



Concerns about standards and quality in higher education

London Churchill College, May 2018

Contents

Introduction	1
Concerns raised	1
The investigation process.....	1
Result of the investigation	2
Explanation of findings	2
Conclusion	9
Recommendations	10

Introduction

1 This is a report of a full investigation of London Churchill College arising from concerns raised by the Department for Education to the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education's (QAA) [Concerns Scheme](#).¹

2 London Churchill College (the College) is an alternative provider of higher education and training based in East London. It offers higher national diplomas (HNDs) in Business, in Health and Social Care and in Hospitality Management awarded through Pearson. In 2016-17 it offered foundation degrees in Business Management and in Events and Hospitality Management awarded by the University of Bedfordshire as the awarding body. In addition the College is a study centre for the Level 6 top-up degrees in Business Management and Health and Social Care offered by the University of Bedfordshire (the University). In 2017-18 the College had 1228 students studying across its HND programmes.

Concerns raised

3 The Department for Education referred a concern to QAA's Concerns Scheme, which investigates concerns about standards, quality and information that higher education providers produce. The concern related to the delivery and teaching of the Foundation Degrees in Business Management and in Events & Hospitality Management in 2016-17. In 2016-17 the College had enrolled 100 students to Year One of these programmes. However, none of these students passed the first year and none progressed to the second year. The College decided to suspend recruitment to these programmes for the 2017-18 academic year.

The investigation process

4 QAA initiated a full investigation, including analysis of documentary evidence and a visit to the College on 25 May 2018. The QAA concerns team (the team) comprised Dr Stephen Ryrie (investigation coordinator and reviewer) and Miss Sarah Riches (reviewer). The College cooperated with the investigation. This report sets out the results of the QAA's findings in relation to the concern raised by the Department for Education.

5 The team considered documentary evidence provided by the College including College policies, minutes of committee meetings, records of student admission processes, programme handbooks, materials relating to student assessment, external examiners' reports, monitoring reports, marketing materials and email communications between College and University staff. In the course of the visit the team held meetings with senior staff of the College, with students and representatives of the University.

6 The team addressed the allegations by considering aspects of the College's arrangements, specifically whether:

- the College had given enough advanced planning and consideration to the programme specification in relation to both content and delivery prior to recruitment
- the College had given sufficient consideration to the demands and requirements of the programme during the recruitment process to ensure students recruited had a reasonable chance of success
- the College had followed its own internal processes and procedures when it began to have concerns about the programme, and whether the concerns escalated appropriately and action was taken swiftly enough

¹ QAA Concerns Scheme: www.qaa.ac.uk/reviewing-higher-education/how-to-make-a-complaint.

- what processes and procedures were in place at the College with regard to the management of the collaborative arrangement with the awarding body
- what measures and systems have been put in place to ensure that a similar circumstances do not occur in the future.

Result of the investigation

7 The concerns were found to be justified. In undertaking the investigation the concerns team made nine recommendations.

Explanation of findings

Whether the College had given enough advanced planning and consideration to the programme specification in relation to both content and delivery prior to recruitment.

8 The College approached the University in 2014 with a view to replacing its higher national diploma provision with foundation degrees. The College's planning was informed by local business needs, the local demographics of potential students and the opportunity to develop a new site at Upton Park. The University and the College executed an Institutional Memorandum of Agreement for delivery by the College of a Foundation Degree in Business Management and for the delivery by the University of a BA Top-Up in Business Management at the College's premises (a Study Centre arrangement).

9 The College states that the foundation degree programmes were approved in line with its Quality Handbook. The Handbook does not distinguish between different types of partnership working with the University (study centre, franchise, validation) in describing the internal approval procedures to be followed. The College provided no evidence of any internal approval processes being undertaken prior to approval by the University. The Quality Handbook has been discontinued and replaced by individual policy and procedure documents. The Programme Design and Development Policy, which was approved in December 2016, is a concise statement of the College's requirements for the development and approval of new programmes. The Policy refers to 'validated' programmes; it does not clearly explain the various types of partnership delivery available with the University and the different responsibilities for admissions, teaching and assessment applicable in each case. However, the Policy does provide for an internal approval event prior to University approval. The concerns team **recommends** that the College should fully implement its internal process for the approval of new programmes prior to approval by an awarding body. The concerns team also **recommends** that the College should develop policy which articulates the different models of collaborative provision and the associated responsibility of the College for curriculum design, teaching and assessment.

