

# Review for Specific Course Designation by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education

## **NS3 UK Ltd t/a Centre for Nutrition Education & Lifestyle Management (CNELM)**

February 2014

### **Contents**

<b>Key findings about NS3 UK Ltd t/a Centre for Nutrition Education &amp; Lifestyle Management (CNELM) .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Good practice.....	1
Recommendations.....	1
<b>About this report .....</b>	<b>2</b>
The provider's stated responsibilities .....	3
Recent developments.....	3
Students' contribution to the review .....	3
<b>Detailed findings about NS3 UK Ltd t/a Centre for Nutrition Education &amp; Lifestyle Management (CNELM).....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1 Academic standards.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2 Quality of learning opportunities.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3 Information about learning opportunities .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Action plan.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>About QAA.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Glossary.....</b>	<b>21</b>

## Key findings about NS3 UK Ltd t/a Centre for Nutrition Education & Lifestyle Management (CNELM)

As a result of its Review for Specific Course Designation carried out in February 2014, the QAA review team (the team) considers that there can be **confidence** in how the provider manages its stated responsibilities for the standards of the programmes it offers on behalf of Middlesex University.

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

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

### Good practice

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

- the effective student-led collection and analysis of feedback which informs the review of programmes (paragraph 2.4)
- the effective and collaborative student engagement in quality assurance processes (paragraph 2.5)
- the recording of and online access to lectures (paragraph 2.6)
- the well-developed strategic management of staff development opportunities (paragraph 2.9)
- the clear and consistent use of forums to support good communication between staff and students (paragraph 3.2)
- the Centre's engagement with its alumni to support their continuing professional development and provide access for staff and students to professional practice updates (paragraph 3.4).

### Recommendations

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

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

- further develop the role of the Ethics Committee as an independent advisory body (paragraph 1.3)
- develop the oversight of marking to ensure students consistently receive timely feedback (paragraph 2.8)
- revise and formalise procedures for authorising changes to published information to further assure the accuracy of content (paragraph 3.5).

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

- evaluate how the new mechanism for student support meets student needs (paragraph 2.7).

## About this report

This report presents the findings of the [Review for Specific Course Designation](#)<sup>1</sup> conducted by [QAA](#) at NS3 UK Ltd t/a Centre for Nutrition Education & Lifestyle Management (CNELM; the Centre), which is a privately funded centre of higher education. The purpose of the review is to provide public information about how the Centre discharges its stated responsibilities for the management and delivery of academic standards and the quality of learning opportunities available to students. The review applies to programmes of study that the Centre delivers on behalf of Middlesex University (the University). The review was carried out by Mr Shahban Aziz, Dr Nick Dickson, Mr Gary Hargreaves (reviewers) and Mrs Mandy Hobart (coordinator).

The review team conducted the review in agreement with the Centre and in accordance with the [Review for Educational Oversight: Handbook](#).<sup>2</sup> Evidence in support of the review included copies of policies and procedures, external examiner and monitoring reports, minutes of meetings and partnership arrangements.

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

- the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (the Quality Code)
- Professional Standards - Nutritional Therapy Council
- Core Curriculum of the Nutritional Therapy Council
- National Occupational Standards - Skills for Health.

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

The Centre is a specialist private provider of higher education programmes in nutrition and nutritional therapy. NS3UK Ltd, more widely known as the Centre for Nutrition Education & Lifestyle Management (CNELM), was established by the current Chief Executive Officer in 2001 as a family-led company. In 2013 CNELM became a wholly controlled, not-for-profit subsidiary of NS3UK Ltd, in which the Chief Executive Officer is the principal shareholder. All higher education programmes are validated by Middlesex University. The Centre also offers level 3 provision including Access to HE courses and specialist centre-devised certificates. Most students are mature learners who are seeking practice-related qualifications.

The Centre operates from a single campus in Wokingham, and is about to move to a new location closer to the town centre due to the redevelopment of their current site. The vision of the Centre is to 'steer the process of the integration of nutritional therapy and personalised nutrition into mainstream health care so that it becomes a widely accessible and accepted health care option; and for the Centre to be viewed as a Centre of Excellence for Education and Research'. The Centre has 255 students registered on programmes in the UK and overseas, covering attendance and distance-learning modes of study.

