



Higher Education Review (Embedded Colleges) of ONCAMPUS LSBU

February 2018

Contents

About this review	1
Key findings.....	2
Judgements	2
Good practice	2
Recommendations and Affirmations.....	2
Financial sustainability, management and governance	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.....	16
3 Judgement: The quality of the information about learning opportunities	32
4 Commentary on the enhancement of student learning opportunities	35
Glossary.....	36

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 LSBU. The review took place from 20 to 21 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 is **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 close collaboration with the university which encourages and enables students to achieve their individual academic potential (Expectation B4)
- The highly effective structure and operation of the student feedback system that ensures regular, active and inclusive student engagement (Expectation B5).

Recommendations and Affirmations

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

Financial sustainability, management and governance

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

About the provider

ONCAMPUS LSBU (the Centre) opened in 2008 and has space allocated to it in the main London South Bank University (LSBU) building.

It currently runs an Undergraduate Foundation Programme (UFP), a Master's Foundation Programme (MFP), and an International Year 1 (IY1) in Business. Student numbers at the centre are growing, currently approximately 480 for the 2017-18 academic year. The quality assurance procedures apply as per every other centre in the network.

The Centre is staffed following the standard ONCAMPUS (the Provider) 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 a Student Recruitment and Support Officer. The Centre hires mainly sessional teachers.

ONCAMPUS LSBU 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 LSBU (the Centre) offers programmes which prepare suitably qualified students for entry into the first and second years of selected undergraduate programmes, and some master's programmes, at LSBU. 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 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 thus enable 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 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 University confirms that students who progress to the University are well prepared to study at higher levels.

1.6 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

1.7 ONCAMPUS LSBU delivers the standard ONCAMPUS programmes: UFP, MFP and IY1 in Business. The academic frameworks and regulations which 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.

1.8 Operation in alignment with the Quality Assurance Manual would enable the Expectation to be met.

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

1.10 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, though they could not recollect the online training programme related to it which had been rolled-out to ONCAMPUS staff in 2017. The Academic Audit Report demonstrated an effective oversight of the Centre's alignment with the Provider-level academic framework and regulations.

1.11 Implementation by LSBU 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

1.12 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 LSBU Centre via the virtual learning Environment (VLE). The preparation of Student Transcripts of results is entirely an ONCAMPUS provider-level function, and LSBU Centre is not involved with this.

1.13 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 Moodle provides access to this record for both staff and students of LSBU Centre.

1.14 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 LSBU Centre through its meetings with staff and students of the Centre.

1.15 Although it is not a LSBU Centre 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 at LSBU Centre through the VLE.

1.16 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

1.17 Academic standards for provision at ONCAMPUS LSBU (the Centre) are set by ONCAMPUS (the Provider) 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 permits progression to appropriate higher levels of study at London South Bank University (the University). Approval is given by the ONCAMPUS Academic Board.

1.18 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.

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

1.20 The programme and module specifications for the MFP and IY1 have recently be revised by ONCAMPUS 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 the University have been involved in the drafting and discussion of new programme specifications.

1.21 The Centre is at the initial stage of developing a new specialised International Year 1 in Engineering. When the initial development proposal is approved, the Centre will be required to develop new module specifications, using standard ONCAMPUS templates, at appropriate levels with intended learning outcomes that would allow students to demonstrate threshold standards. These specifications must be approved by ONCAMPUS Academic Board.

1.22 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 level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

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

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

Findings

1.23 The learning outcomes and assessment strategy for each module are contained in the relevant programme specification. Students at ONCAMPUS LSBU have summative assessments which 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 LSBU 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 LSBU Assessment Strategy which provides a framework for the operation of assessment practices.

1.24 The design of the assessment framework and processes laid down by ONCAMPUS should enable the expectation to be met at LSBU Centre.

1.25 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 LSBU Centre with relevant staff.

1.26 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, for 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 LSBU 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.

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

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Moderate

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

1.28 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 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.

1.29 The review team found that the policies and processes for monitoring and review of the standards of provision delivered at the Centre would allow the Expectation to be met.

1.30 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; 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.

1.31 ONCAMPUS LSBU 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.

1.32 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.

1.33 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.

1.34 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.

1.35 The review team concludes that the policies and processes for monitoring and review of provision in place at ONCAMPUS LSBU are effective. Therefore 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

1.36 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.

