



Higher Education Review (Alternative Providers) of Met Film School Ltd

November 2017

Contents

About this review	1
Key findings.....	2
Judgements	2
Good practice	2
Recommendations	2
Affirmation of action being taken	2
Financial sustainability, management and governance	3
About the provider	4
Explanation of findings.....	6
1 Judgement: The maintenance of the academic standards of awards offered on behalf of degree-awarding bodies	6
2 Judgement: The quality of student learning opportunities	16
3 Judgement: The quality of the information about learning opportunities	35
4 Judgement: The enhancement of student learning opportunities.....	38
Glossary.....	41

About this review

This is a report of a Higher Education Review (Alternative Providers) conducted by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) at Met Film School Ltd. The review took place from 8 to 10 November 2017 and was conducted by a team of reviewers, as follows:

- Dr Dave Dowland
- Mr Christopher Mabika
- Dr Barbara Tarling (student reviewer).

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

In Higher Education Review (Alternative Providers) the QAA review team:

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

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

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

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

² QAA website: www.qaa.ac.uk.

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

Key findings

Judgements

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

- The maintenance of the academic standards of awards offered on behalf of the degree-awarding body **meets** UK expectations.
- The quality of student learning opportunities **meets** UK expectations.
- The quality of the information about learning opportunities **meets** UK expectations.
- The enhancement of student learning opportunities is **commended**.

Good practice

The QAA review team identified the following features of **good practice**.

- The innovative online pre-induction process which facilitates the rapid adjustment of applicants to the School's learning and social environment (Expectations B2 and B4).
- The resourcefulness with which the School uses its position in the industry to facilitate the acquisition of relevant skills and professional development of students and alumni (Expectation B4 and Enhancement).
- The strategic consideration of current industry practice and trends to inform curriculum development (Expectations Enhancement and B3).
- The extensive and creative use of industry expertise and networks to ensure students are fully prepared for immediate employment (Expectation Enhancement).

Recommendations

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

By March 2018:

- review and implement revised terms and conditions to meet statutory and regulatory conditions in order to ensure that the interests of students are protected (Expectations C and B2).

Affirmation of action being taken

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

- action to invest in a Student Information System and qualified professional staff in order to ensure the integrity of student data and to inform decision making (Expectation B4)
- actions to improve the quality, consistency and timeliness of return of feedback on formally assessed work within a timeframe that supports future student learning (Expectation B6)
- action to improve the timeliness and accuracy of information on the virtual learning environment (Expectation C).

Financial sustainability, management and governance

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

About the provider

Met Film School Ltd (the School) states its mission is to inspire a new generation of creative screen professionals, educating them in the contemporary world of story-telling across all screen types and by putting industry at the heart of everything it does. Graduates are equipped with the 21st century skills and mindset for successful careers. The stated goal is to nurture skill and talent, creating a great school which empowers students to pass seamlessly into the world of work.

The destinations of graduates reflect the changing nature of the industry. Film and television remain strong contributors to the national economy, the role of video in the wider economy is growing rapidly, which is reflected in the broader pedagogic approach taken by the School. The Creative Industries Council report in 2016 indicates that the creative industries generate £84 billion a year for the UK economy, with the number of jobs in creative industries rising nearly 20 per cent in the last five years to 1.9 million in June 2016, a rate of growth three times faster than UK average employment trends. Video is increasingly becoming the dominant communication channel for corporations, marketing, and peer to peer, with Facebook predicting that content created by its 1.6 billion users will be close to 100 per cent video within five years. Growth in the creative and screen industries are projected to continue, with video internet traffic forecast to grow at 31 per cent (compound annual growth rate) between 2015 and 2020.

The School has campuses in London and Berlin (the latter outside the scope of this review) and programmes ranging from weekend courses to undergraduate and postgraduate degrees. Met Film School Ltd caters for a broad range of students and interests and has educated over 9,000 students to date. At the time of the review, there were 213 students at the School.

The School is refreshing its branding and the brand structure of its constituent parts to include the School; a graduate opportunities, support and guidance team; a production agency where students and graduates produce content for external clients, and a film production company.

In the last two years, there has been significant investment in the School with the twin goals of improving the consistency in quality of delivery and building a strong and stable base from which to grow.

The report of the QAA monitoring visit in September 2015 stated that the School had made commendable progress with implementing the action plan from the September 2014 Review for Educational Oversight and fully implemented all actions. The report cited the establishment of a single awarding body, substantial staffing appointments, and adjustments to operations and management.

In the last two years the School has:

- expanded senior leadership by splitting the CEO role into a Director and CEO so as to build capacity and increase bandwidth; allow space to focus on pedagogic leadership and bring in corporate and commercial expertise
- appointed an Academic Registrar and invested in building a Registry team and system, and procured and invested in a new student information system (Tribal EBS) which is currently being set up and will be piloted from March 2018
- restructured the admissions and marketing functions to enhance the clarity and consistency of information about programmes, develop marketing reach, and improve the level of advice and guidance

- created a Head of Teaching and Learning role with experience of developing new programmes. They have also instituted a new and more robust process of curriculum review to ensure close monitoring and review courses.
- taken on an additional floor of Ealing Studios, raised finance from the British Film Institute/Creative Skillset to improve the resources in the School, and is due to build a screening theatre in the autumn
- revalidated the BA programme in 2015, following input from students, industry, UWL and external examiners aligned with a changing industry and an innovative assessment strategy.

These developments reflect the organisation's development from being a small school reliant on individual knowledge and application of systems and processes to becoming an institution where systems and processes are embedded.

In June 2014, the School's BA (Hons) Practical Filmmaking programme was awarded the Creative Skillset Tick, which is a recognised mark of quality indicating the courses best suited to prepare students for a career in the Creative Industries. Skillset is the leading professional, statutory and regulatory body for the UK creative industries. The Creative Skillset Tick is an invaluable signpost for potential students, apprentices and employers to indicate those programmes that provide the most up-to-date and relevant industry training and education. This important industry endorsement commends Met Film School's approach to multidisciplinary working, project-led curriculum, innovative teaching styles, strong endorsement by industry, the professional background of the staff and the courses' resources.

Explanation of findings

This section explains the review findings in greater detail.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Findings

1.1 Met Film School Ltd delivers undergraduate and postgraduate programmes in practical filmmaking which are validated by The University of West London (UWL). The academic partnership was first established in 2008, and the partnership agreement was renewed in 2013 and further renewed in August 2017.

1.2 Under the terms of the agreement the School delivers the following programmes: BA Hons Practical Filmmaking (three year and two-year intensive); BA Hons Film and Digital Cinematography (two year intensive); DipHE Practical Filmmaking; CertHE Practical Filmmaking; CertHE Cinematography; MA Directing; MA Screenwriting; MA Producing; MA Postproduction; MA Cinematography; MA Documentary and Factual. The main delivery site is in Ealing, with a smaller school recently established in Berlin.

1.3 The awarding University retains the ultimate responsibility for the award of academic credit and approves all programmes and modifications prior to delivery. It also exercises comprehensive oversight through the appointment of external examiners and link

tutors, through annual monitoring procedures and through periodic revalidations. Full module specifications are prepared for each course and are made available to staff and students through course handbooks, which are published on the VLE. Module guides specify course content, teaching methods, learning outcomes, and assessment criteria, the application of relevant Subject Benchmark Statements, the use of the national qualification descriptors outlined in the FHEQ and the SEEC Credit Level Descriptors, and the careful compliance with the requirements of the awarding body in the design and delivery of programmes is comprehensively evidenced.

