QAA

Higher Education Review (Alternative Providers) of Tottenham Hotspur Foundation

November 2017

Contents

About this review

This is a report of a Higher Education Review (Alternative Providers) conducted by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) at Tottenham Hotspur Foundation. The review took place from 28 to 29 November 2017 and was conducted by a team of two reviewers, as follows:

- Mr Robert Evans
- Dr Jenny Gilbert.

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 (Alternative Providers) 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.

The QAA website gives more information about QAA[2] and explains the method for Higher Education Review (Alternative Providers).[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 (Alternative Providers):
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 on behalf of its degree-awarding body **meets** UK expectations.
- The quality of student learning opportunities **meets** UK expectations.
- The quality of the information about learning opportunities **meets** UK expectations.
- The enhancement of student learning opportunities **requires improvement to meet** UK expectations.

Good practice

The QAA review team identified the following features of **good practice**.

- The high level of personalised support for students combined with the use of the facilities and expertise of the football club provides inspiration and makes a significantly positive contribution to their personal, academic and professional development (Expectations B3, B4).

Recommendations

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

By May 2018:

- develop an agreed and planned procedure for the management of the closure of programmes to protect the interest of students and safeguard the quality of their learning experience (Expectation B8)
- ensure that the student complaint guidance document aligns with the Memorandum of Cooperation between the University and the Foundation and is applied consistently (Expectation B9).

By June 2018:

- document the processes for the production of module reports and the annual monitoring report to include the responsibilities and reporting lines, and ensure that discussion of reports is recorded *(*Expectation B8, Enhancement).

By September 2018:

- review the academic governance structure and procedures to ensure clarity of responsibilities for, and appropriate consideration of, standards and quality at all levels within the Foundation (Expectations A2.1, B8, Enhancement)
- implement a formal process for the design, development and approval of new programmes and variation of existing programmes (Expectations B1, B8)
- develop a strategic approach to the enhancement of student learning opportunities which is embedded at all levels (Expectation B8, Enhancement).

About the provider

Tottenham Hotspur Foundation (the Foundation) is based in North London and has been a registered charity since 2006. The Foundation is the associated charity of Tottenham Hotspur Football Club and is currently based near White Hart Lane stadium. The Foundation has five departments: Education; Health and Wellbeing; Equality and Inclusion; Community Development; and Employment and Skills. Its mission statement is: *Tottenham Hotspur Foundation is committed to providing the best sport, health, training and education programmes for all our communities; creating opportunities, encouraging enterprise and innovation, promoting social cohesion and enhancing life skills.* Higher education was introduced into the education department of the Foundation, building on its further education provision, in 2010.

The Foundation currently delivers two foundation degrees in Applied Sport and Community Development, and Applied Football Coaching and Performance, and these programmes have been validated by Middlesex University (the University) since 2012, although the relationship with the university dates back to 2010 when the programmes were a joint collaboration. At the time of the review visit there were 79 full-time students across both programmes and seven academic staff, including three full-time, delivering the provision. Provision is temporarily delivered from one site shared with Tottenham Hotspur Football Club administration, but students also use the club's training facilities as part of both programmes.

The last QAA review in 2013 was for Specific Course Designation, and in response to the recommendations from that review the Foundation revised its committee structure, leading to the creation of an Annual General Meeting. Library facilities have also been reviewed and updated and students now have access to free photocopying and printing. As part of the QAA annual monitoring process, the Foundation has undergone one annual monitoring visit in 2015 which resulted in a commendable outcome, meaning that the Foundation did not require a visit in 2016.

Explanation of findings

This section explains the review findings in greater detail.

1 Judgement: The maintenance of the academic standards of awards offered 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 Tottenham Hotspur Foundation (the Foundation) currently offers two Foundation Degrees: the Foundation Degree in Science - Applied Football Coaching and Performance, and the Foundation Degree in Arts - Applied Sport and Community Development, both of which are delivered through arrangements with Middlesex University.

1.2 Collaborative arrangements with the University have been in operation since 2010, and from 2012 have taken the form of validated programmes. This means that the programmes are developed, delivered and assessed by the Foundation but the award is made and quality assured by the University. As a result, the latter, as an awarding body, has responsibility for the setting of threshold standards, thereby ensuring that each qualification offered by the Foundation is at the appropriate level in relation to *The Framework for Higher Education Qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland* (FHEQ). The University also ensures that awards are named appropriately and with learning outcomes aligned with relevant qualification descriptors. The programmes are also referenced to the relevant Subject Benchmark Statements.

