



CEG UFP Ltd

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

October 2014

Annex 3: Sunderland Foundation Campus

Introduction and background

Sunderland Foundation Campus (SFoC) was founded in 2011. The Cooperation Agreement with its university partner, the University of Sunderland (the University) was signed in April 2013. SFoC is part of CEG UFP Ltd. It is located on the city campus of the University and offers the Undergraduate Foundation Programme (UFP) with four pathways: Business, Economics, Finance and Management; Computing, Engineering and Sciences; Law, Humanities and Social Sciences; and Life Sciences. There is guaranteed progression to undergraduate degrees of the University and to the FoC International Diploma Programme which provides guaranteed direct entry into the second year of selected business degrees. The Master's Foundation Programme (MFP) provides access to master's degree programmes at the University.

SFoC operates within a centrally administered framework through CEG UFP Ltd's Academic Quality Assurance Manual. The University was involved in the approval of the initial programmes in 2011. It continues to be involved in marketing. The University has no involvement in the committee structure of SFoC. Assessment boards are held centrally by CEG UFP Ltd and the University is not involved.

The self-evaluation document was produced by CEG UFP Ltd alone. There was no student submission because students had only just arrived at SFoC at the time of the review.

Key findings

Academic standards

There can be **confidence** that academic standards at the embedded college are managed appropriately and in accordance with the policies and procedures of CEG UFP Ltd.

Quality of learning opportunities

There can be **confidence** that the quality of learning opportunities at the embedded college is assured and enhanced appropriately and in accordance with the policies and procedures of CEG UFP Ltd.

Information about learning opportunities

Reliance can be placed on the information that the embedded college produces for its intended audiences about the learning opportunities it offers.

Good practice

The review team noted the following **good practice** at Sunderland FoundationCampus:

- the joint marketing initiatives between Sunderland FoundationCampus and its university partner (paragraph 31).

In addition, the following **good practice** was noted across CEG UFP Ltd:

- the quality of information and guidance made available to prospective students (paragraph 42).

Recommendations

The review team makes the following recommendations in relation to this College.

It is **advisable** for Sunderland FoundationCampus to:

- continue to secure greater awareness and detailed implementation of the Academic Quality Assurance Manual (paragraph 8).

In addition, it is **advisable** that CEG UFP Ltd:

- make structured and systematic use of student performance and progression data at provider and embedded college levels (paragraph 12)
- modify programme specifications to accurately describe the recognition of the programmes for progression purposes (paragraph 41).

It would be **desirable** for Sunderland FoundationCampus to:

- build on the progress already made to enhance further the academic interaction with its University partner (paragraphs 4)
- formalise staff induction and mentoring arrangements (paragraph 34).

In addition, it would be **desirable** for CEG UFP Ltd to:

- consider the possibility of certifying students' achievement of learning outcomes (paragraph 9).

Detailed findings

How effectively do CEG UFP Ltd and Sunderland FoundationCampus fulfil responsibilities for the management of academic standards at this college?

1 Arrangements for the management of academic standards remain broadly as they were at the time of the last review in November 2013. CEG UFP Ltd manages academic standards centrally within the quality assurance framework set out in its Academic Quality Assurance Manual 2014-15. The Academic Board has oversight and responsibility for academic standards across the whole of CEG UFP Ltd's campuses. It oversees the procedures for the approval, monitoring and review of academic programmes. The Centre Head for SFoC has responsibility, at an operational level, for the quality assurance of the programmes offered within the Centre, working in conjunction with subject leaders and the Chief Academic Officer. Each programme has a Programme Committee accountable to the Academic Board. It includes both staff and student membership drawn from SFoC.

2 The setting and maintenance of academic standards on CEG UFP Ltd's programmes is managed through the programme approval and periodic review processes detailed in its Academic Quality Assurance Manual. This includes inputs from external academic advisers, together with its procedure for annual Academic Review. At the time of the last review, it was noted that none of the CEG UFP Ltd programmes had been subject to periodic review since their initial approval, although the Academic Quality Assurance Manual indicated this should normally be undertaken at three-yearly intervals. CEG UFP Ltd has commenced periodic review of the Undergraduate Foundation Programme (UFP), with documentation now ready to go out for consideration by external advisers. It is intended that the revised programme would be implemented in 2015-16, and that a joint periodic review of the International Diploma Programme (IDP) and the Master's Foundation Programme (MFP) would then begin, to be completed in 2016.

