ONCAMPUS has current dealings, apart from in instances where the university partner has directly requested this' and also notes the need for subject expertise. An exception to this is when new programmes are designed for, and in conjunction with, a particular university partner rather than being available across all centres. In such cases an external assessor is not used and the process relies on input from the partner university to ensure articulation and appropriate standard. The most recent approval was of this type and did not use any assessor external to the partner university.

1.58 The PPR process involves the scrutiny of a self-evaluation document and a proposed new programme specification by an external reviewer. Whilst the approval process notes a need for subject expertise, Periodic Programme Review refers to a single assessor only, without reference to subject expertise. The team noted that in the case of the UFP periodic review only one assessor was used to comment on the full range of pathways from science and engineering to art. While the assessor was able to comment on generic issues there is a risk that matters of content and subject specific skills are not subject to scrutiny in such a process. The review team **recommends** that CEG ensures that the PPR process includes subject specific externality.

1.59 Standards are set at programme approval and reviewed during the PPR that takes place at least every five years. In order to maintain standards external examiners are

appointed to all programmes and to all subject areas within these. External examiner duties are clearly specified in the External Examiner Handbook, but the team noted that, although the process for appointing external examiners appears to be clearly understood, it is not documented and there had been a considerable delay in replacing an external examiner in the Art and Design area.

1.60 Senior staff told the team that when seeking external and independent advice they prefer to exclude staff from their university partners, but this is becoming more difficult. The current set of external examiners meets this definition of externality as do the two reviewers used in the re-approval of UFP, IY1 and MFP.

1.61 The Expectation is met in that approval and re-approval involve independent and external assessors and external examiners are in place for all programmes. However, there is a moderate risk to standards in the re-approval process if external advisors are not qualified to comment on the range of subject material and it is recommended that CEG ensures that the PPR process includes subject-specific externality.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

The setting and/or maintenance of the academic standards of awards offered by itself and/or on behalf of degree-awarding bodies and/or other awarding organisations: Summary of findings

1.62 In reaching its judgement about the maintenance of academic standards, the review team matched its findings against the criteria specified in Annex two of the published handbook.

1.63 All seven of the Expectations in this area are met and the level of associated risk is low for each.

1.64 There are no areas of good practice. There are two recommendations, one regarding aligning the MFP with the FHEQ and another regarding externality for approval of programmes. One affirmations is identified, namely, the developments being made regarding data analysis.

1.65 The review team concludes that the setting and maintenance of the academic standards of awards offered by itself **meets** UK expectations.

2 Judgement: The quality of student learning opportunities

Expectation (B1): Higher education providers, in discharging their responsibilities for setting and maintaining academic standards and assuring and enhancing the quality of learning opportunities, operate effective processes for the design, development and approval of programmes.

Quality Code, Chapter B1: Programme Design, Development and Approval

Findings

2.1 The process for the design, development and approval of programmes is specified in the Academic Quality Assurance Manual (see section A 3.1). The business case for new programme proposals is initially considered through the ONCAMPUS new programme development (NPD) process and must receive Academic Board authorisation prior to academic development. Once the business case has been approved a programme development team consisting of staff with subject specific knowledge from across the relevant centres produce the initial programme and module specifications. The design and development of ONCAMPUS programmes requires close cooperation with staff involved in the delivery of university programmes for onward progression of successful students. At the approval stage Academic Board appoints an independent external academic adviser to comment on the proposed documents. Delivery of the programme cannot start until any conditions set by the external reviewer, relevant university partners, or Academic Board have been met. Approval if granted is for five years at the end of which the programme is subject to PPR and re-approval.

2.2 The procedures for programme approval laid down in the ONCAMPUS Academic Quality Assurance Manual provide a framework which would allow the Expectation to be met.

2.3 As stated in section A3.1 the standard ONCAMPUS programmes were initially developed and approved prior to its engagement with QAA, and under regulations that existed at that time. The process for programme approval, however, is similar to that of re-approval so that, by examining documentation relating to the re-approval of standard ONCAMPUS programmes and asking staff about this process, the review team was able to test whether the Expectation is met in practice. The review team also examined evidence relating to the design, development and approval of university approved programmes to be delivered by ONCAMPUS.

2.4 Through its NPD process ONCAMPUS is able to identify and ensure that new programmes are appropriately resourced including the availability of specialist staff. The review and re-approval process of ONCAMPUS standard programmes was an extended and iterative process comprising engagement across centres and with relevant university partners. However, as noted in section A3.4 the review team recommends that ONCAMPUS ensure that the PPR process includes appropriate subject-specific externality. Given that the ONCAMPUS programme approval process is similar to its re-approval process this recommendation is relevant here to ensure that programmes provide quality of learning opportunities for students across all subject disciplines.

2.5 The approval for ONCAMPUS to deliver specific university programmes involves extensive engagement with university staff. The approval of such programmes includes detailed mapping of modules against the university programme to ensure that students completing the programme with ONCAMPUS are able to succeed when they progress to the

next level at the university.

2.6 Through the implementation of its own design, development and approval processes, and through collaborative arrangements with partner universities ONCAMPUS is able to ensure that its programmes provide quality learning outcomes for its students. The review team therefore concludes that Expectation B1 is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B2): Recruitment, selection and admission policies and procedures adhere to the principles of fair admission. They are transparent, reliable, valid, inclusive and underpinned by appropriate organisational structures and processes. They support higher education providers in the selection of students who are able to complete their programme.

Quality Code, Chapter B2: Recruitment, Selection and Admission to Higher Education

Findings

2.7 ONCAMPUS uses a world-wide network of student recruitment agents. A detailed, documented compliance framework covers agent recruitment, contractual arrangements, best practice guidelines and compliance monitoring. Rigorous background checks are required for initial appointment. Ongoing monitoring entails analysis of visa refusals, enrolments and completion rates, and a risk-based assessment against defined contractual service levels is applied in cases of non-compliance. Students are invited to provide feedback on the quality of agents' services via the ONCAMPUS induction questionnaire.

