



Higher Education Review (Embedded Colleges) of ONCAMPUS Hull

February 2017

Contents

About this review	1
Key findings.....	2
Judgements	2
Good practice	2
Recommendations	2
About the provider	3
Explanation of findings.....	4
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.....	17
3 Judgement: The quality of the information about learning opportunities	33
4 Commentary on the enhancement of student learning opportunities	35
Glossary.....	36

About this review

This is a report of a Higher Education Review (Embedded Colleges) conducted by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) at ONCAMPUS Hull. The review took place from 14 to 15 February 2017 and was conducted by a team of two reviewers, as follows:

- Professor Alan Jago
- Emeritus Professor Brian Anderton.

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 (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.

The QAA website gives more information [about QAA](#)² and explains the method for [Higher Education Review \(Embedded Colleges\)](#).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 (Embedded Colleges): 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 **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 contractual arrangement with the University for the provision of data on student performance, which will inform admissions criteria and curriculum development (Expectations B2 and B1).

Recommendations

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

By June 2017:

- continue to work with the University to ensure an exit qualification is available to those who successfully complete IY1 Mechanical Engineering, but are not able to progress (Expectation A3.2).

By September 2017:

- adhere to the provider's policy on personal tutorials, to more effectively support students to achieve their personal and professional potential (Expectation B4).

About the provider

ONCAMPUS, part of Cambridge Education Group (CEG), was set up in 2008, initially comprising centres at Coventry University, University of Central Lancashire and London South Bank University. Centres are based on UK and European university campuses, working in partnership with the university to offer guaranteed progression routes. ONCAMPUS Hull (the Centre) is the seventh centre to be opened in the network and is located on the campus of the University of Hull.

The Centre offers an Undergraduate Foundation Programme, International Year 1 Mechanical Engineering programme, and a Master's Foundation Programme. The Centre started admitting students in January 2016 and has recruited approximately 230 students in its first year. There are seven full-time staff and 21 sessional staff.

The Provider (CEG UFP Ltd) identifies changes to government policy on the recruitment of international students as a key challenge. Awareness of pending change is a critical priority for the network and they state they are working to ensure that international students are not negatively affected.

As a new centre, ONCAMPUS Hull has undergone no previous QAA reviews. The Provider received a monitoring visit in January 2016, which recorded that commendable progress had been made 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 Hull (the Centre), embedded in Hull University, is not a degree-awarding body.

1.2 ONCAMPUS Hull commenced delivery of its courses in January 2016. It offers three programmes: the standard Undergraduate Foundation Programme (UFP), the standard Master's Foundation Programme (MFP) and an International Year 1 (IY1) in Mechanical Engineering. The latter is unique to ONCAMPUS Hull. ONCAMPUS is responsible for the overall academic standards on the UFP and MFP programmes delivered through its Hull centre. In relation to the IY1 programme in Mechanical Engineering, the University is responsible for academic standards because the IY1 is identical to Year 1 of the University's BEng Mechanical Engineering, with the addition of English language and greatly increased contact hour delivery. Credits are not awarded in the UFP, but are in the MFP and IY1.

1.3 ONCAMPUS has an agreement in place that the University will offer successful students guaranteed progression to a relevant degree programme at the University. This is achieved through the University issuing to each student accepted for admission to the Centre a conditional offer letter stating that if successful on the ONCAMPUS programme the student has entitlement to a place on the stated degree programme. Thus, quality assurance of programmes is managed entirely by ONCAMPUS, with the exception of the IY1 Mechanical Engineering, through its Academic Board, although ONCAMPUS seeks to involve its university partner in its annual monitoring process.

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 UK Quality Code; Subject Benchmark Statements; and the Northern Ireland Credit Accumulation and Transfer System (NICATS) level descriptors. At programme level, there is no explicit reference of this within the specification. Module specifications make explicit reference to NQF Level 3, but there is no credit rating for modules in the UFP. In the MFP, modules are credit rated and are at Level 6 in the one term programme, and at Levels 4 or 5 in the two/three term programme.

1.5 ONCAMPUS is linking its schemes of work and assessments with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) to ensure that delivery of these matches the English language capabilities of students.

1.6 The design of the process allows the Expectation to be met.

1.7 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 team also held meetings with students, teaching and administrative staff, and senior staff.

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

1.9 Programme documents for the UFP, MFP and the IY1 Mechanical Engineering confirmed that the programmes had been considered in terms of the Quality Code, Subject Benchmark Statements and NICATS level descriptors.

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

1.11 The evidence made available satisfied the review team that the Expectation is met with low 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

1.12 The academic framework and governance for the Centre is based on the provider's policies and regulations. The Chair of Academic Board has ultimate accountability for the quality of provision for the whole of ONCAMPUS. At an operational level, Centre Heads have responsibility for the quality assurance of the programmes offered within the Centre, working in conjunction with Subject Leaders and the Chief Academic Officer. There is a Programme Committee for each programme, which reports to Academic Board. Each centre is represented on relevant programme committees. Also reporting to the Academic Board is the Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC), which has responsibility for the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy. There is also a central Examination Board and associated centrally appointed external examiners. The Examination Boards includes Heads of Centre, Programme Leaders and Subject Leaders in their membership.