3 The annual Academic Review methodology is based on a report completed by the Chief Academic Officer at CEG UFP Ltd. While it contains statistical information about the performance of students in other centres, there is no detailed consideration of SFoC's students. However, the review team was advised that, from the Academic Review of 2014-15, the report would contain a more detailed consideration of SFoC together with a centre action plan. Since the previous review, CEG UFP Ltd has instituted a system of Centre Academic Oversight Audits. SFoC was subject to an academic audit in September 2014. This identified a number of issues requiring attention. The report, together with the SFoC action plan responding to the recommendations, will be considered by the Business Unit Meeting which now has an enhanced academic role.

4 SFoC has a Cooperation Agreement with the University of Sunderland, under which students are guaranteed progression to a range of undergraduate and master's programmes, subject to satisfactory completion of their programme of study at SFoC. The University identified the need to have some oversight of quality and standards issues in 2011-12. Its processes were approved at the meeting of the Academic Experience Committee, following discussions with the Chief Executive of CEG UFP Ltd. The University carried out a matching exercise between SFoC programmes and its own degree programmes at the inception of the Agreement. The University produced an annual review during 2011-12. It would be **desirable** for SFoC to build on the progress already made to enhance further the academic interaction with its University partner.

How effective is the management of student assessment?

5 The Academic Quality Assurance Manual includes the CEG UFP Ltd assessment policy and procedures. Arrangements for assessment setting, marking, moderation and standardisation of marking between centres remain the same as those identified in the 2013 review. Students at SFoC undertake a range of assessments which is common across the whole of the FoundationCampus network. They are exposed to a range of assessment experiences designed to ensure they are well prepared for the transition to a University programme. Assessments are set by the relevant subject leader. Teaching members of the Subject Group have the opportunity to comment on assessments, but they do so retrospectively and do not see examination assessments prior to students sitting them. Arrangements for English language testing are linked to the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) in terms of levels and standards, with testing through an internal test recognised by the University. Students are expected to raise their standard in English language by the equivalent of 0.5 IELTS each term.

6 The Student Programme Handbook (2014-15) makes clear that students must submit assessments by the published deadline, although there is provision for students to claim extenuating circumstances. A plagiarism-detection system allows students to make electronic submission of their coursework, have it checked for authenticity, and receive

feedback on their work. For all failed assessments there is provision for one resit opportunity. Students told the review team that they understood how they were assessed in each module, and assessment criteria and submission dates were clearly communicated. Students said they received verbal and written feedback on their assessed work. This feedback was helpful in relation to improving their future performance. They were not aware of a policy relating to the time within which assessed work should be returned to them. Staff indicated this could vary depending on the nature of the assessment. The FoundationCampus Centre Academic Oversight Audit for SFoC (September 2014) identified a number of shortcomings with respect to the conduct of assessment, including inconsistencies in second marking, inconsistent use of the plagiarism-detection system to record marks and feedback on assessments. SFoC was preparing an action plan to deal with these identified shortcomings, and this would be considered at a future FoundationCampus Business Unit Meeting.

7 Assessment outcomes are subject to scrutiny by the relevant external examiner. They go forward to the FoundationCampus Examination Board for consideration and confirmation. Membership of the Examination Board includes the Head of Centre for SFoC and staff who hold positions as programme or subject leaders. While external examiners do raise a number of issues in their reports, they are broadly positive about the management and maintenance of academic standards on all CEG UFP Ltd programmes.

Where appropriate, how effectively are UK external reference points used in the management of academic standards?

8 The Academic Quality Assurance Manual has been revised so that it reflects the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (Quality Code). Senior staff at SFoC are aware of the mapping which CEG UFP Ltd is undertaking centrally of its own policies and procedures against the Quality Code. CEG UFP Ltd programmes have been aligned with relevant levels in the National Qualifications Framework, and each programme has a programme specification, which applies across all FoundationCampus centres. However, it was not clear that the Academic Quality Assurance Manual informed the academic practice of staff in a systematic manner. It is **advisable** that SFoC should continue to secure greater awareness and detailed implementation of the Academic Quality Assurance Manual.