1.3   Under the Partnership Agreement and Memorandum of Cooperation, the Foundation is responsible for the academic delivery and assessment of the programmes. This includes responsibility for student recruitment and support, and ensuring that programmes are adequately resourced.

1.4   The arrangements in place and the Foundation's meeting of requirements by its awarding body would allow the Expectation to be met.

1.5   In considering this Expectation the review team examined the contractual agreements comprising the Partnership Agreement and Memorandum of Cooperation, along with relevant elements of the quality assurance documentation of the University including the Programme Validation, Review and Modification process, Terms of Reference of the Academic Board and the Regulations for Undergraduate Taught Programmes. The team also met with senior and academic staff.

1.6   Foundation staff consistently asserted that academic standards are set and managed by strict compliance and reliance upon the University's quality procedures. Feedback from the University on the Foundation's annual monitoring report confirms that the modules, programmes and boards were conducted in accordance with the University's requirements and that no significant issues arose during the relevant year.

1.7   Foundation staff have a clear understanding of the systems its awarding body has in place to secure threshold standards, and of how the FHEQ is interpreted and applied in the modules and awards offered on behalf of the awarding body. The review team concludes that the Expectation is met and that the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

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

Findings

1.8   The University's academic frameworks and academic regulations govern the academic standards of its awards. The Foundation asserts that both of the higher education programmes are subject to the academic governance arrangements of the University for the delivery and assessment of the programmes, and for quality assurance.

1.9   Programme Handbooks make appropriate reference to the University's regulations. These handbooks are located on the Foundation's virtual learning environment and are easily accessible by students.

1.10   The Foundation's Head of Higher Education maintains personal oversight of the Foundation's management and implementation of the University's academic frameworks and regulations through a range of meetings and processes including Board of Studies and programme Annual General Meetings, the annual monitoring process including University feedback, and Assessment Board processes.

1.11   Through its feedback on the annual monitoring process the University expresses satisfaction that the programmes are being delivered appropriately and assessed in accordance with its requirements.

1.12   The awarding body's academic frameworks and regulations, combined with the policies and procedures of the Foundation, together with its oversight arrangements, would allow the Expectation to be met.

1.13   The review team tested this Expectation by examining quality policies and procedures of the University, and minutes of relevant meetings including subject and award boards. In addition, the team met with senior and academic staff and students.

1.14   There is no internal quality manual or similar document produced by the Foundation setting out relevant quality assurance processes. Furthermore, the review team noted that within the management and reporting structures of the Foundation there is limited evidence of consideration of academic strategy at Trustees Meetings, and despite the comprehensive terms of reference of the Annual General Meeting (formerly the Higher Education Committee), the evidence revealed by the meeting records does not reflect the level of scrutiny and consideration of issues anticipated. The review team was also unable to evidence detailed analysis of academic quality and standards arising from student outcomes, student feedback and annual monitoring, although Foundation staff confirmed that discussion around these areas did take place in team meetings. In addition, there is no evidence of formal programme group meetings to discuss date-to-day issues among the teaching staff, which would ensure that regular follow-up actions are systematically resolved and reported.

1.15   The review team therefore **recommends** that the Foundation reviews the academic governance structure and procedures to ensure clarity of responsibilities for, and appropriate consideration of, standards and quality at all levels within the Foundation.

1.16   The Foundation has procedures in place which would enable it to carry out its responsibilities around academic frameworks delegated to it by its awarding body. However, these structures are not utilised robustly, which has led to a recommendation. Nevertheless, the Foundation's staff are aware of their responsibilities to ensure that the University's academic frameworks and regulations are fully implemented. The review team therefore concludes that the Expectation is met and that the associated level of risk is moderate, as there are weaknesses in the operation of part of the Foundation's governance structures.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Moderate

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

1.17   Responsibility for the approval of the relevant qualifications and awards rests with the University. As part of this process the Programme Specifications are regarded as being the definitive record of the programme, and are stated to be approved by the University through its validation and external examiner review processes.