1.13 There is an ONCAMPUS Academic Quality Assurance Manual. This contains the ONCAMPUS policies and procedures for programme approval, annual monitoring, periodic programme review and policies and procedures relating to assessment including external examiners and assessment regulations. Students do not receive an award, but they do receive an ONCAMPUS transcript detailing their results on their programme of studies.

1.14 This academic framework and the associated policies and procedures allow the Expectation to be met.

1.15 In considering the Expectation the review team examined the terms of reference of Academic Board; academic regulations addressing programme approval and review, assessment and annual monitoring; the Quality Manual; organisational committee structures, reports and minutes from committees, annual monitoring and programme reviews. The team also held discussions with members of staff from the Centre and from the provider.

1.16 The Quality Assurance Manual describes the processes for programme approval, modifications and review, annual monitoring, moderation and the operation of assessment boards. Both the University and ONCAMPUS have oversight of the standards of the Centre's provision through programme approval processes set out in the regulations and through membership of governance committees. This approach to quality processes and oversight ensures that academic standards are appropriately set and maintained. The ONCAMPUS Academic Office has responsibility for ensuring policies are regularly reviewed and updated as required by any changes to the Quality Code or other changes in the operating environment.

1.17 The comprehensive assessment regulations address all aspects of the academic arrangements required, including coursework submission, marking, moderation and standardisation, student feedback and the use of the external examiners. Staff whom the review team met were aware of the Centre's regulations, policies and procedures relevant to their respective roles. Information about the assessment regulations is available on the virtual learning environment (VLE). Students met by the team were confident that they knew

where to find the information that they needed. Reports from external examiners confirm that assessment and moderation processes are appropriate and that Examination Boards operate effectively.

1.18 The Centre has a comprehensive academic framework and related regulations. The review team therefore considers that the Expectation is met and the associated 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

1.19 Programme specifications define the intended learning outcomes of each programme of study approved, and represent the definitive record of the programme. The programme specification contains module specifications that include the detailed module outline. The Centre does not award qualifications. Centre provision is part of the educational offering of ONCAMPUS and provides progression routes or pathways to University awards. The programme specification is completed to a standard format, which requires that programme and learning outcomes are specified, and there is acknowledgement of relevant reference points.

1.20 The programme approval and modification processes require that formal notification and full approval is received by ONCAMPUS before any changes can be made to the records of provision held by ONCAMPUS and the partner University.

1.21 The requirements of ONCAMPUS together with the regulations and procedures allow the Expectation to be met.

1.22 In considering this Expectation the review team examined the relevant ONCAMPUS regulations, policies and supporting documents, sample programme specifications, and reports from annual monitoring. The team also held meetings with staff and students.

1.23 The documents seen by the team demonstrate full compliance with the regulations. Learning outcomes were appropriately specified at programme and module level. The module specification identifies the module title, the level and any prerequisites. The form contains detailed information and describes the module's aims, content, resources, reading list and assessment methods.

1.24 Students whom the team met were very clear about their programmes of study, the modules they were taking and the assessment requirements.

1.25 Annual monitoring reports seen by the team were comprehensive and indicated where changes were being proposed and a clear action plan to do so.

1.26 The documents seen by the team demonstrate a thorough approach to oversight and a commitment to continuous improvement.

1.27 Programme specifications provide a definitive record of the Centre's provision, and are approved and modified through due process. Therefore the review team concludes that the Expectation is met and the associated 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

1.28 The ONCAMPUS Academic Quality Assurance Manual details the procedures for initial programme approval. The programme development team produces a programme specification and associated module specifications. These are sent to Academic Board for consideration. Academic Board appoints an external academic adviser (usually from a higher education institution with no connection with ONCAMPUS). Academic Board then sends its comments and those of the external adviser back to the programme development team. Where either the Board or the external adviser set approval conditions, these must be met. The curriculum for the IY1 Mechanical Engineering programme is identical to the Year 1 undergraduate degree in Mechanical Engineering at Hull University, with the addition of standard ONCAMPUS modules in English and academic skills. The University quality assures this programme, and it was approved by the University using its own programme approval procedures.

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

1.30 ONCAMPUS makes the point that its current programmes were developed and approved prior to its engagement with QAA, and under the regulations that existed at that time. However, review and reapproval of the UFP was completed at the end of 2014-15, and is ongoing for the MFP and IY1 with reapproval of the new versions of the two programmes scheduled for the end of 2016-17 (see section A3.3 below). The process for programme approval is identical to that of reapproval so that, by examining documentation relating to the reapproval of the UFP and asking staff about this process, the review team was able to test whether the Expectation is met in practice.

1.31 The review team established that Stage One of the reapproval was carried out during a two-day event in February 2014, at which key members of senior staff (including Centre Heads, and staff from sales and marketing, systems, and the Academic Office) were invited to share their experiences of the programme and how it could be improved. The resultant report detailed the proposed revised UFP for delivery from September 2015. The report went to Academic Board for comment, and to an external academic adviser who evaluated and reported on the revised programme proposal. The review team was told the revised programme proposal was shared with all the ONCAMPUS university partners and, through an iterative process, the contents of the finalised programme were agreed with all the partners. This is a time-consuming activity, and ONCAMPUS earmarks two years for the completion of the reapproval process.