9 During 2013-14, the UFP was externally accredited by NCFE, and the International Diploma Programme (IDP) and Master's Programme Foundation (MFP) had their external accreditation transferred to Pearson. However, from 2014-15, CEG UFP Ltd decided to withdraw from external accreditation by both NCFE and Pearson although, at the time of the review, formal notice of withdrawal had not been served. CEG UFP Ltd had used its external accreditations as evidence of its alignment with Chapter B6 of the Quality Code. CEG UFP Ltd also planned to undertake mapping of other sections of the Quality Code to its policies and procedures, but no timescale was indicated for completion of this work. It was clear that for tutorial staff, engagement with the Quality Code was mediated through the use of the Academic Quality Assurance Manual. It would be **desirable** for CEG UFP Ltd to consider the possibility of certifying students' achievement of learning outcomes.

How effectively are external examining, moderation, or verification used to assure academic standards?

10 CEG UFP Ltd has four external examiners (three for UFP and one for IDP/MFP) who moderate academic standards on its programmes, and provide external examiner reports. The Cooperation Agreement between SFoC and the University of Sunderland gives the latter the right but not the obligation to appoint an external examiner to each programme and to attend examination boards. The University does not currently exercise this right. None of the reports seen by the review team contained specific references to SFoC.

The Centre Head and other staff at SFoC, who hold Programme Leader or Subject Leader posts, meet external examiners and hear their verbal comments at the Examination Board. External examiner reports are discussed at Programme Committees and Subject Groups. These bodies assist in the preparation of the formal response by CEG UFP Ltd to each report. External examiner reports are also used in the annual Academic Review of programmes, where responses to external examiner comments form part of the action plan. The reports are also made available to both staff and students at SFoC through the virtual learning environment (VLE). Students were unaware of this facility because they had only been students of SFoC for a few weeks at the time of the review. External examiner reports are made available to the University as part of the recently introduced Annual Report.

How effectively is statistical information used to monitor and assure academic standards?

11 CEG UFP Ltd produces statistical data relating to student profiles and performance. It uses this to undertake annual Academic Review of each programme to enable student performance to be evaluated yearly in the centre and on an inter-centre basis. Centrally based staff are now undertaking desk-based studies of data sets in order to identify areas for investigation as part of the new Academic Quality Audit methodology for centres. The data sets have also underpinned an audit of borderline student performance by programme, which has led to a number of changes being made in terms of entry requirements from some countries, and in terms of student support requirements for centres to implement. Arising from this, SFoC have identified issues relating to achievement in mathematics and physics. It has responded by splitting students into smaller groups and providing additional support.

12 The 2013 review of SFoC recommended that it would be desirable for it to continue to work with its partner University to secure access to statistical information on the progression of its alumni. For 2014, SFoC liaised with the University to set up an annual review meeting between SFoC and staff from the faculties. One outcome of the first meeting was the production of an Annual Report which included a statistical analysis of the progression of SFoC alumni on their subsequent University programme of study during 2012-13. Senior staff said their monitoring of the progression data showed SFoC students are generally performing well on their University programmes. It is **advisable** that CEG UFP Ltd make structured and systematic use of student performance data at provider and embedded college levels.

How effectively are responsibilities for managing and enhancing the quality of learning opportunities fulfilled?

13 The agreement between SFoC and the University sets out their respective responsibilities for the provision of resources and student support. CEG UFP Ltd is responsible for providing the resources required for teaching and learning and supporting students. Since September 2013, SFoC has occupied both floors of the Johnson Building on the University's City Campus and the majority of its teaching takes place in this accommodation, over which it has sole control.

14 Specialist teaching facilities such as laboratories are made available through negotiation with the University. In response to the advisable recommendation in the previous review report that SFoC takes early action to rectify shortcomings in the availability of appropriate laboratory facilities to support student learning, University laboratory facilities are now secured and timetabled at the start of each academic year.

15 Students are issued with a University registration card, thereby enabling them to have full access to University learning resources, including library and IT facilities, and support services. They are also associate members of the University's Students' Union.

