Higher Education Review (Embedded Colleges) of ONCAMPUS London

February 2018

Contents

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 London. The review took place from 22 to 23 February 2018 and was conducted by a team of two reviewers, as follows:

- Emeritus Professor Brian Anderton
- Dr Carol Vielba.

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.

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

The QAA website gives more information about QAA[2] and explains the method for Higher Education Review (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 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 features of **good practice**.

- The highly personalised approach to learning and teaching that supports individual student needs and achievement (Expectation B3).
- The high-quality support given by the Centre that facilitates student progression to a range of appropriate university programmes (Expectation B4).

Recommendations

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

By September 2018:

- Take steps to secure the continuing availability of learning resources to meet students' needs (Expectation B4).

Affirmation of action being taken

The QAA review team make no affirmations at ONCAMPUS London.

Financial sustainability, management and governance

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

About the provider

ONCAMPUS London (the Centre) was set up in 2010 as a partnership between FoundationCampus and Birkbeck College. The first students commenced in the academic year 2011-12. The Centre is based at Birkbeck's central London premises.

There is a progression agreement for undergraduate students in place with Birkbeck and Royal Holloway. In addition, there are agreements with six other parts of the University of London: Goldsmiths; Heythrop College; Institute of Education; The Courtauld Institute of Art; Queen Mary; and the Royal Veterinary College. These agreements permit the Centre and ONCAMPUS (the Provider) to promote the six institutions through their marketing materials. It also facilitates students to become aware of the opportunities at these universities. There is no guaranteed progression to these institutions - students must apply competitively through UCAS for undergraduate programmes, and directly for postgraduate programmes.

ONCAMPUS London currently runs an Undergraduate Foundation Programme (UFP), a Masters Foundation Programme (MFP), and an International Year One (IY1) in Business. In addition, it runs (on behalf of The University of London International Programmes) the University of London International Foundation Programme, and the Graduate Diploma, although these additional courses are not within the scope of this review. In 2017-18 there are approximately 135 student enrolments across the courses.

The Centre is staffed following the standard ONCAMPUS model, and is led by a Centre Head supported by a Deputy Centre Head. In addition, the administrative support of the Centre is provided by a Curriculum Information Officer and Student Recruitment and Support Officer. The Centre hires mainly sessional teachers.

ONCAMPUS London received an annual monitoring visit by QAA in 2017 that concluded that the Centre was making commendable 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 London offers programmes that prepare suitably qualified students for entry into the first and second years of undergraduate programmes, and master's programmes, at selected partner universities and more widely through UCAS. Academic standards for provision at the Centre are set and monitored by ONCAMPUS. Programmes at the Centre are delivered using ONCAMPUS programme and module specifications and make use of centrally designed schemes of work. Alignment of programmes and modules is established during ONCAMPUS-led design and approval. The delivery of programmes in line with approved specifications, and the maintenance of academic standards at the Centre, are monitored by ONCAMPUS and confirmed by external examiners.

1.2   The policies and procedures in place for the delivery of programmes at the Centre are designed to make effective use of national frameworks, guidance and benchmarks, and would allow the Expectation to be met.

1.3   The review team considered a range of documentation including programme and module specifications, schemes of work, Centre monitoring reports, policy documents and templates, and external examiners' reports. The review team also met with teachers and staff responsible for teaching and the oversight of academic standards within the Centre.

1.4   Programme and module specifications used at the Centre indicate levels in relation to the FHEQ and include learning outcomes mapped against the relevant Subject Benchmark Statement. Staff use these specifications, together with ONCAMPUS created schemes of work, to ensure that teaching is delivered at the appropriate level. Further guidance, and oversight of the level of teaching and learning, is provided by programme, pathway and the subject leaders who are responsible for producing schemes of work. Transcripts issued by ONCAMPUS indicate the levels of programmes and modules completed in relation to the FHEQ. ONCAMPUS programme specifications and schemes of work cannot be adapted locally, but teachers are able to vary the speed of delivery and to contextualise as appropriate.

1.5   External examiners comment specifically on the appropriateness of standards set for the programmes and modules that they moderate with reference to national frameworks. Reports indicate that standards set and achieved at the Centre are appropriate. External examiners' reports are available to teaching staff and discussed at staff meetings. Reports also feed into the annual programme reports prepared by the Centre. The Centre's university partners provide data that demonstrates that students who progress to them are suitably qualified to study at higher levels.

1.6   The Centre delivers a separate English course to the rest of the network. The reason for this is the requirement that all students take the International English Language Testing System test for progression purposes. Currently the course has no external examiner but is mapped onto the English programme taught at other ONCAMPUS centres. The Centre is currently seeking accreditation from the British Council and, if granted, will seek acceptance of its own course as an alternative entrance requirement from its university partners. At this point an external examiner would be appointed to comment on standards.

1.7   The Centre offers programmes that align with the FHEQ and other relevant external frameworks and guidance. The review team concludes that the Expectation is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

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

Findings

1.8   ONCAMPUS London delivers the standard ONCAMPUS programmes: UFP, MFP and IY1 in Business. The academic frameworks and regulations that govern these programmes are a provider-level responsibility. The ONCAMPUS Quality Assurance Manual is the primary focus of the framework and regulations. Individual centres are expected to deliver their programmes in alignment with the requirements of the Manual and training has been given to Centre-level staff to ensure this.

