



Educational Oversight for embedded colleges: report of the monitoring visit of CEG UFP Ltd ONCAMPUS January 2019

ONCAMPUS London

Outcome of the monitoring visit

1 From the evidence provided in the annual return and at the monitoring visit, the monitoring team concludes that ONCAMPUS London (the Centre) is making acceptable progress with continuing to monitor, review and enhance its higher education provision since the February 2018 [Higher Education Review \(Embedded Colleges\)](#).

Changes since the last QAA review

2 The overall number of students at the Centre have remained stable. At the time of this monitoring visit there had been a recent change in the Centre Head. This role was now filled by the previous Deputy Centre Head and the previous Centre Head taking on the role of Progression and Partnership Director. There are a number of outstanding staff vacancies awaiting budget approval including Head of Learning and Teaching, and Course Leaders for Business and Science, with these roles were being covered by existing staff.

Findings from the monitoring visit

3 The Centre is making acceptable progress in continuing to monitor, review and enhance its provision. The Centre Head maintains a master list of proposed actions derived from internal reviews such as annual monitoring, and responses to external reviews, including the 2018 Higher Education Review (Embedded Colleges) (HER (EC)). The 2018 HER (EC) report made one recommendation that the Centre take steps to secure the continuing availability of learning resources to meet students' needs and identified two areas of good practice in the highly personalised approach to learning and teaching that supports individual student needs and achievement and the high quality support given by the Centre that facilitates student progression to a range of appropriate University programmes.

4 The action plan includes intended outcomes and the means by which their achievement will be evaluated. It is too early to measure the full impact of actions taken, but some progress is evident. There remain concerns about the space and staff resources and Centre staff cannot currently work in close proximity. An internal audit undertaken by the Provider reported that as a result staff morale was low with some staff having to work at home. Students met by the team reported recent IT issues that have caused problems for them accessing course information and timetables.

5 During the past year an internal review was undertaken place of provision at the Centre. This audit gave the Centre a green red-amber-green traffic light system (RAG) rating. Annual monitoring reports for each programme are produced and these reflect on student

performance and feedback from external examiners, staff and students. These reports contain an action plan for the coming year.

6 The Centre effectively engages students in continuous improvement and enhancement of its provision. Student opinion is elicited through end of module surveys, and meetings with student representatives. Programme Committee meetings have also recently been introduced with staff and student participation across ONCAMPUS centres. The effectiveness of these virtual meetings is yet to be fully evaluated by the Provider. Students who met the review team stated that the Centre actively sought their opinions and listened to them.

7 The review team concludes that the Centre has transparent, reliable and valid admissions processes. Recruitment, selection and admission of students are undertaken centrally by CEG Central Admissions who work with a network of agents. Although a centralised process, the Centre is involved in admissions in various ways. Academic entrance requirements are agreed between the Centre and the University and notified to Central Admissions. These are published on the website and in centrally generated brochures. The Centre is consulted on borderline applications and a decision on their suitability is made by the Head of Centre. The centre is confident that as a result of careful consideration of borderline applicants, it only admits students capable of completing their programmes satisfactorily. The Centre is responsible for providing information and welcome packs to students who have accepted offers of places. Students who met the review team expressed satisfaction with the admissions process, stating that it was smooth and effective, and that they had been well informed throughout.

8 The review team concludes that the Centre operates assessment policies that are rigorous and fair. Assessment is centrally led by subject and pathway leaders whose role extends across all ONCAMPUS centres including that delivered at London. Common summative assessments are undertaken across ONCAMPUS. Standard templates are provided for submission and recording of marks. Assessment and assessment related policies, processes and procedures are set out in the CEG Quality Manual.

9 Staff at the Centre are involved in assessment in a variety of ways. Draft summative assessments are discussed at subject group meetings. Formative assessments are developed both centrally and by local teachers. Marking is undertaken locally within the framework for standardisation and moderation set out in the Quality manual. Feedback to students on formative assessments is provided by the staff at the Centre. Wherever possible, assignments are submitted electronically using plagiarism-detection software. Assessment is discussed at internal staff meetings. Students who met the review team indicated that they were clear about what was expected of them and how their work would be marked. They also stated that they were well briefed on how to avoid plagiarism.

10 No external reviews of the Centre provision have taken place since the 2018 HER (EC).

11 Pass rates on certain programmes and cohorts at the Centre are low. A previous internal audit in July 2018 recommended that the Centre carry out a detailed analysis of its assessment results and produce a clear action plan. At the time of this monitoring visit this analysis had not been completed. However, students who met the review team were positive about the support available to complete their studies successfully.

The embedded colleges' use of external reference points to meet UK expectations for higher education

12 The Centre demonstrates effective engagement with relevant external reference points. The requirements of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education, *The Framework for Higher Education Qualifications* (FHEQ) and other relevant external frameworks are reflected in the regulations, policies and procedures set out in the ONCAMPUS Quality Manual, which in turn informs practice at the Centre. ONCAMPUS centrally appoints external examiners whose reports are shared with the Centre's staff, analysed in annual monitoring reports, and appropriate action taken.

13 Sharing of good practice is encouraged and, as described above, is central to building on the good practice identified in the 2018 HER (EC) report. However, staff who met the review team were not confident in articulating how key external reference points including the Quality Code, are used to maintain standards and enhance quality.

Background to the monitoring visit

14 The monitoring visit serves as a short check on the provider's and its embedded colleges' continuing management of academic standards and quality of provision. It focuses on progress since the previous review. In addition, it provides an opportunity for QAA to advise the provider and its embedded colleges of any matters that have the potential to be of particular interest in the next monitoring visit or review.

15 The monitoring visit was carried out by Mr Phil Markey, QAA Officer, and Professor Graham Romp, QAA Reviewer, on 30 January 2019.

QAA2361c - R10449 - Apr 19

© The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education 2019
Southgate House, Southgate Street, Gloucester GL1 1UB
Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786

Tel 01452 557050
Web www.qaa.ac.uk