1.4 The review team examined committee papers, validation documents, academic regulations, programme specifications and course handbooks, and held meetings with staff, including University representatives, to confirm that the School works effectively with the awarding body to secure academic standards. The team concludes that the Expectation is met and the level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

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

Findings

1.5 Responsibility for the award of academic credit rests with the awarding body, which carries out annual and periodic reviews to verify the School's compliance with its requirements. The University also appoints external examiners and link tutors to monitor and assure academic standards.

1.6 The School employs a number of processes and uses a range of metrics, including internal and external review processes, student performance data and student and tutor feedback to manage the quality of its provision and ensure that it adheres to the University's regulations.

1.7 The review team explored the School's adherence to the awarding body's academic frameworks and regulations in meetings with students and staff and by scrutinising documents, policies and procedures, including external examiner reports, annual monitoring reports, Assessment and Award Board processes, committee minutes and terms of reference.

1.8 The School has recently revised its internal governance structure to separate academic governance from strategic and operational decision making and to provide clearer lines of accountability for quality assurance and the management of academic standards. The revised structure is designed to ensure that the programmes offered by the School continue to be fully aligned with the relevant academic frameworks and adhere to the awarding body's academic and assessment requirements. A new Academic Quality Committee has been established to oversee quality assurance throughout the School and to report annually on all programmes in order to assure the School's Academic Board that the requirements of the awarding body and the expectations of the Quality Code are being met. The committee met for the first time on 19 October 2017.

1.9 The existing system of management groups and subcommittees is modelled on UWL structures. It will be monitored and evaluated by the Academic Quality Committee and will be revised as necessary to ensure its effective operation.

1.10 The School's academic framework is fully aligned with the University's academic regulations and the review team is satisfied that the School is effective in adhering to the processes of its awarding partner. The team concludes that the Expectation is met and the level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met

Level of risk: Low

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

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

Findings

1.11 The Academic Partnership Agreement stipulates that the University will provide all policy and procedural documentation governing the development and delivery of its courses, providing updates when available. The School, working with University course and module leaders, produces definitive course documentation. These documents include course and module specifications. The partnership agreement also requires the School to draw students' attention to all the relevant documentation for their courses, and to inform them how and where to consult the documents. The Academic Partnership Link Tutor is responsible for monitoring the provision of the definitive documents.

1.12 Together teams from the School and the University produce annual updates to the course specification and module study guides. Module leaders provide annually updated learning materials including annual updates to the course specification and module study guides. The University reviews the definitive course documents during the validation process and during the partnership reviews -University Annual Review of Academic Partnership and the Academic Partnership Periodic Review. Course specifications are also scrutinised in the external examining process. These arrangements would allow the Expectation to be met.

1.13 The review team scrutinised definitive course documents, including course specifications, course study guides and assessment guides, and minutes of Academic Partnership Review meetings. External verifier reports offered valuable insight into the standards and usefulness of the information contained in the documents. The team also checked availability of the documents on the virtual learning environment (VLE) and met staff responsible for the production of definitive course documents including the Partnership Link Tutor.

1.14 The 2013-14 Academic Partnership minutes noted that the Registry manages the module documentation. Academic staff stated and senior staff confirmed, that academic teams produce module guides and revise them before the start of each module. The Education and Registry Unit check these documents, and students provide feedback on their clarity and usefulness. Academic staff also make checks to ensure that the documents outline learning outcomes.

1.15 Course specifications follow a standard format, provided in a template by the University, which captures all relevant information including credit details, qualification levels, and module details at each exit point. Detailed Module Study Guides are also available and contain information pertaining to module identification, including codes and titles, levels, length of modules, credits, calculation of awards, modes of learning and learning outcomes. Assessment details are also available separately, including modes of assessment, weightings, award of grades and assessment criteria.

1.16 The Academic Partnership Review meetings since the 2013-14 academic year have consistently noted that course documents were highly informative and were easily accessible on the VLE and were presented in the correct format. The 2014-15 meeting reported that the documents were of a high quality, and were readily available to the

students who were informed at induction about them through a concise summary. Although external examiner reports did not comment specifically on the quality of the documents containing definitive records on programmes and qualifications, they all stated that course information was sufficient and timely. Senior staff and university representatives confirmed that information in the definitive records is checked by UWL and that it is noted to be of acceptable standard.

1.17 The team was able to confirm comments from students and external examiner reports that course documents are available on the VLE. Students also confirmed that study guides, assessment guidelines and criteria are provided for each module and that some examples of past student work available on the VLE were useful. However, they also stated that some information is not available online and/or has not been updated recently. The team concludes that the Expectation is met and that the level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

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

Findings

1.18 The University of West London (UWL) validates the School's programmes and ensures that they meet external reference points. The team viewed definitive programme documentation, validation documents, committee papers and had meetings with staff to confirm that the School follows the requirements of the University through validation and partnership review arrangements. There was evidence that the University systematically checks the proposed and revised programmes against the external reference points, including Subject Benchmark Statements and the FHEQ. The programme documentation articulates the learning outcomes, the teaching and learning strategy, and alignment to the external reference points.

1.19 The School makes use of a wide consultation process, including external input from the awarding body, subject and industrial experts. Teaching staff receive staff development and there is particular provision for sessional teachers and those with limited experience of teaching to facilitate their understanding of external frameworks. External examiners have reported positively on the maintenance of academic standards within the School. The team concludes that the Expectation is met and the level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

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

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

Findings

1.20 The University is responsible for ensuring that credit and qualifications are awarded only where relevant learning outcomes have been satisfied through assessment. Arrangements are in place for assuring the security of assessments. The School Teaching and Learning Strategy promotes the setting of learning outcomes against the appropriate external reference points. The School Assessment Policy is a mechanism for the alignment of student performance to learning outcomes and to the relevant external reference points, including relevant Subject Benchmark Statements and the FHEQ/SEEC level descriptors. The policy outlines the distribution of responsibilities. The learning outcomes are set out in programme specifications and in student handbooks, module study guides and assessment guidelines.

1.21 Module leaders are charged with the effective design of assessment to measure student achievement against learning outcomes and for the review of assessment methods as part of annual quality assurance procedures. The Dean is responsible for ensuring the accuracy and completeness of information about assessment in module and programme handbooks and that teaching staff follow assessment regulations, supported by a checking process managed by the Academic Registrar. Teaching staff participate in staff development on assessment, including provision from the awarding body. Marking and moderation processes ensure the award of credit and qualifications for the achievement of learning outcomes aligned to threshold and institutional academic standards. UWL is responsible for the running of the assessment boards. Assessment is subject to monitoring and review through evaluation of external examiner reports, subject group discussions, programme annual reports and reviews, all overseen by the awarding body. External examiners have reported positively on the maintenance of academic standards within the School. The team concludes that the Expectation is met and the level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

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

Findings

1.22 The awarding body (UWL) retains ultimate responsibility for setting and overseeing the academic standards of its awards. It oversees annual and periodic monitoring and review, which verify that external thresholds are met and that external reference points are used appropriately. The team examined assessment documentation, verification and marking records, external examiner reports and minutes of boards of examiners and held meetings with staff and students to confirm the soundness of arrangements. External examiners' reports are complimentary about the maintenance of standards of assessment through the processes of monitoring and review.

