



# Higher Education Review (Embedded Colleges) of ONCAMPUS Coventry

February 2018

## Contents

<b>About this review .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Key findings.....</b>	<b>2</b>
Judgements .....	2
Good practice .....	2
Recommendations and Affirmations.....	2
Financial sustainability, management and governance .....	2
<b>About the provider .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Explanation of findings.....</b>	<b>4</b>
1 Judgement: The maintenance of the academic standards of awards offered by the provider and/or on behalf of degree-awarding bodies and/or other awarding organisations.....	4
2 Judgement: The quality of student learning opportunities.....	15
3 Judgement: The quality of the information about learning opportunities .....	28
4 Commentary on the enhancement of student learning opportunities .....	31
<b>Glossary.....</b>	<b>32</b>

## About this review

This report should be read in conjunction with the Provider CEG UFP Ltd report.

This is a report of a Higher Education Review (Embedded Colleges) conducted by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) at ONCAMPUS Coventry. The review took place from 27 to 28 March 2018 and was conducted by a team of two reviewers, as follows:

- Dr Sylvia Hargreaves
- Professor Alan Jago.

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)<sup>1</sup> 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 (Embedded Colleges) 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](#)<sup>2</sup> and explains the method for [Higher Education Review \(Embedded Colleges\)](#).<sup>3</sup> For an explanation of terms see the glossary at the end of this report.

---

<sup>1</sup> The UK Quality Code for Higher Education is published at: [www.qaa.ac.uk/quality-code](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/quality-code).

<sup>2</sup> QAA website: [www.qaa.ac.uk](http://www.qaa.ac.uk).

<sup>3</sup> Higher Education Review (Embedded Colleges): [www.qaa.ac.uk/reviews-and-reports/how-we-review-higher-education](http://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 by the provider and/or on behalf of degree-awarding bodies and/or other awarding organisations **meets** UK expectations.
- The quality of student learning opportunities **meets** UK expectations.
- The quality of the information about learning opportunities **meets** UK expectations.

### Good practice

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

- The highly personalised approach to learning and teaching that supports individual student needs and achievement (Expectation B3).
- There were no recommendations or affirmations.

### Recommendations and Affirmations

The QAA review team did not identify any recommendations or affirmations.

### Financial sustainability, management and governance

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

## About the provider

ONCAMPUS Coventry (the Centre) opened in 2008 and resides on the main Coventry University campus. It currently runs the standard UFP programme, the MFP, and the IY1 in Business, and is the largest Centre in the CEG UFP Ltd (the Provider) group with approximately 730 students.

The Centre is staffed following the standard ONCAMPUS model and is led by a Centre Director supported by a Head of Learning and Teaching, a Head of Administration and a Head of Welfare and Accommodation, along with five Course Leaders. In addition, to reflect the size of the Centre, the administrative support of the Centre is provided by several Curriculum Information Officers and Student Recruitment and Support Officers. The Centre hires a mixture of full-time and sessional teachers.

ONCAMPUS Coventry received an annual monitoring review visit by QAA in 2017 and was reported to have made acceptable progress with continuing to monitor, review and enhance its higher education provision.

## Explanation of findings

This section explains the review findings in greater detail.

### 1 Judgement: The maintenance of the academic standards of awards offered by the provider and/or 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 ONCAMPUS Coventry, embedded in Coventry University, is not a degree awarding body.

1.2 ONCAMPUS Coventry offers three ONCAMPUS programmes, the standard Undergraduate, Foundation Programme (UFP), the standard Master's Foundation Programme (MFP), and an International Year 1 (IY1) in Business.

1.3 ONCAMPUS has an agreement in place that the University will offer successful students progression to a relevant degree programme at the University. Thus quality assurance of programmes is managed entirely by ONCAMPUS.

1.4 There are programme specifications for each of the programmes offered. They state that external reference points used in drawing up the programme specification were the Quality Code, Subject Benchmarks and NICATS level descriptors.

1.5 The process would allow the Expectation to be met.

1.6 The review team examined the effectiveness of the practices and procedures by reviewing contractual and approval documentation, including programme and module specifications, and external examiner reports. The review team also held meetings with students, teaching and administrative staff, and senior staff.

1.7 The documentation that the review team examined demonstrated that the Centre adheres to the ONCAMPUS approval, monitoring and review procedures, which safeguard academic standards.

1.8 Programme specifications provide learning outcomes phased to reflect the level of the programmes and a mapping between learning outcomes and modules.