2.8 Admissions are handled by the ONCAMPUS central admissions team. The details of the process and the allocation of responsibilities are clearly set out for relevant staff. Entry requirements for all programmes across the network, which are comprehensively documented, are determined by the Head of Admissions in consultation with partner universities on the basis of a range of criteria, including degree progression requirements and sector benchmarking.

2.9 Prospective students apply for a particular degree programme when they apply for admission to an ONCAMPUS programme. Where (rarely) a university limits progression numbers to a particular degree, central admissions manages the process through weekly recruitment trackers. Applicants may request a campus tour, though this is rare as most apply from overseas.

2.10 Students are asked to report any disabilities or special needs on application, so that support can be provided in accordance with the 1995 Disability Discrimination Act.

2.11 The review team considered the effectiveness of the practices and procedures by viewing the ONCAMPUS website, reviewing student survey data and admission requirements, and examining process, quality management and other documentation including sample offer packs, annual programme monitoring reports and minutes of meetings. The team also held meetings with senior ONCAMPUS staff.

2.12 The review team found that CEG's framework for the recruitment and admissions to its provision is designed appropriately to meet the Expectation.

2.13 Once appointed, agents receive training from the ONCAMPUS sales team, on a one-to-one basis, and other senior staff during overseas visits. The sales team maintains contact with agents, who have access to a regularly updated central repository of recruitment materials.

2.14 Clear and helpful information about centres, the programmes, and the application process is accessible on the ONCAMPUS website. The ONCAMPUS brochure, which is customised for individual centres and available online, details the grade progression requirements for each specific university programme. There is a recommendation to ONCAMPUS concerning the accurate customisation of centre brochures in Part C.

2.15 The standard offer pack provides helpful information including offer conditions, course and fee information and next steps, and confirms eligibility for a specified university degree course, subject to meeting entry criteria. Applicants are referred to the relevant university website for further information about progression degrees.

2.16 Processes for identifying and deciding borderline applications are robust and work effectively.

2.17 Recent induction surveys indicate general student satisfaction with the service provided by agents and confirm the usefulness of the ONCAMPUS website for prospective students. These views were echoed in meetings with students at the centre visits.

2.18 While, in practice, complaints and appeals concerning admissions processes and decisions are dealt with appropriately, and processes are currently being formalised, ONCAMPUS does not at present have documented processes, and applicants are not explicitly informed of their associated rights. The review team recommends that ONCAMPUS establish and formally document policies and procedures for complaints and appeals concerning admissions processes and decisions and make these publicly available.

2.19 Overall, recruitment, selection and admission procedures are transparent and inclusive and operate fairly. The team considers that Expectation is met and the level of associated risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B3): Higher education providers, working with their staff, students and other stakeholders, articulate and systematically review and enhance the provision of learning opportunities and teaching practices, so that every student is enabled to develop as an independent learner, study their chosen subject(s) in depth and enhance their capacity for analytical, critical and creative thinking.

Quality Code, *Chapter B3: Learning and Teaching*

Findings

2.20 ONCAMPUS has a Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy 2016-20 which is owned and managed by the central L and TC. A representative from each centre sits on the committee, in addition to key central staff. The focus of the strategy is on students as independent learners and the provision of a high quality learning environment. Responsibility for the Strategy rests with the Academic Office and the Heads of Centre. External examiners have made positive comments about how well students are prepared for progression to their university partners.

2.21 The policies and practices regarding learning and teaching allow the Expectation to be met.

2.22 The review team tested the Expectation by reviewing documentation including curriculum documents and external examiner reports and by meeting teaching and support staff, and students.

2.23 Teaching staff come from a predominantly further education background. Their teaching practice is supported in a number of ways, including on-line materials through the VLE, specific training delivered to centre staff by the Central Academic Office staff, the biennial Learning and Teaching Conference, regular in-session training days and a continuing professional development (CPD) fund. Staff in some centres have access to staff development opportunities with their university partner. All new staff receive an induction programme. Teaching staff have regular management teaching observations as part of the appraisal process. There is also an informal peer observation system process in operation in some centres.

2.24 Students are given a comprehensive induction programme where they are introduced to their programme as well as their university partner. The students have access to the ONCAMPUS VLE which is used extensively by students and staff to support learning. Students are well supported in their development as independent learners which provides a smooth transition to their degree studies. This transition is helped by contact with the university teaching departments and the ability to use university resources and facilities, although the level of usage and access varies between the centres.

2.25 ONCAMPUS monitors and reviews the effectiveness of learning opportunities by end of programme surveys and by feedback through the committee structure. In addition ONCAMPUS has a Centre Academic Oversight Process which contributes to the review and enhancement of learning opportunities and teaching practices, by providing a health-check on learning and teaching in the centres, and identifying good practice. This practice was initially on a termly basis but the frequency and focus of the audit now reflects a risk based approach based on previous audits.

2.26 Learning resources and student support are in place to support student learning and achievement and prepare students for university study. There are systematic and effective assurance and review processes in place to ensure the quality of provision is

enhanced. The Expectation is therefore met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B4): Higher education providers have in place, monitor and evaluate arrangements and resources which enable students to develop their academic, personal and professional potential.

Quality Code, Chapter B4: Enabling Student Development and Achievement

Findings

2.27 ONCAMPUS has a clear policy to support students in their development. They provide a process for monitoring and preparing for student development, enabling students to reflect and lead their own development through the IT portal, with the provision of in-depth feedback from staff. The Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy has as one of its main aims, the delivery of a personalised approach to the students' experience. Support services are provided in the centre, and in some centres, students have access to specialist support services in their university partners.

2.28 The review team found that ONCAMPUS has appropriate policies and processes in place to monitor and evaluate arrangements and resources that enable students to develop their potential. This would enable the Expectation to be met.

2.29 In order to test the effectiveness of the provider's processes the review team looked at policies and processes, handbooks and supporting documentation. The review team discussed the availability of support services and the development of skills for higher education, in its meetings with both staff and students.

2.30 The review team concludes that ONCAMPUS provides a range of activities and support services that enable students to develop their academic and personal potential and to make a smooth transition to their university studies. Programmes are structured to provide an intensive and supportive study environment, with teaching in small groups and with high levels of contact. By using both regular personal tutorials and regular subject based tutorials staff facilitate individual learning and achievement. New staff are prepared for supporting students by their induction and management support.

