



London Churchill College

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

May 2012

Key findings about London Churchill College

As a result of its Review for Educational Oversight carried out in May 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 Accrediting and Assessment Bureau for Post-Secondary Schools, the Association of Chartered Certified Accountants, Edexcel and the Management Development Partnership.

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 and these awarding 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**:

- effective systems are in place for the organisation and recording of the internal verification (paragraph 1.6)
- thorough mechanisms for the collection, collation and follow-up of student feedback (paragraph 2.10)
- development of the *College Journal of Contemporary Development and Management Studies* to provide a platform for staff and students to publish their research alongside external papers (paragraph 2.13)
- provision of particularly comprehensive information for prospective students (paragraph 3.1).

Recommendations

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

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

- review the remits and meeting schedules of committees to ensure problems are resolved in a timely manner (paragraph 1.3)
- revise the current data recording procedures and templates (paragraph 1.4)
- thoroughly check and formally review all public documents in accordance with the written procedure (paragraph 3.6).

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

- formalise the monitoring of responses to external reports to assure academic standards (paragraph 1.7)
- develop a structured system for sharing of good practice as part of the staff development programme (paragraph 2.14)
- review the accuracy of information provided on the nature and location of the College (paragraph 3.2).

About this report

This report presents the findings of the [Review for Educational Oversight](#)¹ (REO) conducted by [QAA](#) at London Churchill College (the provider; the College). 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 Accrediting and Assessment Bureau for Post-Secondary Schools, the Association of Chartered Certified Accountants, Edexcel and the Management Development Partnership. The review was carried out by Mrs Helen Corkill, Mr Mike Coulson and Professor David Eastwood (reviewers), and Mrs Mandy Hobart (coordinator).

The review team conducted the review in agreement with the provider and in accordance with the [Review for Educational Oversight: Handbook](#).² Evidence in support of the review included the self-evaluation document, copies of policies and procedures, minutes of meetings, the awarding body and organisations' reports and agreements, meetings with staff and students.

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

- the Academic Infrastructure
- the Qualifications and Credit Framework.

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

London Churchill College (the College) is a medium-sized independent provider of higher education, registered in 2006. The College has a single campus located in Whitechapel, a few miles from the City of London. The College mission is to 'contribute to communities through the provision of recognised qualifications; providing long-term societal benefits through transmitting knowledge; developing thinking, practical skills and abilities; preparing students of wider backgrounds to seek out appropriate opportunities'.

The College initially offered a variety of qualifications, but since 2009 has concentrated on a limited number of qualifications and awarding partners in order to maintain numbers and economic viability. In 2009, the College became an approved Edexcel centre offering higher national certificates and diplomas, as well as the level 7 qualification in strategic management. In 2011, an agreement with the Management Development Partnership enabled the College to deliver an honours degree top-up validated by The Manchester Metropolitan University for business administration and management students. The College currently has 516 enrolled students, all of whom are studying on full-time programmes.

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

Accrediting and Assessment Bureau for Post-Secondary Schools (AABPS)

- Level 5 Diploma in Business Management Studies
- Level 6 Diploma in Business Management Studies

Association of Chartered Certified Accountants (ACCA)

- Level 7 Accounting

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

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

Edexcel

- HND in Business
- HND in Computing
- HND in Computing and Systems Development
- HND in Health and Social Care
- HND in Hospitality Management
- Level 7 Extended Diploma in Strategic Management and Leadership

The Manchester Metropolitan University through a collaborative partnership with Management Development Partnership

- BSc (Hons) in Management and Business Administration (top-up)

The provider's stated responsibilities

The College's partnership agreements with its awarding body and organisations vary in the scope of the responsibilities delegated to the College. The College is responsible for the recruitment and admission of students, along with the setting of assessments and moderation of students for Edexcel-validated provision. For other awarding partners, the assessments are externally set and marked, and in the case of ACCA qualifications the College is only responsible for the delivery of the prescribed teaching.