Students feel they are well supported and are satisfied with the level and quality of learning and support resources available to them (see paragraphs 29-33 and 45-46).

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

16 The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages is used across Foundation Campuses to benchmark their English provision. Schemes of work and assessments are aligned with the Framework in order to ensure modules are matched to the pace of learning and expectations of the English language capabilities of students.

How effectively do CEG UFP Ltd and Sunderland Foundation Campus assure themselves that the quality of teaching and learning is being maintained and enhanced?

17 CEG UFP Ltd's Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy (2014-17) is based around four key aims and is accompanied by a detailed action plan. A new central Learning and Teaching Committee reporting to the Academic Board has been set up to oversee its implementation. The committee is also responsible for oversight of CEG UFP Ltd's CPD fund (see paragraph 43). SFoC's Deputy Centre Head is the College's representative on the Learning and Teaching Committee. CEG UFP Ltd is taking a themed approach to the implementation of its strategy in 2014-15, with the first theme being assessment and feedback. Staff seemed largely unaware of this strategy and of any plans for its implementation at local level.

18 Teaching staff are subject to regular observation of teaching, normally carried out by the Centre Head or Deputy Centre Head. The minimum requirement is that teaching staff are observed at least once per academic year and, if possible, twice. Staff who receive an outstanding grade for two consecutive observations are given a 'relief year' during which they may be used as an observer. The outcomes of lesson observations are fed into staff appraisal (see paragraph 42). Where outcomes indicate that improvements are required, observations are repeated.

19 Learning walks, a non-evaluative form of peer observation, have recently been instigated by the teaching staff. Learning walks allow subject staff and English staff to observe each others' lessons, to learn from each others' approaches and to share good practice. While still at an early stage of implementation the review team formed the view that this approach has the potential to further enhance the quality of learning and teaching and would encourage SFoC to continue with and evaluate the impact of this process.

How effectively is student feedback used to assure and enhance the quality of learning opportunities?

20 Students provide feedback through standard evaluation questionnaires and exit surveys. These include an induction survey, followed by a module survey at the end of each term and an end of programme survey. Questionnaires are completed electronically. Current students who met the team were largely unaware of these feedback mechanisms due to the fact they had only been at SFoC for a few weeks but were able to confirm that if they needed to raise issues they would approach their personal tutor. The tutorial system is seen as an effective means of eliciting student feedback (see paragraph 30). Students also commented that they are able to raise issues through the student representation system (see paragraph 26).

21 SFoC operates a 'you said we did' system and actions taken as a result of student feedback are posted on a noticeboard. Student feedback is also considered as part of the

Annual Programme Monitoring process. Notwithstanding these comments, CEG UFP Ltd's recent Centre Audit of SFoC noted limited understanding or evidence of action being taken on student survey feedback.

22 CEG UFP Ltd has developed a revised student representation system including an identified person within each embedded college to lead on student engagement. At SFoC the Acting Deputy Centre Head undertakes this responsibility. Student representatives confirmed that they generally volunteer to be representatives and receive training and support through the embedded college and the University's Students' Union. A student representative handbook is provided that provides details of committee structures and summarises the role of a student representative and how to carry out the role effectively. Student representatives attend the central committees and the local SFoC staff/student consultative committee. Current student representatives were in the process of undergoing training and have not yet had the opportunity to attend committee meetings.

23 CEG UFP Ltd's recent audit noted that SFoC had limited evidence of local staff/student consultative committee meetings being undertaken. The team learned from senior staff at SFoC that this had now been addressed. The minutes of this staff/student consultative committee made available to the team show that students raise a wide range of issues and actions taken as a result of their feedback are generally recorded in subsequent minutes.

24 Overall, students were positive about the responsiveness of the SFoC to the issues they raise although at the time of the review visit current students had had limited experience of both formal survey mechanisms and committee meetings.

How effectively do CEG UFP Ltd and Sunderland FoundationCampus assure themselves that students are supported effectively?

25 Students are provided with a pack of pre-arrival information covering a range of issues such as accommodation, finance, what to bring and getting to the campus. SFoC provides an induction programme for new students which covers programme requirements, an introduction to the University and resources such as the library, orientation to the campus and the city of Sunderland, immigration matters and health care. Students had found the induction to be well presented and useful. Students receive a local SFoC Student Handbook, a FoundationCampus Programme Handbook and schemes of work. Students confirmed that the material they received was clear, accurate and helpful.