2.31 All students receive a thorough induction programme where students are introduced to the practicalities of studying in the UK, and the expectations arising from this. Each student is given a personal tutor. The ONCAMPUS tutorial policy is that all students have personal contact with their personal tutor at least weekly. The centres monitor attendance and student achievement closely. Students at risk are noted and appropriate follow-up action taken. This may involve additional academic support or English language provision. Students who met the review team confirmed that they had ready access to support services should the need for them arise and spoke positively about the ways in which the centres enabled them to develop and achieve. The level of access to support services varied between the centres, although it was always clear to students what was available to them. Information about the services available to them are provided in the Student Handbooks and is available on the VLE.

2.32 The adequacy and efficiency of services that enable student development and achievement is monitored through the Centre Audit, monitoring and periodic review, and discussed both at Staff-Student Consultative Committees (SSCCs).

2.33 The review team concluded that the provider operates effectively to enable students to develop their academic, personal and professional potential. The Expectation is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B5): Higher education providers take deliberate steps to engage all students, individually and collectively, as partners in the assurance and enhancement of their educational experience.

Quality Code, Chapter B5: Student Engagement

Findings

2.34 The ONCAMPUS Quality Assurance Manual lists a number of ways in which students are engaged with quality assurance and enhancement including surveys and student representation on the central Programme Committees, and on the Staff Student Consultative Committees (SSCC) within each individual centre. In view of the poor completion rates of some surveys ONCAMPUS has ceased carrying out end of module surveys and instead has been using prompt questions in the SSCCs to ascertain student views about modules. Minutes from the SSCCs are made available to the L and TC, Programme Committees and to programme/pathway leaders. Questionnaires are continuing in relation to student views about induction with an end of programme questionnaire continuing with questions based around those of the National Student Survey. There is also an intention to use former students to inform programme development. The centres are required to provide student representatives on the central programme committees with training given on how to be effective in the role.

2.35 The framework which ONCAMPUS has set to secure student engagement with quality assurance of their educational experience should ensure that student views are articulated both on a group and on an individual basis and would allow the Expectation to be met.

2.36 In order to ascertain whether this operates in practice, the review team examined documentation including the ONCAMPUS Quality Assurance Manual, the minutes of the Learning and Teaching Committee, Programme Committees, SSCCs, and met with both staff and students.

2.37 Students and staff with whom the review team met at the centres confirmed that the arrangements described in the ONCAMPUS Academic Quality Assurance Manual were operational. There was system of student representation in each centre. Students received training to exercise their role. Students confirmed that they were able to identify issues which they had raised and to which the centres had responded positively. They also understood that it was not always possible for centres to make some changes that students had requested. SSCCs meet termly, and minutes of those meetings are made available to all students. Minutes of the Programme Committees show student representatives making a contribution with a standing item in each meeting devoted to students from each Centre reporting on the experience of students in that Centre.

2.38 It is clear that ONCAMPUS has found engaging students in their processes difficult. They have introduced a range of methods for receiving student feedback and evaluation of their learning experience. From the evidence that the review team saw it is apparent that progress has been made.

2.39 The review team concludes that the provider operates effectively to enable students to be engaged in their learning experience. The Expectation is therefore met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B6): Higher education providers operate equitable, valid and reliable processes of assessment, including for the recognition of prior learning, which enable every student to demonstrate the extent to which they have achieved the intended learning outcomes for the credit or qualification being sought.

Quality Code, Chapter B6: Assessment of Students and the Recognition of Prior Learning

Findings

2.40 Students receive both formative and summative assessment with the latter taking place towards the end of the programmes. Assessments are produced by staff who manage modules (programme, pathway or subject leaders) and summative assessments are common across all ONCAMPUS centres with the possibility of some variation in formative assessments. Feedback is provided to students on their submitted coursework and on formative examinations, but not on summative examinations. The quality manual describes a clear protocol for marking assessments beginning with a standardisation meeting to ensure all staff who mark are working to the same guidelines. A proportion of work is moderated with the person responsible for the module remarking in cases of serious discrepancy. A sample of scripts is also submitted to the relevant external examiner.

2.41 The procedures for setting and marking assessments would allow the expectation to be met.

2.42 The team examined the Quality Manual, the Student Handbook, documentation supplied to staff to support them in the production of assessments and the giving of feedback, Academic Board and Examination Board minutes and subject guides available to MUFJ students. In addition, members of the team met with both staff and students at the various ONCAMPUS Centres and staff at the provider.

2.43 The Quality Manual details the assessment process noting a move towards end of programme assessment. This means that students on three term programmes complete two terms of formative assessment which is followed by final summative assessment in term three.

2.44 Students informed members of the team that assignment descriptions were clear and that they understood what was necessary in order to achieve high marks. Coursework is submitted via plagiarism-detection software and students receive written feedback on all coursework and on formative examinations. Summative examination scripts are not returned. Staff are provided with a Guide to Marking and Feedback, which includes the possibility of verbal feedback on summative examination scripts. Students in the centres indicated that feedback was normally both timely and useful. Although there are no stated maximum times for the marking of work the academic calendar, available on the VLE to both staff and students, states when summative assessments are due and by when they will be marked. In the case of formative assessments turnaround time depends on centre assessment strategy and students should be informed by tutors when to expect their work back.

2.45 The process for producing assessments is detailed in writing. Programme, pathway and course leaders who met members of the team explained the process for setting assignment and examination questions. They confirmed these must be commented on by an external examiner before use. Examination papers for the whole academic year, including sufficient for all intakes and for resits, are set at one time and the decision as to which paper to use for a particular examination slot is made by the central academic team so that those

setting questions are not aware of which questions will appear.

2.46 Work is marked by tutors in the centres. A standardisation meeting is held for all staff who will be marking assessed work in to ensure consistency across centres. The Quality Manual states that 'At least 10% of all assessed work must be second marked by suitably qualified staff, and records kept of agreed marks on the internal moderation sheet. In addition, all fails and assessed work in borderline categories must be second marked. Within this at least one piece of assessment from each grade boundary should be second marked. In cases of substantial discrepancy between marker and moderator the module lead must be informed and may act as a third marker. A selection of work from each centre is sent to the external examiner for comment. The Quality Manual does not specify the composition of this sample, but staff in the centres explained that external examiners would be sent a representative range of work from each centre.