Recent developments

Higher education numbers have grown in the last two years, and the College has expanded its academic and physical infrastructure, including the recruitment of more academic staff. In July 2011, the College entered into an agreement with the Management Development Partnership to deliver a top-up degree in BSc (Hons) in Management and Business Administration validated by The Manchester Metropolitan University.

Students' contribution to the review

Students studying on higher education programmes at the provider were invited to present a submission to the review team. The College facilitated a meeting with student representatives to discuss their academic and pastoral support, learning resources, submission, marking and feedback, and opportunities to attend meetings with programme teams and senior management. The student submission includes a video of the meeting and a written transcript. The review coordinator met students during the preparatory meeting, and the team met students during the review visit.

Detailed findings about London Churchill College

1 Academic standards

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

1.1 The College has effective systems for managing the differing delegated responsibilities of its one awarding body, Edexcel, and three awarding organisations, AABPS, ACCA and the Management Development Partnership. The BSc (Hons) in Management and Business Administration is administered by the Management Development Partnership, a collaborative partner of The Manchester Metropolitan University which is the validating body. The College has not had a formal institutional-level relationship with the University. Unit specifications for Edexcel, AABPS and The Manchester Metropolitan University qualifications remain the responsibility of the awarding partners, which also undertake the external monitoring and quality review of the programmes. ACCA approves the College to operate both as a learning provider and as a computer-based examination centre, and retains responsibility for standards and the setting and marking of external examinations.

1.2 The established management structure within the College defines the responsibilities for the management of academic standards, though reporting structures overlap functional responsibilities. The Board of Directors has oversight of the College's whole provision and is chaired by the Principal who, as functional head of the College, himself reports to the Board through a recently appointed Managing Director. Academic delivery within the College is managed by the Director of Studies who reports to the Principal. The Director of Studies is the line manager for the Programme Manager, who in turn is supported by eight programme leaders and a programme administrator. The Director of Studies also works alongside the Director of Quality Assurance. The Director of Quality Assurance is also assisted by the Programme Manager and the eight programme leaders who function as lead verifier and internal verifiers respectively. Most academic staff (93 per cent) are employed on a part-time basis.

1.3 The flow of standards information is supported by a clearly designated deliberative meeting structure. However, while the function of each of the five committees is well understood by staff, inconsistencies were identified in the flow of information, and the use of committee titles in documents and minutes. The Board of Directors, the Academic Board and the Quality Assurance Committee consider the academic work of the College and receive reports from the other committees, whose meetings are set out in the College's academic calendar. The Programme Committee meets once per semester and reports to the Quality Assurance Committee and then to the Academic Board, both of whom only meet once a year. The Programme Committee is well attended by programme staff and two elected student representatives from each class, and may have over 40 members present at one meeting. The frequency of meetings of the College's Quality Assurance Committee and Academic Board does not support the consistent and timely deliberation of concerns. This has led to some programme issues being considered after the conclusion of the awards. It is advisable that the College reviews the remits and meeting schedules of committees to ensure problems are resolved in a timely manner.

1.4 The College's system for the review of internal standards based on the interpretation of data and pass rates is not sufficiently robust. Each programme produces an annual Review and Enhancement Report, which is presented to the Programme Committee. Each report includes quantitative information on enrolment and achievement, but the current templates are insufficiently clear to allow for comprehensive and robust analysis and

interrogation of the data. This would not allow comparisons from one year to the next. As a result, the College is not able to clearly evidence consideration of student achievement and strategies to improve areas of poor performance. The College is advised to revise the current data recording procedures and templates to support the review of retention and achievement information.

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

1.5 The College makes appropriate use of a range of external reference points to manage the standards of its academic provision. Most staff are conversant with the component parts of the Academic Infrastructure as an overarching framework. Use is made of the subject benchmark statements published by QAA and relevant sections of the *Code of practice for the assurance of academic quality and standards in higher education* (the *Code of practice*), particularly *Section 6: Assessment of students* (2006) and the regulations and programme unit specifications of the individual awarding partners. The Management Development Partnership specifications and materials are written and validated to conform to the Academic Infrastructure throughout. All programme, module and student handbooks are produced in line with the particular requirements of the various awarding partners. The College also makes reference both to *The framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland* (FHEQ) and the Qualifications and Credit Framework in the setting and marking of assessments.

