



Finance and Business Training Ltd

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

November 2012

Key findings about Finance and Business Training Ltd

As a result of its Review for Educational Oversight carried out in November 2012, 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 awards it offers on behalf of the University of Wales, London Metropolitan University, the Chartered Institute of Management Accountants and the Association of Chartered Certified Accountants.

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

The team considers that **reliance can** be placed on the accuracy and completeness of the information that the provider is responsible for publishing about itself and the programmes it delivers.

Good practice

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

- comprehensive communication systems (paragraph 2.4)
- a wide range of mechanisms for the collection and analysis of student feedback (paragraph 2.8)
- comprehensive integrated careers advice service (paragraph 2.10)
- presentation and availability of information in multiple languages on the Manchester website (paragraph 3.3)
- electronic tracking system for monitoring public information and version control (paragraph 3.6)
- extensive support and resources provided to recruitment agents (paragraph 3.8).

Recommendations

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

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

- continue to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the committee structure (paragraph 1.2)
- make external examiner reports available to students (paragraph 1.8)
- develop further the oversight of teaching and learning (paragraph 2.5)
- consolidate oversight of peer review processes (paragraph 2.7)
- develop further the support for postgraduate research and scholarly activity (paragraph 2.12).

About this report

This report presents the findings of the [Review for Educational Oversight](#)¹ (REO) conducted by [QAA](#) at Finance and Business Training Ltd (the provider; FBT). The purpose of the review is to provide public information about how the provider discharges its stated responsibilities for the management and delivery of academic standards and the quality of learning opportunities available to students. The review applies to programmes of study that the provider delivers on behalf of the University of Wales, London Metropolitan University, the Chartered Institute of Management Accountants and the Association of Chartered Certified Accountants. The review was carried out by Dr Glenn Barr, Mr Paul Chamberlain, Dr Elizabeth Smith (reviewers), and Mr Maldwyn Buckland (coordinator).

The review team conducted the review in agreement with the provider and in accordance with the [Review for Educational Oversight: Handbook](#).² Evidence in support of the review was provided in both printed and electronic format and included the self-evaluation, the student written submission, memoranda of agreements, the responsibilities checklist, external examiner reports, annual monitoring reports, the Quality Assurance Manual, assessed student work, committee meeting minutes, scrutiny of the virtual learning environment and the Public Information Policy.

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

- the *Code of practice for the assurance of academic quality and standards in higher education* (the *Code of practice*)
- the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (the Quality Code).

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

Finance and Business Training Ltd (FBT) was founded in 2007 and offers professional and related postgraduate courses in Birmingham and Manchester. FBT is a subsidiary of InterActive Pro Ltd and is one of a number of companies which form a higher education institution (HEI) that operates under the name of the London School of Business and Finance (LSBF). Having been acquired in 2008 by InterActive Pro Limited, FBT became part of LSBF HEI and, since this time, there has been an ongoing process of integrating its operations with those of the rest of LSBF HEI, which is based in London. LSBF HEI operates in Manchester through a separate company, Interactive (Manchester) Ltd, which is also a wholly owned subsidiary of InterActive Pro Limited. Although the company operates under the name LSBF, overseas students at Manchester are admitted under the FBT Tier 4 licence.

FBT has the Association of Chartered Certified Accountants Gold Accreditation Learning Partner status in Birmingham and is a Chartered Institute of Management Accountants' Quality Partner. FBT offers degree courses provided by the LSBF Business School. It also has a School of English, which is accredited by the British Council.

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

¹ www.qaa.ac.uk/InstitutionReports/types-of-review/tier-4.

² www.qaa.ac.uk/publications/informationandguidance/pages/reo-handbook.aspx.