2.47 Once work has been marked it is presented to a pre-examination board (held at the end of Academic Board), held prior to the main Examination Board, at which students with extenuating circumstances can be discussed and their grades modified according to clear guidelines. The pre-examination board may also move student module marks into the next grade boundary in certain circumstances when a student is in a borderline category. All ONCAMPUS programmes are considered at a single Examination Board at which external examiners are present and which is chaired by the Chief Academic Officer. The Examination Board considers individual students on each programme and provides a forum for external examiners to comment.

2.48 The ONCAMPUS Student Handbook gives details of assessment regulations including a statement of the right to a single resit for any piece of work. Normally the mark taken forward will be the higher of the two obtained allowing students to improve their grades particularly in cases where the progression grades for the desired university programme are high. In cases where there has been academic misconduct, however, the resit mark will be capped at 40 per cent. Despite this, students and staff who met with members of the team were not always clear about their rights with respect to resits.

2.49 The team noted that students on the MUFP at ONCAMPUS UCLan were not allowed to progress to the interview stage for the medical degree if they failed to make the required grades at a first attempt. They were eligible to resit, but only to progress to another award of the partner university. This additional requirement is stated in subject guides for these students, but not in the Student Handbook. To ensure clarity it is recommended that this special requirement be included in the ONCAMPUS Student Handbook in addition to being noted in all relevant subject guides.

2.50 These processes enable Expectation to be met and the level of risk is low, however to ensure clarity with respect to resit opportunities for MUFP students, it is recommended that the requirement to achieve the required grade at the first attempt in order to progress to medicine be included in the ONCAMPUS student handbook in addition to being noted in all relevant subject guides.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B7): Higher education providers make scrupulous use of external examiners.

Quality Code, Chapter B7: External Examining

Findings

2.51 External examiners are appointed to all programmes and subject areas and the number has recently been increased to reduce workload on individuals. Examiners are expected to be independent of both ONCAMPUS centres and of partner universities. A handbook exists explaining the role and new external examiners have an induction that is based on a meeting with the academic office team and centre staff at one of the centres. Examiners are encouraged to visit a centre at least once in each academic year. All assessments are scrutinised by externals before being sent to students. Examiners have sight of and comment on a range of marked assessments and are expected to attend examination boards. External examiner reports are made available to students and staff via the VLE and via discussion at programme committees.

2.52 The structure for the appointment and briefing of external examiners and the role which they play in assuring both quality and standards would allow the Expectation to be met.

2.53 The team had access to a range of documentation including the Quality Manual, the External Examiners' Handbook, a list of current external examiners, External examiner reports and the minutes of Examination Boards and Programme. In addition members of the team discussed the use of external examiners with staff at CEG and at individual centres.

2.54 The team was informed that when a new external examiner is appointed the position is advertised and candidates considered by the Chief Academic Officer, Deputy Chief Academic Officer and the appropriate subject leader. A proposal is then made to the Academic Board which is responsible for the appointment. However this process is not formally documented. The team also noted that there had been no external examiner in place for art and design in the current academic year although members were informed that interviews were about to take place. Appointment of an external for English had also been delayed. It is recommended that procedures for the appointment of external examiners are formally documented and that they are appointed in a timely fashion.

2.55 A concise and clear handbook explaining the duties involved is provided to examiners and new appointments also have an induction led by the central academic team and held at one of the centres. They are encouraged to visit centres during their term of office and such visits are evidenced in examination board minutes. Reports are available to students and staff on the VLE and are discussed at programme committees which include both subject leaders and student representatives.

2.56 External examiners are expected to be external to CEG which defines externality as being independent of all its centres and its partner universities the current set of external examiners meets this requirement.

2.57 Examiners are consulted about coursework and examination questions before these are given to students. They receive a range of marked work covering high, medium and low grades and this range is submitted by each centre giving examiners a full picture of performance of students and of marking quality and accuracy. Examiners' reports were generally detailed, submitted on a standard form and included comment on the range of topics expected. In some cases this included comment on the performance of individual centres (particularly valuable in the context of centre based annual monitoring) but the team

was informed that such comment is an expectation rather than a requirement. Examiners attend the Examination Board and their comments are included in Examination Board minutes.

2.58 The External Examiners Handbook states that the Chief Academic Officer 'will send a letter to external examiners acknowledging receipt of the report, which includes the main issues which require a response and giving an indication of measures and timescales for further consideration'. This letter is to be sent within 28 days of receipt of the external examiner's report. CEG was not able to evidence compliance with this and therefore the review team recommends that it is ensured that procedures for responding to external examiners' reports are fully adhered to.

2.59 Processes and procedures indicate that the Expectation B7 is met with external examiners appointed to all programmes, inducted into the provider's approach, expected to comment on assessments before students receive these and to scrutinise the marking process. However, the lack of a formally documented process for appointment, significant delay in appointment and lack of formal response to external examiners' reports indicate a moderate risk to quality and it is recommended that procedures for the appointment of external examiners are formally documented and that they are appointed in a timely fashion, also that it is ensured that procedures for responding to external examiners' reports are fully adhered to.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Moderate

Expectation (B8): Higher education providers, in discharging their responsibilities for setting and maintaining academic standards and assuring and enhancing the quality of learning opportunities, operate effective, regular and systematic processes for monitoring and for review of programmes.

Quality Code, Chapter B8: Programme Monitoring and Review

Findings

2.60 CEG has systems in place for the annual monitoring of all programmes on a centre by centre basis. Annual monitoring reports are developed using statistical data on performance; staff, student and external comments and feedback; and require critical reflection and action plans. Annual monitoring reports are discussed by the relevant programme committee before being received and approved by the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) on behalf of Academic Board (AB). Annual reviews are also prepared at subject level which feed into the annual monitoring process.