10 In June 2015 a University panel approved the franchised delivery of the University's Foundation Degree in Business Management by the College and the use of the College's premises as a study centre for the delivery of the University's BA Business Management (Level 6) Top-up programme. In January 2016 the University approved franchised course delivery by the College of a Foundation Degree in Events and Hospitality Management. Both approvals were subject to conditions and recommendations. Final approval was confirmed to the College in University memoranda dated August 2015 and February 2016 respectively.

11 Definitive course documentation for foundation degree programmes is contained in Course Information Forms (CIFs) and Unit Information Forms (UIFs), prepared by the University. Details of how the partnership will operate and the responsibilities of the University and its collaborative partner in respect of delivery are contained in a Collaborative Procedures Manual (the Manual). A Manual was produced for 2016-17 which covered the

two Foundation Degree programmes and the Level 6 BA Business Administration Top-Up course. Taken together these documents are intended to provide sufficient detail for successful delivery. However, Appendix 1 of the Manual, detailing units comprising the awards and the Colleges tutor's, as presented to the University's UK Partnership Committee was incomplete. Minutes of the College's Partnership meetings prior to the launch of the programmes in September 2016 noted that the University had not received details of College's tutors for each unit; arrangements for assignment writing are also mentioned but it is unclear from the minutes who would be responsible for drafting assessments. Email correspondence between one of the University's link coordinators and the College's programme manager indicates that responsibility for preparing assessments was still under discussion during August and September 2017, although the Manual clearly states that the University's tutors will be responsible.

12 The concern team concluded that the College did not undertake sufficient advanced planning to ensure successful delivery of the programmes as set out in the CIFs, UIFs and Procedures Manual and that the concern is justified.

Whether the College had given sufficient consideration to the demands and requirements of the programme during the recruitment process to ensure students recruited had a reasonable chance of success.

13 The University's minimum benchmark entry requirement for a foundation degree is set out in its Academic Regulations as one A Level or equivalent or 'evidence of experience in appropriate employment'. The CIFs for the foundation degrees delivered by the College refer the reader to the University's standard entry requirements for Foundation degrees which are set out on the University's website for the Foundation Degree in Business Management. Although the relevant webpage purports to set out the University's entry requirements, in practice it describes typical entry routes to a Foundation degree. The College's website set out the entry requirements for the foundation degrees as 120 UCAS points of which 80 should be from one A Level, reflecting the relevant section of each CIF. It states that applications were welcome from candidates who did not meet the normal entry requirements but whose work experience prepared them to succeed on the course. Staff of the College confirmed that the College takes steps to verify the work experience of applicants by contacting the employer in all cases. In the case of the Foundation Degree in Business Management, applicants were expected to have significant business experience and training equivalent to the entry requirements. The College also set out its English Language requirement for applicants who had not studied for the last two years in the medium of English. All applicants were interviewed and those who needed to meet the English language requirement sat a College-devised test.

14 The Manual sets out the responsibilities of the College and the University for the recruitment, selection and admission of students. The College is responsible for recruiting students in accordance with the University's entry criteria as published on the website (generally) and for each programme. The College's admission staff make provisional decisions about the suitability of applicants and send copies of application forms and supporting documentation to the University for final approval. Staff of the University confirmed that all admissions decisions are confirmed by the university's admissions team. In addition, the University's account manager for the College undertakes periodic verification of application forms.

15 College staff who met the concerns team stated that if applicants did not have a Level 3 qualification they would consider the application holistically taking into account work experience alongside other (lower) qualifications. Representatives of the University who met the concerns team stated that partners are expected to liaise with the relevant University Faculty concerning non-standard entry and that the University's Recognition of Prior

Learning (RPL) procedures should be completed. The College stated that it had sent some test admission files to the University but that it had not received any feedback.

16 The concerns team examined a sample of 13 individual student files, which included application forms, copies of passports, verified copies of certification, references from employers, completed admissions interview forms and where appropriate the College's English language assessment test. Neither the application form nor the admissions interview forms clearly records in full the academic qualifications and work experience of applicants.

17 The team found a number of discrepancies and inconsistencies in these files. The files of two students admitted with overseas qualifications equivalent to Level 2 did not contain any independent evidence of the work experience claimed. Two students provided workplace references identical in format and layout but purporting to come from different employers. In one case the reference referred throughout to 'he' although the student is female. The second reference states that the student has been employed as an office supervisor for seven years, which would mean, given her date of birth, since the age of 12. Although the College stated that all employment references were checked with the employer, the team found that three of the 13 files examined lacked convincing evidence of either a Level 3 qualification or suitable work experience, and concluded that the College had failed to ensure that applicants met the entry requirements for each course.