Manchester Centre

University of Wales

- Master of Business Administration (MBA) (85)
- Master of Science in Finance (MSc) (19)

London Metropolitan University

- Master of Business Administration (MBA) (3)
- Master of Science in Finance (MSc) (3)
- Postgraduate Diploma in Accounting and Finance (8)
- Diploma in Higher Education in Accounting and Finance (3)
- Preparatory Diploma in Accounting and Finance (6)

Association of Chartered Certified Accountants (ACCA) (2,109)

Chartered Institute of Management Accountants (CIMA) (399)

Birmingham Centre

University of Wales

- Master of Business Administration (MBA) (66)
- Master of Science in Finance (MSc) (24)

London Metropolitan University

- Master of Business Administration (MBA) (3)
- Master of Science in Finance (MSc) (3)
- Bachelor of Science in Marketing (MSc) (3)
- Preparatory Diploma in Accounting and Finance (3)

Associated of Chartered Certified Accountants (1,362)

Chartered Institute of Management Accountants (242)

The provider's stated responsibilities

FBT has collaborative arrangements with the University of Wales, London Metropolitan University, CIMA and ACCA. The awarding body and organisation agreements vary in the scope and degree of responsibilities, for example in terms of assessments, marking and quality assurance arrangements. CIMA and ACCA take sole responsibility for the setting of assessments, first and second marking of assignments, and feedback to students, along with reviewing and responding to annual monitoring reviews, module evaluations, monitoring of the quality of teaching and learning, and student appeals. In the case of programmes validated by the University of Wales and London Metropolitan University, FBT has overall responsibility for setting assessments, first marking of student assignments and feedback to students. The moderation of first marking is shared with these awarding bodies.

Recent developments

In 2011, FBT and LSBF became accredited centres for Edexcel for Higher National and postgraduate diplomas in business and management, although currently no students are registered on these programmes. FBT, in conjunction with LSBF, has faced a number of challenges recently with its collaborative relationship with the University of Wales. A report undertaken by QAA in 2012 concluded that, within the last year, FBT and LSBF have put in

place measures to strengthen quality assurance arrangements, including securing the standards of awards and enhancing learning opportunities for students.

Students' contribution to the review

Students studying on higher education programmes at the provider were invited to present a submission to the review team. While a number of students attended the preparatory meeting and it was confirmed that FBT would give appropriate support to students in preparation of a written submission, no written evidence was forthcoming. Students representing all programmes, however, contributed positively to the formal meeting during the review visit.

Detailed findings about Finance and Business Training Ltd

1 Academic standards

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

1.1 Overall responsibility for academic standards at FBT is held by the Vice Rector. The Vice Rector leads a senior team, which develops strategy and policy and reports on academic matters to the Chief Executive and Rector of LSBF. The Rector, in turn, reports to the Group Board. The FBT centres in Manchester and Birmingham have centre directors who liaise effectively with the LSBF Group Managing Director on operational and resourcing issues that can be addressed locally. Central support services are based at LSBF, but there are effective local support functions at both FBT centres. Academic and support staff have clearly defined roles and responsibilities and are articulate in expressing their understanding of this.

1.2 The development of terms of reference for the new academic committee structure and its membership across all LSBF centres, including FBT, is currently underway. The team, in line with the outcomes of the recent QAA review of LSBF, acknowledges the extensive institutional-level change that has recently taken place, and concludes that the evidence available is insufficient to evaluate the effectiveness of the new structure. The team, however, while finding evidence of increasing rigour in minute-taking and timely completion of actions, confirms it is desirable that work continues to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the committee structure.

1.3 The responsibility for quality assurance of degree programmes is held by the Registrar. A comprehensive Quality Assurance Manual clearly documents processes and policies. Programme leaders maintain effective oversight of programme management across all centres and liaise with awarding bodies at Joint Boards of Studies. In the Business School, programme and module leaders and module teaching teams are located across each of the centres. Internal module boards compare the performance of students across all centres and report to the Quality Committee and Joint Boards of Studies via the annual monitoring process.

1.4 The responsibility for the quality assurance of professional programmes is undertaken by the Director of Quality Assurance for Professional Programmes. Policies and procedures are clearly stated and have been approved by the awarding organisations within accreditation documentation and during the annual ACCA and CIMA inspection visits.

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

1.5 FBT staff effectively align quality and curriculum developments with a range of external reference points, and, through LSBF, have achieved affiliate membership status of the Association of Business Schools. Assessments are set by the awarding organisations according to the level of study. Guidance is provided by the awarding organisations and LSBF about the use of learning outcomes in identifying the knowledge or skills which are to be assessed and how examiners may approach the design of the assessment. Experienced Professional School staff engage as national assessors for the CIMA and the ACCA.