1.9 The evidence made available satisfied the review team the Expectation is met with a low level of risk.

**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**

1.10 The ONCAMPUS Academic Board has ultimate responsibility for academic standards and quality. Five sub-committees, the Learning and Teaching Committee (with responsibility for the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy), the recently established Quality Committee (with operational oversight of annual monitoring and key quality policies) and three Programme Committees (with responsibility for the MFP, UFP and IY1 respectively) report directly to Academic Board. Subject Groups, responsible for the operation and delivery of the curriculum at subject level for all relevant programmes, report, respectively, to the MFP, UFP and IY1 Programme Committees.

1.11 Executive responsibility for ONCAMPUS academic standards and quality rests with the Chief and Deputy Academic Officers. Centre Heads, who have operational responsibility for provision at centres, exercise ONCAMPUS academic governance functions as members of Academic Board. Deputy Centre Heads, subject, programme and pathway leaders, and tutors have specific responsibilities for quality, including participating in network-wide quality committees.

1.12 Apart from staff-student consultative committees, which are required by ONCAMPUS and operate at the Centre, no particular Centre-level quality committee framework is prescribed. At ONCAMPUS Coventry this framework comprises Centre Leadership Team meetings, Learning and Teaching Team meetings and pathway and subject team meetings. Course leaders are responsible for the management of programmes within subject areas.

1.13 The ONCAMPUS assessment regulations apply to all ONCAMPUS Coventry programmes.

1.14 The arrangements in place would allow the Expectation to be met.

1.15 The review team examined the effectiveness of academic governance by reviewing the ONCAMPUS Quality Assurance Manual and an extensive range of ONCAMPUS and ONCAMPUS Coventry committee minutes. The team also held meetings with senior staff, teaching and support staff, University representatives, and students.

1.16 The Centre is represented effectively within ONCAMPUS through membership of Academic Board and Quality Committee (Centre Head), Learning and Teaching Committee (Head of Learning and Teaching), Programme Committees (course leaders, student representatives) and Subject Groups (all teaching staff). Formally minuted Centre Leadership Team meetings facilitate effective local communication of academic quality matters discussed at Academic Board, through receipt of minutes, accompanied by a verbal report from the Centre Head. Actions to be carried forward at the Centre are recorded. These meetings also cover a range of areas including teaching, learning and assessment, staffing, other resources, student results tracking, and student support.

1.17 The Centre Learning and Teaching team, comprising the Head of Learning and Teaching and course leaders, meets fortnightly to discuss learning, teaching and

assessment, including student performance data, across the provision. Detailed formal minutes are produced. Pathway and English team meetings, also formally minuted, provide an effective forum for all teaching staff to discuss learning, teaching and assessment, as well as operational and administrative matters.

1.18 ONCAMPUS Coventry has in place and operates transparent and effective arrangements for academic governance and management. The Expectation is met and the level of associated 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**

1.19 With the exception of the IY1 Art and Design (currently being marketed for commencement in September 2018) and the IY1 Engineering (very recently approved), which were designed in conjunction with the University, all ONCAMPUS Coventry's programmes were designed by ONCAMPUS. ONCAMPUS is responsible for programme approval, modification and revalidation.

1.20 The programme specifications, which were developed during the programme design phase and formally approved by ONCAMPUS at programme approval, are completed in the ONCAMPUS template and comprise the definitive records of each programme. Setting out programme learning outcomes and organisation, learning, teaching and assessment strategies, arrangements to support student learning, and quality assurance processes, programme specifications provide the reference point for programme delivery and assessment, monitoring and review.

1.21 The arrangements in place would allow the Expectation to be met.

1.22 In considering this Expectation the review team viewed the virtual learning environment (VLE) and examined regulatory, policy and contractual documentation, programme specifications, annual monitoring reports (AMRs), sample schemes of work, and internal meeting minutes. The team also held meetings with senior staff, teaching and support staff, University representatives, and students.

1.23 All programme specifications are readily accessible to staff and students on the ONCAMPUS intranet. In meetings, staff clearly articulated the relationship between programme specifications, schemes of work and teaching and learning, demonstrating an understanding of the role of programme specifications as the reference point for programme delivery. Teaching may be adapted to the local context, but any changes to module or programme specifications require formal approval by Academic Board.

1.24 Teaching observations, team meetings and staff reviews provide key mechanisms for ensuring that programmes are delivered in accordance with the specifications. As required by the ONCAMPUS template, AMRs address core programme elements including content, delivery and assessment, student support, and student feedback.

