



St Peter's College of London

Review for Educational Oversight
by the Quality Assurance Agency
for Higher Education

September 2012

Key findings about St Peter's College of London

As a result of its Review for Educational Oversight carried out in September 2012, the QAA review team (the team) considers that there can be **confidence** in how the provider manages its stated responsibilities for the standards of the awards it offers on behalf of the Association of Business Executives, the Association of Computer Professionals and The Organisation for Tourism and Hospitality Management.

The team also considers that there can be **confidence** in how the provider manages its stated responsibilities for the quality and enhancement of the learning opportunities it offers on behalf of these awarding organisations.

The team considers that **reliance can** be placed on the accuracy and completeness of the information that the provider is responsible for publishing about itself and the programmes it delivers.

Good practice

The team has identified the following **good practice**:

- introduction of a tutorial scheme linked closely to syllabus requirements (paragraph 2.10).

Recommendations

The team has also identified a number of **recommendations** for the enhancement of the higher education provision.

The team considers that it is **advisable** for the provider to:

- review the Quality Manual and Academic Constitution to ensure that they fully reflect the revised procedures (paragraph 1.6)
- introduce action plans linked to academic standards and quality monitoring procedures (paragraph 1.9)
- critically analyse module success rates (paragraph 2.3)
- review the teaching and learning observation scheme, including training provision (paragraph 2.7)
- review the scope and content of the Public Information Policy (paragraph 3.5).

The team considers that it would be **desirable** for the provider to:

- update all policies and procedures consistently to reflect relevant external reference points (paragraph 1.5)
- improve the quality and consistency of written summary feedback to students on their assessments (paragraph 2.6)
- continue the development of the Student Zone to enhance access to resources (paragraph 2.14)
- provide additional subject-specific advice and guidance on entry requirements for individual programmes (paragraph 3.2)
- revise student surveys to include student feedback on public information (paragraph 3.6).

About this report

This report presents the findings of the [Review for Educational Oversight](#)¹ (REO) conducted by [QAA](#) at St Peter's College of London (the provider; the College). The purpose of the review is to provide public information about how the provider discharges its stated responsibilities for the management and delivery of academic standards and the quality of learning opportunities available to students. The review applies to programmes of study that the provider delivers on behalf of the Association of Business Executives, the Association of Computer Professionals and The Organisation for Tourism and Hospitality Management. The review was carried out by Mrs Sue Miller, Ms Francine Norris and Mr Millard Parkinson (reviewers), and Mrs Mandy Hobart (coordinator).

The review team conducted the review in agreement with the provider and in accordance with the [Review for Educational Oversight: Handbook](#).² Evidence in support of the review included the self-evaluation document, copies of policies and procedures, minutes of meetings, awarding organisations' agreements and meetings with staff and students.

The review team also considered the provider's use of the relevant external reference points:

- the National Qualifications Framework
- the Qualifications and Credit Framework.

Please note that if you are unfamiliar with any of the terms used in this report you can find them in the [Glossary](#).

St Peter's College of London (the College) was registered in 2005 and has grown from a very small provider with 30 students and two programmes to delivering seven programmes to 256 full-time students. Situated in the City of London in a single building, the College mission is to be an independent centre for further and higher education learning, making education and learning a stimulating and exciting experience. The College is committed to delivering education to meet the expectations and needs of its students so as to 'widen the depth of their knowledge'.

The College offers provision in tourism and hospitality management and business management, as well as higher level provision in information systems and computer science. Students are mainly recruited from outside of the EU, the majority of whom are aged over 21 years.

At the time of the review, the provider offered the following higher education programmes, listed beneath their awarding organisations, with student numbers shown in brackets:

Association of Business Executives (ABE)

- Level 5 Diploma in Business Management (0)
- Level 6 Diploma in Business Management (84)

Association of Computer Professionals (ACP)

- Level 4 Diploma in Information Analysis and Design (31)
- Level 5 Advanced Diploma in Computer Science (13)

The Organisation for Tourism and Hospitality Management (OTHM)

- Level 4 Diploma in Tourism and Hospitality Management (41)

¹ www.qaa.ac.uk/InstitutionReports/types-of-review/tier-4.