1.18   Programme Specifications are published to students in the relevant Programme Handbooks and include information on programme structure, details of teaching, learning and assessment, and elements of student support.

1.19   The Foundation's adherence to its awarding body's arrangements for the maintenance of definitive documents would allow the Expectation to be met.

1.20   To test the Expectation, the review team examined Programme Handbooks, and met with staff and students of the Foundation.

1.21   With the inclusion of the Programme Specifications, the handbooks clearly communicate the educational aims, intended learning outcomes, modes of assessment and the academic level of each programme. Foundation staff confirmed that these are also reviewed regularly, and any amendments made where required.

1.22   Programme specifications function as the definitive record for each programme delivered by the Foundation, and constitute the reference point for the assessment, delivery and review of its provision. The review team confirmed that these processes operate effectively.

1.23   The Foundation fulfils its obligation to the University in respect of student achievement data by completion of a University spreadsheet at the time of Assessment Boards. This is then taken as the basis for student transcripts and certificates.

1.24   Programme information provided is accurate and comprehensive, and readily available to Foundation students and staff. Definitive programme documentation is used effectively in line with the awarding body's requirements. The review team concludes that the Expectation is met and that the associated level of risk is low.

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

1.25   Formal responsibility for the design and approval of programmes at the Foundation rests with the University. The University ensures that academic standards are set in accordance with its academic frameworks and regulations and at a level that meets UK threshold standards. As the programmes delivered at the Foundation are validated, the Foundation is responsible for programme development, delivery and assessment.

1.26   All programmes are referenced to the Subject Benchmark Statements for Hospitality, Leisure, Sport and Tourism, and they are aligned to the FHEQ and other external benchmarks such as the Foundation Degree Qualification Benchmark. External examiners are appointed by the University and it is a requirement that external examiners confirm that the award is aligned with the FHEQ and applicable Subject Benchmark Statements.

1.27   The robust monitoring and the oversight by the University of the external examining system would allow the Expectation to be met.

1.28   The Foundation's self-evaluation document and the Programme and Module Approval Document state that there are three stages of internal approval for a programme, comprising stage one: business approval, stage two: chief executive approval, and stage three: Board of Trustee approval. These three stages appear to address the approval of the business case for a new programme. There have been no recent approvals of new programmes but some academic staff were able to describe this process. The review team was shown evidence that the Board of Trustees recently received a report on higher education provision but there was no evidence available to confirm that the Board of Trustees discusses and approves new business proposals.

1.29   Senior staff confirmed that there is no internal process for academic approval of programmes and that the most recent programme approval was initiated by internal, informal discussions, with outcomes forwarded to the Board of Trustees. This led to the completion of the University's approval documentation. The responsibilities checklist indicates that the University is responsible for programme development and approval.

1.30   Programmes delivered by the Foundation are properly aligned to the FHEQ, are appropriately mapped against the relevant Subject Benchmark Statements, and academic standards are set and maintained by the University at a level that meets the UK threshold standard for the qualification. The review team concludes that the Expectation is met and that 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

1.31   The Memorandum of Cooperation between the Foundation and the University specifies the responsibilities for the degrees delivered by the Foundation, including the responsibilities related to assessment. While the Foundation is responsible for assessment, it has adopted the University's assessment regulations in full. The module specifications designed at approval outline the learning outcomes that the assessment must achieve.

1.32   The Foundation sets and marks assessment, and moderates or second marks it. External examiners approve coursework and examinations and their associated marking schemes before distribution.

1.33   The adoption of the University's assessment regulations and the monitoring of the processes by the University Link Tutor and the external examiner would allow the Expectation to be met.

1.34   The review team considered the University's regulations and the Foundation's assessment guidance notes, and studied minutes of Assessment Boards and the external examiner's report in order to test the Expectation. The team also verified the assessment process through discussion with staff.

1.35   The process for assessment and its moderation is captured in the Foundation Document for Setting and Running Assessment. Terms of reference for the Student Progression and Assessment Boards are included in the Committee Structure Guidance Handbook. The University Link Tutor chairs the Assessment Board. Senior staff at the Foundation confirmed that the external examiner confirms marks at the Subject Assessment Board and is present at the Progression Board to oversee conformance with regulations.