1.9   Operation in alignment with the Quality Assurance Manual would enable the Expectation to be met by London Centre.

1.10   The review team examined a range of documentation relating to the academic management of the programmes at the Centre, notably the Academic Oversight Audit reports and the annual monitoring reports (AMRs), and met with staff with responsibility for the academic management of the programmes at the Centre.

1.11   In the answers staff gave to the review team's questions, it was evident they were familiar with and followed the requirements laid out in the Quality Assurance Manual. The Academic Audit reports demonstrated an effective oversight of the Centre's alignment with the provider-level academic framework and regulations. Where any deviations from these were identified, recommendations in the report and the Centre's response to these evidenced in the action plan demonstrated academic standards were being secured within the Centre.

1.12   Implementation by the Centre of the framework and regulations laid down in the Quality Manual, coupled with oversight of this through the periodic provider-level Academic Audits ensures 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

1.13   This is an ONCAMPUS provider-level responsibility. ONCAMPUS publishes an overall Programme Handbook and Programme Specifications for each of its three programmes, which contain the definitive record of each programme. These are made available to staff and students at the Centre via the ONCAMPUS virtual learning environment (VLE). The preparation of student transcripts of results is entirely an ONCAMPUS provider-level function, and the Centre is not involved with this.

1.14   The provision of programme specifications by ONCAMPUS creates a definitive record of each programme, and facilitates the Expectation being met. The publication of these on the VLE provides access to this record for both staff and students of the Centre.

1.15   The review team tested whether the Expectation was met in practice by examination of the ONCAMPUS programme specification documentation. It confirmed the availability of this documentation at London Centre through its meetings with staff and students of the Centre.

1.16   Although it is not the Centre's responsibility, it is clear ONCAMPUS maintains definitive records of its programmes through the relevant programme specifications, and this information is made available to both staff and students through the VLE.

1.17   The Expectation is met with a low level of associated risk.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

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

Findings

1.18   Academic standards for provision at the Centre are set by ONCAMPUS during the process of formal approval of new or restructured programmes and modules. Approval of the programme or module specification requires that the proposed provision meets UK threshold standards and facilitates progression to appropriate higher levels of study at partner universities and to other higher education institutions through UCAS. Approval is given by the ONCAMPUS Academic Board.

1.19   The review team found that the policies and procedures in place for the design, development, approval and amendment of programmes at the Centre would enable the Expectation to be met.

1.20   To test the effectiveness of the Centre's procedures, the review team examined policy documents, programme specifications, templates, and manuals. The team read the reports of independent external reviewers involved in the periodic review process. The review team met those responsible for initiatives involving programme design and approval.

1.21   There are no recent examples of modification or amendment of programmes at the Centre apart from the changes wrought by periodic review.

1.22   The programme and module specifications for the MFP and IY1 have recently been revised by the Provider following the periodic review of the two programmes. Standards are considered during the approval process by an independent external reviewer. As noted in Section B1 of this report, staff from the Centre and from partner universities have been involved in the drafting and discussion of new programme specifications. Staff who met the review team noted that during the recent periodic reviews, ONCAMPUS had addressed the concerns of the Centre's partner universities by the introduction of a broader range of modules and an improved structure to the IY1 and MFP programmes.

1.23   The review team concludes that the Centre operates programme approval processes that ensure that programmes meet UK threshold standards and the requirements of ONCAMPUS. 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

1.24   The learning outcomes and assessment strategy for each module are contained in the relevant programme specification. Students at ONCAMPUS London have summative assessments that are set centrally by the relevant subject leader (or equivalent) who also writes the marking scheme. Student assessment is conducted within the framework of assessment regulations contained in the Programme Handbook. The ONCAMPUS approach to the assessment process is contained in the Quality Assurance Manual and is mapped against the Quality Code. Marking and internal moderation is carried out within the London Centre by local Centre staff. ONCAMPUS has standardisation and moderation processes for marking that ensure that assessment decisions are fair to all ONCAMPUS students across all centres. Assessment standards are moderated by external examiners appointed centrally by ONCAMPUS, and all assessment results are considered and confirmed by a central programme assessment board. There is an ONCAMPUS London Assessment Strategy, which provides a framework for the sharing of good practice.

1.25   The design of the assessment framework and processes laid down by ONCAMPUS should enable the Expectation to be met at London Centre.

1.26   The review team examined a range of documentation produced by ONCAMPUS relating to the assessment process and the maintenance of academic standards through assessment. These included the Quality Assurance Manual, the Programme Handbook, programme specifications, analysis of types of assessment by programme, examination board minutes, and external examiner reports. In addition, it discussed the operation of the assessment process at London Centre with relevant staff.

1.27   The documentation examined by the review team showed a robust set of procedures for the setting of summative assessments and their moderation by external examiners, the in-Centre marking and moderation of assessments, the standardisation of marking between Centres, for the external scrutiny of assessment outcomes by external examiners, and the proper conduct of provider-level assessment boards. Discussions with staff at London Centre confirmed the process for the setting of summative assessments by the subject leader, the subject leader's liaison with other staff in the subject team across the ONCAMPUS network of centres to ensure commonality of approach to marking and moderation, and the oversight of standards through the external examining process.

1.28   The evidence seen and heard by the review team confirms that the achievement of learning outcomes is effectively demonstrated through assessment at the Centre, and that academic standards are satisfied through the management of the assessment process. The Expectation is met with a low level of associated 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

1.29   The Centre undertakes monitoring and review of its provision using the framework of its parent organisation CEG UFP Ltd (ONCAMPUS). Relevant policies and processes are set out in the ONCAMPUS Academic Quality Assurance Manual. Centres make monthly data returns related to key performance indicators (KPIs). Centres are responsible for compiling an annual monitoring report for each programme delivered and participate in periodic programme review. More detail on the processes employed can be found in Section B8 of this report.