² www.qaa.ac.uk/publications/informationandguidance/pages/reo-handbook.aspx.

- Level 6 Extended Diploma in Tourism and Hospitality Management (59)
- Level 7 Diploma in Tourism and Hospitality Management (28)

The provider's stated responsibilities

All programmes offered by the College are externally assessed by their respective awarding organisations. All programme specifications are devised by the awarding organisations, and the College follows the appropriate guidance from the awarding organisations with regard to the delivery of the qualifications. The College is responsible for the recruitment of students in accordance with its Admissions Policy and complies with the UK Border Agency legislation and awarding organisations' regulations. Student attendance is monitored closely.

Recent developments

In November 2009, the College acquired additional premises in Commercial Road, London, to accommodate the growth in student numbers. The premises were inspected and approved by the London Borough of Tower Hamlets. The College provision and facilities were inspected by the Accreditation Service for International Colleges in January 2010 with regard to standards, compliance and administrative arrangements. Due to a fall in student numbers in 2011, the College left their original Vallance Road premises to operate only from the Commercial Road campus. Changes in the regulations affecting student visas for the Association of Chartered Certified Accountants programmes resulted in the College withdrawing the programmes in July 2012. The decreased demand for the Association of Business Professionals level 7 programme in Information Systems led to this programme also being withdrawn from the College in July 2012.

Students' contribution to the review

Students studying on higher education programmes at the provider were invited to present a submission to the review team. With support from the Principal and Director of Studies, the Student Committee collated and analysed information gained through questionnaires, video interviews and student focus groups. The final document was agreed by the students. The review coordinator met students during the preparatory meeting and the review visit.

Detailed findings about St Peter's College of London

1 Academic standards

How effectively does the provider fulfil its responsibilities for the management of academic standards?

1.1 The College utilises summative assessments that are externally set and marked by the awarding organisations. The awarding organisations retain direct responsibility for the management of academic standards. The College ensures that the delivery of learning follows the schemes of work provided by the awarding organisations. The Board of Directors comprising the Principal, Director of Studies and Director of Administration have overall responsibility for the delegated delivery of academic standards. The Programme Committee, which includes heads of department and is chaired by the Director of Studies, oversees the standards and quality of programmes and reports to the Board of Directors. A centre delivery agreement is provided by the OTHM, and ACP provides the College with a copy of its code of practice.

1.2 The College has clearly defined mechanisms for communicating with its awarding organisations and the Director of Studies effectively manages the centre accreditation requirements and ensures that the College meets the required academic standards. The accreditation procedure of each awarding organisation involves an annual centre approval process. However, this does not always include a visit to the College or formal review, and is usually an automatic process, though the OTHM visits every three months. The reference letter from the ABE confirms a visit to the College in July 2012 and indicates satisfaction with the academic standards and quality of the provision. No direct reports resulting from centre visits or student external assessment are received by the College, though it would be useful if these were requested. The awarding organisations are not represented on the College's committees and do not attend any academic meetings.

1.3 There is currently no direct contact between the College staff and the ABE for the registration of students. Students undertake their own registration with assistance, as required, from the College. The ABE expressed concerns over low student achievement on its awards in 2010. The College has taken measures to improve student pass rates to the required level, which continue to be monitored by the awarding organisation.

1.4 The Quality Manual produced by the College and distributed to staff clearly identifies responsibilities for academic standards at different levels within the organisational structure. Heads of department are responsible for the monitoring, management and review of academic standards, quality assurance procedures, student progression and achievement. Programme committees attended by all teaching staff meet each month, and are responsible for ensuring the maintenance and enhancement of the academic quality and standards. In addition, the quality audit process conducted by the Principal and the directors enables the College to formally monitor the maintenance of academic standards through the review of results and consideration of Programme Committee meeting minutes. However, while the recent Audit Committee meeting minutes indicate that pass rates are reviewed, there is no explicit reference to monitoring of academic standards.