26 Students have a personal tutor who is responsible for meeting the student regularly. Personal tutors also monitor student attendance. These tutors are supported by a Personal Tutor Handbook. Staff confirmed that they are clear about what was expected of them. Students have weekly structured group tutorials and can also see staff on a one-to-one basis. Additional support for students is provided through the Student Recruitment and Support Officer (SRSO). Students regarded the personal tutoring system as very supportive and identified it as the main mechanism through which to seek help and advice on a range of issues.

27 CEG UFP Ltd's complaints policy has recently been enhanced to make it more understandable to students. Students who met the team were largely unaware of the formal complaints policy or how to make an academic appeal but again commented that they would use the personal tutorial system to access this information if they needed it.

How effectively does Sunderland FoundationCampus manage the recruitment and admission of students?

28 Student enquiries and applications, with the exception of those originating in China which are dealt with by the Beijing office, are handled centrally by CEG UFP Ltd. The central team also makes offers. Students who do not meet the standard entry requirements or have special circumstances (such as welfare requirements) are referred through SFoC to the University who in turn indicate whether an offer can be made to the applicant. The admissions process is clearly documented and well defined admissions criteria relating to local and overseas qualifications in a range of countries are specified in promotional literature.

29 The Student Recruitment and Support Officer handles pre-arrival enquiries and keeps in touch with prospective students through email. Close liaison is also maintained between SFoC and those University staff with responsibility for student admissions. Confirmation of Acceptance for Studies (CAS) numbers belong to the University and CAS letters are issued by the University.

30 Students are primarily recruited through in-country agents who receive regular updates from CEG UFP Ltd's Marketing team. The majority of students at SFoC who met the team had been recruited in this way. Others applied directly to CEG UFP Ltd. In all cases students were satisfied with the recruitment process, including the information they had received about those subjects where progression to the University requires higher grades and/or the number of available places are limited such as in the case of the MPharm programme.

31 The agreement between SFoC and the University sets out their respective responsibilities for the promotion and marketing of programmes. SFoC is responsible for the promotion and marketing of the programmes and for providing information requested by prospective students. The University is expected to promote and market programmes through its normal marketing activities from time to time. The previous review noted that the joint marketing initiatives between SFoC and the University represented good practice. These initiatives continue to be in place and have been enhanced including the identification of and working together in specific markets, joint familiarisation trips to overseas markets, the sharing of information about agents and agent conference activities. The joint marketing initiatives between Sunderland FoundationCampus and its university partner is **good practice**.

32 Staff are working with the University's Faculty of Business and Law to offer recruitment/progression meetings, guest lectures and meet and greet sessions. At the time of the review, students had yet to experience any of these activities and University staff commented that contact between academic staff at the University and the embedded college was still limited.

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

33 SFoC employs a mixture of full-time (currently four) and sessional staff (currently 12). Centre Heads are responsible for recruiting staff. Tutors may come from a variety of backgrounds, but are mainly drawn from further education environments. Sessional staff hours vary depending on student demand for programmes.

34 SFoC has a formal staff development policy which applies to all staff and provides a Staff Handbook which is accessible to all staff online. The handbook sets out current employment practices and the expectations placed on both employer and employee.

In relation to the induction process, the Staff Handbook notes that new staff will have a 'structured Induction Training Plan'. Staff from SFoC confirmed that they had undergone an induction process, but this varied in content. New staff also confirmed that in some, but not all, cases an informal mentoring system was in place through the Deputy Centre Head. The recent CEG UFP Ltd's Centre Audit of SFoC also noted the variation in quality of staff induction within the embedded college. It would be **desirable** for Sunderland FoundationCampus to formalise staff induction and mentoring arrangements.

35 Ongoing support is also provided locally to staff through regular, weekly local staff meetings. Staff commented positively on these meetings as a method of communicating key information to all staff and as an opportunity to raise issues and share practice. Subject group meetings are also held by the relevant subject leader who may be located in a different embedded college of CEG UFP Ltd. These sessions are highly valued by staff.