1.37 External examiners are appointed by the Provider to cover assessment on specific programmes delivered across all centres including LSBU Centre. They will normally be drawn from higher education institutions (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.

1.38 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 LSBU Centre.

1.39 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 LSBU Centre.

1.40 Although programme approval and review is a Provider-level activity, staff at LSBU Centre indicated they had had significant involvement in the recent programme review for IY1 and MFP, and they had liaised with the partner University about proposed programme developments and changes.

1.41 In relation to external examiners, staff at the LSBU Centre confirmed their reports are available to both staff and students on the VLE. They said the reports are discussed within various fora including in subject team meetings led by the subject leader, at the September continuing professional development (CPD) meeting 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. LSBU Centre had also been visited by an external examiner who had advised on marking in chemistry and physics.

1.42 ONCAMPUS has effective and robust systems for the incorporation of external expertise in the setting and maintenance of academic standards in its programme provision. LSBU 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 associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Moderate

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

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

1.44 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.

1.45 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 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, committee minutes and documents associated with programme approval. The review team met those responsible for initiatives involving programme design and approval.

2.4 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 the University to map the new specifications against University programmes to ensure a good fit.

2.5 ONCAMPUS LSBU is at the initial stage of developing a new specialised International Year 1 in Engineering. A niche market in chemical and petroleum engineering has been identified. In London the subject is only offered at LSBU and one other university. The Centre and LSBU are in discussions about the development of the IY1 in Chemical, Process and Petroleum Engineering for presentation to Academic Board for approval according to ONCAMPUS programme approval processes.

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 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. LSBU 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 LSBU Centre, the approach would enable the Expectation to be met.

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

2.10 The review team focussed on those aspects of the recruitment, selection and admissions process that take place at local Centre level. The AMRs for 2016-17 for LSBU Centre throw light on matters related to the recruitment of students. They comment on the increased pressure from the central admissions unit to allow late admission of students to programmes, and the 'huge increase' in borderline admissions (students who did not meet the published entry requirements) which are said to make it extremely challenging to maintain existing quality and standards. LSBU staff explained the measures they had put in place to support students who were borderline applicants. The review team asked whether any analysis had been done on the success rates for students who were borderline admissions for all three programmes, and an analysis was subsequently completed for the team. This analysis showed that borderline candidates ranged from 15 per cent of the 2016-17 intake on the UFP to 29 per cent on the IY1. But in all cases the analysis showed the pass rate for borderline students for all three programmes was significantly higher than the overall pass rate (including both normal and borderline admissions). In relation to the increasing proportion of students who arrived at the Centre after the programme had commenced, the review team asked about 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 students would not be admitted later than four weeks after the commencement of a programme, and the Centre provided additional sessions to help the students catch up. They said it was demanding on staff to prepare materials to support late arrivals, and to run a rolling programme of inductions for them, but it was achievable and ensured the students were not disadvantaged. Some of the students with whom the review team met said they had been late admissions and confirmed the availability and effectiveness of support.

2.11 The review team asked about the scope and accuracy of information provided to students prior to their arrival. Nearly all students the review team met had been recruited via agents. They had received information from their agent, but also weekly emails from ONCAMPUS updating them on their application and what they needed to do. 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, and they had been emailed a copy of the Student Handbook ahead of their arrival.

2.12 The evidence the review team saw and heard confirmed that 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

2.13 The Centre's approach to learning and teaching is developed within the policy framework provided by ONCAMPUS. This framework includes the ONCAMPUS Learning, 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. ONCAMPUS has a teaching observation scheme and supports staff through training and development. It also hosts a biennial learning and teaching conference.

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

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

2.16 To test the effectiveness of the Centre's policies and procedures the review team examined policy documents, monitoring reports and action plans, learning materials, committee terms of reference and minutes, and documents related to staff development and teaching observations. The review team met staff and students to discuss learning and teaching matters.

2.17 Most of the teaching staff at the Centre are employed on a sessional basis. Potential new staff are interviewed and asked to present a lesson plan. Once appointed, a new member of staff has a formal induction and is guided by the relevant pathway leader. Staff recruitment is noted by the Centre as a challenge because of the highly competitive local labour market. Teaching observation takes place in the first month for a new teacher and the observation is graded.