1.30   The review team found that the policies and processes for monitoring and review of the standards of provision delivered at the Centre are designed to meet the Expectation.

1.31   To test the effectiveness of the Centre's approach to programme monitoring and review, the review team looked at policy documents and procedures; templates; the Quality Assurance Manual; examples of student tracking data reports and documents generated during Centre audit, annual monitoring and periodic programme review; subject reviews and external examiners' reports. The review team met staff involved in monitoring and review.

1.32   ONCAMPUS London records the progression and achievement of its students and collects data from the University about the performance of its students after completion of their ONCAMPUS studies. The data collected forms part of the Centre's monthly returns to ONCAMPUS as well as underpinning aspects of centre review and feeding into AMRs.

1.33   AMRs of programmes are prepared by the Centre and draw upon several sources that provide assurance that UK threshold academic standards are met, and that delivery aligns with ONCAMPUS requirements. Sources include reports by external examiners who comment on the standards that are set and those achieved by students; subject reviews which reflect on currency and student performance; and statistics on student attendance, progression and achievement. AMRs are peer reviewed prior to presentation to ONCAMPUS Academic Board.

1.34   Staff from the Centre contribute to periodic programme review (PPR) which considers the level, standards, learning objectives, curriculum and delivery of a programme. The outcome of PPR is a revised programme specification.

1.35   The review team found that the Centre implements ONCAMPUS policies and procedures for programme monitoring and review consistently and effectively to provide assurance that UK threshold standards are met and the programmes it delivers align with ONCAMPUS requirements.

1.36   The review team concludes that the policies and processes for monitoring and review of provision in place at ONCAMPUS London are effective. The Expectation is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

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

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

Findings

1.37   Programme approval and review is a provider-level activity. There is provision within ONCAMPUS procedures for the involvement of an external reviewer in approval and review.

1.38   External examiners are appointed by the Provider to cover assessment on specific programmes delivered across all centres including London Centre. They will normally be drawn from higher education institutions with which ONCAMPUS does not have a relationship. They are involved in the approval of assessments, they moderate standards in relation to assessment outcomes, and they attend the relevant assessment board and produce annual reports. They are supported with an ONCAMPUS External Examiner Handbook.

1.39   Programme approval and review, and the external examining process are Provider-level activities, but their operation should enable the Expectation to be met on behalf of London Centre.

1.40   The review team examined documentation relating to the programme approval and review process, particularly the role of externality, and also the external examining process. It also discussed the input of external expertise and advice with relevant staff at London Centre.

1.41   Although programme approval and review is a Provider-level activity, London Centre has some involvement through being consulted by the Provider about programme development and review, and liaison with partner universities about proposed programme developments and changes.

1.42   In relation to external examiners, staff at the London Centre confirmed their reports are available to both staff and students on Moodle. They said the reports are discussed within various fora including in subject team meetings led by the subject leader, and at the programme boards. In addition, the Centre receives an analysis of key points in the external examiner reports prepared by the Deputy Chief Academic Officer, and this is used as a basis for discussion and development within the Centre.

1.43   ONCAMPUS has effective and robust systems for the incorporation of external expertise in the setting and maintenance of academic standards in its programme provision. London Centre benefits from these Provider-level systems and makes appropriate use of external inputs, particularly external examiner reports, in the management of academic standards at the Centre. The Expectation is met and the level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

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

1.45   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.

1.46   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   Programme design, development, approval and amendment are the responsibility of ONCAMPUS. The stages of approval of new programmes and new or restructured modules are set out in the ONCAMPUS Academic Quality Assurance Manual. Those proposing new programmes or modules complete a template covering the rationale for the proposal, the resources needed to deliver the new provision, and the likely benefits of the proposal. The process involves local centres, staff, university partners, and external advice. Final approval for all such development is given by the ONCAMPUS Academic Board.

2.2   The policies and procedures in place for the design, development, approval and amendment of programmes at the Centre would enable the Expectation to be met.

2.3   To test the effectiveness of the Centre's procedures, the review team examined policy documents, templates and manuals, and documents produced during periodic programme review. The review team met those responsible for initiatives involving programme design and approval.

2.4   There are no recent examples of modification or amendment of programmes or the introduction of new programmes at the Centre apart from the changes wrought by periodic review.

2.5   The Centre has recently been involved in the redesign of the MFP and the IY1 programmes following periodic review. Centre staff, acting as programme, pathway and subject leaders, were involved in the drafting of new programme specifications and their discussion at programme committee meetings. The Centre has also worked with its partner universities to map the new specifications against university programmes to ensure a good fit. The Centre facilitated the restructuring of the IY1 and the MFP and the introduction of new modules to meet the needs of its partner universities.

2.6   The review team concludes that the Centre, in conjunction with ONCAMPUS and its partner university, operates effective processes for the design, approval and amendment of programmes that enable the Expectation to be met, and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

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

Findings

2.7   Routine recruitment, selection and admission are all undertaken at Provider-level by the ONCAMPUS Central Admissions Team. London Centre is only involved in admissions decisions that relate to potential students who are borderline or who have special circumstances. These decisions are discretionary, taken by or on behalf of the Centre Head. Decisions on marginal candidates are fed back to the ONCAMPUS Central Admissions Team for communication to the applicant. Admission requirements are agreed with the university partners and kept under regular review.