1.32 The Centre states that 'a slightly adapted methodology' had been used for approval of the IY1 Mechanical Engineering programme at Hull. The review team established that approval had been managed by the University under its own academic regulations, since the University has responsibility for academic standards on this programme. Subsequent to approval by the University, approval of the IY1 Mechanical Engineering was taken to the ONCAMPUS Academic Board which noted that, as this programme was previously approved by Hull University as the first year of its Mechanical Engineering degree, it did

not require formal programme approval under ONCAMPUS regulations.

1.33 The evidence made available to the review team allows it to conclude that the Expectation is fully met with low risk.

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

1.34 The ONCAMPUS UFP and MFP programmes do not lead to the award of a qualification, and modules are not credit-rated. Rather they provide students who successfully meet the agreed progression requirements the opportunity to go forward to a programme of study at the University. The IY1 Mechanical Engineering is different. Though the ONCAMPUS English for Academic Purposes (EAP) and Academic Skills modules are not credit-rated, the subject modules are identical to those on the Year 1 Mechanical Engineering programme at the University and, as such, they carry Level 4 credits. The programme specification shows the final award on the programme as 'International Year One (Mechanical Engineering)'.

1.35 The ONCAMPUS UFP and MFP programmes are governed by detailed assessment regulations found in the ONCAMPUS Academic Quality Assurance Manual. The IY1 programme is governed by the University's academic and assessment regulations which are implemented at an Examination Board convened by the University.

1.36 The framework of assessment regulations which has been developed by ONCAMPUS should ensure learning outcomes have been met and threshold standards achieved by students successful in assessments. This allows the Expectation to be met in principle.

1.37 To test whether the Expectation is met in practice, the review team examined documentation relating to assessment standards, notably the assessment regulations, documentation relating to changes recommended by the external examiners to the operation of the assessment process, and external examiner reports, as well as discussing assessment with staff.

1.38 The regulatory framework which governs assessment on the UFP and MFP across the whole of the ONCAMPUS network is well established and robust, and its implementation by centralised Examination Boards ensures consistency in standards across different centres including Hull. At the same time, ONCAMPUS has proved willing to revisit the operation of its assessment processes under advice from its external examiners, and a number of beneficial changes have been made.

1.39 For the IY1 programme, standards are wholly regulated by the University which sets and marks all assessments, applies its own assessment regulations and appoints its own external examiners to the programme. The subject modules are identical to those on the Year 1 Mechanical Engineering programme at the University and, as noted, they carry Level 4 credits. The review team asked whether students who successfully completed the IY1 and who would, therefore, have accumulated 120 Level 4 credits on the University Year 1 programme would be eligible for the award of a CertHE by the University. This would be of particular relevance for students who successfully completed the IY1 Mechanical

Engineering programme but who were, for whatever reason, not able to progress to Year 2 at the University. Staff indicated that, as 2016-17 was the first time the IY1 Mechanical Engineering had operated, there was no experience of this, but they hoped successful students who did not progress would be awarded a CertHE by the University as an exit award.

1.40 In its meetings with senior staff, the review team sought further clarification as to whether exiting students on the IY1 Mechanical Engineering would be eligible for a CertHE award. It was told that the Centre was commencing a dialogue with the University with a view to clarifying this point, and with the objective of establishing the position by the time the first cohort of students completed the programme in summer 2017. The review team **recommends** that ONCAMPUS continues to work with the University to ensure an exit qualification is available to those students who successfully complete IY1 Mechanical Engineering, but are not able to progress.

1.41 The Expectation is fully met with low risk.

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

1.42 Programmes are subject to periodic review approximately every five years. The UFP was subject to periodic review and reapproval over a two-year period, with the revised programme commencing in 2015-6. The MFP and IY1 Business are currently undergoing review over a similar extended period, with the revised versions scheduled to commence in 2017-18. The procedure for conducting periodic review is laid out in the Quality Manual. Programme review involves a critical appraisal of the standards and quality of the current programme and examines the views of staff, external examiners and university partners. The aim of periodic review is to gauge the effectiveness of the delivery of the programme, and the quality of the student experience. It also assesses the continued currency of the curriculum and actions needed to remedy any identified shortcomings or areas for enhancement. The programme teams are required to produce the self-evaluation document, and other revised programme documentation. The process of reapproval mirrors that of initial programme approval (see section A3.1), and includes the use of an external academic adviser.

1.43 Procedures for annual monitoring are outlined in the Quality Manual and ultimate responsibility for monitoring lies with Academic Board. The process involves the completion of a standard report form for each programme, while modules are monitored via Subject and Programme Leaders (who have operational responsibility for these), using a standard form. These module evaluation forms are brought together in the programme annual monitoring report (AMR), with any identified actions incorporated into the AMR action plan. AMRs are discussed at the relevant Programme Committee. With effect from the current year's monitoring of 2015-16, Hull, like other centres, has been required to produce a centre-based commentary.

1.44 The procedures for both periodic programme review and annual programme monitoring are clearly articulated and allow this Expectation to be met.