2.18 The curriculum and learning materials used on programmes at the Centre are developed and distributed to all centres. Staff are supported in delivery by the work of pathway leaders who prepare schemes of work and design assessments. Pathway leaders provide support and guidance to the tutors in the Centre. The curriculum emphasises the development of independent learning.

2.19 All Centre staff participate in the ONCAMPUS teaching observation system. The scheme was recently revised to make it more developmental and staff at the Centre have participated in training to operate the new system. Peer observation across discipline areas also takes place.

2.20 Staff have access to staff development activities at the Centre, ONCAMPUS and the University. Centre staff regularly attend the biennial conference. The annual monitoring reviews note the desirability of a greater emphasis on developing staff knowledge and skills to complement training on policies and procedures. This is being addressed through the Providers new online CPD programme.

2.21 Staff and students at the Centre have full access to all University learning resources. Access has recently been enhanced by the relocation of the Centre into a main building of the University. Students who met the review team spoke positively about resources available to support their studies.

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. Special arrangements are made to allow late arrivals to catch up and integrate into the classroom. Students may arrive up to four weeks late due to a variety of circumstances. Courses are structured in the knowledge that the full class may not be present during the first four weeks. A condensed version of the induction programme is held weekly. Personal tutors ensure that late arrivals are familiarised with the learning environment including the VLE; subject tutors ensure that they understand the material the class is covering and how to catch up. Additional classes are timetabled to accommodate late arrivals. A buddy scheme operates. Students who met the review team indicated that late students were not disadvantaged by the timing of their arrival.

2.24 Classes are generally small. Students find the design of the curriculum is helpful in bringing them up to the required level in areas where their prior studies were deficient. Opportunities are provided for students to meet with alumni who have progressed to the University. Staff provide additional tutorials and lessons, in addition to material available on the VLE, to help students who encounter academic problems. Staff maintain academic tracking sheets to identify students whose performance suggests they need additional classes. Extension materials and opportunities to peer mentor and peer teach are available to high performing students. The review team considered the highly personalised approach to learning and teaching that supports individual students' needs and achievement is **good practice**.

2.25 The review team concludes that the human and physical 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. Therefore 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 LSBU (the Centre) works within the framework for supporting students developed by ONCAMPUS. The wider framework is provided by ONCAMPUS Learning, Teaching and Assessment policy. The supportive aims of the strategy are reflected in programme structure and content. Students are assigned personal tutors who have a wide range of responsibilities for monitoring and advising. 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, minutes of committees and staff groups, monitoring and review reports, surveys and tracking data, and other supporting documents. 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 that was developed by the Deputy Head of the Centre. The system of weekly contact, which runs throughout a student's programme, involves both group and individual tutorials that are intended to facilitate learning and development 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.

2.30 Additional support is provided to students who arrive late or have borderline admissions qualifications. The support may take the form of additional classes or tutorial sessions. The Centre has recorded rising numbers of such students requiring additional support in order to succeed in its AMRs. Data on performance of students whose initial qualifications are marginal demonstrate that the support provided is effective.

2.31 Attendance is monitored closely by module tutors. Academic progress is monitored carefully. 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.

2.32 Students at the Centre have access to all available support services at the University including support for special needs and well-being.

2.33 The Centre works closely with the University to support students' development and to ensure a smooth transition to higher level studies. Weekly meetings are held between the Centre head and the University's Senior International Officer (SIO). Discussions cover topics such as marketing and recruitment, admissions, academic integration, student progression, international student support, and operation matters. The SIO arranges student experience days at the University and advises students on their proposed progression routes. Where appropriate students can arrange discussions on an individual basis with University staff. The University offers merit scholarships to ONCAMPUS LSBU students who achieve high grades and levels of attendance. The review team considered that the close collaboration

with the University which encourages and enables students to achieve their individual academic potential constituted a feature of good practice.

2.34 Students that met the review team stated that the support and encouragement to students provided by staff at the Centre had exceeded their expectations. Alumni who met the review team stated that the programmes that they had studied at the Centre had provided them with knowledge and skills that prepared them well for the transition to university.

2.35 The effectiveness of the Centre's approach to enabling student development and achievement is monitored and reviewed through AMRs, Centre Audit, and at periodic programme review. Policies and processes involved in supporting students are discussed regularly at the Centre's staff meetings. Student views of their effectiveness are gathered at SSLCs and through ONCAMPUS-wide Programme Committees and surveys.