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

1.6 Robust systems are in place for the internal verification and auditing of assessments for awards offered by Edexcel and AABPS. The College has a hierarchical system of internal verifiers, reporting to the Director of Quality Assurance. The College provides a handbook and well structured verification templates for use by internal verifiers. Staff reported that the processes are clear and thorough. All verifiers are internally trained and many attend externally-run events. A number of staff also hold assessor and verifier awards. The team supported the findings of Edexcel in January 2011 that the College has good systems in place for the organisation and recording of the internal verification of its higher education awards.

1.7 The College has effective structures and processes for managing standards in relation to its respective awarding partners. The College's academic standards are externally reviewed on an annual basis. Edexcel carries out one quality monitoring visit and one external examining visit per year; and the Management Development Partnership and AABPS visit at least once per year. Although operating on a different basis, ACCA also carries out external visits to the College twice per year and, while the visit does not culminate in a formal report, outcomes are communicated by email. The recommendations and action points from external reports are briefly included in the College's Review and Enhancement Reports and considered by programme teams. These reports are also reviewed at Programme Committee and Academic Board, but the College has recognised that they are not rigorously deliberated. The Academic Board has recently asked the Director of Studies to produce a formal document outlining responses to action points and recommendations from external sources. It is desirable that the College formalises the monitoring of responses to external reports to assure academic standards.

1.8 The College has a number of formal and informal processes where good practice can be shared. The College operates formal systems for peer observation of teaching and for appraisal, both of which allow good practice to be identified and shared with the

programme leaders and the Programme Manager. Where appropriate, good practice is incorporated into the annual Review and Enhancement Reports and reported upwards into the formal committee structure. Staff referred to course team meetings, where specific course-related solutions to problems and success are shared informally. Three teaching staff work across programme sectors and a further 10 members of staff each teach on two business programmes, allowing additional opportunities for the informal sharing of ideas across the College. The College supports staff attendance at external events and college-run external visits, all of which help in the assimilation of standards materials and the sharing of good practice.

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 body 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 Operating primarily through its Academic Board, Quality Assurance Committee, Programme Committee and Assessment Board, the College's quality assurance system is effective in meeting the requirements and responsibilities designated by its awarding partners. The College's agreements, as outlined in paragraph 1.1, vary in the scope and degree of responsibilities, including in terms of setting of assessments, marking and quality monitoring arrangements. For example, in the case of Edexcel, the College sets assessments, assures internal moderation and keeps qualification records. For other awarding partners, assessments are externally set and marked. With the exception of ACCA, the College is responsible for all admissions and registrations.

2.2 The quality assurance system operated by the College effectively addresses the needs of its awarding partners. Programme leaders ensure that student assignments are submitted on time, and internal verifiers scrutinise all Edexcel assignments as part of the quality process. The roles of key committees are understood by staff in ensuring the quality of provision. Student feedback informs the Review and Enhancement Reports, which are reviewed by the Programme Committee. The College regularly monitors, reviews and evaluates its operations to meet the requirements of the awarding partners. The awarding body and organisations monitor the College through scrutiny of assessed work and centre visits. In the case of Edexcel, this includes thorough scrutiny by external examiners and quality officers and annual visits, as discussed in paragraph 1.7. The awarding partners report that the College fulfils its responsibilities for managing and enhancing the quality of learning opportunities.

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

2.3 The College engages well with a wide variety of external reference points, including the awarding partners' standards documentation, the *Code of practice*, the emerging UK Quality Code for Higher Education, the British Accreditation Council and the UK Border Agency. For example, the College's assessment policy is aligned with the *Code of practice, Section 6: Assessment of students*; the programme handbooks with *Section 10: Admissions to higher education*; and the disability policy with *Section 3: Disabled students*. Programme and unit specifications use templates to ensure alignment with the FHEQ and subject benchmark statements.