1.25 Programme specifications are used effectively as the reference point for programme delivery, assessment and monitoring. The Expectation is met and the level of associated 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**

1.26 The ONCAMPUS Academic Quality Assurance Manual details the procedures for initial programme approval. ONCAMPUS Coventry follows the processes for the design and approval of modules, programmes and new pathways.

1.27 The procedures for programme approval provide a framework that allows the Expectation to be met

1.28 The review team considered a range of documentation relating to programme approval and review, including relevant quality assurance processes, programme and module specifications, and committee minutes. The team also met staff responsible for the oversight and operation of the processes within the Centre.

1.29 In following the requirements of the ONCAMPUS Quality Assurance Manual, including the Qualifications Framework, ONCAMPUS centres make rigorous and systematic use of external benchmarks and the FHEQ in England, Wales and Northern Ireland in the design and approval of new programmes.

1.30 In introducing a new IY1 in Art and design at ONCAMPUS Coventry, the process adopted indicated that it conformed to the requirements of the Quality Assurance Manual but relied on the University's processes for both initial approval and externality.

1.31 There are effective processes in place for the approval and re-approval of taught programmes that enable the Centre to ensure academic standards are set at a level that meets the UK standard for the qualification, and are in accordance with ONCAMPUS's academic frameworks and regulations. The review team concludes that the Expectation is met and the associated 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**

1.32 The programme specifications for all the programmes delivered at ONCAMPUS Coventry are completed in the ONCAMPUS template. They set out the intended learning outcomes of the programmes, providing opportunities for students to develop and demonstrate knowledge and understanding, qualities, skills and other attributes in intellectual, subject-specific and transferable skills. Programme specifications also set out assessment methods and describe how these relate to testing the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. Module assessments are designed to combine to assess students on the overall programme outcomes, as represented in the mapping tables contained in the relevant programme specifications.

1.33 The processes and documentation in place would allow the Expectation to be met.

1.34 The review team examined the effectiveness of the practices and procedures by reviewing programme specifications (including mapping tables), sample assignment briefs and external examiner reports. The team also held meetings with senior staff, teaching and support staff, University representatives and students.

1.35 In the meeting with the review team, tutors demonstrated a sound understanding of the relationship between programme and module learning outcomes. Assignment briefs identify the specific learning outcomes being tested.

1.36 Staff and students, together with sample assignment briefs viewed by the review team, confirmed that clear assessment criteria are provided to staff and students with the assignment briefs. Tutors mark assessed work against authorised mark schemes. External examiners confirm that assessment processes are well aligned with the learning outcomes and so effectively test achievement of the learning outcomes.

1.37 The arrangements in place ensure that the achievement of relevant learning outcomes has been demonstrated through assessment. The Expectation is met and the level of associated 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**

1.38 Programmes are subject to periodic review every five years. The procedure for conducting periodic review is set out in the Quality Manual.

1.39 Procedures for annual monitoring are also set out in the Quality Manual. This involves the completion of a standard form for each programme with a Centre-based commentary.

1.40 The procedures for both periodic review and annual monitoring are clearly articulated and allow the Expectation to be met.

1.41 The review team tested whether this was the case by reading documentation. Particularly the Quality Assurance Manual, programme AMRs, and the Centre based Annual Review Commentary for Coventry centre, and also through discussions with staff.

1.42 Documentation relating to the periodic review of the MFP and IY1 demonstrates a robust process which follows ONCAMPUS procedures closely.

1.43 In relation to Annual Programme Monitoring, the AMRs produced for 2016-17 are comprehensive reports which evidence a robust and self-critical process.

1.44 ONCAMPUS has also conducted a Centre Academic Oversight Audit of the Centre, which gives an overall evaluation of how well the Centre is operating and the extent to which they are adhering to ONCAMPUS policies and procedures. The last audit of the Coventry Centre was undertaken in June 2017, and the Centre outcomes were good, rated 'Green' on the ONCAMPUS risk based scale.

1.45 The Expectation is met with a low level of risk

**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**

1.46 ONCAMPUS, which holds ultimate responsibility for academic standards, uses external expertise in its programme design, approval and periodic review processes, and appoints external examiners to its ONCAMPUS programmes, to advise on whether academic standards are appropriately set and maintained. Where programmes are developed in conjunction with university partners, university staff members act as the external body for approval purposes. With regard to the design, approval and review of programmes developed by ONCAMPUS, the processes require consultation with independent external subject specialists. At Centre level, the external examiner system provides for ongoing engagement with external expertise, as does continuing liaison with colleagues at the respective partner universities.