How effectively are external reference points used in the management of academic standards?

1.5 The College has no role in the development of the curriculum it offers or in the setting of summative assessments. Formative assessment makes use of past paper questions and model answers which reflect the appropriate Qualifications and Credit

Framework levels. The College follows the pre-set syllabus and structure provided, as outlined in paragraph 1.1. The College does not produce programme specifications, but students confirmed that they were aware of the specifications and are able to access these from the awarding organisations' websites. Students were not aware of subject benchmark statements. When working with students, staff are encouraged to consider the *Code of practice for the assurance of academic quality and standards in higher education, Section 5: Academic appeals and student complaints on academic matters* and *Section 6: Assessment of students*, but there is no explicit reference to precepts in any College documentation. The use of subject benchmark statements by academic staff is very limited, and the team could not identify any explicit utilisation in policies, guidance, teaching materials, formative assessment, or appeals and complaints procedures. It is desirable that the College updates all policies and procedures consistently to reflect relevant external reference points.

1.6 The College has no formal procedure for monitoring its policies and key procedures to ensure that they are consistently kept updated. The College Quality Manual was updated in 2012 to incorporate some updates, but this has not been reflected in the Academic Constitution which sets out the College's key responsibilities and structures. The Quality Manual has not been mapped against external reference points and makes no reference to awarding organisations' regulations or procedures. It is advisable that the College reviews the Quality Manual and Academic Constitution to ensure that they fully reflect revised procedures and awarding organisations' requirements.

How does the provider use external moderation, verification or examining to assure academic standards?

1.7 The College fulfils its limited delegated responsibility for the managing of academic standards through teaching and formative assessments. Formative monthly assessments are developed and marked as outlined in paragraph 1.5. These are marked and internally verified by heads of department, and oral and written feedback is given to students. The monthly formative assessment tasks effectively support students in ensuring that they are prepared for their final assessments.

1.8 The College makes limited use of external moderation to assure academic standards. All summative assessment is designed and conducted by the awarding organisations. This largely takes the form of external examinations. Students are registered for these examinations on advice from tutors, following formative monthly class tests. Students sit examinations either at local external centres where the awarding organisation takes responsibility for management and invigilation or at the College, where teaching staff follow procedures in accordance with the Examinations Policy. Students who fail an examination usually have one resit opportunity. Results of examinations are sent to the College, following marking and moderation by the awarding organisation.

1.9 Summative assessments, which are marked and moderated by the awarding organisations, provide the evidence by which the appropriateness of academic standards is measured. The College has few formal guidelines for ensuring students' achievement. Reports of Quality Committee meetings and Programme Committee meetings make general comments on success rates, but there are no action plans linked to identified targets for raising success rates at either module or programme level. The annual monitoring reports include pass rate data, but only some basic analysis for each award, and no clear mechanism for recording and tracking agreed actions. It is advisable that the College introduces action plans linked to academic standards and quality monitoring procedures.

The review team has **confidence** in the provider's management of its responsibilities for the standards of the awards it offers on behalf of its awarding organisations.

2 Quality of learning opportunities

How effectively does the provider fulfil its responsibilities for managing and enhancing the quality of learning opportunities?

2.1 The College effectively manages its responsibilities for the quality of learning opportunities. The management responsibilities for quality and standards are outlined in paragraphs 1.1 and 1.4. The detailed Quality Manual is supported by a number of individual policies and procedures, which are provided to all staff and available electronically on the College intranet. The Quality Audit Committee oversees all aspects of quality auditing for programmes across the College, and ensures that discrepancies are reported and addressed.

2.2 Delivery of programmes offered by the College adheres to awarding organisations' guidance. Units of the ACP and OTHM programmes include supervised projects and assignments, which are screened internally by the College before submission to the awarding organisations for external marking. The College is responsible for the delivery of the assignments and the preparation of students for them.