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

2.4 A clearly structured process of annual audit ensures that annual reporting action points are met and reviewed by the Quality Assurance Committee. The College separates responsibilities for programme delivery, headed by the Director of Studies, from quality assurance, headed by the Director of Quality Assurance, who is responsible for monitoring assessment and moderation. This division of responsibilities operates efficiently in practice.

2.5 The College has an articulated review and enhancement process, which reports annually for each programme. Collated by programme leaders and the Programme Manager, annual Review and Enhancement Reports include: module results, student feedback, peer review of lecturers, review of minutes of Programme Committee meetings and actions from external examiners' reports. The Review and Enhancement Reports are forwarded to the College Quality Assurance Committee for consideration, and reports and recommendations are sent to the Academic Board annually, which oversees and prioritises any necessary changes, including provision of finance.

2.6 There is clear documentary evidence that the interlocking committee and board process effectively monitors and enhances quality assurance. The Programme Committee, which meets every semester, provides a common forum for the analysis of teaching and learning at individual programme level, and also reflect and act upon student feedback. Programme handbooks detail a variety of quality assurance mechanisms, including programme management responsibilities, teaching and assessment strategies. Programme teaching team meetings take place four times per semester and prior to the start of the academic year in order to raise awareness of, for example, the awarding partners' expectations and assessment modifications. Outcomes from the programme teaching team meetings inform the annual Review and Enhancement Reports. The College Assessment Board meets once a term to ensure consistency of assessment practices, including annotations, adequacy of feedback, plagiarism control and student discipline.

2.7 In addition to verification procedures by the awarding partners, the College operates a system of internal verification in order to review both the validity of assessment design and the accuracy of assessment judgements, as discussed in paragraph 1.7. Detailed pro formas for both assignment briefs and for assessment decisions are internally verified prior to being passed to programme leaders for implementation. The pro formas are also sent to the Head of Quality Assurance for quality audit and then to the Assessment Board for further consideration and monitoring of consistency of practices.

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

2.8 The student induction programme ensures that students receive an appropriate range of information. The College bag presented to students as part of the induction includes College policies, the student handbook and directions on the use of the virtual learning environment. In addition, students are provided with handbooks outlining programme and unit specifications, intended learning outcomes, learning opportunities and College support services.

2.9 The College does not operate a generic personal tutor system, but a good level of student support is provided through administrative welfare and academic systems. Overseen by the Student Welfare Officer, welfare support extends into assistance with health, financial and regulatory issues. Academic support is provided by individual lecturers, who allocate reasonable time for one-to-one sessions with students, either at the end of classes, through appointments or on an informal basis. Students are also supported by the use of formative assessments to monitor and review their progress. Additional generic classes, including in

the use of academic writing and English language, are also provided. Students expressed considerable satisfaction with both the availability and the helpfulness of the teaching staff. The College also provides additional open-door opportunities for students to meet with programme leaders, the Programme Manager, and the Director of Studies. The College information management system is used to monitor individual student performance and to generate student advice in, for example, areas such as irregular attendance and the timely submission of assessments.

2.10 The College has good mechanisms for collecting and analysing student feedback, which is used to inform ongoing improvements in programme delivery and student support. Module-level questionnaires are used to gather feedback both on the interpersonal and teaching skills of individual lecturers, and on programme content. The results are collated at programme level for Review and Enhancement Reports. Recently, additional questions on levels of pastoral care have been added to the module level questionnaire. In addition to feedback questionnaires, two student class representatives are elected from each class to represent student views at programme team meetings and the Programme Committee meetings. Students confirmed that their views were well represented and acted upon. Students receive feedback through minutes of meetings and on subsequent actions through the virtual learning environment. For example, the College produced several publicity videos, with the final product based on student preferences as to content and format. Student representatives also maintain effective contact with the Student Welfare Officer about external events and visits. The thorough mechanisms for collection, collation and follow-up of student feedback represent good practice.

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

2.11 The College operates a suitable induction programme for new staff to promote understanding of its policies, procedures and practices. The staff handbook contains statutory policies and other necessary employment information, and is issued to all staff at induction. Staff induction may also include an element of vocational or pedagogically relevant training, followed by a re-evaluation after six months. The College operates a three to six-month probationary period leading to in-post continuing professional development targets, with mentoring as appropriate.