18 The concerns team concluded that the concerns are justified. It identified a number of weaknesses in the admissions arrangements for the Foundation degrees. Entry requirements were not described in sufficient detail and consistently across all sources of information provided by the College and University to potential applicants. The College's application form did not capture all relevant information and the Admission Interview Form did not clearly identify on what basis entry criteria had been met. Discrepancies and inconsistencies in workplace references indicate that the College had failed to verify the authenticity of applicants' employment experience in a rigorous and consistent manner and that the University had failed to ensure that all decisions on admissions and on recognition of prior learning were confirmed by its admissions team. Collectively, these weaknesses provided the opportunity for the admission of students who had no reasonable prospect of success on the Foundation degree programmes. The concerns team **recommends** that the College should clarify and publicise entry requirements for each programme, and should take steps to ensure secure implementation of these requirements.

Whether the College had followed its own internal processes and procedures when it began to have concerns about the programme, and whether the concerns escalated appropriately and action was taken swiftly enough.

19 Staff of the College stated that they first had concerns about the courses in January 2017 when it became apparent that the College had been delivering unit BBS013-1 rather than AAF007-1, which had a different assessment regime. In addition, the University expected BBS009-1 to be delivered to that cohort in semester two, as approved. Opportunities for concerns about the delivery of the foundation degree courses to be raised included College programme committees; however, only one programme committee took place during 2016-17, in November 2016, when problems had yet to emerge. College staff whom the concerns team met stated that concerns about the operation of the partnership were raised in the higher education group and the senior management team. Although senior staff of the College affirmed that Academic Board was also aware of the problems being encountered, there is no record in Academic Board minutes in March or July 2017 of any concerns. Surveys of students might also have alerted the College to concerns about delivery but students whom the concerns team met stated that the surveys did not cover assessment issues.

20 The Course Handbooks for the foundation degree programmes refer to the College's complaints procedure but do not offer guidance on how a student might find this procedure. The College's "Student Complaint Policy and Procedure" is available on its website. It includes references to the Student Complaints Policy and Procedure of the University, but these references are inconsistent with the University's procedure in respect of students at its partner colleges. Although in September 2017 some students informally raised concerns with College staff about not having received their results, they were not advised of their right to raise a formal complaint with either the College or the University. No formal complaints were raised with either the College or the University by students on the FD programmes. Students of the College appeared to be unaware of their right to have recourse to the complaints procedures of the University and ultimately to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education. The College confirmed that it has not given consideration to any form of redress for the affected students. The University confirmed that it intends to consider whether any form of redress would be appropriate. The concerns team recommends that the College should ensure that students are provided with accessible and trustworthy information about the complaints procedures to which they have access, including those of awarding bodies. In addition, the concerns team advises the College to consider whether any form of redress should be offered to students on Foundation Degree programmes in 2016-17.

21 The College's Annual Monitoring Policy provides for an Annual Monitoring Report to reflect on academic standards achieved and on students' learning opportunities. However, the College failed to provide an internal monitoring report covering the delivery of the foundation degree programmes. The concerns team **recommends** that the College should strengthen its internal monitoring processes to ensure timely and secure oversight of programme delivery.

22 The University's faculty monitoring report for undergraduate courses for 2016-17 includes consideration of the Foundation Degree programmes at the College. However, the student numbers cited did not represent both cohorts and was accordingly misleading. The report notes that no students from the College have progressed to the second year of the course but there is no analysis of the possible causes. The report includes a summary of common issues identified by external examiners but does not draw attention to concerns raised by an external examiner about the provision at the College in respect of inconsistent marking of student work. The monitoring report did not provide sufficient detail to alert the University's Teaching Quality and Standards Committee to the scale of the difficulties encountered with the partnership or concerns about academic quality and standards. The concerns team formed the view that the University's monitoring of provision at the College lacked the rigour which would have been consistent with secure oversight of the first delivery of a programme with a new collaborative partner.

23 Although the University affirmed that a single external examiner was responsible for covering units on both foundation degree programmes, the examiner's report stated that he was responsible only for the FD Business Management and that he had examined student work on only one unit of that programme. The University's course coordinators prepared a detailed response and action plan that correctly identified most of the operational difficulties associated with admissions and assessment and which appeared to identify appropriate and proportional actions to address them.