2.3 Success rates on programmes have been improving, particularly for the business modules where interventions have been effective in raising results to meet the requirements of the ABE. The College achieved 'preferred provider' status with the OTHM during 2011 and maintained this with above average success rates until disappointing results in the June 2012 examinations. The team was not able to identify any evidence of detailed analysis or strategies in response to the decline in module pass rates. The team considers it advisable that the College critically analyses module success rates and implements suitable interventions to enhance learner progression.

How effectively are external reference points used in the management and enhancement of learning opportunities?

2.4 The use of external reference points to enhance learning opportunities is largely confined to those utilised by the awarding organisations, as described in paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6. Senior staff maintain regular contact with the awarding organisations, and the College complies with the awarding organisations' codes of practice and operating regulations. No formal reports linked to the awarding organisations' monitoring visits are received, though continued accreditation of the College to provide programmes indicates satisfactory compliance.

How does the provider assure itself that the quality of teaching and learning is being maintained and enhanced?

2.5 The Quality Manual, Teaching and Learning Policy, Peer Observation Guidelines, Internal Verification and Assessment Policies provide an appropriate framework for classroom delivery. Heads of department and the Quality Audit Committee ensure that staff provide students with module handbooks, schemes of work and detailed lesson plans prior to the start of each semester. Lecture notes and handouts are prepared and published through the virtual learning environment in advance of classes.

2.6 The use of regular formative assessment forms a key feature of the programme delivery, and is effective in preparing students for the external examinations. Assessment decisions are internally verified and the results are used to inform the monthly progress discussions held by the programme committees. Students confirmed that the oral feedback and annotation of their scripts provides sufficient constructive support for improvement. However, written summary on the front sheets of the formative assessments is limited, and provides no indication of the specific areas for development or how this could be achieved. To ensure the quality and content of feedback, it is desirable that the College improves the quality and consistency of written summary feedback to students on their assessments.

2.7 The College has a well-established peer observation system for assuring the quality of teaching and learning. A system of ungraded classroom observations is carried out by the heads of department and the Director of Studies. The reports summarise strengths and areas for improvement, but no individual development plan is included, and there is no evidence that staff are encouraged to formally reflect upon their own practice. Staff undertaking observations do not receive any specific training and most hold no formal teaching qualifications. While staff apply the general criteria outlined in the Peer Observation Guidelines to inform their reports, these do not reflect the level of delivery or the expected degree of independent learning of the student cohorts. The reports are discussed by the Quality Audit Committee, and common themes identified are taken forward to inform the content of the twice-yearly staff development workshops. To further assure the enhancement of teaching and learning, it is advisable that the College reviews the teaching and learning observation scheme, including training provision.

2.8 Students were enthusiastic about the classroom delivery, and particularly the inclusion of a range of classroom activities, including case studies, small group work, presentations and discussions. Students appreciate the use of up-to-date industry examples provided by staff to supplement the awarding organisations' course materials. The students confirmed their participation in regular module evaluation through anonymous questionnaires and the readiness of staff to respond to requests for additional support and help. The recently constituted Student Union provides a formal link between the College and student body through regular meetings. The College has clear mechanisms for ensuring that all staff are appropriately qualified. All new staff are interviewed by the Principal and qualifications are checked. Lecturing staff are all academically qualified to at least degree level, and their inclusion in programme teams is routinely confirmed with the awarding organisations. A small number of staff hold entry level teaching qualifications, and the College plans to include teaching qualifications as part of the desirable requirements for future lecturer appointments.

How does the provider assure itself that students are supported effectively?