1.23 Assessment is subject to scrutiny through internal moderation, examination boards, monitoring and review, through evaluation of external examiner reports, subject group discussions, programme annual reports and reviews, overseen by the awarding body. UWL has consistently confirmed the robustness of institutional arrangements, most recently through the 2017 Periodic Review. The team concludes that the Expectation is met and the level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

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

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

Findings

1.24 Student professional development and achievement is at the heart of the School's curriculum. The School's Advisory Board includes leading industry experts and many of the staff and freelance tutors are professional practitioners in their own right. Distinguished filmmakers and media professionals give master-classes on a regular basis and the School also organises an extracurricular event series (In Conversation) in which industry guests speak informally to an audience of students, staff and faculty. External recognition includes the School's membership of CILECT and the award in 2014 of the Creative Skillset Tick for its BA (Hons) Practical Filmmaking.

1.25 External examiners appointed by the awarding body monitor and report on academic standards on an annual basis and the School responds. The examiners view student work on the VLE, review marking and assessment and provide confirmation that courses meet UK threshold standards and are comparable with other UK institutions. Their reports and the School's formal responses are published on the VLE and are a discussion item at the School's Academic Board meetings and at the Annual Partnership Review meetings with the awarding body.

1.26 The review team met senior staff and University representatives responsible for the management and maintenance of academic standards, and a panel of employers and industry professionals who gave evidence of their engagement with the School. The team also reviewed documentation showing the School's extensive use of external expertise in the design and delivery of modules and programmes and in the provision of employment opportunities for students.

1.27 External expertise is effectively used in the design and delivery of programmes and the maintenance of academic standards. The team concludes that the Expectation is met and the level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

1.28 In reaching its judgement about the maintenance of the academic standards of awards, the review team matched its findings against the criteria specified in Annex 2 of the published handbook.

1.29 All of the applicable Expectations in this area have been met and the risk is judged low in each case. There were no features of good practice or recommendations in this area.

1.30 The review team concludes that the maintenance of the academic standards of awards offered on behalf of degree-awarding bodies and/or other awarding organisations at Met Film School Ltd **meets** UK expectations.

2 Judgement: The quality of student learning opportunities

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

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

Findings

2.1 The School develops programmes of study under the oversight of the University of West London (UWL), which has acted as the single awarding body since 2013. The School has strategic oversight of the design, development and approval of programmes within the awarding body's requirements. The School prepares the business case and other documentation, including programme and module documentation.

2.2 The team examined validation documentation and the minutes of meetings to check the passage of programme proposals through quality assurance processes, and had meetings with staff and students. As the most recent example of programme development, the BA Hons in Practical Filmmaking was designed through a wide consultation process, including staff, student representatives and external input from the awarding body, subject and industrial specialists. This resulted in enhancement to the provision, with a move towards a programme of shorter modules. It also resulted in the rebalancing of practice and reflection and the reworking of assessment strategy, addressing formative and summative assessment with the articulation across subject disciplines to focus on production, sound, new media, business and the pitching of evidence. The validation documentation shows the alignment of programme proposals to the Quality Code, articulating module content, learning outcomes and supporting learning and teaching plans.

2.3 The senior management stated that the School is reflecting on its structure of committees and management groups and how to develop a structure that is proportionate for a small, specialist institution, while providing a robust basis for quality assurance and enhancement. The School created a standing Curriculum Review Group in 2015 as a forum for course design and as a means of enabling the School to reflect on 'teaching story-telling and production for the screen'.

2.4 The team was assured of the soundness of the current process for the development and approval of programmes. The validation panels, which report to the awarding body, have consistently expressed satisfaction about the outcomes, with several examples of commendations and references to good practice and positive feedback on the quality of the design documentation. The 2017 Periodic Review confirmed the satisfaction of the awarding body with the School's practices, suggesting that the School should monitor the balance of student numbers in line with the needs of industry. The School management groups plan student numbers and resource requirements. Academic Board has oversight of the soundness of the provision of student learning opportunities. The team concludes that the Expectation is met and the level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

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

Findings

2.5 The Academic Validation Agreement, the Responsibilities Checklist and the University's Academic Partnership Handbook state that the School is responsible for the admissions, enrolment, management and administration of the collection and transmission of student data. The School is also responsible for the accreditation of prior learning (APL) while the University stipulates specific requirements for the award of credit for students applying through the APL route. The Academic Regulations also state that the admissions requirements onto individual courses of study are set out in the appropriate course specifications.

2.6 The Academic Partnership Link Tutor ensures that application and admissions procedures, including the process of APL meet University requirements. The School's student admission and APL procedures are among the documents required for scrutiny at the Academic Partnership Periodic Reviews.

2.7 The School has in place an Admissions Policy and the Admissions APL Process. Information contained in individual course specifications includes admissions criteria for different applicant groups such as UK and EU applicants, non-EU applicants, and standard and mature entry routes as well as entry requirements onto each course, including English language requirements. The admissions process is also contained in the Admissions Training Accredited Programmes leaflet, and on the website. These arrangements allow the Expectation to be met.

2.8 The review team scrutinised policy documents and information provided to students on admission including the prospectus and programme specifications. The review team also considered admissions criteria provided to applicants through the website and met students and staff responsible for admissions.

2.9 The Admissions Policy provides the general principles which the School follows in admissions including the provision of guidance and updating of such guidance, availability, range, format and methods of dissemination of information, recruitment, selection and admissions processes, and APL. The policy also contains principles covering interviews, admissions complaints and appeals, and the development of admissions staff. The Admissions Policy, available on the website, includes provisions to support applicants with disabilities/special educational needs and articulates requirements for English language compliance.

2.10 The Admissions Training Accredited Programmes document and the website provide detailed course information including the identification, length, study mode, fees and the intakes available for each course. They also stipulate entry and eligibility criteria including English language competency (equivalent to 6.5 on the International English Language Test scale), which is also available in course specifications, the application and admissions processes and guidance on making complaints and appeals concerning admissions. The terms and conditions contained on the website indicate that programmes can be cancelled at up to one week's notice. While this has not been applied, it has been

raised by students and the School has considered amending this but has not to date taken any clear action. The team therefore recommends that the School review and implement revised terms and conditions to meet statutory and regulatory conditions in order to ensure that the interests of students are protected (see further under Expectation C).

2.11 The Senior Admissions Manager is responsible for admissions, supported by course admissions managers and the Admissions Administrator. A Director of Marketing and Admissions was appointed in 2015 to improve admissions processes and is in charge of communications, working with a team of support staff. The Admissions Review Committee meets quarterly to review the conduct of the admissions process. Staff responsible for admissions stated that the Curriculum Review Group regularly reviews the admissions process and the Academic Board regularly discusses admissions and approves any changes to the Admissions Policy. At its meeting in July 2017, the Academic Board approved substantial changes made to the structure of the Admissions Policy, and amendments to the complaints and appeals process. The School acknowledges that it should make information on the admissions complaints and appeals process more prominent on its website and is taking action to achieve this. Academic Board minutes also state that the policy now clarifies requirements for non-native English speakers in line with UK Visa and Immigration rules, and specifies requirements for personal statements to accompany applications. These changes had been recommended by the Admissions Review Committee in March 2017.