1.45 The review team tested whether this was the case in practice by reading documentation, particularly the Academic Quality Assurance Manual, programme AMRs for 2014-15, and the Centre-Based Annual Review Commentary for Hull Centre, and also through discussions with staff.

1.46 Documentation relating to the periodic review of the UFP programme demonstrates a robust process which follows ONCAMPUS procedures closely, as laid down in the Academic Quality Assurance Manual, and which incorporates externality in the form of an external academic adviser. Oversight of the process by Academic Board is evidenced in the minutes of the Board. Periodic review of the MFP and IY1 Business programmes is currently taking place, following the same procedures.

1.47 In relation to annual programme monitoring, the AMRs produced for 2014-15 for UFP and MFP (plus the International Diploma Programme, the precursor of the IY1 programme) are comprehensive reports that evidence a robust and self-critical process. The Centre-Based Annual Review Commentary for Hull Centre, produced to support annual

monitoring of 2015-16, is comprehensive and evaluative with coverage of student progression and achievement, engagement with the University partner, quality of the provision, and student support and engagement. It incorporates a detailed action plan.

1.48 ONCAMPUS has also instigated a process of Centre Academic Oversight Audits, which give it an overall evaluation of how well centres are operating and the extent to which they are adhering to ONCAMPUS policies and procedures. Centres may experience up to three audits each year, depending on the risk-assessment of the centre. As a new centre, Hull has had two such audits since it opened in January 2016, the second being conducted in November 2016. In both cases the audit outcomes were good, rated 'Green' on the ONCAMPUS risk-based scale.

1.49 The Expectation is fully met with low 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

1.50 ONCAMPUS uses a range of external expertise throughout the development of its programmes and in assessment. The appointment and role of external examiners are covered in the Quality Handbook and in the External Examiner Handbook, and are discussed in section B7. There is also involvement of external expertise during programme development and in the approval process.

1.51 The arrangements which ONCAMPUS has to secure external inputs to the programme development and approval process, and external oversight of the standards in assessment allow the Expectation to be met.

1.52 The review team examined these arrangements through documentation, notably the ONCAMPUS Academic Quality Assurance Manual, the External Examiner Handbook and external examiner reports; and in discussion with staff at ONCAMPUS Hull.

1.53 The operation and effectiveness of external examining arrangements are examined at section B7. Staff explained how Pathway/Subject Leaders engage with subject experts at partner universities in order to discuss curriculum development. This input is used to develop a programme specification and module outlines, and these are then discussed with the partner universities. Through an iterative process, programme development is carried forward by staff to create a finalised programme structure and content, which is acceptable to and will be endorsed by all of the ONCAMPUS university partners. The programme approval process discussed in section A3.1 has a requirement for the programme documentation to be sent to an external academic adviser for comment, and the report of this adviser is considered by Academic Board, with any approval conditions identified by the external adviser needing to be addressed before the programme is permitted to run. The review team noted that ONCAMPUS had a provision for its individual university partners to request programme changes, and asked how this worked in an arrangement where programme content had to be agreed by all partner universities. It was told that, in practice, this would typically be accommodated by making shifts in programme content at a particular centre, but within the overall parameters of the approved programme. An example was given of a centre (not Hull Centre) whose university partner had requested an increase in the proportion of economics delivered within the UFP Business. ONCAMPUS had accommodated this by introducing a replacement economics module which was still part of the overall approved UFP structure.

1.54 The evidence provided to the review team allowed it to conclude that this Expectation is met with low risk.

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

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

1.56 All seven of the Expectations in this area are met and the level of associated risk is low for each. ONCAMPUS Hull effectively follows the requirements of the University to maintain academic standards and these processes are further supported by ONCAMPUS Hull's own internal procedures.

1.57 There are no areas of good practice or affirmations identified. One recommendation is made, requiring the Centre to work with the University of Hull to provide an exit award for students who complete the IY1 Mechanical Engineering programme, but are not able to progress.

1.58 The review team concludes that the maintenance of the academic standards of awards offered by itself 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 process for the design, development and approval of programmes is laid out in the Quality Manual (see section A 3.1). A new programme development process has to be initiated, and proposals have to be approved by Academic Board in order to progress. This process was applied to the UFP and MFP programmes which operate at Hull Centre. The IY1 Mechanical Engineering was approved by the University using its own quality assurance procedures, and ratified by Academic Board.

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

2.3 The process for programme approval is identical to that of reapproval so that, by examining documentation relating to the reapproval of the UFP and asking staff about this process, the review team was able to test whether the Expectation is met in practice.

2.4 Following a two-day event in February 2014, at which key members of senior staff were invited to share their experiences of the programme and how it could be improved, a report was produced which detailed the proposed revised UFP for delivery from September 2015. The report went to Academic Board for comment, and to an external academic adviser who evaluated and reported on the revised programme proposal. The revised programme proposal was shared with all the ONCAMPUS university partners and, through an iterative process, the contents of the finalised programme were agreed with all the partners. This is a time-consuming activity, and ONCAMPUS earmarks two years for the completion of the reapproval process.