36 Teaching staff at SFoC are subject to regular observation of teaching, normally carried out by the Centre Head or Deputy Centre Head (see paragraph 18). The outcomes feed into a formal performance review (appraisal) which is conducted annually by the line manager. Staff at SFoC confirmed they underwent an annual review with the Deputy Centre Head; they commented that during this process development and performance objectives are set and these are reviewed on a six-monthly basis. Staff development needs are identified as part of this process.

37 There are various development opportunities for staff, including in-session training days, attendance at conferences and seminars and opportunities for staff development through subject groups. A reading week was introduced in December 2013 to allow staff across centres to meet up and to undertake staff development opportunities. The Learning and Teaching Committee has responsibility for the continuing professional development (CPD) fund to which all staff members are encouraged to apply. The first allocation of funds is to be decided at the December 2014 meeting of the committee. Staff at SFoC were aware of the CPD fund and several members of staff had applied for funding.

38 The previous review suggested that it would be desirable for SFoC to liaise with its University partner to identify staff development opportunities. It was confirmed by senior University staff that this was being followed up by SFoC, with access being provided to academic development materials and to the University's staff development programme.

How effectively do CEF UFP Ltd and Sunderland FoundationCampus ensure that learning resources are accessible to students and sufficient to enable them to achieve the learning outcomes?

39 As described in paragraphs 13-14 the majority of SFoC's teaching takes place in accommodation over which it has sole control. Specialist teaching facilities such as laboratories are made available through negotiation with the University. Students have full access to University learning resources, including library and IT facilities.

40 CEG UFP Ltd introduced a virtual learning environment (VLE) at the start of 2013-14. It has also produced student and staff training documents and has delivered training sessions to support its implementation. Locally within SFoC personal tutors and administrative staff have supported students in its use. Senior staff informed the reviewers that there had been some initial teething problems with implementation and use of the VLE but these had now been resolved. The minimum expectation in relation to content is that schemes of work are made available to students. Students commented that they are able to access learning materials, such as lecture notes, via the VLE.

How effective are Sunderland FoundationCampus' arrangements for assuring the accuracy and completeness of information it has responsibility for publishing at this college?

41 CEG UFP Ltd is responsible for producing all public information on its programmes, including prospectuses and website content. Information is produced in conjunction with, and signed off by, each of its University partners. It is also responsible for producing programme specifications, which are agreed in conjunction with each university, and programme handbooks. The current version of the programme specifications indicates that CEG UFP Ltd programmes are 'accredited by FoC University partners'. University representatives indicated that the University does not regard the statement in the programme specifications that the guarantee of a place constituted accreditation of the programme by the University. At the same time, the University indicated it would use the scheduled partner review to consider what were the appropriate arrangements for it to put in place in relation to SFoC, including a consideration of the academic level and the option of accreditation. In the light of CEG UFP Ltd's decision to withdraw from external accreditation by NCFE and Pearson, the current wording of the programme specifications in relation to programme accreditation is inaccurate and needs to be rectified. It is **advisable** for CEG UFP Ltd to modify programme specifications to accurately describe the recognition of the programmes for progression purposes.

42 There is a hard copy prospectus for SFoC and the same information is contained on the CEG UFP Ltd website which was redesigned and relaunched in 2013-14. Students also receive an induction pack which includes the Student Handbook. The latter is produced in CEG UFP Ltd's house style, but includes local information as well as generic material. Students indicated that they found the information they receive, including information from agents, prior to entry, accurate and helpful. The 2013 review identified a problem relating to information made available to students entering programmes where one University progression route required a higher than normal level of achievement. The MPharm has a limited number of places available to progressing students but students had reported that they did not have this information prior to making their decision. This information is now made available to potential students through the website and prospectus and, in the case of MPharm, by a letter sent to all potential students which clearly states the special arrangements relating to progression to this programme at the University. Students confirmed they had been clear about these additional progression requirements and limitations at the time they made their decision to join their programme. The review team consider that the quality of information and guidance made available to prospective students across CEG UFP Ltd is **good practice**.