1.47 The arrangements in place would allow the Expectation to be met.

1.48 The review team examined the effectiveness of the arrangements by reviewing process and procedural documentation, programme approval documentation and external examiner reports. The team also held meetings with senior staff, teaching and support staff, University representatives and students.

1.49 In the meeting with the review team, the Centre Director referred to enhanced engagement with the University as one of the Centre's major achievements in recent years. Senior staff, tutors, students and University representatives described the nature of such engagement: structured links with University faculties; guest lectures from university staff; alumni working with groups of current students; and student visits to faculties, including attending lectures. These activities have led to enhancements to courses and to the student experience.

1.50 Most notably, the Centre worked closely with the University on the design of the new IY1 Art and Design programme. Associated documentation records joint meetings at which senior ONCAMPUS and Centre staff and senior, faculty and programme staff from the University considered the draft programme specification, specific course progression, curriculum, resources, and the student experience, and undertook detailed mapping against equivalent University modules.

1.51 In addition to the use of external examiners under formal ONCAMPUS processes, the opportunity for external examiner Centre visits provides for ongoing engagement with external expertise. In a recent report, an external examiner recorded a visit to ONCAMPUS Coventry (which included a meeting with students) and commented on good practice in learning, teaching and pastoral support at the Centre.

1.52 ONCAMPUS Coventry uses external and independent expertise effectively with respect to programme design, ongoing development and review. The Expectation is met and the level of associated risk is low.

**Expectation: Met**  
**Level of risk: Low**

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

1.53 In reaching its judgement, the review team matched its findings against the criteria specified in Annex 2 of the published handbook.

1.54 All of the seven Expectations in this area are met with low risk. There are no recommendations, affirmations or areas of good practice recorded for this section of the report.

1.55 The review team concludes that the maintenance of the academic standards of awards at ONCAMPUS Coventry meets UK expectations.

1.56 The review team concludes that the maintenance of the academic standards of awards offered by the provider and/or on behalf of degree-awarding bodies and/or other awarding organisations **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 arrangements for design, development and approval of programmes are detailed in the Quality Manual. This process applies to the UFO, MFP and IY1 programmes which operate at ONCAMPUS Coventry.

2.2 The procedures for programme approval laid down in the ONCAMPUS Academic Quality Assurance Manual provide a framework that in principle allows the Expectation to be met.

2.3 The review team examined documentation related to approval and re-approval of the Centre's programmes and asked staff about the process, and thus was able to test whether the Expectation is met.

2.4 In approving the proposed IY1 in Art and Design at ONCAMPUS Coventry the Centre relied on the University's processes for both externality and initial approval. Although in principle the processes outlined in the Quality Manual are followed, there are some adaptations as a consequence of the involvement of the University partner.

2.5 The evidence made available to the review team satisfied it that this Expectation is met with a low level of risk.

**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**

2.6 ONCAMPUS uses a world-wide network of student recruitment agents, which operates within a detailed, documented compliance and monitoring framework. Students are invited to provide feedback on the quality of agents' services via the ONCAMPUS induction questionnaire. Admissions are handled by the ONCAMPUS admissions team. Entry requirements are determined by the Head of Admissions, in consultation with partner universities, on the basis of a range of criteria, including degree progression requirements and sector benchmarking. Prospective students apply for a particular degree programme when they apply for admission to an ONCAMPUS programme. Heads of Centre have a formal role in admissions, making final decisions on borderline applications passed to them by the ONCAMPUS admissions team.

2.7 Admissions processes would allow the Expectation to be met.

2.8 The review team considered the effectiveness of the practices and procedures by viewing the ONCAMPUS website, reviewing survey and student completion data and examining procedural and compliance documents and other documentation including annual programme monitoring reports and sample offer packs. The team also held meetings with senior, teaching and support staff, University representatives and students.

2.9 Clear and comprehensive information about ONCAMPUS Coventry, the programmes, the entry requirements and the application process is accessible on the website. The brochure, which is available online, details the grade requirements for progression to each specific Coventry University programme. The helpful standard offer pack, sent out by the ONCAMPUS admissions team, sets out offer conditions and course and fee information and confirms eligibility for a specified degree course, subject to University entry criteria. Applicants are referred to the University website for further relevant information.

2.10 The Centre Director makes decisions, in consultation with the University, on borderline applications passed to him by ONCAMPUS central admissions. The process may include an interview, and decisions are based on an applicant's potential to succeed, demonstrated by qualifications and attributes in relation to the demands of the relevant course. Recent completion data shows that pass rates for borderline students are broadly in line with those for non-borderline students, indicating that the Centre's borderline decision-making process is robust overall, though this data is to be treated with a degree of caution, as it records percentage pass-rates rather than the percentage of students eligible to progress.