1.6 Degree programmes validated by the University of Wales and London Metropolitan University align with the Credit and Qualifications Framework for Wales and *The framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland*. Responses to

external examiner reports are discussed within internal boards and the Quality Assurance Committee considers proposals for new degree programmes against external reference points prior to their submission to the validating university. These activities are promoting awareness of the Academic Infrastructure and the new Quality Code for Higher Education. Staff welcome the growing engagement with London Metropolitan University in activities relating to the design of programmes in accordance with external reference points.

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

1.7 External examiners for the degree programmes confirm that the commitment and professionalism of the FBT staff, coupled with the revised management structure, now contribute to the effective oversight and response to issues raised. Degree programmes are externally examined according to the validating university's procedures. External examiners attend Joint Boards of Studies and the responses to their reports are collated and included in enhancement plans for action by the programme team, the School Board, Quality Assurance Committee and Academic Board.

1.8 There is evidence of a creative and original approach to the design of assessments for the postgraduate programmes and the developing relationship with London Metropolitan University has resulted in shared staff development activity around the theme of assessment and feedback. Assessments provide opportunities for group work, which rewards individual contributions and tests practical and presentation skills and knowledge. Standard assessment templates outline learning outcomes and the allocation of marks specifically related to knowledge evidenced or skills demonstrated. Guidance on how students can improve their work together, with the provision of greater clarity on how agreed marks are identified by first and second markers, are currently under review. Students are positive about the assessment process and understand the role of external examiners. Degree students attend Joint Boards of Studies where external examiners provide verbal feedback. Reports are made available to students upon request. It is desirable that FBT makes external examiners' reports available to all degree students.

1.9 In the Professional School, summative assessments are set and marked by the awarding organisations. Students are able to take mock exams and are provided with helpful formative feedback. Professional organisation representatives visit the institution for annual inspection purposes. Reports of these visits are positive and matters raised are acted upon effectively by programme leaders.

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

2 Quality of learning opportunities

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

2.1 Arrangements for the management and enhancement of the quality of the student learning experience and outcomes for FBT are as those described in paragraphs 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4. Robust monitoring processes are in place at the FBT centres to ensure effective responses to the requirements of the validating bodies and the structures of the larger LSBF organisation. These processes are well understood by academic and administrative staff.

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

2.2 The use of external reference points in the management and enhancement of learning opportunities reflects those delineated in paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6 and of the larger LSBF organisation. There is strong evidence, in a range of policy documents, of effective engagement with the *Code of practice*, for example *Section 3: Disabled students* and *Section 8: Career education, information, advice and guidance*.

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

2.3 Provision at FBT operates within the wider central senior management structure of LSBF, which is ultimately responsible for education policies and support services, including human resources, admissions, careers, IT, marketing and learning resources. The management of the quality of learning opportunities is coordinated across the two academic schools through clearly defined lines of communication to the senior levels of the institution. There are clear distinctions between academic and professional programmes and distinctive management processes within the two schools. Operational responsibility for assuring the quality of teaching and learning is effectively shared between the Programme Director for the Professional School and the Programme Director for the Business School.

2.4 Programme Committee members and module teams undertake regular centre visits and weekly online conference calls, and, where appropriate, heads of learning resources and specialist careers staff are involved ensuring operational issues are addressed speedily and consistently. Efficient circulation of minutes ensure arrangements are well understood by academic and administrative staff, who confirm these practices enhance performance review and provide opportunities for the sharing of good practice across centres. The comprehensive communication systems, which ensure timely and effective engagement with operational issues, are good practice.

2.5 Recent developments in teaching and learning have been informed by the development of an 'academic signature', which emphasises a commitment to preparation for employment and entrepreneurship for learners, achieved within a context of diversity and cultural awareness. Development of a comprehensive learning and teaching strategy, bringing together the curriculum priorities of academic, professional and vocational programmes, is currently underway. It is desirable to develop further procedures for the oversight of teaching and learning.