---

<sup>1</sup> [www.qaa.ac.uk/InstitutionReports/types-of-review/designated-providers/Pages/default.aspx](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/InstitutionReports/types-of-review/designated-providers/Pages/default.aspx)

<sup>2</sup> [www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Pages/REO-designated-providers-handbook-13.aspx](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Pages/REO-designated-providers-handbook-13.aspx)

At the time of the review, the Centre offered the following higher education programmes, listed beneath their awarding body, with the student headcount in brackets:

### **Middlesex University**

- BSc (Hons) Nutritional Therapy (43)
- BSc (Hons) Nutritional Science (87)
- Postgraduate Certificate in Personalised Nutrition (8)
- Postgraduate Diploma in Personalised Nutrition (17)
- MSc Personalised Nutrition (102)

### **The provider's stated responsibilities**

The Centre is responsible for the management of admissions, assessment and internal verification for all its programmes. Online mechanisms are in place to support distance-learning provision. Students attending programmes at the Centre have access to clinical placements. Link tutors and external examiner reports inform the maintenance of academic standards and the quality of learning in line with the University's and professional body requirements.

### **Recent developments**

The BSc (Hons) Nutritional Therapy attendance programme is being phased out and replaced with the BSc (Hons) Nutritional Science combined with the CNELM Nutritional Therapy Practice Diploma. The Centre has applied for programme validation for the BSc Nutritional Science programme for delivery via distance learning in September 2014 alongside the revalidation of the BSc for attendance mode. Two MSc programmes are currently being developed to enlarge the course offer. The Centre also moved in March 2014 to new premises which offer additional capacity for growth in student numbers.

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

Students studying on higher education programmes at the Centre were invited to present a submission to the review team. The results of the surveys devised, circulated and analysed by student representatives were summarised in the student written submission, which the team found very informative. The coordinator met with students as part of the preparatory visit, and the team met with students during the review visit to further explore students' perspectives.

## Detailed findings about NS3 UK Ltd t/a Centre for Nutrition Education & Lifestyle Management (CNELM)

### 1 Academic standards

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

1.1 The Centre has strong links with the University, who as the awarding body retains responsibility for academic standards. The Centre has clearly set out responsibilities for its management of standards which are outlined in the organisational and governance procedures and in the terms of reference for committees. The Subject Assessment Board and Awards Board meetings take place twice per year and are chaired by the Middlesex University Link Tutor, to provide an overview of academic standards. The Board of Studies, which is attended by the Head of Quality Assurance, Head of Education, the Principal, Heads of Level and module leaders and the link tutors, reviews external examiner reports, annual monitoring reports and module feedback from student representatives. The Quality Assurance Senior Management Committee discusses and monitors academic management at programme level. The Quality and Senior Management Committee retains a strategic role in overseeing the development and management of the organisation and compliance with the University's requirements.

1.2 The Centre has considerable autonomy in its management of academic standards. Responsibilities are devolved to teaching staff and managed by Heads of Level, who report to the Head of Education. The Company Managing Director, who is also the Head of Quality, is actively involved in committee meetings and the management of academic matters. The management of academic standards, expectations and procedures are clearly set out in the Organisation, Management and Governance Policy, and are reviewed, discussed and monitored by the Board of Studies and the Quality Assurance Committee. The Centre's Strategic plan demonstrates a measured approach to the development and enhancement of the Centre's management and development of provision. For example, the research strategy which is managed by the Principal is under development to ensure that appropriate resources are in place to support research by both staff and students. The roles and responsibilities for the management of standards are clear and understood by all staff.

1.3 The Centre does not separate the management of commercial elements from the management of its education provision. The top-level management of academic standards sits alongside the business development and commercial aspects of the Centre, with decisions ratified through the Quality and Management Committee. As the senior managers have an economic interest in the organisation, it is the Education arm of the Ethics Committee that provides independent oversight and a forum for considering issues and complaints. However, the Ethics Committee meets infrequently and only in response to identified concerns, which limits its capacity. It is **advisable** that the Centre review and further develop the role of the Ethics Committee as an independent advisory body in the management of new developments and academic matters.

1.4 The deliberative meetings and processes highlight the overarching monitoring and review of validated programmes. A Link Tutor is provided by both the University and the Centre and they act as conduits for informal and formal discussions and reporting to the Board of Studies. The processes and policies demonstrate a broad evidence-based approach that supports the monitoring of academic standards. Issues and actions are generally picked up quickly and addressed with the engagement of staff and student representatives, and the Board of Studies as appropriate.