2.12 An annual staff appraisal, conducted by line managers, is used to set staff development targets for the coming year, and may include assessments of previous probationary requirements. Primary responsibility for identifying training needs is seen as lying with the individual. The College operates a compulsory system of peer review and peer observation of teaching as part of appraisal. Peer observers are not formally trained by the College, but are usually qualified teachers. Peer observation and student module feedback are linked with staff appraisal, and also inform the staff development priorities. Although a number of staff have teaching qualifications, this is not a formal College requirement. Additional support to improve the quality of teaching is made available from staff with teaching qualifications. Continued poor teaching scores may lead to non-renewal of contracts.

2.13 Scholarly research is actively promoted by the College, most recently through the inauguration and publication of the College's *Journal of Contemporary Development and Management Studies*, which also invites submission of papers from external professionals and academics. Students are encouraged to develop papers for publication based on their project research, and there are also opportunities for students to collaborate with academic staff for joint publications. This initiative enhances the quality of the learning experience and the currency of teaching resources. The development of the College *Journal of Contemporary Development and Management Studies* provides a platform for staff and

students to publish their research alongside external papers and supports recognition of staff and student work. This represents good practice.

2.14 The College encourages staff development with support either through time release or through fee contributions. The College also organises regular lecturers' meetings, including preparation meetings, Programme Committee meetings, markers' meetings and Assessment Board meetings, designed to augment and cascade the sharing of good practice. Information sessions are also provided on any changes made by the awarding partners, as outlined in paragraph 1.8. Ongoing staff development and training in vocational areas is supported, and part-time lecturers share practices from other institutions. However, while there are a number of activities which support the sharing of practices as part of broader quality assurance activities, there is no formal system for the sharing of good practice across the College. It is desirable that a structured system for sharing of good practice is made part of the staff development programme to further support the quality of learning.

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

2.15 Library provision within the College is limited. The College has, however, recently extended its book stock and students are encouraged to make use of additional local and institutional library resources, together with resources available through the awarding partners' websites. The provision of online journals and e-books is also limited, but the College is investing further in this resource. The virtual learning environment, as discussed in paragraph 3.3, is used extensively as an informative teaching resource and students find this to be both accessible and useful. The College has well established procedures for ensuring that teaching staff upload materials in a timely manner. This is overseen by the Programme Manager and the Director of Studies with his assistant. Students value the availability of the chat room facility as a vehicle for sharing information and assessment support.

2.16 Students are well supported by both academic and administrative staff. Teaching staff are well qualified in their subject areas and class sizes ensure students can receive individual attention and support. Students praised the support provided by the lecturers both in terms of their subject knowledge and their overall approachability. However, the basement classroom and facilities have been criticised by students as cold and poorly lit, and the College is seeking to make improvements to the infrastructure.

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 The College has a range of effective mechanisms in place for communicating information about its provision to students and other stakeholders. Some use is made of printed material, although the College is moving towards the sole use of electronic media, particularly through the website and the virtual learning environment. The prospectus and student handbook are available as downloads from the College's website. The prospectus

provides comprehensive course information, details of student facilities and the application procedure, which students reported as being clear and helpful. The student handbook, also issued to students in hard copy at induction, contains a wide range of useful information, including admissions and administrative procedures. The College website provides extensive information for prospective students, describing life in the UK and student facilities. Information has been compiled in response to common questions asked by prospective students. This is good practice.

3.2 The students confirmed that they had received accurate and clear pre-course information about the College, although the physical College location relative to well known London landmarks was further than anticipated. Some images on the website and in pre-course leaflets do not accurately reflect the locality or facilities. It is desirable that the College reviews the accuracy of the information provided on its nature and location. The College has also identified that a wider range of public information would be useful. This may include outcomes of student surveys on satisfaction with programmes and the quality of teaching along with pass rates and progression to employment data.