2.5 A feature of the contract between ONCAMPUS and the University of Hull is that the latter has agreed to provide detailed data on the achievement of ONCAMPUS alumni as they progress through the University. At the time of the review visit, the Centre was anticipating receipt from the University of data relating to the results from its first cohort of students who had just completed semester one at the University. Availability of this data on an ongoing basis should enable ONCAMPUS to fine-tune its curriculum to enhance the effectiveness with which it prepares its students for transition to the University, and is a feature of good practice (see B2 below).

2.6 The evidence made available to the review team allows the Expectation to be fully met with low 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

2.7 Recruitment of students is managed centrally, and there is a detailed central admissions process. The CEG Central Admissions Team manages the whole process, recruiting through a network of CEG agents in target countries. Agents receive training to support students effectively in making the correct choice of course and location. They receive update training especially when a new centre is opened. There is a CEG Agent Management Policy. Part of the student induction survey conducted by CEG in the centre asks students to reflect on their experience with agents and pre-arrival information. Admissions criteria are agreed with the University, and are overseen by Academic Board. The Head of Centre briefs the central admissions staff on the particular requirements and characteristics of the Hull Centre. The Head of Centre may also be involved in discussions about marginal students. Admissions requirements are publicised to prospective students on the CEG website and in physical prospectuses.

2.8 Students are asked to report disabilities when they apply for admission, and the information is recorded on the CEG Management Information System. Students have access to information on the CEG website prior to entry to their programme, and they can contact their chosen centre with any pre-arrival enquiries.

2.9 The admissions process with its associated procedures, documentation and website information allow the Expectation to be met.

2.10 In order to test this Expectation the review team examined the admissions processes documentation and the information on the website relating to admissions. It also examined the role of agents and the training that was provided for them. The team met staff involved with recruitment and admissions as well as asking students about their admission experience.

2.11 Agents play a central role in the recruitment policy. Accordingly, CEG conducts thorough checks prior to contracting with an agent. Agents are supported by CEG marketing and admissions staff. Central staff visit centres to reinforce their knowledge.

2.12 Students whom the review team met considered they had been well supported and advised, through the process of making an informed decision, by admissions staff and by agents. They understood how the admission process worked and were clear about what they needed to do. They considered they were appropriately prepared for entry to the Centre.

2.13 Monitoring and review of the operation of recruitment, selection and admission policies and procedures is regular, through oversight monitoring by Academic Board. Any changes proposed to entry criteria have to be agreed with the University partner. Discussions occur regularly with the University both formally through the Joint Partnership Strategy Board and the Academic Partnership Board, and also informally between the Head of Centre and University faculty staff about both admission and progression requirements.

2.14 When the Hull Centre was set up the contract between the University and CEG stipulated that the University would provide data on student performance, which will inform admissions criteria and curriculum development. The data will be provided on a regular basis, and will form an integral part of the review of the recruitment, selection and admissions processes. The review team considers that this will make a positive contribution to the students' learning experience and is **good practice**.

2.15 The review team saw evidence of inclusive and thorough recruitment policies and carefully detailed procedures for recruitment, selection and admission of students. On the basis of the evidence considered the review team concludes that the Expectation is met and the associated level of 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

2.16 CEG has a Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy 2016-20, which is owned and managed by the central LTC. A representative from each centre, including one from Hull, sits on this committee. The focus of the strategy is on students as independent learners and the provision of a high quality learning environment. Responsibility for delivering the strategy rests with the Academic Office and the Heads of Centre. External examiners have made positive comments about how well students are prepared for progression to the University.

2.17 The policies and practices of the Centre allow the Expectation to be met.

2.18 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.

2.19 Teaching staff mainly come from a further education background. Their teaching practice is supported in a number of ways, including online materials through the VLE, specific training delivered 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 in the Hull Centre have some access to staff development opportunities in the University, which the Head of Centre is seeking to extend. All new staff receive an induction programme and are 'buddied' by a more experienced member of staff. Teaching staff have regular management teaching observations with the Head or Deputy Head of the Centre, as part of the appraisal process. Currently there is an informal peer observation process in operation, with an intention to make this more formal.

2.20 Students are given a comprehensive induction programme where they are introduced to their programme as well as the University. The students have access to the ONCAMPUS VLE which is used extensively by students and staff to support learning. Students are well supported in their development as independent learners. They say they have a smooth transition to the University. The transition is helped by contact with the University department they will be joining and by use of University resources.

2.21 ONCAMPUS monitors and reviews the effectiveness of learning opportunities by end-of-programme surveys and by feedback through the committee structure. In addition, ONCAMPUS has a Centre Academic Oversight Audit process which contributes to the review and enhancement of learning opportunities and teaching practices, by providing a health-check on learning and teaching in the centre, and identifying good practice. This process was initially on a termly basis but the frequency and focus of the audit now reflects the experience of previous audits. The Hull Centre was audited in November 2016, with a number of actions and good practices noted.

2.22 Learning resources and student support are in place to support student learning and achievement and prepare students for university study. There are systematic and effective assurance and review processes 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

2.23 ONCAMPUS has a clear policy to support students in their development through the use of Individual Learning Plans, which were introduced in 2014-15. 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. The Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy has as one of its main aims the delivery of a personalised approach to the students' experience. Support services are provided in the Centre and additionally students have access to specialist support services at the University.