24 Email correspondence and minutes of partnership meetings show that individuals within the College and University worked to attempt to resolve difficulties as they arose. However, as the year progressed the number and scale of problems relating to assessment processes increased. Ultimately, the College's concerns were escalated to the University's Vice-Chancellor in late October 2017.

25 The concerns team concludes that the concern is justified. Although College managers were aware of ongoing difficulties, the College's mechanisms for identifying problems including programme committees, student surveys and complaint procedures did not operate effectively to alert senior staff and the College's committees to the severity of problems being encountered. The College failed to provide an internal annual monitoring report which considered the foundation degree programmes. The College's Academic Board failed to identify and address difficulties being encountered in respect of assessment processes. In addition, the University's internal monitoring process contained inaccurate data about student numbers on programmes at the College, failed to identify poor progression rates and failed to draw attention to an external examiner's concerns. The College failed to ensure that students were aware of their right to make a complaint about the College's provision and failed to provide accessible and trustworthy information about complaints procedures available to students.

What processes and procedures were in place at the College with regard to the management of the collaborative arrangement with the awarding body?

26 The foundation degree students were recruited in September 2016 with teaching commencing in October 2016. The College acknowledged that during the course of the academic year a number of difficulties emerged. Students confirmed that they had experienced difficulties relating to the timing and content of assessments, to the communication of information about assessment tasks to students, to the communication of individual students' results to them, and to the availability of opportunities to undertake resits of assessments.

27 The CIF for the Business Management programme included two accounting units, BBS013-1 Introduction to Financial and Management Accounting and BBS003-2 Accounting for Business Management. At some point after the approval event in June 2015 and before the commencement of teaching in October 2016 these units were replaced by AAF007-1 Introduction to Financial and Management Accounting and AAF009-2 Accounting for Business Management. A consequence of the change was that the assessment type for the Level 4 unit had changed from a written report to a written examination. The College was made aware of the change in February 2017, only shortly before the first assessment was due and mid-way through the delivery of the year-long unit. Staff of the College expressed the view that lack of timely communication by the University of these changes, and lack of effective communication about the assessment of other units, played a large part in causing the difficulties experienced by students, see paragraph 30.

28 Staff of the University confirmed that a change to units had taken place, and acknowledged that the University is responsible for preparing and maintaining the CIF. However, at the time of the concerns visit the CIF available on the University's website continued to set out the course structure as including BBS013-1 and BBS003-2. Although University staff accepted that its link coordinator was responsible for ensuring communication with the College at unit level, they were unable to confirm whether or how the information about this change had been communicated to the College.

29 The Manual states that LCC students follow the University's registration process. Completion of the registration process enables students to access the University's resources including the Learning Resource Centre and BREO (the University's VLE). The Course Handbooks for the Foundation Degree Business Management and the Foundation Degree Events and Hospitality Management each refers students to the College's VLE and, despite including references to resources available on BREO, states that access by College students to BREO is available only to Level 6 BA Top-up students. Students stated that the College had not told them that they were entitled to access BREO. The University's

representatives affirmed that registration should be completed within two weeks of the start of the course.

30 The Manual states that the University is responsible for setting assessments, that assignment submissions will be made via plagiarism-detection software accessed through BREO, that University tutors undertake first and second/double marking, that examination boards are held at the University, and that students notified of results through the University eVision system. Problems with the assessment process included: some University tutors being unaware that their unit was being delivered by the College; lack of clarity about whether University or College staff were responsible for setting assessments and who was responsible for first marking; delayed access to assessment briefs by College staff; confusion over week numbers with the result that the assessment schedule at the College was not synchronised with the University's calendar; students' assignments were uploaded to the College's VLE site rather than the University's BREO with the result that University staff could not easily access material to undertake second marking; confusion relating to re-assessment; awareness of the assessment regulations responsibility for processing students results, the location and dates of examination boards; and communication of results to students and the College. These matters were raised and discussed in email correspondence between University and College staff and at face-to-face meetings between August 2016 and October 2017. The correspondence indicates that the University allowed the College to depart from the requirements of the Procedures Manual in several respects including allowing: College staff to set their own assessments, students to submit assessments via the College's VLE and College staff to undertake first marking. The concerns team **recommends** that the College should work with the University to further develop the Collaborative Procedures Manual in order to ensure that it contains all information necessary for the smooth and timely delivery of programmes. The concerns team also **recommends** that the College should ensure that delivery of programmes takes place in accordance with the Collaborative Procedures Manual.