### **How effectively does the Centre make use of external reference points to manage academic standards?**

1.5 A number of external reference points are used effectively in the management of academic standards. These include engagement with professional bodies and associations, and reference to National Occupational Standards and subject benchmarking which are referenced in programme specifications and validation documents. In addition, input from other institutions and professionals is evident in Heads of Level meetings and the annual monitoring reports. For example, the Irish Institute of Nutritional Health is working closely with the Centre to support development of modules for their Higher National programmes. This kind of activity has the potential to enhance the overall provision by making use of external occupational networks to provide a more balanced approach, criticality and dissemination of good practices.

1.6 The Quality Code is clearly referenced in programme specifications and handbooks. The Centre also reflects the Quality Code within their policies and procedures. Operationally, the validated programme specifications and module handbooks demonstrate alignment with subject benchmarks, *The framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland* (FHEQ) levels and National Occupational Standards, as do the assessment and teaching and learning strategies.

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

1.7 The links with the University underpin effective and robust responses to external examiner reports, and are effective and timely in supporting the monitoring and enhancement of academic standards. External examiner and professional body reports are reviewed by the Head of Quality and Head of Education and discussed at programme level. The Centre prepares evidence-based annual monitoring reports which draw on input from module leaders, the Link Tutor, Heads of Level and student surveys. Action plans capture recommendations which are monitored by Heads of Level, and progress is reviewed at Boards of Studies.

1.8 Overall, the Centre is effective in its management of academic standards. Boards of Studies and programme-level meetings ensure that recommendations from external examiners are effectively actioned, and that standards are regularly monitored. Clear use is made of external reference points including those related to professional practice and subject benchmarks. The Ethics Committee has oversight of any conflicts of interest but meets rarely. The further development of the role of the Ethics Committee as an independent advisory body would support the Centre's consideration of new developments and academic matters.

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

## **2 Quality of learning opportunities**

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

2.1 The Centre effectively fulfils its delegated responsibilities for the management and enhancement of the quality of the learning opportunities. The delegated responsibilities are set out in the validation agreement with the University as outlined in paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2.

Regular reviews of teaching and learning take place and outcomes are considered at the Heads of Level meetings and the Quality Assurance Committee. Recommendations made by external examiners are monitored through annual monitoring reports, action plans and Boards of Studies meetings.

2.2 The current committee structure supports the management and enhancement of the quality of learning opportunities and is being reviewed and formalised further as student numbers increase. Day-to-day management of quality is carried out by the Head of Quality who is supported by the Head of Education and the senior management team. The Quality Assurance Committee monitors action plans and reports from module leaders, and student feedback is provided through regular surveys and reports from student representatives at Boards of Studies.

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

2.3 The Centre makes effective use of external reference points. Recommendations made by the awarding body inform the embedding of the Quality Code in programme documentation. Policies and procedures reference both the Quality Code and the awarding body requirements. The Centre is also beginning to use the Quality Code more extensively to support its management and enhancement of quality through its guidance documents. Clear use of the relevant subject benchmark statements and professional body standards, particularly in respect of clinical practices, is incorporated in handbooks.

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

2.4 The Centre has an education strategy which is effectively integrated within its academic management of provision. There is regular interaction with the University Link Tutor and the outcomes of external examiner reports are discussed along with module reports. Student engagement is good, and includes use of surveys and online forums. Student representatives have control of an online survey account, paid for by the Centre, which allows them to collect and analyse student feedback. This development was initiated by the students who use it as a means of encouraging better uptake of surveys including by students on distance-learning modes of study. The student collection and analysis of feedback has led to the enhancement of module and annual monitoring reports. The effective student-led collection and analysis of feedback which informs the review of programmes is **good practice**.

2.5 Student views effectively inform the management of teaching and learning. Student representatives have access to a range of training materials to support them in their role, and reported that they find these to be useful. There are no formal staff-student consultative committees, but student representatives attend Boards of Studies meetings and provide a summary report for each module. Students are also consulted at every stage of policy and procedure development, and their feedback constitutes an essential part of programme reviews. The effective and collaborative student engagement in quality assurance processes is **good practice**.

2.6 Staff recruitment and development policies and processes are effective in supporting the quality of teaching and learning. The teaching staff have an extensive range of subject skills, knowledge and professional experience, which is valued by students. All lectures and some support sessions are filmed and rapidly uploaded to the Centre's virtual learning environment for student access. Recorded lectures are used to support staff development, the peer review of teaching, and to facilitate sharing good practices.

The commitment of the Centre to the recording of and online access to lectures, which enhances the student experience and promotes staff development, is **good practice**.