3.3 The virtual learning environment is a key source of information for students and provides access to additional materials. All lecturers use the virtual learning environment effectively to provide students with programme and unit handbooks, Programme Committee minutes, e-library references, lesson plans, lecture notes, assignments and academic communications. The students find the system accessible and very helpful. The detailed user guide to the virtual learning environment is clear and comprehensive, and provides effective guidance for students. Limited use is made of a teacher's area, which currently only houses the Quality Manual.

3.4 The College monitors the information provided by agents to prospective students. Staff indicated that video interviews are used to validate student identity, confirm intention to study and also validate agent information. Students are invited to provide feedback on the quality of information provided by agents to the admissions team.

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

3.5 There is an established policy for the management of public information, supported by a clear flow chart. The policy requires that all public information is checked for accuracy and completeness by an internal reviewer and authorised for release by a director or member of senior management, using a prescribed form. The policy requires that any public documents already published be reviewed retrospectively, but evidence indicates that this has been only partially implemented.

3.6 A detailed procedure for the production of public information lists the key staff responsible for producing and reviewing the student handbook, programme handbooks, prospectus, website and advertisements. The Programme Manager is responsible for checking accuracy, although responsibility is also delegated to programme leaders. The Director of Studies and his assistant monitor all uploads to the website and virtual learning environment. A wide range of helpful information is published by the College for students, but checks on accuracy are not always thorough. Documents reviewed showed minor errors, and there is limited evidence to demonstrate consistent implementation of the procedures, and little clear method of checking version control in many documents. The College should ensure that procedures are followed to reduce the risk of inaccurate or potentially misleading information being published. To ensure that all information is systematically updated and accurate, it is advisable that the College thoroughly checks and formally reviews all public documents in accordance with the written procedure to assure the accuracy of information provided to students.

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

London Churchill College action plan relating to the Review for Educational Oversight May 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"> effective systems are in place for the organisation and recording of the internal verification (paragraph 1.6) 	<p>Maintain the use of standardised internal verification forms</p> <p>Annual quality audit checklist to ensure that the recording of internal verifications is maintained</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>31 October 2012</p>	<p>Programme Manager</p> <p>Quality Assurance Committee</p>	<p>Reflection in the external examiners' report</p> <p>Positive evaluations from teaching staff in the teaching meetings</p>	<p>Director of Studies</p> <p>Academic Board</p>	<p>Views and reports of external examiners will be sought concerning the effectiveness of the internal verification process</p> <p>Suggestions will be sought from members of the Quality Assurance Committee</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> thorough mechanisms for the collection, collation and follow-up of student feedback (paragraph 2.10) 	Organise scheduled feedback events and continue to hold Programme Committee meetings at least once per term	Ongoing	Director of Studies	Maintain and improve student satisfaction and reduced level of student complaints	Academic Board	Evaluate the views of students expressed in the student feedback questionnaires and Programme Committee

³The 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 body and organisations.

	Circulation of the minutes of the meetings to student representatives					meetings Annual evaluation by the Academic Board
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> development of the <i>College Journal of Contemporary Development and Management Studies</i> provide a platform for staff and students to publish their research alongside external papers (paragraph 2.13) 	Continue to publish the journal and invite students and lecturers of the College and overseas contributors to submit their research for publication	Ongoing Next journal by 31 May 2013	Principal	Publication within May 2013 At least one author to be included from each of the following groups: the College student body, College lecturers, and overseas contributors	Board of Directors	Views of students and lecturers expressed in the lecturers' meetings and Programme Committee meetings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> provision of particularly comprehensive information for prospective students (paragraph 3.1). 	The website and prospectus will continue to be updated on an annual basis Update on an annual basis for the start of each new academic year	September 2012	Director of Facilities and Virtual Learning Environment	Maintain and improve student satisfaction and reduced level of drop out/course transfers	Principal	Evaluation of student feedback questionnaires, minutes of the Programme Committee meetings, and evidence of complaints
Advisable	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
The team considers that it is advisable for the provider to:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> review the remits and meeting 	Review the terms of reference of	10 December	Board of Directors for	Reduced level of recurrent	Board of Directors	Evaluate comments made