2.8   In so far as decisions on recruitment, selection and admission are made in London Centre, the approach used has the potential to meet this Expectation.

2.9   The review team examined documentation relating to the student recruitment process at Provider-level and its interface with the Centre, and also pre-arrival information given to students. A pre-arrival mobile phone app is used to assist students to transition to the Centre. The review team met with members of staff at London Centre, in particular to discuss issues relating to admission of borderline applicants and late arrivals, and also discussed with students their experience of the admissions process.

2.10   The review team focused on those aspects of the recruitment, selection and admissions process that take place at local Centre level. The AMRs for 2016-17 for the Centre throw light on matters related to the recruitment of students and their subsequent performance on their programme of study. Both the UFP and IY1 reports note the perceived impact of students who were borderline admissions (did not meet the published entry requirements) on declining pass rates. In the case of London Centre, the AMR for UFP 2016-17 estimates 3 per cent of students were borderline in terms of academic achievement and 22 per cent in terms of English language competence. In the case of IY1 where nearly a third of admissions in 2016-17 were borderline, the AMR indicated a concern about the impact of borderline admissions on the quality of students on the programme. The action plan annexed to the IY1 AMR proposed holding pre-admission interviews via Skype and English writing/critical analysis testing to address the issue of student quality but, at the time of the review visit, both of these were still under consideration and had not yet been implemented. The review team requested and was provided with an analysis of the success rates for students who were borderline admissions for all three programmes. In the case of London Centre, this showed that the pass rate for borderline students on all three programmes was significantly lower than the overall pass rate (including both normal and borderline admissions) for each programme at the Centre.

2.11   A further aspect of admissions was the increasing proportion of students who arrived at the Centre after the programme had commenced, and the potential for this to cause progression problems for the students concerned as well as possibly being disruptive for students who had arrived on time. The review team was told the issue had been raised and discussed at the Provider-level Learning and Teaching Committee. Students would not be admitted later than four weeks after the commencement of a programme, and the Centre now sent pre-course work to students whose arrival was delayed and offered academic

support sessions to assist students on arrival to catch up on missed work. Some of the students whom the review team met said they had been late admissions and confirmed the availability and effectiveness of support.

2.12   The review team asked about the scope and accuracy of information provided to students prior to their arrival. Students confirmed the information provided both directly and via agents had been accurate and had enabled them to make an informed choice. Pre-arrival information and checklists were also valued by students, particularly the pre-arrival phone app. The AMR for 2016-17 for the MFP programme noted a number of students had not realised they had to take the test of the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) as a requirement for progression from the MFP, and they had chosen to transfer to university pre-sessional programmes rather than completing the MFP at the Centre.
The action plan included a requirement for better training of admissions staff and agents on the specific progression requirements of the MFP.

2.13   ONCAMPUS London is aware of the lower progression rate experienced by students who are borderline admissions on all three programmes and is considering action to address this. Nevertheless, the evidence that the review team saw and heard confirmed 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   The Centre's approach to learning and teaching is developed within the policy framework provided by the Provider. This framework includes the ONCAMPUS Teaching and Assessment Strategy 2016-20 which is overseen by the Learning and Teaching Committee that includes a representative from the Centre. Pathway leaders working across centres create schemes of work and teaching resources available to all teaching staff. The Centre has developed its own English language programme to meet the particular needs of its partner universities. ONCAMPUS has a teaching observation scheme and supports staff through training and development. It also hosts a biennial learning and teaching conference.

2.15   The Centre is responsible for recruiting teaching and local administrative staff and for the provision of appropriate learning resources.

2.16   The review team found that the Centre has appropriate policies and processes in place in relation to learning and teaching to meet the Expectation.

2.17   To test the effectiveness of the Centre's policies and procedures the review team examined policy documents, legal contracts, reports and action plans, committee terms of reference and role responsibilities; documents related to teaching observations and documents related to training and development. The team reviewed teaching materials and schedules. It also met staff and students to discuss learning and teaching matters.

2.18   Most of the teaching staff at the Centre are employed on a sessional basis. Potential new staff are interviewed and deliver a seminar. All new staff receive a formal induction. New members of academic staff are mentored by their relevant pathway or subject leader: their teaching is observed at an early stage. Levels of staff turnover and recruitment resulting from the highly competitive local labour market have been noted as a problem in Centre audit and AMRs. The Centre is currently fully staffed.

2.19   Subject-based curricula and learning materials used on the programmes at the Centre are developed and distributed to all centres within the ONCAMPUS network. Staff are supported in delivery by the work of pathway leaders who prepare schemes of work and design assessments. Pathway leaders also provide support and guidance to the tutors at the Centre. The English language courses delivered at the Centre differ from those provided at other centres as they prepare students for the IELTS test which is required by partner universities and for application through UCAS. The programmes offered emphasise the development of independent learning.

2.20   All Centre staff participate in the ONCAMPUS teaching observation scheme. The scheme was recently revised to make it more developmental. Staff at the Centre have participated in training to operate the new scheme. Staff have access to staff development offered at the Centre and ONCAMPUS. They may also be funded to attend external courses.