2.36 The review team concludes that Centre, working with the University, operates effectively to enable students to develop their academic, personal and professional potential. The Expectation is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

Quality Code, Chapter B5: Student Engagement

Findings

2.37 ONCAMPUS LSBU 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 ONCAMPUS meet with students during centre audit and feedback the outcome of such meetings to the Centre in audit reports.

2.38 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. ONCAMPUS LSBU are eligible to be members of the University's Students' Union.

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

2.40 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.

2.41 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 and may be interviewed by staff for selection purposes if too many apply. If there are insufficient volunteers, staff may approach a student who is performing well and attends regularly to take on the role. Representatives receive briefings and a handbook. Continuing support is provided in regular meetings with the curriculum information officer. They also receive a certificate acknowledging their work as a student representative at their award ceremony.

2.42 The SSLC meets weekly, alternating an academic and a social agenda. Dates of meetings and minutes are posted on notice boards and are available electronically. Students who review team met stated that the student representative system worked effectively. They related examples of social events that had been arranged and study issues that had been raised and changes made as a result of student inputs. They noted that fellow students increasingly discussed issues with them. In addition to SSLC meetings, student representatives meet regularly with the head and deputy head of centre.

2.43 Centre Audit reports comment favourably on student engagement at ONCAMPUS LSBU. They note that the student representative system is in place and working effectively and with details of meetings and minutes widely available. Also noted is the good response rate by students at the Centre to ONCAMPUS surveys which indicate high levels of student satisfaction.

2.44 The review team found that the Centre exhibits an open culture and a range of opportunities for student engagement that are effective in allowing the student voice to be heard. The team also concludes that the Centre responds effectively to student views and endeavours to ensure that students are aware of the contribution that they make. The review team found that the highly effective structure and operation of the student feedback system

that ensures regular, active and inclusive student engagement is **good practice**.

2.45 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

2.46 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 and are teacher-led. Students at ONCAMPUS LSBU 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 LSBU 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 LSBU Assessment Strategy.

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

2.48 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 LSBU Centre with relevant staff and with students.

2.49 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, for 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 LSBU Centre confirmed the process for the setting, marking and moderation of summative assessments in English and in academic subjects. English tests are written centrally, but English teachers in LSBU Centre can input to the process. There is also a process for standardising of English marking between centres, based on the marking of a sample of work. Summative academic subject assessments are set by the subject leader, subject staff in the individual centres are able submit comments and ideas, but they are not privy to the final examination paper before students have taken it. As soon as the assessments have been taken, subject leaders convene a meeting of other staff in the subject team across the ONCAMPUS network of centres to ensure commonality of approach to marking and moderation. Marking is conducted in-Centre, and a sample of scripts is moderated by a second marker who is also a member of the subject team in-Centre. A defined sample of scripts goes to the relevant external examiner who provides oversight of standards across all ONCAMPUS centres. Procedures are in place to make

reasonable adjustments for the assessment of students with special needs. 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, and they attend the virtual marking standardisation meeting. They are paired with a more experienced member of in-Centre staff in the subject teaching team. The recently introduced LSBU Centre Assessment Strategy is said to provide a structure for mid and end of term assessments, and ensures consistency of assessment within the Centre.

2.50 Students indicated that assessment briefs were clear and there was usually a seminar within which the broad requirements of the assessment could be discussed. This confirmed student views expressed in the student submission. These students said it was clear to them how staff conducted assessment and how to get full marks prior to them commencing an assignment. They were taught about plagiarism and why plagiarism-detection software was used to submit assignments. Staff have deadlines for the marking and return of summative course works to students. Formative assessments are returned to students with a commentary. Summative assessments are not normally returned to students but they do receive one-to-one face-to-face feedback on these assessments. English assessments having marking criteria and are marked electronically against these through plagiarism-detection software. The timeline for the giving of feedback on assessments is recorded and monitored through Shackleton, the student database, and used to prepare individual student academic progress reports. Students indicated feedback given by staff on assessments made clear how the work could be improved and, if students needed further help, one to one meetings with staff could be arranged. Students showed a clear and accurate understanding of the rules governing late submission of assessments, and procedures for dealing with failure and resists.