2.11 Applicants are asked to report any disabilities or special needs, so that appropriate support can be provided. Over recent years, ONCAMPUS Coventry has admitted and subsequently supported a wheelchair bound student and two dyslexic students.

2.12 The 2016-17 induction survey indicates that ONCAMPUS Coventry students are generally satisfied with agents' services and confirms the usefulness of website information.

Students whom the review team met confirmed that they received useful, accurate information pre-arrival.

2.13 Overall, recruitment, selection and admission procedures are transparent and inclusive and operate fairly with respect to the ONCAMPUS Coventry programmes. The Expectation is met and the level of 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**

2.14 ONCAMPUS has a Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy 2016-20 which is owned and managed by the central Learning and Teaching Committee. A representative from ONCAMPUS Coventry sits on the committee. The focus of the strategy is on students as independent learners and the provision of a high-quality learning environment. Responsibility for the Strategy rests with the Academic Office and the Heads of Centre. External examiners have commented positively about how well students are prepared for progression to their university partners.

2.15 The policies and practices would allow the Expectation to be met.

2.16 The review team tested the Expectation by reviewing documentation including curriculum documents and external examiner reports, and by meeting teaching and support staff, and students.

2.17 Teaching staff come from a predominantly further education background. Their teaching practice is supported in a number of ways, including online materials through the VLE, specific training to Centre staff by the central Academic Office, the biennial Learning and Teaching Conference, regular in-session training days and a Continuing Professional Development fund. Staff at ONCAMPUS Coventry have access to staff development opportunities in their University partner. All staff receive an induction programme. Teaching staff have regular management teaching observations as part of the appraisal process. There is also an informal peer observation process in operation in the Centre.

2.18 Students are given a comprehensive induction programme where they are introduced to their programme as well as their University partner. The students have access to the ONCAMPUS VLE which is used extensively by students and staff to support learning. The highly personalised approach to learning and teaching that supports individual student needs and achievement is **good practice**. Students are well supported in their development as independent learners, which gives them a smooth transition to their degree studies. This transition is helped by contact with the University teaching departments and the ability to use University resources and facilities.

2.19 ONCAMPUS monitors and reviews the effectiveness of learning opportunities by end of programme surveys and by feedback through the committee structure. In addition the ONCAMPUS Centre Academic Oversight Process contributes to the review and enhancement of learning opportunities and teaching practices.

2.20 Learning resources and student support are in place to support student learning and achievement and prepare students for University study. They are systematic and effective assurance and review processes are in place to ensure the quality of provision is enhanced. The Expectation is met and the associated 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**

2.21 ONCAMPUS has a clear policy to support students in their development. They provide a process for monitoring and preparing for student development, enabling students to reflect and lead their own development through the IT portal, with the provision of in-depth feedback from staff. Support services are provided in the Centre and have access to specialist support services at the University.

2.22 The review team found that ONCAMPUS Coventry has appropriate policies and processes in place to monitor and evaluate arrangements and resources that enable students to develop their potential. This enables the Expectation to be met.

2.23 In order to test the effectiveness of the provider's processes, the review team looked at policies and procedures, handbooks and supporting documentation. The review team discussed the availability of support services and the development of skills for higher education in its meetings with both staff and students.

2.24 The review team concludes that ONCAMPUS Coventry provides a range of activities and support services that enable students to develop their academic and personal potential. Programmes are structured to provide an intensive and supportive study environment. With teaching in small groups and high levels of contact and by using both regular personal tutorials and regular subject-based tutorials staff facilitate individual learning and achievement. New staff are prepared for supporting students by their induction and management support.

2.25 All students receive a thorough induction programme where students are introduced to the practicalities of studying in the UK, and the expectations arising from this. Each student is given a personal tutor. The ONCAMPUS tutorial policy is that all students have personal contact with their students at least weekly. The Centre monitors attendance and student achievement closely. Students at risk are noted and appropriate follow up action taken. Students who met the review team confirmed that they had ready access to support services should they need them, and spoke positively about the ways in which the Centre's staff enabled them to develop and achieve. Information about the services available to them are provided in the Student Handbooks and is available on the VLE.

2.26 The adequacy and efficiency of services that enable student development and achievement is monitored through Centre Audit, annual monitoring and periodic review, and discussed both at Staff-Student Consultative Committees (SSCCs) and Programme Committees.