1.36   All assessment decisions are internally moderated and verified by an external examiner reporting to the University. Reports from the external examiner, and the University's response to the annual monitoring report, confirm that appropriate standards are met.

1.37   The Foundation, in working with its awarding body, has a range of appropriate processes in place for the effective assessment of learning outcomes, the monitoring of standards, and the associated award of credits and qualifications. The review team concludes that the Expectation is met and that the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (A3.3): Degree-awarding bodies ensure that processes for the monitoring and review of programmes are implemented which explicitly address whether the UK threshold academic standards are achieved and whether the academic standards required by the individual degree-awarding body are being maintained.

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

Findings

1.38   Since 2012, the two programmes offered by the Foundation have been approved under the University's validated provision. Responsibility for monitoring and review of the foundation degree programmes lies with the University, and the Foundation undertakes annual monitoring of programmes as required by the University. A six-yearly Periodic Review of Taught Programmes is undertaken by the University and is next due in March 2018.

1.39   Details of all the University's policies and processes for collaborating with partners are recorded in the University Handbook. The requirement for the completion of the annual monitoring report by the Foundation Link Tutor is also recorded in the handbook. The annual monitoring report for the two programmes is completed on the University template. The University guidance requires that annual monitoring reports should be considered at the Foundation's Board of Studies, or equivalent, with comments and actions included in the minutes. The Foundation's remit for the Board of Studies confirms this responsibility.

1.40   Compliance with the University's policies and processes for collaborating partners ensures that UK threshold academic standards are achieved and academic standards are maintained, and this compliance would allow the Expectation to be met.

1.41   The review team tested this Expectation by studying the self-evaluation document, the University's Learning and Quality Enhancement Handbook, the Foundation's annual monitoring reports and the minutes of the Board of Studies. The review team also explored, in meetings, the Foundation staff's understanding of the processes.

1.42   The self-evaluation document states that annual programme monitoring is part of the Foundation's quality framework in order to monitor the students' learning opportunities, student performance and the continuing currency and relevance of the programme. However, there was no documentation of the Foundation's approach to monitoring and review and staff were unable to describe it. A single report is submitted to the University in mid-October each year.

1.43   The remit of the Board of Studies includes a requirement to discuss the annual monitoring report and its action plan. In the three sets of Board of Studies minutes provided to the team, there was no discussion of the annual monitoring report or the associated action plan. In the minutes of one meeting, it was noted that the annual monitoring report was received and deposited on the VLE and in another meeting there was a record that the annual monitoring report is produced in order to gain student finance. On receipt of the external examiner's report the University Link Tutor provides a response to the annual monitoring report, which is forwarded to the Foundation. This response focuses primarily on the external examiner's comments and confirms that standards are maintained.

1.44   The Foundation complies with the University's annual monitoring processes, allowing for UK standards to be achieved and academic standards to be maintained.

The review team concludes that the Expectation is met and that 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

1.45   Overall responsibility for the quality and standards of provision within the Foundation is as described in Expectations A1, A2, and A3. Responsibilities are clearly outlined in the Memorandum of Cooperation between the Foundation and the University. The University's Learning and Quality Enhancement Handbook, available online, specifies all the processes. The Foundation relies on the University's mechanisms for setting and maintaining academic standards at the approval of programme stage. There is a requirement for one or two external assessors to be on the University's approval panel of partner programmes.

1.46   External examiners are appointed by the University to oversee assessment on the two foundation degrees delivered by the Foundation. There is a set of criteria that must be complied with for the appointment of external examiners.

1.47   Compliance with the University procedures ensures that external and independent expertise is used, which would allow the Expectation to be met.

1.48   The review team considered the approach to externality by reviewing documentation produced by the Foundation and through consideration of reports from the external examiner. In addition, the team discussed the approach to externality with a range of Foundation staff and students.

1.49   The Foundation has no internal process for academic approval of programmes and an incomplete business approval process. Staff were, however, able to describe the process by which they were advised by the University to find the necessary external examiner and assessors by joining and consulting a JISC list.

1.50   As well as approving draft assessments and scrutinising the internal marking and moderation process, the external examiner previews and reports on module handbooks for the forthcoming year. Not only does the external examiner ensure that standards are maintained, but he also comments on aspects of quality, critiquing the information provided on the VLE and the introduction of new processes to articulate double marking.