2.12 The website and the Admissions Training Accredited Programmes document stipulate that standard applicants with the requisite qualifications present a personal statement; a compulsory academic essay and supporting work in the form of a portfolio. Other applicants are required to provide more evidence of their qualifications and experience. There are separate application routes for those who do not meet the prescribed entry requirements. The admissions staff and the Academic Registrar consider applications for the recognition of prior learning with the oversight of the University. There is provision for training and development for admissions staff. The website and the Admissions Training Accredited Programmes document also list the documents required for entry onto the School's programmes and conditions and requirements for consideration for overseas applicants, including Tier 4 rules. The School conducts events such as open evenings for prospective students. Students confirmed that the information they received was generally accurate.

2.13 Prospective students download a form from the website and then email or post it to the Admissions team. Successful applicants at this stage are invited for an interview. Those who secure a place are required to pay a deposit of the fees immediately, before the offer can be confirmed. Appeals against admissions decisions are to be made within 20 working days of the feedback on the outcome of the interview. Successful applicants receive an offer letter and confirmed students receive a welcome letter inviting them to take part in an online pre-induction course and outlining documents required on their first day at the School. Students confirmed that admissions decisions are made on the basis of an interview.

2.14 Students admitted onto the School's courses have access to a pre-induction programme available on the website, which students confirmed was optional and that it gave them a useful introduction to the types of assessment criteria and weighting, types of feedback, study skills and expectations on the course. Staff and students confirmed that those students who access the pre-induction find the on-site induction much easier and settle much quicker onto their course. The review team considers **good practice** the innovative online pre-induction process which facilitates the rapid adjustment of applicants to the School's learning and social environment. The induction process includes course and study information, introductions to the academic team, expectations of students and what they can expect, assessments and academic support arrangements as well as student

representation. It also includes welfare information, such as resources, personal tutorial system and pastoral support. The School ensures that students enrol with both institutions as part of the induction process, and receive ID cards from both institutions. Students provide feedback on various aspects of their experience at the School including the admissions and induction processes, which students regarded positively in the student submission, at a Graduate Forum in April 2017 and at the meeting with the review team. The Expectation is therefore met and the associated risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

Quality Code, *Chapter B3: Learning and Teaching*

Findings

2.15 The School's approach to teaching and learning is set out in the Teaching and Learning Strategy and is designed to support the School's mission to provide high quality education and practical training in the film, television and online screen industries to an internationally diverse student population. The strategy is managed by an education team consisting of the Dean, the Head of Teaching and Learning, the Head of Screen Enterprise and the Education Manager.

2.16 Learning opportunities and teaching practices are shaped and reviewed by the Curriculum Review Group and by the MA and BA programme committees and are monitored and evaluated by a newly formed Academic Quality Committee reporting directly to the Academic Board. The University maintains oversight of the School's provision through annual and periodic monitoring, Module Assessment Boards, Student Progress and Award Boards, and through annual reports from course leaders, link tutors and external examiners. The policies and procedures in place would allow the Expectation to be met.

2.17 The review team examined the effectiveness of learning and teaching procedures by examining policy documents, student and tutor handbooks, peer review and tutor training documentation, module evaluation forms, and student progression and attainment data. The team also viewed the course handbooks and module study guides provided to students on the VLE and held meetings with senior staff and awarding body representatives, students, academic staff, professional support staff and industry representatives.

2.18 The School is committed to providing high quality tuition from experienced industry professionals and currently engages around 50 freelance professional tutors, all with relevant specialist experience. In addition, distinguished film and media specialists give master-classes and lectures and take part in extracurricular events. Students value their exposure to the professional expertise of their tutors; the majority report favourably on the quality of teaching at the School and they particularly value the fact that most of their tutors are currently working in the industry.

2.19 Responsibility for the selection and approval of teaching staff is shared jointly with the University. Tutors are recruited, trained and managed according to the principles set out in the Tutor Recruitment and Development Policy which is reviewed annually, and previous higher education teaching experience is regarded as being desirable but not essential. Teaching performance is measured through classroom observation, and through tutor and student feedback.

2.20 The Tutor Handbook contains information about the School's teaching and learning strategy, a brief introduction to the Quality Code and a link to relevant Subject Benchmark Statements, together with information and guidance on the School's key administrative processes and policies. The School's Education Team organises an annual training programme that covers induction, module-specific training, assessment and marking, module documentation, peer review, and the personal tutor system. Information on academic frameworks and governing regulations is provided by the Academic Registrar.

The School also provides a useful new tutor induction pack and a tutor's guide to the VLE. Module-specific training is managed by the relevant module leader or by the School's Head of Teaching. Lesson plans provide guidance on each module teaching session to ensure consistency of delivery, and sessional tutors who are new to the School work with more experienced mentors. Teaching staff can also enrol on UWL's Continuing Professional Development course Supporting Student Learning. A number of staff have already completed the module, which leads to Associate Fellowship of the Higher Education Academy, and are planning to progress to the next level.

2.21 The library resource at the School is very small but students have access to library and online resources at UWL and also to the free reference library at the British Film Institute. Of more importance to nearly all students, however, is the quality of the filmmaking equipment that is available to them. Although the School's external examiners have confirmed that the equipment currently available is sufficient to meet module learning outcomes, the School has listened to student feedback and has recently concluded an agreement with a large hire company that will secure access to industry-standard equipment.

2.22 The School's strategic analysis of current industry trends informs its academic provision and modules are designed to enable students to underpin their practical skills with an industry-relevant framework. As part of their programmes of study, students train in practical production skills across a range of media, and engage in real life briefs for external clients on a range of platforms. There is a considered intention to ensure that students acquire a range of transferable skills and are able to adapt to new employment opportunities in a rapidly changing environment. The team considers the strategic consideration of current industry practice and trends to inform curriculum development to be good practice, as discussed in more detail under Enhancement.

2.23 Met Film School Ltd provides an exciting creative environment in which students are supported and challenged to achieve their learning goals, to develop as independent learners and to enhance their capacity for analytical, critical and creative thinking. The team concludes that the Expectation is met and the level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

Quality Code, Chapter B4: Enabling Student Development and Achievement

Findings

2.24 The School offers a range of resources and opportunities to support student development and achievement. Course handbooks and module study guides are provided on the VLE and an informative Student Handbook includes information on guidance and support arrangements. The School has policies in place on admissions, attendance and student welfare and wellbeing and the Management Team meets fortnightly to coordinate student support mechanisms and services. The processes in place to monitor development and enable students to develop their academic, personal and professional potential would allow the Expectation to be met.

2.25 The review team examined the effectiveness of the School's approach to student development and achievement by scrutinising student guidance information, minutes of meetings, programme specifications, course handbooks, module study guides and VLE materials, and through discussions with staff and students.