2.9 The College Admissions Policy and Procedures are used effectively to recruit students. Students are provided with a range of information prior to arrival and have a brief induction to their programme. Prior qualifications are verified and profiles are submitted to the awarding organisations for confirmation before students are enrolled. Students receive a general Student Handbook, including details of relevant College policies and procedures, contacts and other useful information. The recently introduced Tutorial Support Policy makes provision for regular small group tutorials, and students have a designated tutor to provide academic support. In addition, the Student Welfare Officer meets all new students and is available to provide pastoral support and guidance.

2.10 Effective mechanisms are in place for collecting student feedback and ensuring that the student voice informs improvements. Students were complimentary about the support they receive from all areas of the College. The pre-course information and advice and

guidance during induction are considered helpful. The student submission indicates a high level of satisfaction with the classroom delivery, while also including comments on lack of individual support and limited tutor contact. In response to student concerns, the College has recently introduced the academic tutorial system outlined in paragraph 2.9. Students reported the new system is working well and appreciate the support provided. The introduction of the tutorial scheme linked closely to syllabus requirements supports the enhancement of the quality of learning opportunities and represents good practice.

2.11 The College undertakes analysis of student retention information through Programme Committee meetings. Retention issues generally relate to visa and attendance problems, and the College provides support to students who wish to apply for visa renewal. Attendance is closely monitored to comply with the UK Border Agency regulations and the College uses text and email messaging to alert students to any potential attendance violations. The Student Welfare Officer provides additional support to address underlying and contributory problems concerning, for example, finance, travel and housing.

What are the provider's arrangements for staff development to maintain and/or enhance the quality of learning opportunities?

2.12 The College Staff Development Policy indicates a clear commitment to an ongoing programme of events and activities to support staff. A series of workshops looking at expected practice and College policy content have taken place. One member of staff has recently undertaken a Preparing to Teach in the Lifelong Learning Sector programme. The identification of good practice in classroom delivery is undertaken through the observation scheme, as outlined in paragraph 2.7, and informs workshops as appropriate.

2.13 Staff are encouraged and supported to attend the training events provided by the awarding organisations, and confirmed the usefulness of these activities in supporting their teaching. Workshops are provided twice a year by the ABE and the OTHM. Monthly programme team meetings within the College look at formative assessment processes, which are informed by workshops attended. As yet, the College has no appraisal scheme, but this is being developed to further support staff development. New staff are encouraged to shadow experienced teaching staff, particularly for practical workshops.

How effectively does the provider ensure that learning resources are accessible to students and sufficient to enable them to achieve the learning outcomes?

2.14 The College has a clear Resources Policy covering the provision of facilities. Students have access to computer facilities to support their learning, and the College also provides wireless internet access for students who use their own laptops. Students are able to access a Student Zone through the College website, where lecture notes and some support materials are available. This virtual learning environment does not include reference materials or handbooks, and no student feedback facility is available electronically. Students indicated that, while they find the Student Zone useful, they would appreciate more resources being made available. It is desirable for the College to continue the development of the Student Zone to enhance access to resources and materials.

2.15 A small library is available and the book stock is regularly reviewed and supplemented in line with programme requirements. The programmes are well resourced, including materials provided by the awarding organisations. The College has responded to student requests for resources through the introduction of e-library facilities. Awarding organisations' representatives confirm that the necessary resources are in place to support the programmes. The introduction of the Student Union has provided an additional mechanism for student requests to be voiced and has resulted in the provision of common

room facilities and a vending machine, and for the development of a more active social calendar.

The review team has **confidence** that the provider is fulfilling its responsibilities for managing and enhancing the quality of the intended learning opportunities it provides for students.

3 Public information

How effectively does the provider's public information communicate to students and other stakeholders about the higher education it provides?

3.1 Responsibility for the production of public information is shared with the awarding organisations, and the College has clear mechanisms for ensuring that information is reviewed and updated. The principal vehicle for the communication of public information about the College is the website. The website is comprehensive and effective in detailing information on the programmes offered, including general entry requirements, fees and an overview of course content. Links to the external websites of the three awarding organisations are provided for accessing further information and programme resources. Students are also able to download the College prospectus, an application form and the Student Handbook, along with forms for lodging complaints and requesting refunds. Students confirmed that they find the website clear and user-friendly.