1.51   Given its connection with Tottenham Hotspur Football Club, the Foundation is also able to call upon the first team sports scientists to assist in the delivery of the Football Fitness and Nutrition module. This provides access to external expertise in the delivery of parts of the programme for the benefit of students. In addition, the Foundation makes use of its links with the University, and networking opportunities using placements to provide external reference points, ensuring that students are well prepared for employment and their professional development.

1.52   Use of internal, independent expertise by the Foundation ensures that UK threshold standards as well as the standards expected by its awarding body are met. The review team

concludes that the Expectation is met and that the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

1.53   In reaching its judgement about the maintenance of the academic standards of awards, the review team matched its findings against the criteria specified in Annex 2 of the published handbook.

1.54   All but one of the applicable Expectations in this area have been met and the risk is judged low in each case but one, where the risk was found to be moderate. There are no features of good practice and one recommendation identified in this area.

1.55   There is a governance framework in place at the Foundation and the terms of reference for its various committees are clear. However, the review team found that there was a lack of consistency in the effectiveness of this structure and detail in its consideration and analysis of programme reporting, and information was not comprehensive. Therefore, a recommendation about reviewing this structure has been included.

1.56   The review team concludes that the maintenance of the academic standards of awards offered on behalf of degree-awarding bodies and other awarding organisations at the provider **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   The two higher education programmes offered by the Foundation are delivered through 'validated programme' arrangements with the University. This means that the programmes are developed, delivered and assessed by the Foundation but the award is authorised and quality assured by the University. As a result, the latter has responsibility for the setting of threshold standards, with learning outcomes aligned with relevant qualification descriptors. The programmes are also referenced to the relevant Subject Benchmark Statements.

2.2   The Foundation is responsible for the design, delivery and assessment of the programmes. The latter includes ensuring that procedures are in place to set assessments at an appropriate level, thereby enabling students to demonstrate achievement of the specified outcomes. This includes responsibility for student recruitment and support, and ensuring that programmes are adequately resourced.

2.3   The Foundation's internal process for approval is stated to comprise three stages: Business Approval, Chief Executive Approval, and Full Trustee Approval. This process would be completed prior to formal validation by the University.

2.4   The Foundation's own internal design and approval processes would allow the Expectation to be met.

2.5   The review team tested the Expectation through the consideration of relevant Foundation documents and processes of the University, minutes of meetings and through discussion with Foundation senior staff.

2.6   While the University's programme development and approval processes are robust and well established, there is less clarity of the Foundation's internal processes. The Foundation's Programme and Module Approval document, setting out the process for approval, makes reference to the three-stage process, but no details or further evidence is provided. In particular, no evidence was available to substantiate processes for the design and development of programmes.

2.7   The review team found that there is no separate and formal process for internal programme approval. The forum for decisions on any new programmes would normally be discussions between the programme managers and the Chief Executive Officer, with final decisions made by the Board of Trustees. Decisions are made based on the perceived market, financial considerations and general resources, including staff expertise. The sample provided of records of Trustee meetings does not provide clear evidence of such considerations. In addition, there was no evidence to suggest that any student input or externality is considered in the general consideration of new programmes.

2.8   Despite the limited nature of the higher education offering, and the lack of recent programme development activity, the review team considers that the internal procedure

would nevertheless benefit from the introduction of a more formal process for internal approval of programme developments. The review team therefore **recommends** that the Foundation formalises and articulates an internal procedure for the design, development and approval of new programmes and variation of existing programmes. This would provide a transparent forum, along with an audit trail, for decisions on the strategic direction of programmes, including academic matters concerning learning, teaching and assessment strategies and the choice of programmes.

2.9   The Foundation's processes around the design and approval of programmes are informal and have resulted in a recommendation. However, given that the Foundation has not recently developed any new programmes and currently has no plans to do so, the Foundation does adequately discharge its responsibilities in this area. The review team concludes that the Expectation is met and that 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

2.10   Entry requirements are set by the Head of Higher Education of the Foundation in conjunction with the University. These are published to prospective students on the Foundation's website and there is also provision for applicants who do not meet traditional entry requirements. The latter may submit an Accreditation of Prior Experiential Learning portfolio to assess whether they possess the necessary experience and skills to progress on the programmes.