2.61 PPRs are undertaken on a roughly five-year cycle. Such reviews involve the organisation, centres, university partners and external advisers. The process includes analysis of statistical data and monitoring reports prepared in the period since the last review. The outcome of periodic review is a revised programme specification.

2.62 CEG requires all centres to provide monthly performance data related to its key performance indicators (KPIs), which cover both business and academic objectives. The organisation operates a system of unannounced Centre Audits which cover academic and operational issues. The frequency of such audits is determined on a risk basis.

2.63 CEG has processes in place to safeguard the interests of students in the event of closure of provision. Safeguards are also written into the formal memoranda of cooperation with partner universities.

2.64 The review team found that the policies, processes and procedures in place at CEG for monitoring and review of the quality and standards of its provision would allow the Expectation to be met.

2.65 To assess the effectiveness of these processes the review team looked at policy documents and procedures; templates; the quality assurance manual; reports and documents generated during annual monitoring, PPR and Centre Audit; and committee terms of reference and minutes. The review team met senior staff responsible for monitoring and review.

2.66 A new system of annual monitoring has been introduced and was operational for the first time for 2016-17 reports. Previously a single annual monitoring report was produced for each programme at organisational level. The new system requires each centre to produce a report for each programme that it delivers. Reports are produced by Centre Heads using a standard template that covers the operation of the programme over the past year as well as strengths and weaknesses. Reports identify good practice and issues of concern. Action plans are required. Draft reviews are discussed at programme committees with students present. Before presentation to the QAC each report is peer reviewed by another Centre Head, who provides a critical analysis of the document and may propose changes to the report or the action plan. Academic Board does the final sign off based on the minutes of QAC.

2.67 The new annual monitoring reports are not aggregated into cross-centre programme reports. However, the organisation stated that with the additional detail and

analysis provided by the new reports it was possible to identify broad themes across the centres reflecting common issues and challenges. QAC is charged with monitoring the implementation of action plans developed as part of annual monitoring. Implementation will also be tracked through Centre Audits. Staff that met the review team stated that the initial round of annual monitoring reports had worked effectively; some enhancements will be made next time, for example improved statistical data.

2.68 Policies and procedures for monitoring and review are set out in the ONCAMPUS Academic Quality Assurance Manual. However, the latest edition of the manual pre-dates the new annual monitoring process which is described in a separate policy document.

2.69 Following an advisable recommendation in the previous QAA review of CEG the organisation has developed and implemented a first cycle of periodic reviews of its programmes. A schedule for the next round of such reviews on a five-year rolling basis has been published. The process for periodic review is set out in the ONCAMPUS Academic Quality Assurance Manual. Periodic review is overseen by the QAC and involves the L and TC as well as programme committees. Academic Board approves the revised programme specification that results from periodic review. The full review process is spread over a period of a year or more. Statistical and other documentation related to the operation of the programme are assembled and consultative meetings are held with staff, students, alumni, and university partners. Based on the data and consultations, a revised programme specification is developed by CEG which is then mapped against university requirements before final sign-off. An external academic provides a general commentary on the proposed new specification. The review team found the periodic review process to be thorough and effective. Following the completion of the first round of reviews the organisation is looking into ways of streamlining the process.

2.70 The previous QAA review of CEG also recommended the desirability of strengthening the academic oversight of individual centres. In response, the organisation developed and implemented a system of regular unannounced half-day audit visits by members of CEG staff to each centre. During the visits meetings are held with staff and students to explore adherence to CEG policies, data profiles, and current activities and issues. Reports identify good practice which is shared via the L and TC and Academic Board. Reports also contain two RAG-ratings (red, amber, green), one for academic matters and one for operational matters, and recommendations for addressing problems and issues. Red ratings require action to be taken within two weeks. The timing of subsequent audits is determined by the ratings. Extraordinary audits may be undertaken where a significant issue has been identified in a centre. The outcomes of Centre Audits are reported to the Operation Board and thence to the CEG Board. The review team found the use of Centre Audits to be a robust monitoring mechanism that ensures that problems, once identified, are dealt with promptly and effectively.

2.71 All centres send monthly statistical reports to ONCAMPUS CEG relating to both academic and business KPIs. The need to improve management information is one of the themes that emerged from the first round of centre-based annual monitoring reports. CEG is undertaking an organisation-wide systems integration project that will bring different data sets together and provide more relevant data to centres. This improvement will facilitate comparative analysis of student performance and progression. The review team **affirms** the improvements being made to systems for data analysis.

2.72 There are no recent examples of programme closure.

2.73 The review team concludes that CEG operates effective systems of monitoring and review of its provision delivered at its centres. The Expectation is met, and the level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B9): Higher education providers have procedures for handling academic appeals and student complaints about the quality of learning opportunities; these procedures are fair, accessible and timely, and enable enhancement.

Quality Code, Chapter B9: Academic Appeals and Student Complaints

Findings

2.74 The ONCAMPUS appeals and complaints policies and processes, which apply across the ONCAMPUS network, are set out in the Academic Quality Assurance Manual.

2.75 The appeals procedure clearly defines the grounds for appeal, which exclude academic judgement, and sets out deadlines. The process is facilitated by the ONCAMPUS Chief Academic Officer, who undertakes an initial assessment, subsequently either referring to the original decision-making body for a response or rejecting the appeal, as appropriate. If not upheld at this stage, the appeal moves to the Academic Appeals Committee, initially for examination by a staff committee member who may reject or accept the appeal or refer it to a full committee hearing. At all stages, the process provides for information/clarification to be sought from relevant parties.

2.76 The Academic Appeals Committee, acting under the full delegated authority of Academic Board, comprises at least two members of Academic Board, one of whom acts as chair and neither of whom have been involved in the original decision, and a student delegate or an academic staff member. Student appellants are invited and encouraged to attend the Academic Appeals Committee hearing, conducted in accordance with the detailed, documented procedure. The outcome is conveyed to the appellant and to the relevant Centre Head (for action where required) and formally reported to Academic Board.