3.2 Entry requirements made available on the College website reflect awarding organisations' requirements, but offer no additional guidance on previous subject knowledge or experience. Most students are interviewed and this provides the opportunity for advice and guidance regarding the appropriate programme of study. However, this process does not always highlight the need for prior subject knowledge, for example sound knowledge of mathematical techniques for computing and business finance, or relevant industry experience. Students indicated that having a clear understanding of the level of numerical skills required would be an advantage. It is desirable that the College provides additional subject-specific advice and guidance on entry requirements for individual programmes.

3.3 There is limited responsibility delegated to the College for the publication of programme information. Full programme specifications are available on the awarding organisations' websites and the College uses these as the basis for the production of the module handbooks. The module handbooks include schemes of work, timetables identifying formative assessment points, resources and references. The College has been developing a standard format for the presentation and content of module handbooks to ensure consistency across its provision. Staff have access to an intranet, which houses programme materials and a range of management information, and which acts as a key information source for new staff.

How effective are the provider's arrangements for assuring the accuracy and completeness of information it has responsibility for publishing?

3.4 The College has developed a policy and procedures for the management of public information, which, while limited in scope, is operating effectively. The policy sets out the procedures for the production, checking and signing off of published information. In particular, there is guidance for ensuring the accuracy of marketing information, the prospectus and the website. Information for marketing materials and the prospectus is provided by designated individuals at programme level and signed off by the Principal,

the Director of Studies or Director of Administration, as appropriate. The prospectus is reviewed each semester and updated to reflect any changes to course information. There is provision for immediate updates to the prospectus and website, if required by regulatory changes. Clear processes are in operation for the regular review and management of programme-related information, prior to the commencement of each semester. Individual lecturers are responsible for updating module handbooks, schemes of work and producing lecture notes for issue three weeks in advance of taught sessions to support students' preparation. The quality and accuracy of module handbooks is overseen by the Programme Director and Director of Studies. Where appropriate, the awarding organisations assure the accuracy and appropriate use of their logos and programme information, initially at the point of accreditation and then annually through the reaccreditation process.

3.5 The Public Information Policy covers processes for assuring the accuracy of external facing information, but the team could identify little evidence of the systematic management and updating of internal documents and policies. Furthermore, the frequency and timing of reviews is predominantly externally driven, either by the awarding organisations or by changes in the regulatory environment, rather than by a need for systematic review of all public information and policies. It is advisable that the College reviews the scope and content of the Public Information Policy.

3.6 Student feedback is not directly sought through surveys or meetings to inform and ensure the accuracy and completeness of public information. Student opinions are sought informally during induction, through discussion with tutors and through the Student Union, although there are no mechanisms for recording points raised. To further assure the accuracy and completeness of public information, it is desirable that the College revises student surveys to include student feedback on public information.

The team concludes that **reliance can be placed** on the accuracy and completeness of the information that the provider is responsible for publishing about itself and the programmes it delivers.

Action plan³

St Peter's College of London action plan relating to the Review for Educational Oversight September 2012						
Good practice	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
The review team identified the following areas of good practice that are worthy of wider dissemination within the provider:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> introduction of a tutorial scheme linked closely to syllabus requirements (paragraph 2.10). 	Maintain the tutorial scheme where questions are solved and more individual attention is given to students	Monthly	Senior Administrator, Director of Studies	Results of formative and summative assessments	Board of Directors	Review by the Head of Department after each summative assessment
Advisable	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
The team considers that it is advisable for the provider to:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> review the Quality Manual and Academic Constitution to ensure that they fully reflect the revised procedures 	Review the Quality Manual and Academic Constitution to include mapping against external reference points and to awarding	October 2012	Director of Administration	Accuracy of information and consistency with the operations of the College evident in minutes of meetings (Programme Committee, General	Principal	Review by the Principal or Director of Studies/Administration every six months to produce an updated version of the Quality Manual and the Academic Constitution

³ The provider has been required to develop this action plan to follow up on good practice and address any recommendations arising from the review. QAA monitors progress against the action plan, in conjunction with the provider's awarding organisations.