2.24 The review team found that the Centre 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.

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

2.26 The review team concluded that the Centre provides a range of activities and support services that enable students to develop their academic and personal potential and to make a smooth transition to their university studies. Programmes are structured to provide an intensive and supportive study environment with teaching in small groups and with high levels of contact. By using the students Individual Learning Plans staff facilitate individual learning and achievement. New staff are prepared for supporting students by an enhanced induction section in the VLE.

2.27 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. It is their responsibility to meet each student regularly. The ONCAMPUS personal tutor policy is that all students have personal contact with their students at least once a week. At the Hull Centre there are programmed tutorials on a termly basis, although informal arrangements in addition to this may be made by either staff or students. Currently there are three members of staff who act as personal tutors, with a student population of over 200. The review team **recommends** that the Centre adheres to the provider's policy on personal tutorials, to more effectively support students to achieve their personal and professional potential. It is acknowledged that students have good access to staff and that the support they receive is appreciated by the students.

2.28 The Centre monitors attendance and student achievement closely. Students at risk are noted and appropriate follow-up action taken. This may involve additional academic support or English language provision. Students who met the review team confirmed that they had ready access to support services should the need for them arise and spoke positively about the ways in which the Centre enabled them to develop and achieve. Information about student services is provided in student handbooks and is available on the VLE.

2.29 The adequacy and efficacy 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.

2.30 The review team concludes that the Centre operates effectively to enable students to develop their academic, personal and professional potential but with a weakness in the current operation of the personal tutor policy. The Expectation is met and the associated risk is moderate.

Expectation: Met

Level of risk: Moderate

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

2.31 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 the central programme committees and on the SSCC within each individual centre. ONCAMPUS has identified poor completion rates of surveys as a problem, and work has been undertaken to improve these. However, the quality and value of responses to surveys has been a continuing issue, and the decision has been taken to cease to carry out end-of-module surveys, instead using prompt questions in the SSCC to ascertain student views about modules. Minutes from the SSCC are made available to the LTC, programme committees and to Programme/Pathway Leaders. Questionnaires are continuing in relation to student views about induction with an end-of-programme questionnaire with questions based around those in the National Student Survey (NSS). There is also an intention to use former students to inform programme development, though the use of alumni students at the Centre is currently relatively under-developed. Centres such as Hull are required to provide student representatives on the Centre SSCC and on the central programme committees with training given on how to be effective in the role.

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

2.33 In order to ascertain whether this is true in practice, the review team examined documentation including the ONCAMPUS Academic Quality Assurance Manual, the minutes of the programme committees, specimen SSCC minutes, and met both staff and students.

2.34 Students and staff met by the team confirmed that the arrangements described in the ONCAMPUS Quality Manual were operational at the Centre. There is a representative for each student group, selected by group members (13 representatives in total). Staff said students received training for their role in the form of a meeting with key staff, a presentation, and a question and answer session. Students confirmed, both in their meeting with the review team and in their written submission, that these arrangements were in place, and were able to identify issues which they had raised and where the Centre had responded positively. At the same time students recognised it was not always possible for the Centre to make the changes students had requested. The SSCC meets twice per term, and the minutes are made available to students. Staff indicated the SSCC meetings consider more general issues but also programme-level issues, which gives students the opportunity to comment by exception on any module-level concerns. Students said they felt comfortable contributing their views at meetings. Minutes of the programme committees show student representatives making a contribution, with a standing agenda item in each meeting devoted to students from each centre reporting on the experience of students in that centre.

2.35 The review team was satisfied this Expectation was met with low 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

2.36 ONCAMPUS describe their approach to assessment as rigorous, and this is articulated in the ONCAMPUS Academic Quality Assurance Manual. Academic Board has oversight of the assessment process, with external monitoring through subject specific external examiners (see section B7).

2.37 In principle, the approach to assessment adopted by ONCAMPUS, and which operates in a standardised way across all its centres including Hull, should ensure equitable, valid and reliable processes of assessment operate, and enable every student to demonstrate the extent to which they have achieved the intended learning outcomes. This allows the Expectation to be met in principle.

2.38 In order to test whether this is the case in practice, the review team examined the assessment regulations and processes detailed in ONCAMPUS documentation, reviewed external examiner reports, and held meetings with senior and teaching staff, and with students.

2.39 There is a framework of assessment regulations, which includes policies relating to variation of assessments for students with special needs, and extenuating circumstances policies. There is a common curriculum which operates across all ONCAMPUS centres, and associated with this are common summative assessments across all centres. This helps to secure a consistent standard of assessment across the ONCAMPUS centre network. The assessment process is led by Pathway/Subject Leaders. It is ONCAMPUS policy to expose students to a wide variety of assessment methods to assess both subject knowledge and study skills, and with the objective of giving them experience of the full variety of assessment approaches they will meet later in their university programme.

2.40 External examiners are fully engaged in the assessment process, and approve all summative assessments as well as moderating assessment outcomes (see section B7). The assessment regulations contain policies and procedures for internal moderation together with standardisation procedures before summative assessments are marked. The new UFP places emphasis on formative assessment in the first two terms, with summative assessment in the final term. The intention is for formative assessment to be conducted on a delegated basis at centre-level. The LTC has requested each centre to produce its own formative assessment strategy, and the Hull Centre has done so. External examiner reports confirm that assessment is conducted in a manner which is both fair to students and consistent between centres.