2.26 The School uses key performance indicators, graduate destination data and a variety of student feedback mechanisms to monitor student development and achievement. The School's Teaching and Learning Strategy emphasises the School's commitment to industry-relevant professionalism, ethical practice, diversity and collaboration. Student employability and career progression are primary strategic objectives and the School seeks to ensure that its educational provision is closely aligned with industry practice and trends. Student professional development is embedded in the curriculum and consolidated through extracurricular activities and through interaction with tutors who are active in the industry. Extracurricular development activities are offered through Met Film Futures, a suite of services providing students and graduates with career advice, networking support and access to employment opportunities. The team considers the resourcefulness with which the School uses its position in the industry to facilitate the acquisition of relevant skills and the professional development of students and alumni to be **good practice** (see also the judgement on Enhancement).

2.27 Information on learning opportunities is contained in the student handbook and is highlighted for students during induction activities. Students also receive a comprehensive guide to the practical aspects of filmmaking at the School. Students reported that their module guides contain assessment guidelines and criteria and some useful examples of past work but that some information on the VLE is in need of updating. The School acknowledges that there have been problems in maintaining accurate and up-to-date information on the VLE and it has recently recruited additional professional staff and invested in a new Student Information System which is expected to be transformative in ensuring the consistency and timeliness of information. The review team **affirms** the actions to invest in a Student Information System and qualified professional staff in order to ensure the integrity of student data and to inform decision-making.

2.28 Before their arrival at the School, students are encouraged to engage in a six-week online 'pre-induction' programme to help them to prepare for the academic and practical demands of life as a Met Film School student. Weekly online sessions provide information on the screen industry, suggestions for essential reading and viewing, guidance on good academic practice and the avoidance of plagiarism, and an introduction to critical thinking and critical practice. Participants can undertake practice essays and assignments, set up

online identities, upload and share their work and engage in discussion forums. Students who take the course appear to integrate more quickly into the academic community and the School has plans to capture their feedback more formally. The team considers the innovative online pre-induction process which facilitates the rapid adjustment of applicants to the School's learning and social environment to be good practice as considered under Expectation B2.

2.29 Students report overall satisfaction with the School's induction process, which includes presentations from the Registry and Welfare Services. The School employs a part-time counsellor from the British Association for Counselling and Psychotherapy to provide on-site confidential support to students and to alert academic tutors in how to recognise signs of potential student distress. Students also have access to UWL well being and welfare services; take-up of the services is monitored and evaluated.

2.30 The School offers academic and personal support for students with additional learning needs, including dyslexia, dyspraxia, and related reading and writing challenges and it works with Dyslexia Action to provide support and referral services as well as on-site training for teaching staff. A process diagram aids staff in helping students to access support, and students may also be supported by UWL's Disability Team. Discussions with staff and students confirmed that the School has processes in place to offer reasonable adjustments in assessment for students with additional needs and that students are confident of their ability to access support when it is needed.

2.31 All students on accredited courses are assigned a personal tutor as a mentor to support their academic and personal development. Until recently it has been the practice for meetings to take place only when requested by the student. However, from October 2017 there will be three mandatory meetings over the course of the academic year to ensure that the policy's objective of enhancing student development through contact with a single staff member who monitors and supports their progress throughout their programme of study is met.

2.32 The Student Attendance Policy and associated monitoring activities are part of the School's commitment to support students in their engagement with programmes of study, to prepare them for the expectations of prospective employers in the screen industry, and to meet Tier 4 Visa obligations. The policy is clearly articulated and widely disseminated and is monitored and reviewed annually by the Academic Board. Attendance requirements are included in the Student and Tutor Handbooks and the full policy document is available on the VLE. The minimum attendance requirement is 80 per cent and cohort attendance figures for 2014-17 indicate that all cohorts exceeded that objective.

2.33 The School has arrangements and resources in place that enable students to develop their academic, personal and professional potential. The School is reviewing its terms and conditions in order to confirm how it will safeguard the interests of students when a programme closes. The review team concludes that the Expectation is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

Quality Code, Chapter B5: Student Engagement

Findings

2.34 The Responsibilities Checklist for the partnership with the University states that the School is responsible for student engagement. The Student Charter, which was recently approved by the Academic Board was incorporated into the Student Handbook, now available to students, and underpins the School's commitment to student engagement. The Student Charter requires that the School and the students work together, providing mutual feedback formally and informally in order to enhance the student experience. The Student Charter is one of the documents listed for scrutiny by the University during the Academic Partnership Review.

2.35 Within the governance structure, opportunities for students to provide feedback on their experience are provided through Student Representative meetings. The School has in place a Tutor Evaluation Policy which stipulates that student feedback shall inform all aspects of the student experience and enhancement; assist in improving the quality of learning, teaching and assessment; and take student views into account for purposes of quality management. The School informs students about the nature of their engagement during the induction process and in Academic Boards attended by student representatives. The School states that students and tutors feedback on the course delivery and assessments.

2.36 The team examined the School's governance structure, course leader reports, student feedback and reports of the evaluation of the feedback as well as minutes of meetings that discussed student feedback or involved students, and convened meetings with student representatives and with staff responsible for student engagement.

2.37 Senior staff stated, and students confirmed that the School has an ethos of listening to students, working together with staff as a close community to ensure the effectiveness of student engagement. Course leader annual report templates require that the course leaders comment on student engagement activities within their courses. These reports consistently provide the details of the process for student engagement, which includes the selection of student representatives by the students for each undergraduate or postgraduate cohort. Course leader reports comment on the outcomes of the student feedback and what actions resulted from them.

2.38 Students provide feedback on various other elements of their studies including modules, programmes of study, pre-induction and induction activities, and are involved in periodic review, overseen by the awarding body, and are consulted about validation/revalidation including the revalidation of the BA Hons Practical Filmmaking in 2015.

2.39 Students also provide direct feedback on their experience to the personal tutors. Student representatives have regular meetings with the Dean of School, Head of Teaching and Learning and the Academic Registrar and sit on School Boards such as the Academic Board and some School Management Team meetings. The target is to hold such meetings every six weeks. The School states that it developed a new Attendance Policy partly due to feedback from students about disruption caused by those students who do not attend class or come into class late. Attendance metrics are reviewed by managers, and a regular report is submitted to the Board.

2.40 Resource requirements are informed by student feedback, with student input into most committees and in recent activities such as the recent award ceremony, rebranding activities, and in most developments and initiatives through formal and informal student engagement. Teaching staff also stated that they ensure that their teaching and assessment are at the appropriate level and that they exchange good practice through the consideration of student feedback. Students confirmed that student representatives had meetings with the Dean and Education Manager and regular meetings with the Registrar, and that they receive minutes of committee meetings which they can disseminate to other students. They stated that they usually consult with their groups ahead of meetings to raise issues and report back after meetings and that through regular dialogue with management most issues of concern raised by students had been addressed.

2.41 Although students refer to demand for the creation of a Students' Union, they recognise the challenges to the establishment of a sustainable organisation within a relatively small institution. The School regards student representation as an area for review and improvement. Further elections for class representatives are scheduled for later in November 2017. Students also stated that training for representatives is provided with support from the Registrar. The team concludes that the Expectation is met and the level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

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

Findings

2.42 Assessment and the recognition of prior learning are subject to the regulatory framework of the awarding body, which oversees the validity and reliability of assessment outcomes. The Assessment Policy sets out the School's approach, including the rationale for the balance of formative and summative assessments.