2.6 Responsibilities and arrangements for the appointment of staff are clearly defined and understood. Staff appointed to the Professional School are expected to have a relevant professional qualification, extensive teaching experience and proven examination success rates. Procedures for the mentoring of staff, classroom observation, annual academic staff appraisal and entitlement to staff development are set out in the Quality Assurance Manual. Experienced staff act as mentors or professional advisers, to newly appointed tutors. This arrangement is appreciated by staff and leads to the sharing of innovative approaches to teaching and learning. A well managed scheme is in place for the annual performance review of full-time teaching staff and professional support staff, alongside a centralised 'job family' model to ensure parity of experience and opportunity.

2.7 An informal teaching observation scheme has been translated into a clearly structured developmental peer review enhancement process for all teaching staff. It is intended that this confidential process contributes to the sharing of good practice within and across curriculum teams. The team confirms that it is desirable to consolidate oversight of peer review processes to enhance the sharing of good practice in teaching and learning.

2.8 Student feedback is efficiently collected and critically evaluated at appropriate levels within the organisation. Responses from students are obtained through one-to-one tutorials, questionnaires and feedback forms, programme committees and specialist student liaison staff. Data on the quality of teaching, course content and organisation, module guides, learning resources, learning support and communication is collected and statistically evaluated for Business School courses. Similar data is gathered and analysed for CIMA and ACCA programmes at the FBT centres. Outcomes demonstrate a high level of student satisfaction. In addition, feedback is obtained in both the Birmingham and Manchester centres from open student forums which provide opportunities to raise a wide range of issues. Students and staff confirmed the effectiveness of these and were able to identify issues that have subsequently been addressed. These include the provision of study spaces at busy times, revision of library opening hours and the availability of online class materials. The wide range of mechanisms for the collection and analysis of student feedback, which result in high quality data sets, effectively inform quality assurance procedures and are good practice.

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

2.9 Admission and induction processes are clearly articulated and feedback data collected on the effectiveness of student induction. Tutorials are provided for feedback on assessed work. Students and staff were able to provide diverse examples of the effective use of formative assessment, including feedback on early draft material, exercises in good academic practice, trial of examination papers and the use of social media. Study and language skills tuition is available in Birmingham and Manchester. Students experience a variety of modes of study and programme delivery. At both centres, a balance of direct, blended, distance and individual study is provided. As part of its learning and teaching strategic development FBT, is evaluating the effectiveness and balance of learning styles from academic, vocational and professional programmes.

2.10 A comprehensive and effective integrated careers and progression advice service is in place at both centres. This provides informed one-to-one advice to students across curriculum areas and includes mechanisms for monitoring effectiveness. Although a recent development, students confirm the value of the service, and it is good practice. Robust policies and procedures are in place for the support of disabled students and staff gave examples of these being implemented.

What are the provider's arrangements for staff development to maintain and/or enhance the quality of learning opportunities?

2.11 A staff development policy emphasises the currency of staff knowledge, quality of classroom teaching, sharing of good practice and achieving enhancement of the student learning experience. A variety of methods is in place to help achieve this, such as mentoring, coaching and secondments. The policy seeks to hold a balance between individuals being responsible for their own continuous professional development and line managers providing development opportunities. The mechanism for establishing staff needs is through the annual development review process.

2.12 Recent curriculum developments in partnership with London Metropolitan University have led to joint staff development events in support of some postgraduate programmes. Staff are expected to be aware of teaching and learning challenges in a diverse student environment and to engage in research and scholarly activity in support of their teaching. Professional School staff have extensive and current industry-based expertise. Evidence of academic research and scholarly activity, however, is limited, particularly in support of level 7 programmes. Although there is effective staff development activity, particularly with partners, scope exists for a more coordinated approach. It is desirable to develop further the

support for postgraduate research and scholarly activity particularly related to teaching and learning at level 7.

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

2.13 Students confirmed that high-quality learning and teaching environments, including library facilities with defined opening hours, are available at both campuses. As a result of feedback from students, library opening hours have recently been significantly extended at both centres. The library in Manchester contains core reading materials and other learning resources. Similar conditions exist in Birmingham, where there are also photocopying, printing and scanning facilities. Students from both centres confirmed that the facilities available are fit for purpose.

2.14 Through the wider infrastructure of LSBF and in partnership with the validating bodies and organisations, FBT enables access to an extensive set of online networks and library resources. The availability of these is clearly stated in student handbooks, the virtual learning environment and reinforced at student induction. A recently enhanced system provides students with electronic materials in direct support of their programmes at FBT. In response to student requests, FBT have provided a range of online resources complementary to those of London Metropolitan University. Where appropriate, these are supplemented with selective access to the more widely available interactive system operated by LSBF.