31 The FD Business Management results have been fully processed through the University's examination board. None of the students were permitted to progress to the second year of the course. Of the 96 students presented to the September 2017 Board, 63 failed to achieve any credits, of these 25 failed to record any marks. 33 students achieved credits ranging from 30 to 105. The Events and Hospitality Management results have yet to be finalised through the University's examination boards. Students that were on this programme are still awaiting the confirmation of their results for 2016-17.

32 During 2016-17 the College's quality assurance policies and procedures were contained in a Quality Assurance Handbook. The contents of the Handbook were structured around the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (Quality Code), but the section covering Expectation B10 contains little information about how the College will manage academic collaborative delivery with its awarding bodies.

33 Details of the management of the partnership are contained in the Memorandum of Agreement with the University, the CIFs, UIFs, and the Manual. The Manual describes how the partnership between the College and the University will operate, and the roles and responsibilities of staff. It is designed to supplement the contractual and approval documents. The Manual is updated annually by the University's account manager and approved by the University's UK Partnership Committee. The Manual for 2016-17 covered the BA Business Management Top-up and Foundation Degree courses. The Manual is deficient in several respects: Appendix 1 containing the unit schedule and the names of College tutors is incomplete; it does not set out the pattern of delivery mapped against the University's academic calendar, nor key dates in the assessment calendar such as those of examination boards. In practice, the University allowed the College to depart from many of the arrangements set out in the Manual including: admission of students; registration of

students; use of the College's VLE in preference to BREO; and responsibility for setting and marking assessments. Omissions from the Manual combined with a willingness to allow the College to depart from its requirements contributed to the subsequent difficulties.

34 As noted in paragraph 28, the University amended the programme specification for the Business Management course after the approval event in June 2015 prior to delivery by the College in September 2016. The College was unaware of the change in the unit specifications and delivered an unapproved unit to students between October 2016 and January 2017. At the time of the concerns visit in May 2018 the University's website was still hosting a CIF, which did not contain the up-to-date list of units to be completed for the award.

35 The concerns team concludes that the concern is justified. The College and University failed to abide by the operational requirements as set out in the Manual in respect of the registration of students, the use of BREO as the repository for teaching and assessment materials and access to students work and responsibilities for setting and marking assessments. Key operational information such as sequencing of units, the contact details of unit tutors at both the University and College, the academic calendar, and recording of result and examination board arrangements were not shared and agreed on a timely basis. As noted at paragraph 31, students have not all yet been informed of their assessment outcomes and of the award of any credit due to them. The concerns team **recommends** that the College should work with the University to ensure, as a matter of urgency, that the assessment outcomes of all students on foundation degree programmes in 2016-17 are considered by an Examining Board and that the students are notified of the award of any credit.

36 The Collaborative Procedures Manual is not fit for purpose: it does not include all the necessary information required to manage the partnership, required information was not provided and in any event, the University allowed the College to depart from the agreed arrangements. The College for its part sought to depart from the arrangements for delivery as set out in the Manual. The University failed to inform the College on a timely basis that the units comprising the Business Management course had been amended and retained an out-of-date version of the CIF on its website.

What measures and systems have been put in place to ensure that similar circumstances do not occur in the future?

37 The College has a Policy for Programme Modification and Withdrawal, which was approved in December 2016. Programme withdrawals must be approved by the senior management team and Academic Board before the awarding body is notified. Although the Policy covers the situation where a course is withdrawn before students enrol, it is inadequate in that it does not provide details of the responsibilities of the College and the rights of students if a course is withdrawn part-way through delivery. The concerns team **recommends** that the College should establish and implement a policy in respect of programme closure which protects the academic interests of current students affected by a decision to close a programme.

38 Although the foundation degree students started the second year of their programmes in September 2017, the College decided not to continue to deliver the courses. Students were offered the opportunity to apply for HND programmes; 48 are now enrolled on HND programmes at the College. Although some of these students achieved Level 4 credits on the foundation degree courses, none have been considered for the transfer of credit under the College's recognition of prior learning procedures.

39 The University is in the process of implementing the outcomes of an investigation into its partnership with the College and has notified the College that it is terminating the

partnership. Staff of the University stated that it has taken steps to further strengthen its oversight of collaborative partnerships including enhancing and clarifying the role of Director of UK Partnerships, strengthening the monitoring of the implementation of the Procedures Manual and reinforcing the current requirement that Examination Boards reach a decision on every student, based on the available profile.