2.43 Students have access to induction resources, assessment guidance and definitive documentation, including student handbooks, programme specifications and module study guides. These include information about expectations of achievement, specific learning goals and outcomes and the balance of formative and summative assessments, together with information about core texts and learning resources and advice on how to avoid plagiarism and other forms of academic misconduct. Students are able to track their academic progress through the VLE. The Academic Registry processes assessment submissions through the VLE, using software to detect suspected plagiarism. Assessment is carried out in English only.

2.44 Marking and moderation arrangements are carried out as required by UWL, including standard arrangements for double-marking and the settlement of differences between markers. External examiners provide external scrutiny and the assessment boards operate under the oversight of the awarding body, with a two-tier system of module and award boards. Assessment is also subject to monitoring through evaluation by subject groups and the cycle of annual programme and periodic monitoring and review, overseen by UWL. The Academic Registry tracks approved assessment requirements to ensure that they are implemented consistently.

2.45 Staff take advantage of opportunities for staff development. There are arrangements to support sessional staff and other staff who are new to teaching in higher education.

2.46 The Admissions Policy sets out arrangements for applications for exemptions and the recognition of prior learning. The School uses templates to support the systematic implementation of procedures, which operate under the internal oversight of Academic Board. The awarding body has consistently expressed satisfaction with the assessment arrangements, through annual and periodic monitoring reports. External examiners' reports have expressed satisfaction and complimented the School on the extent of the reflection on assessment through the processes of monitoring and review.

2.47 The Assessment Policy sets out the School's approach, including the rationale for the balance of formative and summative assessment. Students have access to induction resources, assessment guidance and definitive documentation, including student handbooks, programme specifications and module study guides. Included is information about expectations of achievement, specific learning goals and outcomes and the balance of formative and summative assessments, together with information about core texts and learning resources and advice on how to avoid plagiarism as well as other forms of academic misconduct. Students are able to track their academic progress through the VLE.

The Academic Registry processes assessment submissions through the VLE, using software to detect suspected plagiarism.

2.48 The team was informed that the School had recognised some shortfall with the timeliness of feedback on assessed work and the consistency of the quality of feedback between modules. The team noted evidence of the School taking action through the tracking of the return of feedback on course work and a key performance indicator reporting to the board of directors and through the provision of staff development for teaching staff, although the results of these actions remain to emerge more fully. The team **affirms** the School's action to improve the quality, consistency and timeliness of return of feedback on formally assessed work within a timeframe that supports future student learning.

2.49 The team tested the Expectation by checking documentation and meeting students and staff and representatives of the awarding body. The team concludes that the Expectation is met and the level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

Quality Code, Chapter B7: External Examining

Findings

2.50 The University is responsible for the selection, appointment and regulation of external examiners. Contractual arrangements are coordinated by the University's Quality Office and the University's Quality Handbook outlines their responsibilities.

2.51 The School has two external examiners who cover all undergraduate and postgraduate courses respectively. They use the VLE to view student work and supporting documentation including module study guides, assessment criteria, learning goals and assignment briefs. Working closely with the School's Registry staff, they assess the quality of student assignments and review the marking spread. The examiners' reports are received by the University who then send them to the School for formal response by the Dean. Outcomes are reviewed at the Collaborative Partnership Annual Review meetings and in course leader annual reports and any actions and recommendations are addressed by the School's Leadership Team and Academic Quality Committee. These arrangements would allow the Expectation to be met.

2.52 The review team tested the effectiveness of the procedures by examining a range of documentation including documents relating to module assessment and award boards, external examiner reports, annual review reports, the regulatory requirements of the awarding body and the formal responses made by the School. The team also held meetings with senior staff including awarding body representatives, teaching staff and students.

2.53 The School has a good understanding of the importance of the external moderation process, and external examiner reports and School responses are shared with staff and students via the VLE. Students are aware of their availability but the School intends to improve signposting and highlight the significance of the reports for students more effectively.

2.54 Recent external examiner reports are extremely positive. They verify that student performance standards are comparable with those of similar courses in other UK institutions, that assessment processes are appropriate and fully evidenced, that there is sufficient evidence of double-marking/moderation and that students are given useful feedback.

2.55 The School has also drawn on the expertise of its external examiners to improve the advice on academic writing and best practice referencing in the online BA and MA pre-induction courses and to design a specific study skills session for induction week. The School makes effective use of its external examiners. The review team concludes that the Expectation is met and the level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

Quality Code, Chapter B8: Programme Monitoring and Review

Findings

2.56 The School meets the requirements of the awarding body, which assures the operation of programme monitoring and review in line with the guidance in the Quality Code. The responsibilities and procedures are defined in the University's Quality Handbook and other documents. Internally, annual programme monitoring and review are overseen by committees, reporting to Academic Board, and the School draws on feedback from staff and students and student performance data. Teaching staff participate in staff development to support their participation in programme review, including an annual tutor training programme. The awarding body checks the efficacy of arrangements through annual and periodic partnership reviews and annual reports from the link tutors.

2.57 The introduction of the Academic Quality Committee adds to the level of scrutiny of academic standards and quality. The School is considering how to optimise its structure of committees and management groups so that it is proportionate to the needs of a small specialist institution, while providing robust assurance and support.

2.58 The team saw evidence, however, of the soundness of the School's operations and that the School had responded to actions arising from reviews. The awarding body has consistently expressed satisfaction with the robustness of the School's approach, most recently through the Annual Partnership Review, as confirmed through the results of annual and periodic partnership reviews and revalidations. The team concludes that the Expectation is met and the level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

Quality Code, Chapter B9: Academic Appeals and Student Complaints

Findings

2.59 The responsibilities for handling student complaints is assigned to the School at the operational level. The School has a Complaints Policy in place, which was approved by the Academic Board in March 2017 in its current format. The Complaints Policy is supported by the Complaints Flow Chart which shows that complaints not resolved by the School are passed on to the University for review. The University offers guidelines for escalating complaints not resolved to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA), of which the school has been a member since September 2015.

2.60 The Complaints Policy states that it is available to all its students and students can lodge a complaint up to 90 days after the end of their course. It also states that the complaints procedure is principally for the use of individual students, and where there is a collective complaint by a number of students, a spokesperson should be appointed to liaise with the School. The Academic Board is responsible for consideration of complaints data. These arrangements allow the Expectation to be met.

2.61 The review team considered the guidelines from the University in order to establish the responsibilities for complaints assigned to the School. It scrutinised the School's policy and procedure documents and templates relating to complaints, as well as statistics and incidents of complaints reported. The team also met staff who deal with complaints as well as with student representatives.

2.62 The School encourages students to report complaints within 10 working days. Students can raise complaints through a mailbox. The complaints procedure has three stages, namely the informal stage, the formal stage, and the review by awarding body. Stage one complaints are normally those related to teaching, and these can be dealt with by any of a number of staff in named capacities. They are normally dealt with by the person concerned and the staff member is required to inform the student of the outcome of complaints in writing within 20 working days of the student making the first contact. Students can meet with the Dean or other appropriate members of staff at this stage. Dissatisfied students may escalate complaints to the formal stage, within 10 working days and those submitted after this timeframe are considered 'out of time'. Formal complaints are reported by email on a prescribed form to the Academic Registrar, who should provide the student with a formal acknowledgement within five working days, also stating whether or not the review is allowed. All concerned parties have access to all the evidence provided for the complaint. A written decision is made within 20 working days and reported to the Academic Board. A student who is still not satisfied at this stage can escalate the complaint by writing to the University Secretary. The School issues a Letter of Completion of Procedure to the student informing them of their right to take the matter up with the OIA.