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

3 Public information

How effectively does the provider's public information communicate to students and other stakeholders about the higher education it provides?

3.1 FBT provides wide-ranging and accessible information in digital and print formats, while maintaining FBT Birmingham and LSBF Manchester as distinct brands within the LSBF family. Students confirmed that the respective brand identities are clear. FBT Birmingham is described on the website as the training and business development division of LSBF. Both centres have their own website presence with focused information on accommodation, social life and campus facilities. Students confirmed that the respective academic offers were influential in the application process. Both websites provide clear information about programmes, open days, careers and study in the UK and online.

3.2 Concise electronic fact sheets for each programme clearly outline the entry requirements, career progression, awarding bodies and organisations. Links provide easy access to detailed information at module level on intended learning outcomes and assessment methods. Centre and awarding body application forms are available online. The website offers a range of social networking links, facilitating communication through the cross-centre social media sites. A detailed policy regulates the use of social media by staff.

3.3 In common with the main LSBF website, information is clearly presented in seven languages through links from the LSBF Manchester website, although not the FBT Birmingham website. Students who met the team agreed that the provision of information in

their own language gave them confidence when applying from outside of the UK. The team confirms that the presentation and availability of information in multiple languages on the Manchester website provides clear and accessible information to students and is good practice. Clear and informative printed prospectuses, and other promotional materials, are available to prospective students, recruitment agents, current students and other stakeholders. The focused approach to information is further supported by the recent appointment of a regional marketing manager.

3.4 Student handbooks based on a generic LSBF template are clear and appropriate and contain useful information on living and studying locally and in the UK. Comprehensive programme handbooks contain detailed information on modules, learning outcomes, assessment processes, regulations and student support mechanisms. Current programme handbooks contain a useful chart of policies and procedures with web links to London Metropolitan University website. Procedures for complaints and appeals are presented in considerable detail, including a complaints form. Students are well informed of policies and procedures, such as appeals and unfair practices through handbooks and class sessions.

How effective are the provider's arrangements for assuring the accuracy and completeness of information it has responsibility for publishing?

3.5 There are robust procedures for assuring accuracy and completeness of information. A comprehensive Public Information Policy and procedures document aligns with the Academic Infrastructure and the UK Quality Code for Higher Education, and is well understood across the organisation. The broad-ranging policy allocates responsibilities to specific departments with different top-level sign-off and includes procedures to ensure accuracy and checking of material produced by overseas agents. The Head of Brand and Marketing is responsible for the accuracy and completeness of matters relating to programmes, the Head of Communications and Engagement is responsible for press relations and engagement with the media. The Group Managing Director is responsible for agreements with partners and external stakeholders. FBT as part of LSBF complies with its delegated responsibilities, as set out in the agreements made with the awarding bodies and organisations.

3.6 The Public Information Policy assures accuracy of information through checking procedures applied from initial design of programmes through to validation, promotion and implementation. To ensure that detailed course information is sufficient and accurate, module and programme leaders based across all FBT centres have initial control of the content of handbooks and course outlines. A comprehensive training programme for the public information policy informs current and new members of both academic and support staff. An electronic tracking system supports the process of monitoring public information, reminding staff of their responsibilities six weeks before action is required. The system ensures accurate version control and detailed audit trails, although it does not currently extend to student or programme handbooks. The electronic tracking system for monitoring public information and version control is good practice.

3.7 Central management of FBT information by LSBF in London ensures commonality and consistency of information for centre websites. There is an effective process for the regular review of electronic public information with website content reviewed twice yearly. Student feedback and changes made by the awarding bodies and organisations, stakeholders, legislation are taken into account in the review, for example to encompass changes resulting from new validating partners.

3.8 Recruitment agents for the FBT centres are required to submit proposals for advertisements and promotional material to LSBF's Business Development Manager for approval, two weeks before they are to be used. Clear and well presented templates are

provided for this purpose. LSBF provides extensive advertising and promotional materials and high levels of support to recruitment agents, including regular visits to the countries where they are based. The Business Development Manager and Marketing Department representatives approve material for overseas recruitment activities, with or without conditions, before submission to the Head of Brand and Marketing for final approval. The extensive support and resources provided to recruitment agents to promote overseas development activities is good practice.