<p>schedules of committees to ensure problems are resolved in a timely manner (paragraph 1.3)</p>	<p>Academic Board, Quality Assurance Committee, Programme Committee and Assessment Board, and clarify any role ambiguity that may exist</p> <p>Propose in September 2012 to the Academic Board to review the frequency of the Academic Board and Quality Assurance Committee meetings to be held twice in a year</p>	<p>2012</p> <p>10 September 2012</p>	<p>Academic Board, for Quality Assurance Committee, Programme Committee and Assessment Board</p>	<p>systematic problems affecting over two academic terms</p> <p>Comments from the external examiners and improved performance evidenced in the Review and Enhancement Reports</p>		<p>by external examiners in their reports and review the analysis of the College's Review and Enhancement Reports</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> revise the current data recording procedures and templates (paragraph 1.4) 	<p>Produce a new template to record module/unit results for the current and previous year, using a baseline cohort size as evidenced from module registration</p> <p>Train programme leaders on how to write evaluative Review and Enhancement Reports comparing</p>	<p>10 December 2012</p> <p>20 February 2013</p>	<p>Academic Board</p> <p>Director of Studies</p>	<p>New Review and Enhancement Report template</p> <p>More evaluative Review and Enhancement Reports</p> <p>Easy comparison of results across different programmes</p> <p>Consistent and</p>	<p>Board of Directors</p> <p>Director of Studies</p>	<p>Evaluate the Review and Enhancement Reports produced by different programme leaders</p> <p>Evaluate the comments made by external examiners in their reports</p> <p>Evaluate the effectiveness of</p>

	the students' results across both different modules and different programmes at College level as well as at national level			improved pass rates		these new templates by listening to the views of the programme leaders
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> thoroughly check and formally review all public documents in accordance with the written procedure (paragraph 3.6). 	Revise the list of authorised reviewers of documents and the two-tier approach to the review of information in public domain	31 December 2012	Academic Board	Timely completion of review of public information forms by authorised individuals	Board of Directors	Evaluate the accuracy and consistency of public information
	Producers of documents will use version control for all documentation Version control will include the review date in order to provide an efficient method of evaluating version control across multiple documents	31 September 2012	Director of Facilities and Virtual Learning Environment	All public documents will have version control, including review date	Principal	
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"> formalise the monitoring of responses to external reports 	Produce an annual report evaluating comments made by the awarding body	31 September 2012	Director of Studies	A formal report outlining action points to address the	Principal	Evaluation of external examiners' reports

to assure academic standards (paragraph 1.7)	and organisations in their visits to the College The report will outline responses to action points and recommendations made by the awarding body and organisations or their representatives			recommendations made by external examiners, representatives of the awarding body and organisations Improved Review and Enhancement Report		Evaluation of Review and Enhancement Reports
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> develop a structured system for sharing of good practice as part of the staff development programme (paragraph 2.14) 	Produce a good practice report and organise a staff development session annually to share all of the good practices that are accumulated from the various sources, such as external report by the awarding body and organisations, QAA report, student feedback, Programme Committee meeting report, peer evaluation, lectures meeting or training, assessment board report and ISO 9001:2008 report	31 December 2012	Programme Manager	A formal structural report and sharing it among the staff annually will help to share the good practices across entire departments in the College and adopt staff development programme accordingly	Director of Studies	Evaluation of external reports issued by the awarding body and organisations, QAA report, peer evaluation, and minutes of lectures' meeting
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> review the accuracy 	Review the College	1	Director of	Accurate images	Principal	Review website,

<p>of information provided on the nature and location of the College (paragraph 3.2).</p>	<p>website, prospectus, and leaflets, and identify the inaccuracy of images and location of the College, and replace them with the accurate images that reflect representation of the students and location</p>	<p>September 2012</p>	<p>Facilities and Virtual Learning Environment</p>	<p>and location of the College to represent to prospective students the College they are intending to study at and reduce students' dissatisfaction or misrepresentation</p>		<p>prospectus and leaflets</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: Handbook⁴](#)

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 957 08/12

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 2012

ISBN 978 1 84979 608 8

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

Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786