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

2.7 There are transparent and well-understood mechanisms in place to support students. A review of student support arrangements was carried out in 2013 and structural changes introduced to student support systems. Previously, all students were allocated a personal mentor who they could contact online, and meet with once per term. The student audit indicates that while not all students took advantage of the student mentor support, those who did found the system very useful. The new role of Head of Level created in 2012 includes the responsibility for agreeing study plan changes. Following the student support review two new roles were created to provide student support. The Student Support Manager post has responsibility for providing general pastoral support, while the professional mentor supports students through one-to-one and group sessions focusing on the development of professional competencies. Students reported that they considered the previous personal mentor system more useful than the revised system. It would be **desirable** for the Centre to evaluate how the new mechanism for student support meets student needs.

2.8 Key performance indicators, retention and progression data are effectively considered within annual monitoring reports and in committee meetings and support the management of teaching and learning. The feedback provided on assessed work is clear and informative. Students reported, however, that they do not always receive timely feedback on their summative assessments. The delay in the provision of feedback does not always allow students to use the constructive comments to improve their work on subsequent assignments. It is **advisable** that the Centre develop the oversight of marking to ensure students consistently receive timely feedback on their assessed work.

### **How effectively does the Centre develop its staff in order to improve student learning opportunities?**

2.9 The Centre has an effective staff training and development policy which includes formal mechanisms to identify additional support for less experienced staff. Teaching staff are predominantly part-time or sessional lecturers. A number of staff have teaching qualifications and others are working towards qualified teacher status. Lecturers are encouraged to attend events held at the University and reported these particularly useful for tutors who have limited higher education teaching experience. Access to recorded lectures also supports peer review and sharing good practices. Further, the Centre provides strategic funding for staff to acquire higher qualifications including doctorate and teaching qualifications. This well-developed strategic management of staff development opportunities enhances teaching and learning practices and is **good practice**.

2.10 A formal and effective process for peer observation of teaching staff includes new clinical practice staff who are observed by the Clinic Manager. Visiting lecturers are observed before they teach any classes, and enhancements are made if required at that point. The Centre's peer-reviewed journal, *The Nutrition Practitioner*, gives staff and graduates an opportunity to publish papers on nutritional research and encourages engagement with scholarly activities.

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

2.11 Learning resources are both accessible and well managed. Students are provided with a range of resources, including access to online journals and databases. Resources are reviewed regularly and appropriately through committee meetings and annual monitoring reports, and recommendations for additional resources are proposed and discussed. The Centre has recently provided students with access to Science Direct, which students reported they find useful as part of a strategy to move to the use of online libraries. Students commented that they would appreciate access to a greater range of journals and databases.

2.12 Students can attend programmes either in person (attendance mode) or by distance learning. Resources are in place to ensure comparability and consistency of the student learning experience for both modes of study. Students reported that they found the flexibility of study modes and the accessibility of resources to be good. The Centre's Education Strategy reflects the importance attached to accessible learning materials and inclusive student support.

2.13 The Centre's management of the quality and enhancement of learning opportunities is effective. A number of good practices were identified including access to a range of online lectures, and the student engagement in the quality assurance processes including the student-led collection and analysis of feedback. Staff development is well managed and effectively supports the development of teaching staff and the sharing of good practices. The timing of feedback on assessed work, however, needs to be more consistent, and the new system of student support evaluated to ensure it meets students' needs.

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

## **3 Information about learning opportunities**

### **How effectively does the Centre communicate information about learning opportunities to students and other stakeholders?**

3.1 Students and other stakeholders are provided with clear information about the Centre's programmes and learning opportunities. Information is provided through the website, the prospectus, programme and module handbooks, the virtual learning environment and emails. Module handbooks are comprehensive and outline learning and teaching strategies, assessment methods and the development of key skills. Students are invited to provide feedback which informs the review and improvement of published information.

3.2 Students regularly interact through online forums. The forums allow students to communicate at a module, programme and institution level, and effectively support sharing of information and gathering of feedback. Student representatives are able to communicate the outcomes of surveys and actions taken by management in response to student feedback. The outcomes of Board of Studies meetings are also made available by the student representatives. This clear and consistent use of forums to support good communication between staff and students is **good practice**.