Action plan¹

Sunderland FoundationCampus: action plan relating to Embedded College Review for Educational Oversight December 2014						
Good practice	Intended outcomes	Actions to be taken to achieve intended outcomes	Target date(s)	Action by	Reported to	Evaluation (process or evidence)
The review team identified the following areas of good practice that are worthy of wider dissemination within CEG UFP Ltd:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the quality of information and guidance made available to prospective students (paragraph 42) 	Information and guidance made available to prospective students continues to be of high quality	Monitor quality of information via standard methods, and make enhancements where deficiencies are identified	No target date - part of ongoing quality process governing information	Marketing Manager, FoC	Academic Board	Student surveys Agent surveys
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the joint marketing initiatives between Sunderland Foundation-Campus and its University partner (paragraph 31). 	Joint marketing initiatives are enhanced, and performance evaluated, and consider utilising good practice across FoC	Evidence of joint marketing initiatives formally captured and evaluated to ensure initiatives are having positive impact on student recruitment	December 2015	Centre Head Sunderland FoC	Academic Board	Report to Academic Board on an annual basis about marketing initiatives in order to share good practice across FoC

11

¹ 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 partner higher education institution.

						Student recruitment data demonstrates enhancements
Advisable	Intended outcomes	Actions to be taken to achieve intended outcomes	Target date(s)	Action by	Reported to	Evaluation (process or evidence)
The team considers that it is advisable for Sunderland Foundation-Campus to:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to modify programme specifications to accurately describe the recognition of the programmes for progression purposes (paragraph 41) 	Programme specifications accurately describe the recognition of the programmes for progression purposes	Programme specifications are modified accordingly	January 2015	Chief Academic Officer	Academic Board	<p>Modified programme specifications</p> <p>Academic Board minutes</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> make structured and systematic use of student performance and progression data at CEG UFP Ltd and embedded college levels (paragraph 12) 	Structured and systematic use is made of student performance and progression data is used throughout FoC	<p>Build looking at performance data into termly audits</p> <p>Continue to request data from university partners</p>	<p>January 2015</p> <p>May 2015</p>	<p>Chief Academic Officer</p> <p>Centre Heads, FoC Centres</p>	<p>Academic Board</p> <p>Academic Board</p>	<p>Audit reports</p> <p>Evidence of statistical data from university partners on how FoC students are progressing</p>

						Reports on these data
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> continue to ensure a greater awareness and a detailed implementation of the Academic Quality Assurance Manual at the Campus (paragraph 8). 	All staff are aware of, and can demonstrate an awareness of, the Quality Manual	Undertake further continuing professional development in this centre on the Quality Manual, and check engagement via the termly audit process	August 2015	Centre Head, Sunderland FoC, Chief Academic Officer, Deputy Chief Academic Officer	Academic Board	Audit reports demonstrate greater engagement with the Quality Manual
Desirable	Intended outcomes	Actions to be taken to achieve intended outcomes	Target date/s	Action by	Reported to	Evaluation (process or evidence)
The team considers that it would be desirable for Sunderland Foundation-Campus to:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> formalise staff induction and mentoring arrangements (paragraph 34) 	Formal staff induction and mentoring arrangements are offered to all new staff members	<p>FoC staff induction process to be followed (evidence by termly audits)</p> <p>Mentoring process to be developed and implemented</p>	<p>June 2015</p> <p>June 2015</p>	<p>Centre Head, Sunderland FoC</p> <p>Centre Head, Sunderland FoC</p>	<p>Academic Board</p> <p>Learning and Teaching Committee</p>	<p>Termly audit process will identify where staff induction process has been followed</p> <p>Centre to produce mentoring process for consideration by Learning and</p>

						Teaching Committee, and evaluated by staff members
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • build on the progress already made to enhance further the academic interaction with its University partner (paragraph 4). 	Successful engagement with the university partner maintained	<p>Undertake the regular annual monitoring process with the University.</p> <p>Undergo the periodic partner review process as instigated by the University</p>	<p>January 2015</p> <p>January 2015</p>	Centre Head, Sunderland FoC, Chief Academic Officer, Deputy Chief Academic Officer	Academic Board	Reports from University partner received at Academic Board.

QAA1150c - R4463 - Mar 15

© The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education 2015
Southgate House, Southgate Street, Gloucester GL1 1UB

Tel 01452 557000
Email enquiries@gaa.ac.uk
Web www.gaa.ac.uk

Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786