2.77 The complaints process begins locally with the member of staff concerned or another staff member and, if unresolved, moves to the Centre Head (or, for a complaint against them, to another Centre Head) for formal review and thence, if still unresolved, to final review by the Reviewing Officer (Chief Operating Officer, Chief Academic Officer and/or Managing Director). At the formal stage, complaints are submitted via standard forms to the ONCAMPUS central administration team, which administers the process. Deadlines for each stage are set out clearly, and the process is formally completed with a written response to the complainant, together with a 'Completion of Procedures' letter if the complaint is not upheld.

2.78 The review team made a recommendation at Expectation B2 that ONCAMPUS establish and document a formal appeals procedure regarding admissions processes and decisions.

2.79 The policies and processes in place would allow the Expectation to be met.

2.80 In considering this Expectation the review team viewed the VLE and examined regulatory documentation, the marking and feedback guide, the student handbook, the complaints log, the tutorial scheme of work and meeting minutes, with associated documentation. The team also held meetings with senior ONCAMPUS staff.

2.81 The most recent annual report to Academic Board on appeals, for 2016-17, records five appeals, none of which was upheld. This report provides analysis and evaluates commentary, with recommendations for action. The report identified the need for students to be reminded of the grounds for appeal and about plagiarism. The new personal tutorial scheme of work, which includes a session on complaints, exams and coursework

procedures, including plagiarism, provides a good opportunity for these matters to be revisited.

2.82 A network-wide log records the nature and outcome of complaints. In total, seven formal complaints have been received and investigated over the past three years, only one of which was upheld.

2.83 ONCAMPUS maintains a rule that students do not have access to their marked summative examination scripts, including students who are considering making an appeal under the formal process. In order to ensure that all parties have equal access to all the evidence that will be used as a basis for determining the outcome of an appeal, the review team recommends that ONCAMPUS ensure that marked examination scripts are made available to students who are considering making an appeal under the ONCAMPUS appeals process and that it is written into the process.

2.84 Students have access to clear information about complaints and appeals processes. The appeals policy and procedure are set out in full in the ONCAMPUS student handbook. The complaints policy and procedure, together with the relevant forms for the formal stages of the process, are accessible to students on the VLE.

2.85 ONCAMPUS has procedures for handling complaints and appeals that are, overall, fair, accessible and timely and enable enhancement. The Expectation is met and the level of associated risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

The quality of student learning opportunities: Summary of findings

2.86 In reaching its judgement about student learning opportunities, the review team matched its findings against the criteria specified in Annex two of the published handbook.

2.87 All nine of the Expectations in this area are met and the level of associated risk is low for eight and moderate for one, Expectation B7.

2.88 There are no areas of good practice. There are four recommendations regarding complaints and appeals, two regarding external examining and one regarding making marked exam scripts available for students when making an appeal. There is one affirmation regarding the progress made in data analysis.

2.89 The review team concludes that the quality of student learning opportunities at the provider **meets** UK expectations.

3 Judgement: The quality of the information about learning opportunities

Expectation (C): UK higher education providers produce information for their intended audiences about the higher education they offer that is fit for purpose, accessible and trustworthy.

Quality Code, Part C: Information about Higher Education Provision

Findings

3.1 The CEG marketing department has responsibility for issuing public information such as prospectuses and maintaining the accuracy of information on the website for ONCAMPUS. A member of the central marketing team sits on Academic Board. Students may also obtain information and advice from overseas agents. Agents are subject to regular monitoring and training by centre staff.

3.2 The website provides information which explains the mission and values of the ONCAMPUS programmes, and how they fit within the broader higher education environment. The website incorporates a Coursefinder facility, which allows prospective students to locate programmes of study in different ONCAMPUS centres. It provides information on entry requirements specific to the prospective student's country of origin, visa requirements, duration of the programme, fees and progressions routes.

3.3 Current students are provided with a single ONCAMPUS Student Programme Handbook. This gives an overview of the student's programme, guidance on academic support arrangements, statement of the regulations governing key areas such as assessment, extenuating circumstances and academic misconduct, arrangements for student engagement and representation, and a statement of student entitlements and responsibilities. Responsibility for maintaining the handbook lies with the central academic office, and the information contained is checked and overseen by the Chief and Deputy Chief Academic Officers. The handbook is available through the ONCAMPUS VLE. Module specifications are made available to students through the programme specification. These provide students with detailed information concerning the logistics of delivering the module, module content and assessment requirements. Most information is centrally provided, but each centre also has its own centre Student Handbook or equivalent, providing locally contextualised information, but still provided in a standard ONCAMPUS format and made available electronically and in hard-copy formats.

3.4 Completing students receive a transcript which details the outcome of their programme, including individual module marks and English marks (for students who take the ONCAMPUS Test of English). It is centrally controlled, printed on secure paper with watermarking and hologram, and incorporating a 'unique student identifier'.

3.5 In principle, ONCAMPUS has a structure and processes in place that ensures the Expectation is met and that the information it produces and publishes about the learning opportunities it offers through its centres is fit for purpose, accessible and trustworthy.

3.6 The review team examined whether the Expectation was met in practice through a detailed review of the content of the ONCAMPUS website. This included testing its fit against the indicators of sound practice laid out in the Expectation. It examined the Induction Survey of all new students in which they were asked to comment on their experience with agents and their use of the ONCAMPUS website. It also examined other material produced for students including the Programme Handbook and the centre-specific student handbooks.

It met with senior staff including those with overall responsibility for prospectus and website information. And it met with students in all centres under review and asked them about the accuracy, accessibility and usefulness of information they received prior to becoming a student, and the information they received subsequent to enrolment.

3.7 The review team found the ONCAMPUS website easy to navigate, and it provided information that covered all the indicators of sound practice laid down in the expectation and which relate to students prior to enrolment. In particular, the coursefinder facility readily enables students to narrow their search criteria to find the location(s) in which they are interested to study, the subject area and level of study they are seeking. They can then drill down to find out more detail about the course including the requirements for entry for someone coming from their country of origin. Fee information is also provided as well as general information about the centre including information about accommodation and the partner university. Information is provided about the individual university degrees to which students would be eligible to progress, and a statement of the progression requirements. Where, for a particular degree, the university specifies something outside the standard progression requirements, these are highlighted and can be viewed in a drop-down box. It is also possible to download a copy of the centre brochure, so that the student would have a copy of the information specific to the centre in which they planned to study. The ONCAMPUS Induction Survey, although a bit dated and with a poor response rate in some centres, confirmed around three-quarters of students had used the website, and the vast majority though it useful or very useful in making their decision where to study. Students with whom the review team met in the individual centres also confirmed the usefulness of the website.