3.3 The information on the website is useful, reliable and up to date. Website information is supplemented by a comprehensive prospectus, available to download from the website home page, along with links to learning resources and fees information. The partnership with the University is clearly explained on both the website and in the prospectus and students confirmed they understand the relationship. Students identified that the layout of the website, however, could be clearer and programme information more detailed. The information published on the virtual learning environment in contrast is clear, informative and easy to use. Students indicated that they are very satisfied with the accuracy, usefulness and wealth of the information provided on the virtual learning environment. Every page of the virtual learning environment also includes guidance on how to reference effectively.

3.4 The Centre maintains good communications with its alumni. Graduates are provided with access to online discussion forums, job opportunities and mechanisms for communication with fellow graduates and staff. Graduates are also able to access online lectures, modules and resources to support their professional development, and are invited to present guest lectures on professional practice. The Centre's engagement with its alumni to support their continuing professional development and provide access for staff and students to professional practice updates is **good practice**.

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

3.5 The Centre has informal procedures for managing the accuracy of the information it is responsible for publishing. The website and programme information including handbooks are updated by a number of different staff and signed off by the Head of Quality Assurance, but with limited records kept of updates. Changes to the website and the prospectus are regularly made to mirror any changes to the handbooks or programme details. While this system is working with the current range of provision, a formalised tracking of amendments would ensure updates are consistently managed. It is **advisable** that the Centre revise and formalise procedures for authorising changes to published information to further assure the accuracy of content particularly in the light of planned expansion to its range of provision.

3.6 Student engagement is an effective part of the Centre's strategy for the development and management of information. Students are actively involved in ensuring the accuracy and completeness of information about learning opportunities. Students are regularly asked to provide feedback and to notify the Centre of any inaccuracies in public information. The Student Representatives Handbook sets out the role of students in supporting the Centre's management of information. Students indicated that they are satisfied with the accuracy, detail, completeness and usefulness of the information they receive.

3.7 Communications are effectively managed by the Centre. The students play an active role in reviewing the information on learning opportunities and report that they are satisfied with the information they receive. The engagement with alumni is an area of good practice offering opportunities for graduates to both publish papers through the Centre's online journal and to access lectures and training events. The procedures for amending and updating information remain informal and would benefit from being revised to support accuracy as the Centre expands its range of provision.

<p>The team concludes that reliance <b>can</b> be placed on the information that the Centre produces for its intended audiences about the learning opportunities it offers.</p>
---

## Action plan<sup>3</sup>

NS3 UK Ltd t/a Centre for Nutrition Education & Lifestyle Management (CNELM) action plan relating to the Review for Specific Course Designation February 2013						
Good practice	Intended outcomes	Actions to be taken to achieve intended outcomes	Target date(s)	Action by	Reported to	Evaluation (process or evidence)
The review team identified the following areas of <b>good practice</b> that are worthy of wider dissemination within the Centre:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the effective student-led collection and analysis of feedback which informs the review of programmes (paragraph 2.4)</li> </ul>	<p>To maintain and enhance the active contribution of students to the programmes offered by CNELM</p> <p>Student representatives are clear about the role they have in representing student views and the importance that CNELM places on this role</p>	<p>Update and re-issue online Student Representatives Handbook to include details about the role they have in surveying students on their experience of learning and engagement with the programme including suggestions for improvement</p>	End of May 2014	Centre Administrator and Student Representatives	Head of Education and Head of Quality Assurance	<p>Student feedback on the new handbook</p> <p>Student representatives' feedback on induction sessions</p> <p>Board of Studies meeting minutes</p>
	<p>Students can see that that their views are taken seriously by CNELM and actioned where</p>	<p>Formalise a student representative induction including guidance from Middlesex University</p>	First one April 2014 and subsequently	Head of Education	Centre Administrator & Head of	Quality and Management Board of Studies

<sup>3</sup> The Centre has been required to develop this action plan to follow up on good practice and address any recommendations arising from the review. QAA monitors progress against the action plan, in conjunction with the Centre's awarding body.

	appropriate	Continue to invite student representatives to Boards of Study meetings  Invite student representatives to join selected discussion points of quality and management meetings as appropriate	annually early March  In advance of every Board of Studies  As appropriate	Link Tutor  Meeting Chair	Quality Assurance  Head of Quality Assurance and Centre Administrator  Head of Quality Assurance  Reported where appropriate via deliberative meetings	meeting minutes  Annual Monitoring Report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the effective and collaborative student engagement in quality assurance processes (paragraph 2.5)</li> </ul>	Maintain and enhance student engagement with the quality assurance process	Invite student representatives to join selected discussion points of quality and management meetings as appropriate	As appropriate from September 2014	Meeting Chair	Head of Quality Assurance	Quality and Management meeting minutes  Board of Studies meeting minutes  Annual Monitoring Report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the recording of and online access to lectures (paragraph 2.6)</li> </ul>	Continue to develop the online lecture format	Investment in equipment to support better quality recording  Investigate options for replacing use of flipcharts	May 2014  End of December	Director IT/ Technical Assistant/ Principal  Director IT/Technical	Directors  Directors	Staff workshop short report  Feedback from staff training