2.41 In the case of the IY1 Mechanical Engineering programme, the University controls the assessment process. Its staff set and mark assessments, it appoints external examiners who have oversight of assessment on the programme, and it convenes the Examination Board, which operates within the framework of the University's assessment regulations. ONCAMPUS has no involvement in the assessment of IY1 Mechanical Engineering, except in relation to its oversight of their results in the ONCAMPUS EAP and Academic Study Skills modules.

2.42 Students receive specific training on correct academic practice. Plagiarism-detection software is used to support students' understanding of plagiarism as well as a tool for identifying academic malpractice. Where applicable, the software is used in the marking and provision of feedback on coursework. Feedback is given to students on all assessments, whether individually and/or on a group basis. Staff indicated work is normally returned to students within a week, and students confirmed this was the case. Students also said they found assessment briefs clear and understood what was required of them. They confirmed they received feedback on assessed work, and found this helpful in understanding the mark they had been given and how to improve this. They also said that they were able to talk to tutors about their assessments if they needed additional help or clarification of the mark. At the same time, there was clear understanding on the part of both teaching staff and students that it was not possible to appeal against academic judgements. The Centre also makes use of a student progress-tracking spreadsheet, which provides oversight where student assessment results give rise for concern, and which enables students at risk to be identified, and additional support made available.

2.43 Overall, the review team concludes this Expectation is met with low risk.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

Quality Code, Chapter B7: External Examining

Findings

2.44 ONCAMPUS appoints external examiners to each of its programmes, and they cover assessment across all the centres including Hull. It has clear procedures for the appointment and operation of external examiners in its Quality Manual. It also has an External Examiner Handbook which provides details of the role and responsibilities of external examiners. An enhanced induction process has been introduced for new external examiners, and more generally external examiners are encouraged to visit at least one centre each year so they become more familiar with the aims and objectives of ONCAMPUS.

2.45 In principle, ONCAMPUS has a framework of external examining for its programmes which should ensure appropriate external oversight of academic standards, including those at Hull Centre. This allows the Expectation to be met in principle.

2.46 In order to ascertain whether this is the case in practice, the review team examined a range of documentation relating to external examining at ONCAMPUS, including the Academic Quality Manual, External Examiner Handbook, External Examiner Induction Process, Programme Committee minutes, and external examiner reports. The review team also discussed the external examining process and use of external examiner reports with staff and students at Hull Centre.

2.47 ONCAMPUS has external examiners appointed to each of its programmes and, responding to feedback from current external examiners, it has increased the number of examiners in order to manage workload and to permit more academic focus in the role. It has also introduced a number of modifications to the assessment process on advice from external examiners. The role of external examiners is clearly articulated for both the external examiners themselves and for staff in the centres through the External Examiner Handbook. This makes clear the role of external examiners is to act as external moderators of standards, and not as double-markers, though they may be asked to arbitrate where internal examiners are not able to reach an agreed mark. There is an effective process of induction for new external examiners.

2.48 External examiners moderate all summative assessments before they are taken by students. They also receive a structured sample of student work for all summative assessments, in order to moderate marking standards. External examiners produce annual reports using a standard ONCAMPUS pro forma and these reports are made to the Chief Academic Officer. External examiner reports are discussed at the relevant Programme Committee at their first meeting of the new academic year. They are also discussed by staff in Subject Group meetings across centres, and in team meetings within centres. A summary report of external examiner comments is produced centrally, and distributed to Heads of Centre. As well as being discussed at Programme Committee meetings at which student representatives are present, staff indicated that students could access external examiner reports on the VLE. Some of the students met by the team were aware of external examiners, but none had seen any reports.

2.49 It is the responsibility of the Chief Academic Officer to coordinate responses to external examiner reports, and external examiner comments and responses to them form part of the annual monitoring review process. As a new centre, Hull has not so far benefited from a visit by any of the external examiners.

2.50 Academic standards on the IY1 Mechanical Engineering programme are the responsibility of the University of Hull, and University-appointed external examiners provide oversight of academic standards on this programme. Since the programme is in its first year of operation, this has not yet happened in practice.

2.51 The evidence seen by the review team confirms that ONCAMPUS operates a robust system of external examining, and makes effective use of external examining inputs in ensuring academic standards on its programmes. The Expectation is met with low risk.

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

2.52 The processes for annual monitoring and for periodic programme review are clearly articulated in the Academic Quality Assurance Manual. These processes are described in section A3.3.

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

2.54 The review team was able to test this in practice by examining a range of documentation relating to the recent periodic review of the UFP, the annual monitoring for 2014-15 and the ongoing monitoring of 2015-16, and through meetings with staff during the review visit

2.55 As described in section A3.3, the approach to periodic review adopted by ONCAMPUS is a robust process. The annual monitoring reviews are comprehensive and demonstrate a self-critical approach.