3.8 ONCAMPUS recruits most of its students via agents, something confirmed by students the review team met. It provides group and one to one training sessions, and annually updated agent information packs to ensure its agents provide students with accurate and reliable information. The Head of ONCAMPUS London also told the review team he undertook in-country training visits to ensure agents properly understood the distinctive offering at the Centre with its different progression arrangement. The Induction Survey asked students about their experience with their recruiting agent, whether they had been given the ONCAMPUS prospectus and whether there were ways the service of the agent could be improved. Most students indicated satisfaction. Information on the quality of agent support is forwarded to the Chief Operating Officer to identify areas for improvements and gaps in knowledge. When students the review team met were asked about the accuracy and usefulness of information they received from agents, most were similarly satisfied.

3.9 The review team were interested to know to what extent ONCAMPUS had taken account of the HE: Consumer Law Advice for Providers produced by the Competition and Markets Authority. The team was told it had reviewed its application forms and changed some of the guidance on marketing material it used.

3.10 Students received pre-arrival information in varying formats, but in all cases, students said this provided a valuable and effective bridge into study at the centre. Students also said they received timely and helpful information by email from recruitment and admissions. On arrival students have access to the Programme Handbook which is a composite document for the three main programmes ONCAMPUS provides through its centres, UFP, IY1 and MFP. Together with the online programme specifications, it provides all the information specified in the Expectation indicators of sound practice, and it does so from the meta level of ONCAMPUS requirements and regulations, down to the micro-level of individual modules. One anomaly in the Programme Handbook is that there is no specific reference to the MUFP or the IY1 Engineering.

3.11 Students in all centres reviewed told the review team they found the information they were provided with on their programme generally met their requirements and they found it fit for purpose, accessible and trustworthy. From the evidence the review team saw and heard, both centrally and at the individual centres, it generally agreed ONCAMPUS had robust procedures to ensure the Expectation is met. There is one important exception to this relating to the new Reading Centre in its first year of operation. The review team found three breaches relating to the website for Reading Centre and in the hardcopy prospectus: a) The website and centre prospectus included the QAA Logo with a statement that the Centre was QAA approved and regularly reviewed by the Agency. At the time of the review this could not be true since it was the first visit by a QAA review team; b) The Reading brochure indicated that students of the Centre had full access to university learning resources. The review team found this was not the case with students able to use the library with borrowing rights, but they had no access to the university's online information and learning resources; c) The information provided to art and design students did not inform them they would have to pay additional costs for materials in Term Three. ONCAMPUS Marketing staff acknowledged there were errors in the information being provided to prospective students at Reading Centre which had the potential to mislead students. They believed the standard ONCAMPUS centre website template had been simply rolled forward, and insufficient care had been taken to include centre-specific information. ONCAMPUS had responded by updating the Reading website and was seeking to recover inaccurate brochures from agents. The review team therefore recommends that centrally produced public information is customised accurately so that it is fully applicable to each centre.

3.12 The evidence seen and heard by the review team, both centrally and at the individual centres gives broad confidence that Expectation C is met. ONCAMPUS has robust procedures which are operating well in all centres. The exception is the new Reading Centre where some significant inaccuracies in information provided to students were identified. This was, from the perspective of all the other visits made and documentation reviewed, an anomalous outlier. For this reason, the review team took the view that the Expectation was met. However, to reflect the seriousness of the Reading case, and to highlight the importance of ONCAMPUS ensuring centrally produced public information for new centres is carefully checked and customised to ensure accuracy, the level of risk was identified as moderate.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Moderate

The quality of the information about learning opportunities: Summary of findings

3.13 In reaching its judgement about student learning opportunities, the review team matched its findings against the criteria specified in Annex two of the published handbook

3.14 There are no good practices or affirmations. There was one recommendation regarding ensuring that centrally produced public information is customised accurately so that it is fully applicable to each Centre.

3.15 The Expectation is met with moderate risk.

3.16 The review team concludes that the quality of the information produced by the provider about its provision **meets** UK expectations.

4 Judgement: The enhancement of student learning opportunities

Expectation (Enhancement): Deliberate steps are being taken at provider level to improve the quality of students' learning opportunities.

Findings

4.1 The organisation describes its approach to enhancement as 'holistic'. ONCAMPUS has recently developed an Enhancement a UK Europe Strategy 2017-20, which identifies five strategic imperatives which relate directly or indirectly to the quality and enhancement of student learning opportunities. Strategy which focuses on ways in which the organisation can identify and respond to opportunities for enhancement. The implementation of the Enhancement Strategy is overseen by the Academic Board. The Enhancement Strategy is supported by the Learning Teaching and Assessment Strategy, which is overseen by the L and TC.

4.2 The Enhancement Strategy sets out the organisation's key processes and procedures for the identification of enhancement opportunities and the sharing of good practice. These mechanisms are centred on three cross-centre structures, namely the L and TC, subject groups and programme committees. The latter bodies involve students. Annual monitoring reports and Centre Audits evaluate the effectiveness of enhancement initiatives and identify good practice as well as areas for action. Other local mechanisms for discussing enhancement and sharing good practice include peer observation and staff meetings. CEG organised events such as the biennial Learning and Teaching Conference provide further opportunities for exchange of ideas on best practice.

4.3 Centres develop strategic growth plans that reflect the organisation's strategic imperatives. Each centre is also required to develop a local enhancement strategy to fit within the overarching strategy for ONCAMPUS UK Europe.

4.4 The review team found that policies and procedures in place would allow the Expectation on Enhancement to be met.

4.5 In order to assess the effectiveness of ONCAMPUS's approach to enhancing the quality of learning opportunities, the review team looked at strategies and plans; policy documents; quality assurance processes and procedures; terms of reference, agendas and minutes of committees and other groups; centre audit reports; and annual monitoring reports. The review team also read evidence related to examples of enhancement provided by the organisation. The review team discussed the organisation's approach to enhancement with senior staff of ONCAMPUS.