2.21   ONCAMPUS London is based in Birkbeck, University of London. The space available to the Centre has recently been increased, but as a result academic and administrative staff are no longer co-located. To accommodate student numbers, the Centre has also acquired use of space in the nearby University of Law on a temporary basis. Senior staff at the Centre are confident that the lease will be renewed. Students have access to the library and computers at Birkbeck. Those studying at the University of Law site have internet access but limited library access. The review team **recommends** that the Centre and its parent organisation take steps to ensure the continuing availability of learning resources to meet students' needs.

2.22   Teaching quality and the quality of learning resources are monitored by ONCAMPUS through surveys, audits and feedback from external examiners. This data is made available to the Centre and feeds into AMRs which evaluate learning and teaching. Actions to improve or enhance quality are identified.

2.23   A one-week induction is provided for all new students. The Curriculum Information Officer provides support to students arriving late or who have borderline entry qualifications.

2.24   Classes are generally small. Students who met the review team stated that their programmes provided a bridge to the culture and educational system of the UK. Students find that the curriculum helps to bring students with different levels of knowledge of a subject up to the required level for university entry. In addition to materials available on the VLE, tutors provide additional classes and tutorials if needed to support students encountering academic problems. Extension work is available to high performing students and classes may be streamed or involve different materials and assignments to cater for differing student abilities and levels of learning. The student body at the London Centre is not only diverse in background, but also comprises students aiming to progress to a broad range of institutions and degrees through the UCAS system. The review team considered the highly personalised approach to learning and teaching that supports individual students' needs and achievement to be **good practice**.

2.25   The review team concludes that learning resources in place at the Centre are used effectively to support student learning and achievement and progression to university studies. There are systematic and effective monitoring and review processes in place to ensure that the quality of provision is maintained and 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

2.26   ONCAMPUS London (the Centre) works within the framework for supporting students developed by the Provider. The wider framework is provided by the ONCAMPUS Learning, Teaching and Assessment Policy. The supportive aims of the structure are reflected in programme structure and content. Students are assigned personal tutors who have a wide range of responsibilities for monitoring and advising. In addition, the Centre has higher education advisers whose role is to assist students to apply for university entrance. Systems are in place to track student progression and alert staff to difficulties a student may be facing. Access is provided to specialist support services if required.

2.27   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.

2.28   To test the effectiveness of the Centre's approach, the review team looked at policies and procedures, legal contracts, minutes of committees and staff groups, monitoring and review reports, data related to tracking and student progression, and learning materials. The review team discussed the availability of support services and the development of skills for higher education with both staff and students.

2.29   The personal tutor system follows an ONCAMPUS-wide framework. The system of weekly contact, which runs throughout a student's programme, involves both group and individual tutorials intended to facilitate learning in a holistic way. Personal tutors are available to respond to problems raised by students and act proactively if students are seen to have difficulties or to be falling behind. Interactions with students are recorded on a database system to ensure that staff provide a consistent message to individual students and are aware of any problems that may affect performance. Student progress is discussed at regular staff meetings. Student support is evaluated in Centre audits and in annual monitoring reviews. Problems that have been identified in these reports have been addressed.

2.30   Attendance is monitored closely by module tutors. Academic progress is monitored carefully. Particular attention is paid to monitoring English language performance as all students have to obtain IELTS scores acceptable for university entrance. Additional academic support is provided for late starters and those who begin their programme with marginal qualifications. Initiatives taken include pre-course booklets with exercises for students to do before they arrive, diagnostic tests in mathematics; and smaller group sizes.

2.31   Students have access to supportive services at Birkbeck and other study sites. Some services such as counselling have been withdrawn owing to cost factors. The Centre's Recruitment and Support Officer has a welfare role and is able to draw upon specialist support from Birkbeck when required. A reasonable adjustment policy in relation to assessment is in place. The Centre also has a fitness to study policy, which includes an action plan that can be operated at any point during a student's period of study.

2.32   The Centre operates a unique pattern of progression to university studies among the network of ONCAMPUS centres. Formal progression agreements are in place with Birkbeck and Royal Holloway. Further formal progression opportunities are under

discussion. The majority of students progress to other institutions or programmes either within the network of seven London-based universities that partner in various ways with the Centre or to universities across the country. All students at undergraduate level complete a UCAS form.

2.33   The Centre has two dedicated members of staff who work with students to facilitate progression. Students have an academic interview on arrival to check that they are on the right pathway and that their aspirations are feasible. Support available to students includes weekly sessions on topics such as writing applications, researching available degrees, and notifying students of open days. Speakers are invited from partner universities. Support and advice for clearing and alternative options are also available to students who do not achieve their required grades. Students speak highly of the support available to them in making the transition to university. The high-quality support given by the Centre that facilitates student progression to a range of appropriate university programmes is **good practice**.

2.34   The curriculum focuses not only on subject and language preparation but also on learning skills such as critical thinking. A new initiative is a focus on employability, including a presentation by university careers staff. Therefore, the Expectation is met with a low level of associated risk.

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

2.35   ONCAMPUS London works within the framework for student engagement set out in the ONCAMPUS Academic Quality Assurance Manual. ONCAMPUS conducts student surveys after induction and at the end of a student's period of study across all centres. The results of these surveys are made available to the Centre and feed into annual monitoring reviews. Staff from the Provider meet with students during Centre audit and feed back the outcome of such meetings to the Centre in audit reports.

2.36   There is a system of elected student representatives who participate in cross-centre programme committees and local staff student liaison committees (SSLCs) whose minutes are discussed by Learning and Teaching Committee. ONCAMPUS also encourages students to give feedback in more informal settings such as tutor meetings.