The team concludes that **reliance can be placed** on the accuracy and completeness of the information that the provider is responsible for publishing about itself and the programmes it delivers.

Action plan³

Finance and Business Training Ltd action plan relating to the Review for Educational Oversight November 2012						
Good practice	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
The review team identified the following areas of good practice that are worthy of wider dissemination within the provider:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> comprehensive communication systems (paragraph 2.4) 	<p>Ensure that the communications systems continue to be effective not only in Finance and Business Training Ltd, but across the Group</p> <p>Scheduled and diarised regular link meetings to be encouraged</p> <p>Regular visits by senior staff to centres to meet staff and students</p>	December 2013	Executive deans	Successful outcome to the monitoring of schedule and diaries which shows evidence of the continuation of good practice	Vice-Rector	Academic Board and Quality Committee
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a wide range of mechanisms for the 	Review the present systems at Finance	December 2013	Deans and programme	Effective mechanisms in	School boards and Quality	Academic Board

³ The provider 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 provider's awarding bodies and organisations.

collection and analysis of student feedback (paragraph 2.8)	and Business Training Ltd, identify best practice and use elsewhere in London School of Business and Finance		leaders	place across all London School of Business and Finance programmes and courses with rates of return of 60%	Committee	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> comprehensive integrated careers advice service (paragraph 2.10) 	<p>Continue to develop the careers advice service across the Group</p> <p>Separate strategy to be created for Birmingham, Manchester and London for careers including a business development strategy for each campus for employer engagement – several relevant partnerships with companies</p>	<p>Target dates required</p> <p>Initial progress report in May 2013</p> <p>Full report in December 2013</p>	Head of Careers and careers managers in Birmingham and Manchester	Satisfactory outcomes to student surveys, employer feedback and internship/ full-time job statistics	Quality Committee	Vice Rector and Academic Board
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> presentation and availability of information in multiple languages on the Manchester website (paragraph 3.3) 	In line with work across the Group, ongoing review of top performing countries for additional language sites working with the International Team in terms of	<p>To be included as part of the Group's interim internal audit in April and full internal audit in October</p> <p>Final report</p>	Website manager	To secure clear actions for improvement on the current website and to target an increase of two further language additions by	Group Managing Director	Academic Board and Senior Management

	<p>content and to ensure compliance with the Public Information Policy</p> <p>Continue to develop this across all parts of the Group as well as Finance and Business Training Ltd</p> <p>Hold workshops and so on where necessary</p>	2013		2015		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • electronic tracking system for monitoring public information and version control (paragraph 3.6) 	<p>In line with work across the Group, continue with training on the Public Information Policy and processes and periodic review</p> <p>Extend tracking so that it encompasses student handbooks and other non-marketing focused materials</p>	June 2013	Head of Marketing	Zero complaints and zero inaccuracy in public information	The Group Managing Director	Academic Board and Senior Management
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • extensive support and resources provided to recruitment agents (paragraph 3.8). 	<p>Keep under review materials to ensure they are accurate</p> <p>Continue mystery shopping exercise</p>	<p>Interim internal audit in June 2013</p> <p>Full report in 2013 on the</p>	Head of International Recruitment	Satisfactory outcome to the internal audit	The Group Managing Director	Academic Board and Senior Management

Desirable	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
The team considers that it is desirable for the provider to:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> continue to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the committee structure (paragraph 1.2) 	The process of monitoring and developing the committee structure will continue and will ensure the particular needs of Finance and Business Training Ltd are met	Initial report in July 2013 Implementation of changes by December 2013	Members of staff responsible for supporting and servicing committees and so on	Regular meetings with effective system of agendas and minutes	Academic Board Executive Steering Committee	Academic Board
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> make external examiner reports available to students (paragraph 1.8) 	Action is already being taken within the constraints of the partner institutions	July - September 2013	Registrar Business School	All external examiner reports for programmes of higher education institution partners (subject to any constraints imposed by partners freely available to students online)	Business School Board	Academic Board
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> develop further the oversight of teaching and learning (paragraph 2.5) 	The Quality Committee has established a subcommittee to develop a teaching and learning strategy	December 2013	Executive Dean of the Business School (as Chairman)	Initial report by June with agreed processes being rolled out in the autumn	Quality Committee	Academic Board