(paragraph 1.6)	organisation regulations or procedures			administrative and Quality Audit Committee) and documents (module handbooks, tutorial, lesson plan, peer report, formative assessment, staff, development, academic progress, induction, staff development)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> introduce action plans linked to academic standards and quality monitoring procedures (paragraph 1.9) 	Action plans to be introduced in accordance with the decisions in the next Quality Audit meeting	December 2012 and then every semester	Director of Administration	Improved academic standards and quality monitoring	Board of Directors	Summative assessment and feedback from staff and students, action plan to monitor progress of the suggested actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> critically analyse module success rates (paragraph 2.3) 	Report for analysing success and retention rates for all modules after each examination sitting	October 2012 and after each sitting of examination, to be reviewed every semester	Head of each department	Decisions and actions for improving success rates of each module	Board of Directors	Summative assessment and retention rates to meet awarding organisation requirements, report on summative assessment, minutes of Programme Committee meetings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> review the teaching and learning observation scheme, including training provision 	Form for each observed tutor to reflect on the peer process	December 2012	Principal	Improved peer observation and performance by tutors	Board of Directors	Performance of tutors through peer observation, student feedback and summative

(paragraph 2.7)	Training for teaching qualification for existing staff External workshop to be arranged					assessment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> review the scope and content of the Public Information Policy (paragraph 3.5). 	Schedule to be made for checking all policies, procedures and information on the website including the Student Zone	October 2012	Director of Administration	All policies and public information will contain up-to-date, accurate information	Board of Directors	Student and staff feedback
Desirable	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
The team considers that it is desirable for the provider to:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> update all policies and procedures consistently to reflect relevant external reference points (paragraph 1.5) 	Check and update all policies for relevant external reference points	November 2012	Director of Administration	Accuracy of referencing so that all the policies are consistent with the external guidelines	Board of Directors	Review by Board of Directors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> improve the quality and consistency of written summary feedback to students on their assessments (paragraph 2.6) 	Discuss in Programme Committee meeting, review of formative assessment feedback through internal verification	September 2012	Director of Studies	Better feedback in formative assessment and better results in summative assessments (exams and assignment) as students are more	Board of Directors	Review of formative assessment feedback (internal verification)

				aware of ways to improve their work		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> continue the development of the Student Zone to enhance access to resources (paragraph 2.14) 	Check whether all lecture notes, module handbooks and other information are up to date, enhancement of resources managed and monitored in quality audit meeting	September 2012	Senior Administrator	<p>Accuracy of information</p> <p>Monitoring of range of resources to support student learning</p>	Board of Directors	Review by Director of Studies, student feedback on the resources
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> provide additional subject-specific advice and guidance on entry requirements for individual programmes (paragraph 3.2) 	Update entry requirements on website and prospectus, change application form to include student feedback on website from applying students	September 2012	Principal	Accuracy of information to potential students which would be known by student feedback in application form	Board of Directors	Student feedback
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> revise student surveys to include student feedback on public information (paragraph 3.6). 	Update student feedback form to include questions on clarity and sufficiency of public information	September 2012	Student Welfare Officer	Gain student feedback on website and the Student Zone	Board of Directors	Review of student feedback by the Student Welfare Officer every semester

About QAA

QAA is the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education. QAA's mission is to safeguard standards and improve the quality of UK higher education.

QAA's aims are to:

- meet students' needs and be valued by them
- safeguard standards in an increasingly diverse UK and international context
- drive improvements in UK higher education
- improve public understanding of higher education standards and quality.

QAA conducts reviews of higher education institutions and publishes reports on the findings. QAA also publishes a range of guidance documents to help safeguard standards and improve quality.

More information about the work of QAA is available at: www.qaa.ac.uk.