2.11   The Foundation's arrangements around the admission of students onto its higher education programmes would allow the Expectation to be met.

2.12   In considering this Expectation the review team examined the admissions policy and processes, along with published admissions information. The team also met with senior, academic and professional support staff and students.

2.13   All applications are made through the UCAS system, and standardised documentation is used to ensure consistency of approach and that the process aligns with the Admissions Policy of the Foundation. The admissions process also incorporates a telephone interview to assess prospective students' suitability for the programme in question.

2.14   At an early stage of the process prospective students are invited to disclose any additional support they may require so that appropriate arrangements can be discussed and agreed in advance of enrolment. Qualifications are also checked in advance of enrolment.

2.15   The review team found the Foundation's admissions processes to operate effectively. Students who met the review team found the application process clear and well structured. Accurate and timely information was available to them during the admissions process, and they could easily find information about the programme structure and content on the website and in the prospectus.

2.16   The Foundation has robust and effective admissions and selection policies and procedures in place, which it implements effectively. The review team therefore concludes that the Expectation is met and that the 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

2.17   The Foundation's strategic approach to learning and teaching practices is directly linked to the Academic Strategy of the University. This is based on active learning, where students take some responsibility for their learning. The learning and teaching methods are articulated in the Programme Handbooks. Formative assessment is embedded into all modules, and students receive feedback on it within 10 working days, normally through Turnitin.

2.18   All Foundation staff of the higher education academic team are appropriately qualified for their role and possess postgraduate qualifications. The appointment of staff is also subject to confirmation by the University under the terms of the validation process. The Foundation is able to use the first team sports scientists of Tottenham Hotspur Football Club to assist with the delivery of the Football Fitness and Nutrition module. This enables access to highly qualified external input into the programme.

2.19   There is an established teaching observation process which is linked into the annual Performance and Development Reviews (PDR). This accommodates peer review and also observation by management. The PDRs, conducted by the Head of Higher Education, allow the setting of targets for staff and a discussion of their individual developmental needs. The process is documented in the comprehensive Employee Handbook. Teaching quality is also monitored by student feedback, module evaluations and the National Student Survey (NSS).

2.20   There are also close links with the University regarding staff development opportunities and the Foundation is able to access the former's staff development activities, along with the facility to attend 'Partner Away Days' to engage with other collaborative partners. A Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education delivered by the University is also compulsory for new Foundation staff with limited prior teaching experience.

2.21   The Foundation's adoption of the University's Academic Strategy and its own internal processes to enable effective teaching and learning would allow the Expectation to be met.

2.22   The review team tested this Expectation by reviewing Foundation policies, Programme Handbooks, monitoring reports and relevant meeting minutes. The team also met with senior and academic staff, and students.

2.23   Academic staff are suitably qualified and have the appropriate career experience to teach at the relevant subject level. Teaching staff qualifications are checked as part of the recruitment procedure and approval is also obtained from the University. New staff receive a comprehensive induction by the Head of Higher Education. Staff who met the review team reported that their initial induction had been valuable.

2.24   The Foundation recognises staff as a valuable resource. The Staff Development Policy demonstrates a strong commitment to supporting staff development activities for both

full-time and part-time staff. The Foundation hosts a number of CPD workshops related to learning, teaching and assessment. In addition, teaching staff have the opportunity to attend staff development sessions provided by the University.

2.25   The Foundation regularly monitors the quality of teaching through management-led teaching observations. The Head of Higher Education observes all teaching staff once per semester and findings are discussed individually with staff, where necessary actions are agreed with timescales for completion. Students actively participate in the evaluation of teaching quality by completing an evaluation form.

2.26   The Foundation works effectively with staff and students to provide a supportive and beneficial environment for the provision of learning opportunities and teaching practices. The review team concludes that the Expectation is met and that 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

2.27   The Foundation is committed to providing a range of support services for students. Students receive guidance on their programme of study through induction processes and comprehensive handbooks. The former outline the programme structure, content and timetables along with the support services and facilities. The latter contain a range of useful information relating to the programme, its delivery and assessment, regulatory requirements and the support available.