		Experiment with split-screen technology and evaluate the feasibility of this	2014 End of December 2014	Assistant/Principal	Reported where appropriate via deliberative meetings	Annual Monitoring Report Student IT Survey Annual Monitoring Report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the well-developed strategic management of staff development opportunities (paragraph 2.9)</li> </ul>	Attract and retain committed and well-trained staff	CNELM to fund to the equivalent of two places on the PGCE at Middlesex University collaborative partner fee each year until all module leaders have teaching qualifications. Other teacher training courses considered	Jan 2019	Head of Education & staff members involved in staff appraisal as appropriate	Directors	Annual staff appraisal Staff training records
		Fund two more trained coach trainers over the next three years	Jan 2017	Practice Supervisor & Head of Education	Managing Director & Financial Director	Staff survey on success of workshops and training provided
		Encourage members of academic staff where appropriate to undertake MSc/Dip courses at CNELM particularly if provision is expanded	As appropriate	Head of Education	Head of Quality Assurance	Annual Monitoring Report
		Use the Annual Monitoring Report and annual staff appraisal process to inform design annual staff	Annually in April	Link Tutor & Head of Education	Head of Quality Assurance	

		training workshop plans				
		Maintain online access to staff workshops as appropriate and use as resources for induction	With immediate effect			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the clear and consistent use of forums to support good communication between staff and students (paragraph 3.2)</li> </ul>	Continue to use and enhance the forums as a communication tool	<p>Share best practice of forum management via 'Heads Up' staff update and the student newsletter, the 'Nutritional Supplement', emailed monthly</p> <p>Review the use of staff forums for knowledge, content and version management</p>	<p>Monthly Heads of Level meetings</p> <p>Twice a month - Heads Up</p> <p>Monthly - student newsletter</p> <p>End of September 2014</p>	<p>Heads of Level</p> <p>Head of Education - Heads Up</p> <p>Communications Manager - student newsletter</p>	Head of Education	<p>Student and staff feedback</p> <p>Board of Studies</p> <p>Staff minutes</p> <p>Annual Monitoring Report</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Centre's engagement with its alumni to support their continuing professional development and provide access for staff and students to professional practice updates (paragraph 3.4)</li> </ul>	<p>Create good links with CNELM graduates and the wider profession</p> <p>Further support the growth of training opportunities open to other nutrition professionals</p>	<p>Investigate further with a view to implementation following the recent management meeting that explored continuing professional development (CPD) opportunities the Centre might provide to the wider profession</p> <p>Review and, if necessary, update the alumni package</p>	<p>January 2015</p> <p>November 2014</p>	<p>Communications Manager, Head of Education, Professional Mentors</p> <p>Head of Education, Communications Manager and</p>	<p>Head of Quality Assurance</p> <p>Head of Quality Assurance</p>	<p>Communications Manager to produce a short report evaluating any actions taken to enhance CPD opportunities and create a proposal for future CPD options</p> <p>Evaluation of the 2013 Graduate Survey led by the Head of Education</p>

		Communicate details of alumni package to graduates	End November 2014	Professional Mentors Communications Manager	Head of Quality Assurance  Reported where appropriate via deliberative meetings	informed revisions to the alumni package  Evidence of increased alumni registrations  Annual Monitoring Report
<b>Advisable</b>	<b>Intended outcomes</b>	<b>Actions to be taken to achieve intended outcomes</b>	<b>Target date(s)</b>	<b>Action by</b>	<b>Reported to</b>	<b>Evaluation (process or evidence)</b>
The team considers that it is <b>advisable</b> for the Centre to:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>further develop the role of the Ethics Committee as an independent advisory body (paragraph 1.3)</li> </ul>	<p>The Ethics Committee has a more defined role and there is greater transparency in their involvement with CNELM</p> <p>The Ethics Committee are more visible and have the opportunity for proactive involvement with CNELM</p>	Review and agree with the Ethics Committee a revised role with renewed Terms of Agreement and a revised Ethics Committee Policy to disseminate to students and staff alongside other associated updated policies and documentation demonstrating their wider involvement with the Centre	November 2014	Principal, Head of Education, Centre Administrator	Head of Quality Assurance, Directors	Analysis of survey via minutes of Committee meetings and Annual Monitoring Report