	<p>which will include oversight</p> <p>The aim will be to produce a group-wide policy with more detailed policies to reflect the different types of courses</p>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> consolidate oversight of peer review processes (paragraph 2.7) 	<p>Following a pilot, a programme of training is being undertaken with the aim of having a revised process in place in the Business School</p> <p>Further discussion to take place in respect of the Professional School and Vocational School</p>	<p>Completion by end of July 2013</p> <p>Pilot in the Professional School and Vocational School and full processes in place by 2014</p>	<p>Dean and associate deans of the Business School</p> <p>Dean of the Professional School and Vocational School</p>	<p>All staff actively participating in the process</p> <p>Evidence of good practice being reported to the Quality Committee</p>	Quality Committee	Academic Board
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> develop further the support for postgraduate research and scholarly activity (paragraph 2.12). 	<p>The Quality Committee has established a Continuing Professional Development and Research Subcommittee to review present policies in respect of academic staff, to</p>	December 2013	Head of Research	<p>Clear policy and budget in place</p> <p>The establishment of two research centres/groups to develop and build on existing research strengths that will</p>	Quality Committee	Academic Board

	<p>advise on priorities and to prepare an annual publication setting out activities undertaken</p> <p>The Quality Committee will seek to ensure that there is a clear budget for continuing professional development and research activities in the next financial year</p>			<p>be encouraged to publish findings and so on both internally and externally</p> <p>The aim is to produce six refereed articles by the end of 2013</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.

More detail about Review for Educational Oversight can be found at: www.qaa.ac.uk/institutionreports/types-of-review/tier-4.

Glossary

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

Academic Infrastructure Guidance developed and agreed by the higher education community and published by QAA, which is used by institutions to ensure that their courses meet national expectations for academic standards and that students have access to a suitable environment for learning (academic quality). It consists of four groups of reference points: the **frameworks for higher education qualifications**, the **subject benchmark statements**, the **programme specifications** and the **Code of practice**. Work is underway (2011-12) to revise the Academic Infrastructure as the UK Quality Code for Higher Education.

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

academic standards The standards set and maintained by institutions for their courses and expected for their awards. See also **threshold academic standard**.

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

awarding organisation An organisation with the authority to award academic qualifications located on the Qualifications and Credit Framework for England and Northern Ireland (these qualifications are at levels 1 to 8, with levels 4 and above being classed as 'higher education').

Code of practice *The Code of practice for the assurance of academic quality and standards in higher education*, published by QAA: a set of interrelated documents giving guidance for higher education institutions.

designated body An organisation that has been formally appointed to perform a particular function.

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

enhancement Taking deliberate steps at institutional level to improve the quality of **learning opportunities**. It is used as a technical term in QAA's audit and review processes.

feature of good practice A positive aspect of the way a higher education institution manages quality and standards, which may be seen as exemplary to others.

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:

⁴ www.qaa.ac.uk/publications/informationandguidance/pages/reo-handbook.aspx.

The framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FHEQ) and The framework for qualifications of higher education institutions in Scotland.

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

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

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

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

programme (of study) An approved course of study which 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 An institution that offers courses of higher education, typically on behalf of a separate **awarding body or organisation**. In the context of REO, the term means an independent college.

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

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

quality See **academic quality**.

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

threshold academic standard The minimum standard that a student should reach in order to gain a particular qualification or award, as set out in the **subject benchmark statements** and national qualifications frameworks. Threshold standards are distinct from the standards of performance that students need to achieve in order to gain any particular class of award, for example a first-class bachelor's degree. See also **academic standard**.

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

RG 1114 002/13

The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education

Southgate House
Southgate Street
Gloucester
GL1 1UB

Tel 01452 557000
Fax 01452 557070
Email comms@qaa.ac.uk
Web www.qaa.ac.uk

© The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education 2013

ISBN 978 1 84979 801 3

All QAA's publications are available on our website www.qaa.ac.uk

Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786