4.6 The review team observed that ONCAMPUS's strategic imperatives are embedded in the organisation's reporting mechanisms and action plans. The five imperatives relate to quality and the student experience; partnership development including new progression opportunities; staff development; operational excellence; and innovation. These imperatives, which inform centre strategies, are reflected in Centre Audits, monthly reporting on KPIs, and annual monitoring reports. All centres are required to develop local enhancement strategies within the framework of the Enhancement Strategy: most have done so, and the remaining strategies will be completed by the end of the year.

4.7 The Academic Board has identified three top priorities for enhancement across the organisation. The three priorities are improving the student data system to allow easier and better tracking of student performance; increasing student engagement; and increasing opportunities for staff to undertake CPD. Actions taken in relation to these priorities have

been discussed earlier in this report.

4.8 ONCAMPUS promotes an ethos of continuous improvement which was reflected in meetings with staff and students across the organisation. The minutes of cross-centre bodies such as the L and TC subject groups, and programme teams, as well as local staff meetings, demonstrate that CEG actively identifies and pursues opportunities for enhancement. The review team saw evidence of enhancement initiatives that have resulted from the operation of quality assurance processes. Annual monitoring reports for programmes and subject areas, and Centre Audits, all identify areas for enhancement activity and include action plans to ensure that these are taken forward. Students contribute to these processes through feedback mechanisms such as surveys and staff student liaison committees. Student membership of programme committees allows students to be involved in discussing and agreeing enhancement initiatives at programme level.

4.9 Good practice is identified during centre audits and annual monitoring reports which are brought to the attention of ONCAMPUS's committees for wider dissemination. The annual monitoring process includes peer commentary on draft reports which allows for critical reflection and facilitates the identification of good practice. Other opportunities such as teaching observation and the Learning and Teaching Conference are provided for staff to exchange ideas and improve practice. Subject groups at organisational and centre level, as well as centre-level staff meeting, provide further opportunities for staff discussion and exchange.

4.10 The effectiveness of ONCAMPUS's Enhancement Strategy is reviewed annually by the Academic Board using measures such as pass rates, student evaluations, audit results and external examiner reports. The first such review has not yet taken place.

4.11 ONCAMPUS takes deliberate steps to improve the quality of students' learning opportunities through strategic initiatives and the operation of cross-centre structures that give staff and students the opportunity to engage in continuous improvement and share good practice. The review team concludes that ONCAMPUS's approach is effective. The Expectation is met and the associated risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

The enhancement of student learning opportunities: Summary of findings

4.12 In reaching its judgement about student learning opportunities, the review team matched its findings against the criteria specified in Annex two of the published handbook

4.13 There are no good practices, recommendations or affirmations. ONCAMPUS takes deliberate steps to enhance student learning opportunities.

4.14 The review team concludes that the enhancement of student learning opportunities at the provider **meets** UK expectations.

Glossary

This glossary is a quick-reference guide to terms in this report that may be unfamiliar to some readers. Definitions of key operational terms are also given on pages 24-27 of the [Higher Education Review \(Embedded Colleges\) handbook](#).

If you require formal definitions of other terms please refer to the section on assuring standards and quality: www.qaa.ac.uk/assuring-standards-and-quality.

User-friendly explanations of a wide range of terms can be found in the longer Glossary on the QAA website: www.qaa.ac.uk/Pages/GlossaryEN.aspx.

Academic standards

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

Award

A qualification, or academic credit, conferred in formal recognition that a student has achieved the intended **learning outcomes** and passed the assessments required to meet the academic standards set for a **programme** or unit of study.

Awarding organisation

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

Blended learning

Learning delivered by a number of different methods, usually including face-to-face and e-learning (see **technology enhanced or enabled learning**).

Credit(s)

A means of quantifying and recognising learning, used by most institutions that provide higher education **programmes of study**, expressed as numbers of credits at a specific level.

Degree-awarding body

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

Distance learning

A course of study that does not involve face-to-face contact between students and tutors but instead uses technology such as the internet, intranets, broadcast media, CD-ROM and video, or traditional methods of correspondence - learning 'at a distance'. See also **blended learning**.

Dual award or double award

The granting of separate awards (and certificates) for the same **programme** by two **degree-awarding bodies** who have jointly delivered the programme of study leading to them. See also **multiple award**.

e-learning

See technology enhanced or enabled learning.

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 our review processes.

Expectations

Statements in the **Quality Code** that set out what all UK higher education providers expect of themselves and each other, and what the general public can therefore expect of them.

Flexible and distributed learning

A programme or module that does not require the student to attend classes or events at particular times and locations. See also **distance learning**.

Framework

A published formal structure. See also **framework for higher education qualifications**.

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* (FQHEIS).

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 audit and review processes.

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.

Multiple awards

An arrangement where three or more **degree-awarding bodies** together provide a single jointly delivered **programme** (or programmes) leading to a separate **award** (and separate certification) of each awarding body. The arrangement is the same as for **dual/double awards**, but with three or more awarding bodies being involved.

Operational definition

A formal definition of a term, establishing 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.

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.

Self-evaluation document

A report submitted by a higher education provider, assessing its own performance, to be used as evidence in a QAA review.

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.

Technology enhanced or enabled learning (or e-learning)

Learning that is delivered or supported through the use of technology.

Threshold academic standard

The minimum acceptable level of achievement that a student has to demonstrate to be eligible for an academic **award**. Threshold academic standards are set out in the national **frameworks** and **Subject Benchmark Statements**.

Virtual learning environment (VLE)

An intranet or password-only interactive website (also referred to as a platform or user interface) giving access to **learning opportunities** electronically. These might include such resources as course handbooks, information and reading lists; blogs, message boards and forums; recorded lectures; and/or facilities for online seminars (webinars).

Widening participation

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

QAA2141 - R9893 - June 18

© The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education 2018
Southgate House, Southgate Street, Gloucester GL1 1UB
Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786

Tel: 01452 557050
Website: www.qaa.ac.uk