		<p>Create a dedicated area of the CNELM website for the Ethics Committee where all relevant information and updates will be located and facilitate the ability of the members to upload documents and share a forum</p>	September 2014	Director of IT and Principal	Head of Education, Principal, Directors	
		<p>Appoint a member of staff who is not part of the Ethics Committee to become a link between CNELM and Ethics Committee</p>	End of May 2014	Centre Administrator	Principal	
		<p>Provide within the revised Terms of Agreement a variety of mechanisms in which the Ethics Committee can contribute their views and where appropriate advice to the Centre without associated personal liability; and to help inform the business decisions made by the Directors minimise risk to students, the quality of their education and the overall professional image of the Centre</p>	September 2014	Head of Education, Principal, Centre Administrator, Head of Quality Assurance	Directors	

		Short survey to evaluate Committee members' views and experiences of opportunities to further engage with the Centre with a view to adapting as appropriate; and staff evaluation of increased involvement by the Ethics Committee	Summer 2015	Principal/ Research Director	Reported where appropriate via deliberative meetings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>develop the oversight of marking to ensure students consistently receive timely feedback (paragraph 2.8)</li> </ul>	Ensure that students benefit from the feedback in timeframe that means the feedback remains relevant and can be used to support their learning	Student management system to be updated to capture marking release dates for modules and calculate basic stats on release time. System to include a mechanism to monitor marking timetable and send automatic alerts to module markers when marking is not complete to target	January 2015	Research Director	Head of Quality Assurance, Head of Education	Analysis of student feedback to identify whether marking turnaround time supports their learning needs
	CNELM demonstrate good process in managing assessment	Head of Education to maintain the marking calendar	July 2014 and annually in July thereafter	Head of Education	Heads of Level, Head of Quality Assurance	Heads of Level reports available to programme team
	CNELM use the marking and feedback process to help inform how modules could be developed to further support student achievement e.g. identifying issues that could be effectively	Head of Level to proactively monitor marking progress across module and collect statistics to indicate percentage of marking released within targets and report findings at	With immediate effect	Head of Level	Head of Quality Assurance	Staff appraisal  Minutes of Heads of Level; Senior Management; Board of Studies Meetings

	addressed in subsequent modules in the programme	<p>Heads of Level meetings; annual appraisals; and Heads of Level annual reports</p> <p>Where marking will not meet published target date this is communicated effectively to students</p> <p>Module leaders to create module leader reports within two months of the module completing. Head of Level to monitor compliance and to chase up missing reports</p> <p>Head of Education to update Head of Level report pro-forma</p> <p>Reports to be written in preparation for Board of Study to include modules being presented at each board</p>	<p>August 2014</p> <p>June 2014</p> <p>September 2014</p> <p>September 2014</p>	<p>Module Leaders</p> <p>Module Leaders and Heads of Level</p> <p>Head of Education</p> <p>Heads of Level</p>	<p>Heads of Level, Head of Education</p> <p>Head of Education, Head of Quality Assurance</p> <p>Head of Quality Assurance, Level Heads</p> <p>Head of Education</p> <p>Reported via deliberative meetings and Annual Monitoring Report</p>	<p>Annual Monitoring Report</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>revise and formalise procedures for</li> </ul>	Version control of documents is well managed	Investigate and implement software options to manage version control of	June 2014	Director of IT and Research	Head of Quality Assurance	Evaluation of investigation reported via

authorising changes to published information to further assure the accuracy of content (paragraph 3.5)	Documentation is consistent, when information is updated in one document it is updated in any other relevant documents	documents		Director	and Communications Manager	Heads of Level and Senior Management meeting minutes
		Chosen software solution, if identified, is implemented and staff trained in how to use	September 2014	Communications Manager	Head of Quality Assurance	If software solution identified, evaluation of effectiveness of training and use reported via Heads of Level and Senior Management meeting minutes
		Until version control software is in place will operate using current system of dating documents. Reminder to all staff who make updates to documentation	Immediately	Programme Leaders and Link Tutor	Head of Education and Head of Quality Assurance	Improvements to current system evaluated and reported via Heads of Level and Senior Management meeting minutes
		Confirm delegated authors, editors and approvers for all documentation and create list delegated responsibility	September 2014	Centre Administrator	Head of Quality Assurance	Evaluation of student feedback
		Form to be designed to track approval for changes to website data	June 2014	Director of IT and Principal	Head of Quality Assurance	Annual Monitoring Report
		Longer-term website data to be configured to allow different staff members to edit and release documents	March 2015		Reported via deliberative meetings and Annual Monitoring Report	