Conclusion

40 The concern relating to whether the College had given enough advanced planning and consideration to the programme specification in relation to both content and delivery prior to recruitment is upheld. The College had failed to undertake sufficient advanced planning to ensure successful delivery of the programmes. The College had not undertaken a secure process of internal approval of the programmes and had not developed a clear internal understanding of its responsibilities for their successful delivery. These shortcomings mean that the College's provision does not meet Expectation B1 of the Quality Code.

41 The concern relating to whether the College had given sufficient consideration to the demands and requirements of the programme during the recruitment process to ensure students recruited had a reasonable chance of success is upheld. There were a number of weaknesses in the admissions arrangements for the programmes. Entry requirements were not described in sufficient detail and consistently by either the College or the University. The College's application form did not capture all relevant information and the Admission Interview Form did not clearly identify on what basis entry criteria had been met. Discrepancies and inconsistencies in workplace references indicate that the College had failed to verify the authenticity of applicants' employment experience in a rigorous and consistent manner and that the University had failed to ensure that all decisions on admissions and on recognition of prior learning were confirmed by its admissions team. Collectively, these weaknesses provided the opportunity for the admission of students who had no reasonable prospect of success on the programmes. These shortcomings mean that the College's provision does not meet Expectation B2 of the Quality Code.

42 The concern relating to whether the College had followed its own internal processes and procedures when it began to have concerns about the programme, and whether the concerns escalated appropriately and action was taken swiftly enough, is upheld. The College's mechanisms for ensuring successful programme delivery and assessment did not operate effectively. The College's Academic Board and its Programme Committee failed to identify and address difficulties being encountered in respect of assessment processes. The University's internal monitoring process lacked the rigour which would have been consistent with secure oversight of the first delivery of a programme with a new collaborative partner. The College has an inadequate policy governing the closure of programmes, in that it does not set out measures to secure the academic experience of students already enrolled on a programme facing closure. These shortcomings mean that the College's provision does not meet Expectation B8 of the Quality Code.

43 The College failed to ensure that students were aware of their right to make a complaint about the College's provision and failed to provide accessible and trustworthy information about complaints procedures available to students. These shortcomings mean that the College's provision does not meet Expectation B9 of the Quality Code.

44 The College had inadequate processes and procedures in place with regard to the management of the collaborative arrangement with the University. The College and University failed to abide by the operational requirements as set out in the Collaborative Procedures Manual in a number of respects. The Manual fails to include all the necessary information required to manage the partnership, and in any event, the University allowed the College to depart from the agreed arrangements. The College for its part sought to depart

from the arrangements for delivery as set out in the Manual. In consequence, the College was unable to ensure that arrangements for assessment were valid and reliable. These shortcomings mean that the College's provision does not meet Expectation B6 of the Quality Code.

45 In the light of the conclusions of the report, the College is required to provide an action plan to QAA within four weeks of publication setting out how it will address the findings from this investigation.

Recommendations

46 The concerns team recommends that the College should:

- fully implement its internal process for the approval of new programmes prior to approval by an awarding body (paragraph 9)
- develop policy which articulates the different models of collaborative provision and the associated responsibility of the College for curriculum design, teaching and assessment (paragraph 9)
- clarify and publicise entry requirements for each programme, and should take steps to ensure secure implementation of these requirements (paragraph 18)
- ensure that students are provided with accessible and trustworthy information about the complaints procedures to which they have access, including those of awarding bodies (paragraph 20)
- strengthen its internal monitoring processes to ensure timely and secure oversight of programme delivery (paragraph 21)
- work with the University to further develop the Collaborative Procedures Manual in order to ensure that it contains all information necessary for the smooth and timely delivery of programmes (paragraph 30)
- ensure that delivery of programmes takes place in accordance with the Collaborative Procedures Manual (paragraph 30)
- work with the University to ensure, as a matter of urgency, that the assessment outcomes of all students on Foundation Degree programmes in 2016-17 are considered by an Examining Board and are notified of the award of any credit (paragraph 35)
- establish and implement a policy in respect of programme closure which protect the academic interests of current students affected by a decision to close a programme (paragraph 37).

47 In addition, the concerns team advises the College to consider whether any form of redress should be offered to students on foundation degree programmes in 2016-17.

QAA10228 - R10228 - Jul 18

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

Tel: 01452 557 050

Website: www.qaa.ac.uk