2.37   The review team found that the policies and processes that are in place at the Centre would allow the Expectation to be met.

2.38   To test the effectiveness of the Centre's policies and procedures for student engagement, the review team looked at policies and procedures, committee minutes, monitoring reports, and surveys. The review team discussed student engagement with staff and students.

2.39   The role of a student representative, its importance and its potential, is explained at induction. Students are asked to express an interest in the role. Staff make the final nominations based on attendance, motivation and tutors' comments. Training is made available. Representatives receive briefings and a handbook. They also receive a certificate and their contribution is noted on university applications. Students at the Centre are not members of the Birkbeck Students' Union. Discussions are being held with the Union to obtain affiliation.

2.40   The SSLC meets regularly and covers both academic and social affairs. At the request of the student representatives, meetings are held twice weekly for an hour. Staff may attend and Birkbeck representatives may also attend. Students met by the team stated that the student representative system worked effectively. The review team saw examples of study issues that had been raised and changes made because of student inputs. Students commented favourably on the Centre's openness and willingness to listen and respond to student feedback. They also commented favourably on their ability to give feedback on modules to ONCAMPUS through the programme committees.

2.41   Centre audits and AMRs refer to factors which have the potential to impact student engagement. These include problems with space and poor attendance by a minority of students: these factors are discussed further in Section B4 of this report. Despite these difficulties the review team found that the College exhibits an open culture and a range of formal and informal opportunities for student engagement that are effective in allowing the student voice to be heard. The team also concludes that the College responds effectively to student views and endeavours to ensure that students are aware of the contribution that they make.

2.42   The review team concludes that the Centre promotes a range of effective opportunities for students to engage in quality assurance and enhancement.
The Expectation is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

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

Findings

2.43   Student assessment is conducted within the framework of assessment regulations laid down by the Provider and contained in the Programme Handbook. The ONCAMPUS approach to the assessment process is contained in the Quality Assurance Manual and is mapped against the Quality Code. There is no provision for the accreditation of prior learning, and students must successfully complete the entire programme of study to progress. The learning outcomes and assessment strategy for each module are contained in the relevant programme specification. Formative assessments are set within the Centre. Students at ONCAMPUS London have summative assessments which are set centrally by the relevant subject leader (or equivalent) who also writes the marking scheme. Marking and internal moderation are carried out within the London Centre by local Centre staff. ONCAMPUS has standardisation and moderation processes for marking, which ensure that assessment decisions are fair to all ONCAMPUS students across all centres. Assessment standards are moderated by external examiners appointed centrally by ONCAMPUS, and all assessment results are considered and confirmed by a central programme assessment board. There is an ONCAMPUS London Assessment Strategy which provides a framework for the sharing of good practice.

2.44   The design of the assessment framework and processes laid down by ONCAMPUS would enable the Expectation to be met at the Centre.

2.45   The review team examined a range of documentation produced by ONCAMPUS relating to the assessment process and the maintenance of academic standards through assessment. These included the Quality Assurance Manual, the Programme Handbook, programme specifications, analysis of types of assessment by programme, examination board minutes, and external examiner reports. It also discussed the operation of the assessment process at London Centre with relevant staff and with students.

2.46   The documentation examined by the review team showed a robust set of procedures for the setting of summative assessments and their moderation by external examiners, for the in-Centre marking and moderation of assessments, the standardisation of marking between Centres, the external scrutiny of assessment outcomes by external examiners, and the proper conduct of Provider-level assessment boards. Discussions with staff at the Centre confirmed the process for the setting of summative assessments by the subject leader, the subject leader's liaison with other staff in the subject team across the ONCAMPUS network of centres to ensure commonality of approach to marking and moderation, and the oversight of standards through the external examining process. Procedures are in place to make reasonable adjustments for the assessment of students with special needs and Centre staff said that, in practice, the examinations officer liaises with the relevant member of the teaching staff to agree what is a reasonable adjustment. New staff are able to draw on help and advice on the conduct of assessments from the subject leader and other staff in the subject team from across the ONCAMPUS network. They would also normally have an experienced member of Centre staff as their mentor.

2.47   Students are able to submit draft assessments and gain formative feedback on them ahead of the submission of the final summative assessments. Staff have deadlines for the marking and return of summative course-work to students. Examination based assessments are not normally returned to students. Students indicated that assessment briefs were clear and there was usually a seminar within which the broad requirements of the assessment could be discussed. Work was normally returned to students within the time-frame indicated, and the feedback was clear and helpful. It was normal for students to have a session with the relevant subject tutor to go through their marked work. Students showed a clear and accurate understanding of the rules governing late submission of assessments, and procedures for dealing with failure and re-sits.

2.48   The evidence seen and heard by the review team confirms that London Centre operates equitable, valid and reliable processes of assessment within the framework laid down by ONCAMPUS at provider-level. The Expectation is met with a low level of associated 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

2.49   External examiners are appointed by the Provider to cover assessment on specific programmes delivered across all centres including London Centre. They are normally drawn from HEIs with which ONCAMPUS does not have a relationship. They are involved in the approval of assessments, they moderate standards in relation to assessment outcomes, and they attend the relevant assessment board and produce annual reports. They are supported with an ONCAMPUS External Examiner Handbook.

2.50   External examiners' reports are largely at the generic programme level, and only occasionally make comments on individual centres. Within the Examination Board minutes, there is a record of verbal comments made by external examiners which do frequently relate to the performance of students by Centre. External examiner reports are made available to staff and students through Moodle and through discussion at programme committees.