2.63 Students are informed about the complaints procedure through the Student Handbook and links provided within handbooks. Details of the complaints procedure are also available on the VLE and are covered at induction. Student feedback on the complaints processes is considered. Students expressed an understanding of the complaints procedure. Students confirmed that help relating to complaints is available from student representatives, module leaders and the Academic Registrar, and impartial support is also available from other sources including the School councillor and support services provided by UWL.

Students stated that they have access to the University complaints process but this is not clearly signposted. Complaints data is discussed with student representatives at Academic Board meetings. The School stated its intention at admissions to make information on procedures for complaints more prominent on its website.

2.64 The School reports that seven escalated complaints have been dealt with to date, one of which was escalated to the University and then to the OIA, relating to Admissions. The OIA ruled in favour of the School.

2.65 The University is responsible for handling academic appeals. Students are informed about the appeals procedure through the Complaints Policy which is summarised in the Student Handbook, and UWL Academic Regulations. Students are signposted to the University Student Handbook in which the appeals process is provided in full. Students understand the appeals procedure and the processes of taking up appeals with the University. The Expectation relating to complaints and appeals is met and the level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B10): Degree-awarding bodies take ultimate responsibility for academic standards and the quality of learning opportunities, irrespective of where these are delivered or who provides them. Arrangements for delivering learning opportunities with organisations other than the degree-awarding body are implemented securely and managed effectively.

Quality Code, *Chapter B10: Managing Higher Education Provision with Others*

Findings

2.66 The School has addressed the delivery of courses at its premises in Berlin within documentation provided for the visit. However, it is clear that the Berlin School is not a separate organisation. It falls under the same management and academic framework structure, delivers the same courses, follows the same policies and is governed by the academic regulations of the University of West London in exactly the same way as the London School.

2.67 In terms of the Expectation, it seems clear that Met Film School does not deliver learning opportunities with any other provider or organisation. Students do not undertake placements or work-based learning as integral parts of their programmes. When they work on briefs for external clients, as they do during the MA Industry Project, they remain under the direction of School members of staff.

2.68 The team therefore concludes that Expectation B10 is not applicable to Met Film School Ltd.

Expectation: Not applicable

Level of risk: Not applicable

Expectation (B11): Research degrees are awarded in a research environment that provides secure academic standards for doing research and learning about research approaches, methods, procedures and protocols. This environment offers students quality of opportunities and the support they need to achieve successful academic, personal and professional outcomes from their research degrees.

Quality Code, *Chapter B11: Research Degrees*

Findings

2.69 The School does not offer any research programmes therefore this Expectation does not apply.

Expectation: Not applicable

Level of risk: Not applicable

The quality of student learning opportunities: Summary of findings

2.70 In reaching its judgement about the quality of student learning opportunities, the review team matched its findings against the criteria specified in Annex 2 of the published handbook.

2.71 Of the 10 applicable Expectations in this area all were met and all had low levels of associated risk. There are three features of good practice in this area: one relating to the online pre-induction process (Expectations B2 and B4); one relating to strategic consideration of current industry practice to inform curricula (Expectation B3); and one relating to the School's use of industry networks to ensure students' acquisition of relevant skills (Expectation B4). These latter two also contribute to Enhancement.

2.72 There is one recommendation around revision of terms and conditions to protect students' interests (Expectation B2) which also relates to Expectation C.

2.73 The team made two affirmations: one around the investment in the Student Information System and qualified staff (Expectation B4) and one around the actions to improve feedback on assessed work (Expectation B6).

2.74 The review team concludes that as all the Expectations are met, the quality of student learning opportunities at the School **meets** UK expectations.

3 Judgement: The quality of the information about learning opportunities

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

Quality Code, Part C: Information about Higher Education Provision

Findings

3.1 The Academic Partnership Handbook and the Responsibilities Checklist indicate that the University has effective control over the accuracy of all information, publicity and promotional activity related to learning opportunities delivered with its academic partners. It regularly monitors partner websites and promotional material. The Academic Partnership Link Tutor ensures the currency and appropriateness of all information. The Partnership Handbook states that the School ensures that students are given accurate and comprehensive information about their course comparable to the information given to students studying similar courses at the University. This includes the Academic Partnership arrangement, responsibilities of the different parties, the status of the student with regard to the University, opportunities for students to have the agreed use of the University's learning and other resources, the complaints and appeals procedures and how to use them, as well as other important information relating to the programme of study and the award.

3.2 The School states that the website was recently redesigned with a view to ensuring the information is not only factually correct, but is also presented in a manner that is attractive to prospective students and aims to give a genuine feel of life as a student at the School. The arrangements allow the Expectation to be met.

3.3 The review team scrutinised information for students including the website, handbooks, and prospectus. The team met students and staff responsible for publicity as well as academic and support staff.

3.4 The Public Information Policy is overseen by a team led by the Director of Marketing and Admissions. The team checks for accuracy, timeliness and consistency of information and monitors published information. Any changes to published material are restricted and require approval by this team. A log is kept and reviewed and the process is clearly set out. The Director of Marketing and Admissions checks all materials before they are submitted to Academic Board for approval and signed off by the Director. Key documents including the prospectus, website and handbooks are subject to a responsible, accountable consideration and evaluation process by the Director of Marketing and Admissions. Information is reviewed by the Education Team prior to publication and posting on the VLE. Information is also checked by UWL.

3.5 Students can make their first contact with the School through the website. This contains all critical information including the Admissions Policy, entry requirements, details of the application process, course details and information on fees and any costs. Tier 4 students in particular receive information concerning what they require to secure visas and how to settle in the UK. The website also contains dates for study, learning resources, and information on careers support and employment as well as information about guest speakers to the School. However, in section 6.1 of its terms and conditions on the website the School states that it reserves the right to cancel any course at any time up to and including the start date of the course. These terms and conditions have the potential to disadvantage students. The review team therefore **recommends** that the School review and implement revised

terms and conditions to meet statutory and regulatory conditions in order to ensure that the interests of students are protected (see also Expectation B2).

3.6 On admission, students have access to course and module information through their cohort areas of the VLE, with information about how to make use of the VLE. Students also receive course calendars, course outlines, induction week timetables, module study guides, assessment guidelines, and examples of student work, as well as handbooks and course specifications.

3.7 The VLE site contains a range of information and resources, including student handbooks and some other guides at institutional and programme and modular level along with course specifications. Included are policies on learning and teaching and assessment; links to the Academic Regulations of the awarding body; information about complaints and appeals and mitigating circumstances claims; guidance on avoiding plagiarism, and access to equipment, the library and other learning and student support resources. There are opportunities for online interaction through student fora, information about School and programme meetings and information about student induction.

3.8 The Student Handbook is a reference point with links to information about student support services, an introduction to learning and teaching support, student representation arrangements and complaints and appeals with cross-references to other resources. The course specifications that have been provided are appropriate and are available on the VLE together with module guides. External examiners' reports and responses are available on the VLE.