2.27 The review team concludes that ONCAMPUS Coventry operates effectively to enable students to develop their academic, personal and professional potential. 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**

2.28 The ONCAMPUS Academic Quality Assurance Manual lists a number of ways in which students are engaged with quality assurance and enhancement, including surveys and student representation on both central Programme Committees and Centre SSCCs. Prompt questions at SSCCs have replaced end-of-module surveys. Minutes from SSCCs are made available to the Learning and Teaching Committee, Programme Committees and to programme/pathway leaders. Questionnaires are continuing in relation to student views about induction and the end of programme. ONCAMPUS Coventry provides student representatives on the central Programme Committees, with training on how to be effective in the role.

2.29 The framework that ONCAMPUS has set to secure student engagement with quality assurance of their educational experience should ensure that student views are articulated both on a group and on an individual basis and allows the Expectation to be met.

2.30 In order to ascertain whether this operates in practice, the review team examined documentation including the Quality Manual, the minutes of relevant committees and met with both staff and students.

2.31 Staff and students that the review team met confirmed that the arrangements described in the Quality Manual were operational. There was a system of student representation. Students received training to exercise their role. Students confirmed that they were able to identify issues which they had raised and to which the Centre had responded positively. They also understood that it was not always possible for the Centre to make any changes that students had requested. SSCCs meet termly and minutes of their meetings are made available to all students. Minutes of the Programme Committees show student representatives making a contribution, with a standing item in each meeting devoted to a student from each Centre reporting.

2.32 The review team was satisfied and the Expectation was met with a low level of associated risk.

**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**

2.33 In accordance with ONCAMPUS strategy, programme specifications set out a range of assessment methodologies including project work, reports, essays, presentations, and examinations. The strategic approach highlights the value of formative assessment.

2.34 Assessment processes for all ONCAMPUS programmes operate within a network-wide system. Subject groups are responsible for producing assessments. External examiners must be consulted on draft examination papers and marking schemes. Student requests for 'reasonable adjustments' are considered by the ONCAMPUS Chief Academic Officer and the range of available adjustments is formally documented. Marking and moderation is completed by tutors at centres, using authorised mark schemes. Subject groups must undertake pre-assessment standardisation involving all relevant tutors. External examiners scrutinise sample marked assessed work. Plagiarism-detection prevention software is used to support students' understanding of plagiarism and as a tool to deal with academic offences. Responsibility for providing feedback to students rests with tutors. Examination boards are administered by ONCAMPUS. Extenuating circumstances are considered at pre-examination boards.

2.35 Assessment processes allow the Expectation to be met.

2.36 The review team examined the effectiveness of the practices and procedures by reviewing policy and procedural documentation, internal moderation reports, external examiner reports and annual programme monitoring reports. The team also held meetings with senior, teaching and support staff, University representatives, and students.

2.37 In meetings at the review visit, staff described the assessment process at ONCAMPUS Coventry, including tutor participation in (conference call) standardisation meetings, the use of authorised mark schemes and internal moderation. Written records provided clear evidence of moderation. Course leaders stated that cross-network post-marking moderation also takes place.

2.38 Students receive individual feedback on formative assessments, provided orally and via written records accessible to students on the VLE. ONCAMPUS does not require the provision of individual feedback to students on summative examinations, and students are not allowed access to their marked examination scripts. Staff said that individual feedback is provided on all summative assessments except examinations, for which generic feedback is given to the student group. Overall, feedback is sufficient to help students improve their work.

2.39 Teaching staff met by the review team referred to a 10-day deadline for return of students' marked work. While there is no specific ONCAMPUS feedback deadline, the ONCAMPUS annual calendar sets marking and moderation deadlines for summative assessments.

2.40 Students commented positively on the variety of modes of assessment, and the in-depth discussion with tutors and written reports providing feedback on individual performance, which help them improve their results.

2.41 Assessment processes at ONCAMPUS Coventry operate fairly and in accordance with ONCAMPUS requirements. The Expectation is met and the level of associated 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

2.42 External examiners are appointed by ONCAMPUS. They are inducted to their role and guided by the external examiner handbook.. External examiners must be consulted on draft examination papers and related marking schemes. The ONCAMPUS report template asks external examiners to comment on the academic standards of the awards, student achievement, assessment processes, and curriculum design and delivery. The processes also require formal responses to be made by ONCAMPUS directly to external examiners, following consideration of their reports. External examiners are encouraged to visit one of the centres in each year of their appointment.