2.51   ONCAMPUS has a robust system of external examining that should ensure the Expectation is met.

2.52   The review team accessed documentation relating to the ONCAMPUS external examining system, notably the Quality Assurance Manual, Examination Board minutes, External Examiner Handbook and external examiner reports. It also had meetings with staff in London Centre about the operation of the external examining system within the Centre, and with students about their awareness of the external examiners.

2.53   Both staff and students in the Centre confirmed the availability of external examiner reports on Moodle. External examiners operate at programme level, and their reports are largely generic making only occasional references to individual centres. Senior staff indicated the reports were circulated to all teaching staff, together with the summary of issues arising from the reports produced by the Deputy Chief Academic Officer. Teaching staff confirmed they had access to the external examiner reports and that they were discussed in a variety of fora notably the subject group meetings convened by the subject leader. The peer review of the AMR 2016-17 for the UFP felt London Centre was not sufficiently reflective about external examiner comments in the AMR report. Notwithstanding this, generally it was evident that London Centre takes appropriate account of external examiner inputs. Students were aware that external examiner reports were available on Moodle, and that they were discussed at the Programme Committees.

2.54   Though external examining is largely a Provider-level activity, the review team saw and heard evidence which supported the view that London Centre makes effective use of external examiner reports. The Expectation is met. There were no specific issues regarding this Expectation. However, because of issues found at the Provider 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 Provider (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

2.55   The Centre undertakes monitoring and review of its provision using the framework of its parent organisation ONCAMPUS. Relevant policies and processes are set out in the ONCAMPUS Academic Quality Assurance Manual. Centres make monthly data returns related to academic and business KPIs. ONCAMPUS surveys students at key points during their programmes and passes the data to each Centre. Centres are responsible for compiling an AMR for each programme delivered. This is a new process implemented for the first time this year. Periodic programme review is led by the Provider but involves the local centre throughout.

2.56   The review team found that the Centre has appropriate policies and processes in place for the monitoring and review of its programmes that are designed to maintain standards and enhance the quality of learning opportunities.

2.57   To test the effectiveness of the Centre's procedures the review team examined a range of documents including policies and templates; the Quality Assurance Manual; reports of annual monitoring, periodic programme reviews and reports of Centre audit. The team also looked at minutes of meetings and met with staff involved in monitoring and review.

2.58   Regular staff meetings, chaired by the Head or Deputy Head of Centre, are held of academic and administrative staff, and with the Centre's partners, to monitor operations and programme delivery. The Centre receives data from its university partners on retention and degree classifications of the students that progress from its courses. This data allows the Centre to check the effectiveness of its programmes in preparing students for higher levels of study. The Centre also receives student survey data and the outcomes of Centre audit from the Provider which feed into the annual monitoring process. Student views are collected regularly through SSCCs.

2.59   Centre audit undertaken by ONCAMPUS alerts the Centre to issues that have the potential to compromise quality and standards. For example, a recent audit identified issues with space, staffing, information systems, and an aspect of student support that precipitated action by both the Centre and Provider.

2.60   Annual monitoring is a shared responsibility between ONCAMPUS and the Centre. The Head of Centre prepares an AMR using a standard template, which is peer reviewed before being approved by the ONCAMPUS Quality Assurance Committee on behalf of Academic Board. The Centre Head also acts as a peer reviewer of AMRs prepared at other centres. AMRs are completed by the end of the calendar year for the past academic year. Reports draw upon a broad range of data including student performance and progression statistics, as well as staff, student and external examiner feedback. Reports identify good practice and include action plans to address weaknesses and opportunities. The reports read by the review team were comprehensive and reflective.

2.61   Staff at the Centre have been actively involved in the recent periodic reviews (PPR) of provision through their membership of Programme Committees, Quality Assurance Committee and Academic Board. The Centre has also played a key role in PPR by working with its partner universities to map the proposed new programme specifications thus

ensuring that the revised programme is fit for purpose.

2.62   The review team found that the Centre uses a range of effective mechanisms to monitor the operation and performance of its programmes. It also implements thoroughly ONCAMPUS policies for regular reporting and annual review and participates fully in periodic review.

2.63   The review team concludes that the Centre operates ONCAMPUS processes for the monitoring and review of its provision effectively. The Expectation is therefore met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

Quality Code, *Chapter B9: Academic Appeals and Student Complaints*

Findings

2.64   ONCAMPUS has procedures for academic appeals and complaints that apply to all centres. They are located in the Academic Quality Assurance Manual and made available to students through the Programme Handbook. Academic Board receives an annual report on appeals and complaints.

2.65   The ONCAMPUS procedures that are in operation at the London Centre should allow the Expectation to be met.

2.66   The review team examined the ONCAMPUS procedures for academic appeals and complaints, and had meetings with staff and students to discuss their operation at the London Centre. There was no log of appeals or complaints to review since there had not been any during the period since the last monitoring visit in 2017.

2.67   Senior staff indicated that, while the attention of students is drawn to the appeals and complaints procedure, the Centre had not received any formal appeals or complaints. Should students have any issues, these would normally be dealt with quickly and informally. The review team asked whether there was a danger that, by dealing with appeals or complaints informally, recurring patterns of student concern might not be identified. However, senior staff believed that, if there were issues that came up a number of times, they would be picked up through course leader meetings. Students told the review team they were aware of the procedures made available through the VLE, and should they wish to make a formal appeal or complaint they could download the necessary forms from the VLE. They were able to give some examples that had arisen of concerns relating to the teaching of modules. But they had preferred to raise these with the Centre staff through the student representative system.