More detail about Review for Educational Oversight can be found at: www.qaa.ac.uk/institutionreports/types-of-review/tier-4.

Glossary

This glossary explains terms used in this report. You can find a fuller glossary at: www.qaa.ac.uk/aboutus/glossary. Formal definitions of key terms can be found in the [Review for Educational Oversight: Handbook](#)⁴

Academic Infrastructure Guidance developed and agreed by the higher education community and published by QAA, which is used by institutions to ensure that their programmes meet national expectations for academic standards and that students have access to a suitable environment for learning (academic quality). It consists of four groups of reference points: the **frameworks for higher education qualifications**, the **subject benchmark statements**, the **programme specifications** and the **Code of practice**. Work is underway (2011-12) to revise the Academic Infrastructure as the UK Quality Code for Higher Education.

academic quality A comprehensive term referring to how, and how well, institutions manage teaching and learning opportunities to help students progress and succeed.

academic standards The standards set and maintained by institutions for their programmes and expected for their awards. See also **threshold academic standard**.

awarding body A body with the authority to award academic qualifications located on the **framework for higher education qualifications**, such as diplomas or degrees.

awarding organisation An organisation with the authority to award academic qualifications located on the Qualifications and Credit Framework for England and Northern Ireland (these qualifications are at levels 1 to 8, with levels 4 and above being classed as 'higher education').

Code of practice *The Code of practice for the assurance of academic quality and standards in higher education*, published by QAA: a set of interrelated documents giving guidance for higher education institutions.

designated body An organisation that has been formally appointed to perform a particular function.

differentiated judgements In a Review for Educational Oversight, separate judgements respectively for the provision validated by separate awarding bodies.

enhancement Taking deliberate steps at institutional level to improve the quality of **learning opportunities**. It is used as a technical term in QAA's audit and review processes.

feature of good practice A positive aspect of the way a higher education institution manages quality and standards, which may be seen as exemplary to others.

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:

⁴ www.qaa.ac.uk/publications/informationandguidance/pages/reo-handbook.aspx.

The framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FHEQ) and The framework for qualifications of higher education institutions in Scotland.

highly trusted sponsor An education provider that the UK government trusts to admit migrant students from overseas, according to Tier 4 of the UK Border Agency's points-based immigration system. Higher education providers wishing to obtain this status must undergo a successful review by QAA.

learning opportunities The provision made for students' learning, including planned **programmes of study**, teaching, assessment, academic and personal support, resources (such as libraries and information systems, laboratories or studios) and staff development.

learning outcome What a learner is expected to know, understand and/or be able to demonstrate after completing a process of learning.

operational definition A formal definition of a term, which establishes exactly what QAA means when using it in reports.

programme (of study) An approved course of study which 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.

provider An institution that offers programmes of higher education, typically on behalf of a separate **awarding body or organisation**. In the context of REO, the term means an independent college.

public information Information that is freely available to the public (sometimes referred to as being 'in the public domain').

reference points Statements and other publications that establish criteria against which performance can be measured. Internal reference points may be used by providers for purposes of self-regulation; external ones are used and accepted throughout the higher education community for the checking of standards and quality.

quality See **academic quality**.

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.

threshold academic standard The minimum standard that a student should reach in order to gain a particular qualification or award, as set out in the **subject benchmark statements** and national qualifications frameworks. Threshold standards are distinct from the standards of performance that students need to achieve in order to gain any particular class of award, for example a first-class bachelor's degree. See also **academic standard**.

widening participation Increasing the involvement in higher education of people from a wider range of backgrounds.

RG 1049 12/12

The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education

Southgate House
Southgate Street
Gloucester
GL1 1UB

Tel 01452 557000
Fax 01452 557070
Email comms@qaa.ac.uk
Web www.qaa.ac.uk

© The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education 2012

ISBN 978 1 84979 724 5

All QAA's publications are available on our website www.qaa.ac.uk

Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786