2.43 The external examiner arrangements in place allow the Expectation to be met.

2.44 In considering this Expectation the review team viewed the VLE and examined regulatory documentation, the external examiner handbook, annual programme monitoring reports, external examiner reports and minutes of meetings. The team also held meetings with senior staff, teaching and support staff, University representatives, and students.

2.45 External examiner reports, which are readily accessible to staff and students on the VLE, are considered at Centre Learning and Teaching Team meetings and by subject teams. Responses to identified Centre-specific concerns are taken forward by course leaders, with oversight by the Head of Learning and Teaching. The revised programme annual monitoring system, which requires Centre-authored reports to be produced, should provide enhanced Centre-led monitoring and evaluation of action taken in response to external examiner feedback, though at the date of the review, the first annual cycle had only recently been fully completed and it was not possible to assess the effectiveness of the revised system in this regard.

2.46 In a recent report, an external examiner recorded a visit to ONCAMPUS Coventry (which included a meeting with students) and commented on good practice in learning, teaching and pastoral support at the Centre.

2.47 The Centre implements ONCAMPUS processes with respect to external examiners, and therefore the Expectation is met. There were no specific issues regarding this expectation. However, because of issues found at the Provider (CEG UFP Ltd) concerning the lack of a formally documented process for appointment, significant delay in appointment and lack of formal response to external examiners' reports there is a moderate risk to quality. Further details can be found in the CEG UFP Ltd report.

**Expectation: Met**

**Level of risk: Moderate**



**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**

2.48 The processes for annual monitoring and for periodic review are clearly articulated in the Academic Quality Assurance Manual. These processes are outlined at section A3.3.

2.49 In principle, the approach which ONCAMPUS has adopted should ensure it is able to operate effective, regular and systematic processes for the monitoring and for the review of programmes, allowing the Expectation to be met.

2.50 The review team was able to test this in practice, by examining a range of documentation relating to the periodic review of the MFP and IY1, the annual monitoring of 2016/17 and through meetings with staff during the review visit.

2.51 It was clear to the review team that the processes for annual monitoring and periodic review of programmes were effective.

2.52 The review team concludes that ONCAMPUS Coventry operates robust procedures for both periodic programme review and annual programme monitoring, which ensure the Expectation is met with a low level of risk.

**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**

2.53 ONCAMPUS appeals and complaints policies and processes, which apply across the ONCAMPUS network, are set out in the Academic Quality Assurance Manual.

2.54 The appeals procedure, which is facilitated by the ONCAMPUS Chief Academic Officer (CAO), defines the grounds for appeal and sets out deadlines. Following initial assessment by the CAO, and if not upheld or rejected at this stage, an appeal moves to the Academic Appeals Committee, which acts under the full delegated authority of Academic Board. The outcomes of the committee hearing are conveyed to the appellant and to the relevant Centre Head (for action where required) and formally reported to Academic Board.

2.55 The complaints process begins locally with the staff member concerned or another member of staff and, if unresolved, moves to the Centre Head (or, for a complaint against them, to another Centre Head) for formal review and thence, if still unresolved, to final review by the Reviewing Officer (Chief Operating Officer, Chief Academic Officer and/or Managing Director). Deadlines for each stage are set out clearly, and the process is formally completed with a written response to the complainant, together with a 'Completion of Procedures' letter if the complaint is not upheld.

2.56 Policies and procedures for student complaints and appeals allow the Expectation to be met.

2.57 In order to test this Expectation the review team viewed the VLE and examined policy and procedural documents and other documentation including the student handbook, the ONCAMPUS complaints log and meeting minutes, with associated documentation. The team also held meetings with senior staff, teaching and support staff, University representatives, and students.

2.58 The complaints policy and procedure, together with the relevant forms for the formal stages of the process, are accessible to students on the VLE. The appeals policy and procedure are set out in full in the ONCAMPUS student handbook.

2.59 There were no appeals from ONCAMPUS Coventry students in 2016-17. The ONCAMPUS complaints log records seven complaints from ONCAMPUS Coventry students over the last five years, only one of which was upheld. At ONCAMPUS Coventry, informal complaints, together with the outcomes, are recorded in individual student files. These digitised records can be accessed by all staff, and a 'flagging' facility is used to alert individual staff to matters of particular relevance to them.

2.60 Students whom the review team met said that advice and support would be available from academic or administrative staff should they wish to pursue a complaint or appeal.