2.68   Although there is no evidence of the appeals and complaints procedures operating in practice, ONCAMPUS has robust systems in place with which students are familiar and mechanisms for reporting and learning from appeals and complaints should they arise. The Expectation is met with a low level of risk.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

The quality of student learning opportunities: Summary of findings

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

2.70   All nine Expectations in this area are met with low risk, except for Expectation B7, which is met but with a moderate associated risk. A cross-reference to a recommendation for the Provider has led to the higher level of risk for this Expectation. There is one further recommendation situated in Expectation B4 which recognises the ongoing challenge of sourcing appropriate resources for students.

2.71   There is a good practice in Expectation B3, which recognises a theme across all of the centres in the ONCAMPUS network. A further feature of good practice in Expectation B4 identifies the support offered to learners to aid progression to a range of universities.

2.72   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 central ONCAMPUS marketing department has responsibility for issuing public information such as prospectuses and maintaining the accuracy of information on the website. Current students are provided with the ONCAMPUS Student Programme Handbook. This gives an overview of the student's programme, guidance on academic support arrangements, statement of the regulations governing key areas such as assessment, extenuating circumstances and academic misconduct, arrangements for student engagement and representation, and a statement of student entitlements and responsibilities. Responsibility for maintaining the Handbook lies with the central academic office, and the information contained is checked and overseen by the Chief and Deputy Chief Academic Officers. The Handbook is available through the ONCAMPUS VLE. Module specifications are made available to students through the programme specification. These provide students with detailed information concerning the logistics of delivering the module, module content and assessment requirements. This information and documentation is common to all ONCAMPUS centres. There is in addition an ONCAMPUS London brochure available in hardcopy and electronically, and this gives specific information about programmes in the Centre and progression routes, as well as more general information about living and studying in London. Information and advice about ONCAMPUS is also made available to potential students through agents appointed by ONCAMPUS. There is an Agent Compliance Policy, and training is given to agents.

3.2 The procedures and systems in place at Provider-level, and which operate on behalf of centres, should ensure information for students and others is fit for purpose, accessible and trustworthy.

3.3 In order to ascertain whether the Expectation is met in practice, the review team accessed both hardcopy and electronic documentation produced by ONCAMPUS for students and potential students. It also examined the ONCAMPUS public-facing website, and talked to relevant staff and to students.

3.4 ONCAMPUS produces documentation for both potential and enrolled students that is comprehensive and user-friendly. Both the ONCAMPUS London brochure and website provide students with clear information on progression options which is particularly important for London Centre as it has a more complex offer to students than other centres. The Head of Centre also told the review team he is regularly involved in briefing agents about the distinctive offer from London Centre. ONCAMPUS conducts an induction questionnaire survey that includes questions about students' experience of the admission process and the accuracy and usefulness of information with which they were provided directly and via agents. London Centre supplements this by interviewing all students on entry to the Centre which enables the Centre to monitor whether information being given to students is fit for purpose, accessible and trustworthy. In their written submission in support of the review, students indicated they had information about term dates, their programme and its rules from several sources. These included weekly meetings with their personal tutor, the information in the Programme Handbook and on the VLE. Students met by the team confirmed the

information provided both directly and via agents had been accurate and had enabled them to make an informed choice. One UFP student had thought that London Centre provided guaranteed progression for successful candidates to their particular University of choice, but this proved not to be the case. However, this appeared to be an isolated example.

3.5   Overall, the evidence seen and heard by the review team satisfied it that information, which ONCAMPUS provides for both potential and enrolled students of London Centre is fit for purpose, accessible and trustworthy. 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 concerning the procedures for signing off published material the Expectation is classed as a moderate risk. Further details can be found in the Provider (CEG UFP Ltd) report.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Moderate

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

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

3.7   The Expectation in this area is met with moderate risk. There are no areas of good practice or affirmations for the Centre in this section. There is a cross reference to a recommendation made at Provider level, which has resulted in a moderate risk level being assigned.

3.8   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 London has developed its approach to enhancement within the framework set out by ONCAMPUS, namely the ONCAMPUS UK EU Strategic Plan 2017-20 and the ONCAMPUS Enhancement Strategy 2016-17. Within this framework the Centre has developed its own Strategic Growth Plan to build locally on the strategic imperatives identified in the organisation's strategic plan. The Centre has also developed its own Enhancement Strategy. The Strategy identifies those within the Centre that form the Enhancement Team each of whom focuses on distinct stages of the student journey. It also identifies the opportunities and challenges posed by the need to balance ONCAMPUS objectives and centralised curricula against the needs of multiple university partners and the profile of individual cohorts of students.

4.2   Continuous improvement and sharing of good practice are embedded in the activities and quality assurance mechanisms in place at the Centre. Teaching observations include the identification of good practice and its sharing with others. Good practice is identified in Centre audits and in AMRs. Minutes of SSLCs demonstrate continuing attention to identifying and addressing opportunities for enhancement as well as sharing ideas about improving practice.

4.3   The review team saw examples of recent enhancement activity including staff development, innovative approaches to teaching, learning and assessment and student support. Many examples of enhancement happened when staff at the Centre responded to issues and opportunities raised by students.

4.4   The review team saw examples of good practice at the Centre that were being shared across the organisation, such as sharing of teaching and induction materials with another centre in the ONCAMPUS network.

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.