2.51 The evidence seen and heard by the review team confirms that LSBU 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

2.52 External examiners are appointed by the Provider to cover assessment on specific programmes delivered across all centres including LSBU 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.

2.53 External examiners' reports are largely at the generic programme level, and only occasionally make comments on individual centres. External examiner reports are made available to staff and students through the VLE and through discussion at programme committees. They are also shared and discussed at the September LSBU Centre CPD day.

2.54 ONCAMPUS has a robust system of external examining that would allow the Expectation to be met.

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

2.56 Both staff and students in the Centre confirmed the availability of external examiner reports on the VLE. External examiners operate at programme level, and their reports are largely generic making only occasional references to 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, and LSBU staff confirmed they had been visited by the science external examiner for the UFP, and received helpful comments. 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 and at the September LSBU Centre CPD day. Generally it was evident that LSBU 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.

2.57 Though external examining is largely a Provider-level activity, the review team saw and heard evidence which supported the view that LSBU 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

2.58 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 the Centre. ONCAMPUS also undertakes regular audits of its centres who receive the reports and act upon agreed action plans. 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 ONCAMPUS but involves the local centre throughout.

2.59 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.

2.60 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; and reports of annual monitoring, the review team also looked at minutes of meetings and met with staff involved in monitoring and review.

2.61 Regular staff meetings, chaired by the Head or Deputy Head of Centre, are held of academic and administrative staff, and with the University to monitor operations and programme delivery. The Centre receives data annually from the University 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 ONCAMPUS which feed into the annual monitoring process. Student views are collected regularly through SSLCs.

2.62 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 Head of Centre also acts as a peer reviewer of AMRs prepared at other centres. Annual monitoring reports 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.

2.63 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 LSBU to map the proposed new programme specifications thus ensuring that the revised programme is fit for purpose.

2.64 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.

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

2.66 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.

2.67 The ONCAMPUS procedures which are in operation at the LSBU Centre should allow the Expectation to be met.

2.68 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 LSBU 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.

2.69 Senior staff indicated that, while the attention of students is drawn to the appeals and complaints procedure, LSBU 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 notes made on Shackleton. Students who met with the review team had little awareness of the formal appeals procedure, and said they would talk to a tutor about any concerns they had. In relation to complaints, students saw this as something they would raise with the Centre Head through the student representation system.

2.70 Although there is no evidence of the appeals and complaints procedures operating in practice, ONCAMPUS has robust systems in place and mechanisms for reporting and learning from appeals and complaints should they arise. Although students showed a relative lack of familiarity with formal processes, their approach would still be likely to lead to a resolution of any appeals or complaints. Therefore Expectation is met with a low level of associated risk.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

The quality of student learning opportunities: Summary of findings

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

2.72 All nine Expectations in this area are met with low risk, except for Expectation B7 which is met but with a moderate level of associated risk. There are no recommendations in this section, but a cross reference to a recommendation for the Provider has led to the higher level of risk associated to B7. There is a good practice in Expectation B3, which recognises a theme across all of the centres in the ONCAMPUS network. A further two features of good practice in expectations B4 and B5 are identified and are specific to ONCAMPUS LSBU. There are no affirmations in this section.

2.73 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 LSBU brochure available in hardcopy and electronically, and this gives specific information about programmes in the Centre and progression routes, as well as the LSBU Merit Scholarship scheme. The ONCAMPUS LSBU Student Handbook covers the social aspects of being a student at the Centre. 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, 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 LSBU Brochure and website provide students with clear information on progression routes at the partner University. ONCAMPUS conducts an induction questionnaire survey which 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. Students with whom the review team met confirmed the information provided both directly and via agents had been accurate and had enabled them to make an informed choice.

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 LSBU 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 LSBU 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 which highlights processes that underpin continuous improvement including assessment tracking; academic counselling; the provision of student support; staff and student meetings; teaching observations; and staff development.

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 sharing this with others. Good practice is identified in Centre Audits and in AMRs. Minutes of staff meetings and staff student liaison committees 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 good practice at the Centre which were being shared across the organisation such as an under-18s student representative and the sharing of teaching with staff at another centre using Skype. Staff at the Centre have developed the personal tutor system which is shared across ONCAMPUS. Student feedback was instrumental in another initiative of developing student experience days to provide specific information about progress degrees.

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.

QAA2141e - R9893 - June 18

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

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