2.61 ONCAMPUS Coventry students have access to appropriate processes, information, advice and support should they wish to pursue a complaint or appeal. The Expectation is met and the associated level of risk is low.

**Expectation: Met**  
**Level of risk: Low**

## The quality of student learning opportunities: Summary of findings

2.62 In reaching its judgement, the review team matched its findings against the criteria specified in Annex 2 of the published handbook.

2.63 All nine Expectations in this area are met with low risk, except for Expectation B7 which is met but with a moderate level of associated risk. There are no recommendations or affirmations for the Centre in this section. However, a link to a recommendation for the Provider has led to the higher level of risk associated to B7.

2.64 The highly personalised approach to learning and teaching that supports individual student needs and achievement was identified as good practice.

2.65 The review team concludes that the quality of student learning opportunities at the Centre **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 ONCAMPUS central marketing department is responsible for issuing public information, and for maintaining the accuracy of the website. The central marketing team is represented on Academic Board, to facilitate the oversight of processes to ensure the accuracy of externally published information. Information is available to prospective students via printed literature and the ONCAMPUS website, and information is also available from ONCAMPUS overseas agents. The ONCAMPUS programme handbooks are produced centrally, maintained by the academic office and held on the ONCAMPUS VLE. The information they contain is checked and overseen by the Chief and Deputy Chief Academic Officers. Student transcripts are produced centrally by ONCAMPUS.

3.2 Responsibility for signing off ONCAMPUS Coventry-specific published information rests with the Centre Director. Operational arrangements at ONCAMPUS Coventry work differently from those at other centres. The Centre Marketing Manager, acting as the local representative of the central marketing team, is responsible for the production of the Centre brochure, which is the source document for other forms of published information, before formal ONCAMPUS sign-off.

3.3 The arrangements in place would allow the Expectation to be met.

3.4 In considering the effectiveness of the processes for ensuring that published information is fit for purpose, accessible and trustworthy, the review team viewed the ONCAMPUS Coventry website and examined the brochure, student handbooks and other published information. The team also held meetings with senior staff, teaching and support staff, University representatives, and students.

3.5 The processes for production and approval of published information are led by the ONCAMPUS Coventry Marketing Manager. Information for publication in the brochure is generated locally. The brochure is proof read by all staff and approved by the University and ONCAMPUS before publication. All other Centre-specific information, including the Centre student handbook, is checked internally by Centre staff and by ONCAMPUS. Once approved, Centre-specific information is uploaded to the website by the Marketing Manager.

3.6 Clear and helpful information for prospective students about ONCAMPUS Coventry, the programmes, the entry requirements, the application process and the grades required for onward progression to each specific Coventry University programme is accessible on the ONCAMPUS website. Prospective and new students also have access to additional information online, including the useful ONCAMPUS Coventry pre-arrival guide and student handbook. For current students, the ONCAMPUS Programme Handbook, which provides comprehensive programme information, is supplemented by the Centre-specific student handbook.

3.7 In the meeting with the review team and in their written submission, students confirmed the helpfulness of the comprehensive information provided online and in handbooks.

3.8 The arrangements in place at the Centre operate effectively to ensure that published information is fit for purpose, accessible and trustworthy. Accordingly, the Expectation is met. There were no specific issues at this Centre in relation to this Expectation. However, because there were issues at the provider level (CEG UFP Ltd) concerning the procedures for signing off published material the expectation is classed as a moderate risk. Further details can be found in the CEG UFP Ltd report.

**Expectation: Met**

**Level of risk: Moderate**

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

3.9 In reaching its judgement, the review team matched its findings against the criteria specified in Annex 2 of the published handbook.

3.10 The Expectation in this area is met with moderate risk. There are no areas of good practice, recommendations or affirmations for the Centre in this section. However, a link to a recommendation for the Provider has led to the moderate level of risk.

3.11 The review team concludes that the quality of the information produced by the Centre about its provision **meets** UK expectations.

## 4 Commentary on 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 ONCAMPUS has a newly instigated Enhancement Strategy, which is supported by the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy. Centres are expected to produce a Centre specific **enhancement** strategy that they wish to undertake for their students.

4.2 The review team examined relevant documentation and discussed the Centre specific enhancement strategy with staff and students.

4.3 ONCAMPUS Coventry has as its main priorities for enhancement, the provision of more space, enhancing course level relationships with the University, and improving the quality of assessment and delivery.



## 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 24-27 of the [Higher Education Review \(Embedded Colleges\) 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](http://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](http://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.

QAA2141a - R9893 - June 18

© 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](http://www.qaa.ac.uk)