2.56 The review team concludes that ONCAMPUS operates robust procedures for both periodic programme review and annual programme monitoring, which ensures the Expectation is met with low 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

2.57 ONCAMPUS has procedures for both academic appeals and complaints. They are available in the appendices of the Quality Manual and are in Student Programme Handbooks. Academic Board receives an annual report on the number and range of appeals and complaints with the intention to learn from any patterns and to adjust processes accordingly.

2.58 The complaints and appeals procedures are appropriately detailed and timescales are included. The Centre has satisfactory policies and procedures in place that would enable the Expectation to be met.

2.59 The review team tested the effectiveness of the procedures by examining documentation, including the policies for both complaints and appeals. The review team also held meetings with staff and students.

2.60 The Quality Assurance Manual provides clear guidance and direction for both staff and students regarding the appropriate procedure to follow for both complaints and appeals. The manual is available electronically to both staff and students. The policy is comprehensive. The procedure and grounds for making an appeal against the outcome or conduct of an examination or coursework is very clear and straightforward.

2.61 The procedure for complaints gives due regard to the confidentiality for staff and students and seeks to ensure that no student is disadvantaged by bringing a complaint. There is encouragement within the policy to try to resolve complaints informally. Students are encouraged to talk to their personal tutor in the first instance, and are required to initiate a complaint within one month of any unsatisfactory circumstance occurring. If the issue is not resolved informally locally, students raise the complaint with the Head of Centre. Should this not satisfactorily deal with the matter, the final stage of the process is managed centrally by a Reviewing Officer.

2.62 Students who the review team met were unaware of the detail of the process that they would follow if they wished to make a complaint or an appeal. Their first port of call would be a member of staff or the Head of Centre, who they were confident would advise them appropriately. They were aware of the range of ways they could seek further information or support if required, including through the student representatives, and through support staff both in the Centre and the University. The students confirmed that the Centre is responsive to any issues they raised.

2.63 The number of formal complaints and appeals has been very low in CEG centres.

2.64 The evidence from the documentation and the meetings held with staff and students demonstrates that there are policies in place to deal with both complaints and appeals, but that there is a culture, supported by the policy framework that seeks to ensure that

complaints are resolved informally wherever possible. The review team concludes therefore that 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

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

2.66 All nine of the Expectations in this area are met. The level of associated risk is low for all expectations except B4, which is deemed to be of moderate risk. There is a recommendation in B4 that the Centre adheres to the Provider's own policies on personal tutorials. There is one area of good practice identified that recognises the contractual arrangement with the University for the provision of student performance data. There are no affirmations recorded.

2.67 The review team concludes that the quality of student learning opportunities at the Provider **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 Responsibility for issuing public information and its accuracy rests with the Provider's Central Marketing Department. This includes all prospectuses and the website. There is a representative of the central marketing team on Academic Board whose role is to make sure that information is transferred and that all public information is accurate. All marketing and other materials for the Centre have to be signed off by the University before publication.

3.2 Programme Handbooks are maintained by the Academic Office and are held by the Deputy Chief Academic Officers, and considered and commented on by the LTC.

3.3 Full information about the Centre, the location and courses available, along with the process of application and admission is provided on the ONCAMPUS website.

3.4 The design of these policies and procedures allows this Expectation to be met.

3.5 The review team examined the effectiveness of the policies and procedures in place for information by examining relevant documentation, including minutes of meetings demonstrating oversight and by exploring the information available on webpages and printed prospectuses and handbooks. The review team also held meetings with students and staff.

3.6 The information on the webpages seen by the review team was clear, current and accurate. It was accessible, with links to other resources that students might need to refer to in order to make choices.

3.7 The students whom the review team met were satisfied with the information that they had received through the process of application and on arrival. They confirmed that the initial orientation programme was informative and that the detailed course information is easy to find on the VLE. The students were confident in their knowledge of Centre policies and procedures, and if unsure about anything, that they would know how to find the information. They also stressed the willingness of staff to respond to any queries that they had.

3.8 The Centre makes available clear and accurate information to prospective and current students enabling them to make informed choices about programmes of study. ONCAMPUS has in place appropriate mechanisms to check that information is accurate. Therefore the review team concludes that the Expectation is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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 low risk. Systems are in place to ensure that the quality of information is fit for purpose, accessible and trustworthy. There are no recommendations, affirmations or features of good practice in this section.

3.11 The review team concludes that the quality of the information produced by the provider 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 says it takes a 'holistic approach' to enhancement and its Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy is central to this approach. The first programme committees of the academic year have an agenda item 'sharing good practice' which provides the opportunity for centres to draw aspects of their own good practice to the attention of other centres in the ONCAMPUS network. A significant aspect of good practice in the setting up of the Hull Centre has been to incorporate into the contract with the University a commitment by the University to provide detailed progression and achievement data to the Centre on its ONCAMPUS alumni. This data should ensure that ONCAMPUS and the Centre are able to refine curriculum content and teaching and learning to enhance the effectiveness with which students are prepared for transition to the University.

4.2 The unannounced termly Centre Academic Oversight Audit process is seen as a key strength, as outcomes can be used to enhance the quality of learning opportunities across all ONCAMPUS centres.

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.

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.

QAA1861- R8324 - May 17

© The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education 2017
Southgate House, Southgate Street, Gloucester GL1 1UB
Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786

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