3.9 Students agree with management and staff statements that there is now improved communication through the student information system. Students also stated that the VLE contains most of the information they need with additional information provided by tutors. Students also noted that they were generally satisfied with the information they received before and after admission to the School. All Academic Partnership Review reports stated that information for students was accurate. The latest Partnership Review report judged that reliance could be placed on the School's provision of appropriate and correct public-facing information. Students also confirmed that the VLE has become more user-friendly recently, but the content still varies between modules and programmes. Management and staff stated that not all changes have yet been rolled out. The review team **affirms** the School's action to improve the timeliness and accuracy of information on the VLE. The team concludes that the Expectation is met and the risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

3.10 In reaching its positive judgement, the review team matched its findings against the criteria specified in Annex 2 of the published handbook. The Expectation for this judgement area is met and the associated level of risk is low.

3.11 There is one recommendation to review terms and conditions to ensure the interests of students. There is one affirmation around actions to improve the timeliness and accuracy of information on the VLE. The team identified no features of good practice.

3.12 The review team therefore concludes that the quality of the information about learning opportunities at the School **meets** UK expectations.

4 Judgement: The enhancement of student learning opportunities

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

Findings

4.1 The School management states that its strategic aims for enhancement include excellence in education and delivery, defined by high quality student experience and student employability.

4.2 In order to test the School's strategic and operational approach the review team met staff and students, employers and industrial representatives. The team considered institutional strategic and operational plans and the minutes of meetings and key performance indicators, based on student feedback and student performance data.

4.3 The team saw evidence of enhancement relating to the defined themes operating on multiple levels across the School from the board and the leadership team to teaching and support staff and students. The School has invested significant resources to address the aim to enhance operations, systems and processes. Additional support staff have been appointed with experience of good practice in higher education, including the Academic Registrar and the Education Manager, with the latter post providing support for learning and teaching and the student representative structure. There is significant investment in student information and records systems to support the tracking of the student lifecycle and to enable the effective coordination of student retention, progression and achievement, and the team saw evidence of work on process development. The On-Track Buzz system will be a means of enabling communication between students and staff through social media.

4.4 Students have a wide range of opportunities to take part in institutional committees in order to contribute their views to discussion about institutional improvement. Responding to student feedback, the School has invested in a production facilities centre, with the intention of linking resources more closely to academic needs.

4.5 Staff across the School have opportunities to share good practice through a framework of meetings and staff development sessions and through annual and periodic programme monitoring and review. Professional and support staff have access to professional networks, including, for example, the AUA and Supporting Professionalism for Admissions.

4.6 The School is reflecting on the extent to which its current structure of committees and working groups meets the needs of a small specialist institution and how it can best track institutional progress through the governance mechanisms. The team noted the system of key performance indicators reported to the Board and the School's use of data to inform strategic thinking. There is, for example, analysis of business and strategic trends in the industry to guide curricular and educational development across the academic provision.

4.7 The revalidation of the BA Hons Practical Filmmaking in 2015 was the result of monitoring course delivery, including feedback from staff and students. This has led to enhancement of the provision, with a move towards a programme of shorter modules and the re-balancing of practice and reflection, formative and summative assessment and articulation across subject disciplines to focus on appropriate production skills, as part of the School's considered drive to respond to the rapid changes in the industry. The suite of master's programmes was designed in 2013 to enable students to work collaboratively across specialist skill sets on common projects. The School has developed the provision

further with MA students required to respond collectively on briefs from external clients within specific deadlines, working with many leading industrial firms and organisations and enhancing graduate prospects. The team concludes that the strategic consideration of current industry practice and trends to inform curriculum development is **good practice**.

4.8 The team heard from employers of the positive impact of the School on the career development of students and the contribution made by students and alumni to the industry. The School has developed several organisational mechanisms to mediate and extend its work on employability and entrepreneurship and the nurturing of graduates with the versatility to work immediately in the industry. Students across the School are enabled to take part in real life briefs as part of their programmes, to train in practical production skills and to experience work on innovation with employers. Met Film, and Met Film Futures promote innovation and provide support, advice and employment opportunities for students and graduates. Met Film Creative offers clients bespoke content produced by students and graduates, and is an example of how the School is helping students to develop skills for rebranding and the opening of new opportunities alongside traditional film production skills. Met Film Production enables students to gain experience of working in television and larger fiction productions. The team considers the extensive and creative use of industry expertise and networks to ensure students are fully prepared for immediate employment to be **good practice**. The School monitors its graduate outcomes through the Destination of Leavers from Higher Education and its own surveys, which indicate that a high proportion of graduates are working in the creative industries. The Smart Screen Creative Awards, launched in 2016, are a means of profiling student achievement within the industry in categories including innovation, audience engagement, impact, diversity, entrepreneurship and creative excellence, with several students gaining professional opportunities.

4.9 The team recognised good practice in the resourcefulness with which the School uses its position in the industry to facilitate the acquisition of relevant skills and professional development of students and alumni (see Expectation B4), and in the extensive and creative use of industry expertise and networks to ensure students are fully prepared for immediate employment. The School is also considering its committee and management structure to provide further support for enhancement. Overall, the School's reflective and driven use of its position in the industry to enhance the professional and career development of its graduates is **commended** and the level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

The enhancement of student learning opportunities: Summary of findings

4.10 The review team reached the judgement by matching its findings against the criteria specified in Annex 2 of the published handbook. The single Expectation for this judgement area is commended and the associated level of risk is low. There are three features of good practice related to the School's ethos of involvement of industry practitioners on its staff and in the development and delivery of its programmes and the continuing development of these in response to changes in the industry.

4.11 The first is the resourcefulness with which the School uses its position in the industry to facilitate the acquisition of relevant skills and professional development of students and alumni; secondly, the strategic consideration of current industry practice and trends used to inform curriculum development; and finally the extensive and creative use of industry expertise and networks to ensure students are fully prepared for immediate employment.

4.12 The review team concludes that the enhancement of student learning opportunities at Met Film School is **commended**.

Glossary

This glossary is a quick-reference guide to terms in this report that may be unfamiliar to some readers. Definitions of key operational terms are also given on pages 21-24 of the [Higher Education Review \(Alternative Providers\) handbook](#).

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

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

Academic standards

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

Award

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

Awarding organisation

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

Blended learning

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

Credit(s)

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

Degree-awarding body

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

Distance learning

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

Dual award or double award

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

e-learning

See technology enhanced or enabled learning.

Enhancement

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

Expectations

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

Flexible and distributed learning

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

Framework

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

Framework for higher education qualifications

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

Good practice

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

Learning opportunities

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

Learning outcomes

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

Multiple awards

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

Operational definition

A formal definition of a term, establishing exactly what QAA means when using it in reviews and reports.

Programme (of study)

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

Programme specifications

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

Quality Code

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

Reference points

Statements and other publications that establish criteria against which performance can be measured.

Self-evaluation document

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

Subject Benchmark Statement

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

Technology enhanced or enabled learning (or e-learning)

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

Threshold academic standard

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

Virtual learning environment (VLE)

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

Widening participation

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

QAA2069 - R9755 - Feb18

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

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