Desirable	Intended outcomes	Actions to be taken to achieve intended outcomes	Target date/s	Action by	Reported to	Evaluation (process or evidence)
The team considers that it would be <b>desirable</b> for the Centre to:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>evaluate how the new mechanism for student support meets student needs (paragraph 2.7)</li> </ul>	<p>Ensure that CNELM are offering support in a way that is useful and accessible to students</p> <p>Identify ways in which the support to students could be improved</p> <p>Students to have greater awareness of the use of interim awards and enhanced awareness of job opportunities</p>	<p>Creation and analysis of interim short survey of student body and other stakeholders after eight months of the support services</p> <p>Module feedback form to be updated to include question about professional mentor service in handbooks and online module surveys</p> <p>Module leaders to raise any issues about student support indicated in the module feedback forms or during the course of the module</p>	<p>December 2014</p> <p>September 2014</p> <p>November 2014</p>	<p>Professional Mentors, Student Support Manager, Coach Mentor, Head of Education, Link Tutor</p> <p>Head of Education</p> <p>Module Leaders</p>	<p>Practice Supervisor, Head of Quality Assurance</p> <p>Module Leaders</p> <p>Heads of Level, Student Support Manager</p> <p>Reported where appropriate via deliberative meetings</p>	<p>Results analysed and an interim report made available end of January in time for inclusion in Annual Monitoring Report</p> <p>The results will feed into any revisions to the service and the Annual Monitoring Report for 2016. Any points for improvement or good practice will be presented at Board of Study</p> <p>Module feedback forms</p> <p>Annual Monitoring Report</p>

## About QAA

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

QAA's aims are to:

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

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

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

More detail about Review for Specific Course Designation can be found at:  
[www.qaa.ac.uk/InstitutionReports/types-of-review/designated-providers/Pages/default.aspx](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/InstitutionReports/types-of-review/designated-providers/Pages/default.aspx).

## Glossary

This glossary explains terms used in this report. You can find a fuller glossary at: [www.qaa.ac.uk/aboutus/glossary](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/aboutus/glossary). Formal definitions of key terms can be found in the [Review for Educational Oversight \(and for specific course designation\): Handbook, April 2013](#).<sup>4</sup>

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

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

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

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

**differentiated judgements** In a Review for Specific Course Designation, separate judgements respectively for the provision validated by separate awarding bodies.

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

**external examiner** An independent expert appointed by an institution to comment on student achievement in relation to established academic standards and to look at approaches to assessment.

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

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

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

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

---

<sup>4</sup> [www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Pages/REO-designated-providers-handbook-13.aspx](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Pages/REO-designated-providers-handbook-13.aspx)

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

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

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

**provider(s) (of higher education)** Organisations that deliver higher education. In the UK they may be a degree-awarding body or another organisation that offers programmes of higher education on behalf of degree-awarding bodies or awarding organisations. In the context of Review for Specific Course Designation the term means an independent college.

**public information** Information that is freely available to the public (sometimes referred to as being 'in the public domain').

**quality** See **academic quality**.

**Quality Code** Short term for the UK Quality Code for Higher Education, which is the UK-wide set of reference points for higher education providers (agreed through consultation with the higher education community, and published by QAA), which states the Expectations that all providers are required to meet.

**reference points** Statements and other publications that establish criteria against which performance can be measured. Internal reference points may be used by providers for purposes of self-regulation; external ones are used and accepted throughout the higher education community for the checking of standards and quality.

**subject benchmark statement** A published statement that sets out what knowledge, understanding, abilities and skills are expected of those graduating in each of the main subject areas (mostly applying to bachelor's degrees), and explains what gives that particular discipline its coherence and identity.

**threshold academic standards** The minimum acceptable level of achievement that a student has to demonstrate to be eligible for an academic award. Threshold academic standards are set out in the national **frameworks for higher education qualifications** and **subject benchmark statements**. See also **academic standards**.

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

## QAA745 - R3696 - May 14

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

Tel 01452 557000  
Email [enquiries@qaa.ac.uk](mailto:enquiries@qaa.ac.uk)  
Website [www.qaa.ac.uk](http://www.qaa.ac.uk)

Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786