2.28   Student support facilities available include academic and pastoral support, providing a named academic contact (Personal Tutor) with whom students can discuss their personal development and any pastoral-type needs. Meetings take place at least twice a year to discuss academic matters and support for learning. Personal Tutor Guidelines are produced for both staff and students and set out clearly the expectations on each.

2.29   The Foundation's Disability Support Service provides advice and support on course-related needs including special provision for assessments, along with advice on funding. The Foundation is aware of the increasing incidence of mental health issues among students and for the current year a National Health Service workshop on coping with stress has been incorporated into the study skills module. Furthermore, a full-time Higher Education Student Counsellor has been recruited to enhance the support services.

2.30   The Foundation's VLE is used by academic staff as a tool to support student learning. This has been updated to the latest version and customised with the Foundation's branding. Teaching staff upload lesson plans and assessment information, which students can access remotely. Students make use of anti-plagiarism software when submitting assessments electronically. The Foundation regularly monitors the resources made available to students on the VLE.

2.31   Library facilities are provided via a dedicated library room containing two personal computers, printing facilities and group work space. The Foundation also provides free printing for its students. Following feedback from staff and students, Sage journals have been replaced by a subscription to the online EBSCO journals.

2.32   The Foundation provides comprehensive guidance to students outlining the individual academic and pastoral support that they can expect from their Personal Tutors. Mandatory study skills modules focusing on academic writing skills are also incorporated into the curriculum.

2.33   The Foundation's arrangements around the facilities and support practices to enable student development and achievement would allow the Expectation to be met.

2.34   The review team tested this Expectation by considering student support policies and processes, external examiner reports and relevant meeting minutes. The review team also met with senior and academic staff and students.

2.35   The review team found that the Foundation has a strong ethos of academic support and pastoral care for its students. Before the start of their programmes all students are provided with a detailed induction that introduces them to their programme and academic and pastoral support arrangements. Staff recognise that students are individuals and employ

strategies to accommodate their needs, including additional one-to-one sessions, comprehensive feedback, clearly explaining learning outcomes and providing extra support, even to the extent of making themselves available through social media out of hours. This was noted and highly regarded by the students.

2.36   Students who met the review team spoke highly of the quality of support and resources provided for them throughout the programme. In particular, they praised the uniqueness of the experience arising from the benefits of the link with the football club, which include the input of the first team sports scientists into relevant aspects of their programmes, the provision of sports kit at no extra cost, free match tickets and the use of some of the training ground facilities for some aspects of their programme.

2.37   The following feature of **good practice** was identified: the high level of personalised support for students combined with the use of facilities and expertise of the football club provides inspiration and makes a significantly positive contribution to their personal, academic and professional development.

2.38   The Foundation has appropriate policies, procedures and practices in place to ensure that every student is enabled to develop as an independent learner, study their chosen subject(s) in depth and enhance their personal development. Student support is a priority for the Foundation and this, along with access to the football club's facilities, has led to the identification of good practice. The Expectation is therefore 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

2.39   The Foundation has a Student Feedback Policy and students are informed of the policy in their Programme Handbook. There are a number of platforms available to students to provide feedback on their experience in relation to teaching and assessment and other support issues. In addition to these standard mechanisms of student feedback, student representatives are permitted to contribute to the decision-making process in key committee meetings. This includes students being members of the Board of Studies and other students being members of the Annual General Meeting. The former is an opportunity for students to discuss academic issues with the Head of Higher Education, along with academic and support staff, on a twice-yearly basis, and the latter is a more formal end-of-year review mechanism.

2.40   The Foundation's processes to engage with students collectively and individually regarding their learning experience would allow the Expectation to be met.

2.41   The team tested this Expectation by speaking to students and staff and by considering a range of documents, including the Student Feedback Policy.

2.42   Methods of collecting student feedback include surveys administered at relevant points following admission, induction and at the conclusion of modules. Students who put themselves forward for the student representative system are trained. The Student Representation and Consultation System document outlines the roles and responsibilities of student representatives. It also describes the role of the staff liaison contact, who is responsible for ensuring the selection of student representatives, their training and the arrangement of meetings. During the training, student representatives are informed of the Foundation's regulations and processes and of the responsibilities that they are expected to undertake. Student representatives confirmed that the training that they received for their role was appropriate.

2.43   The main student representatives are required to attend the Board of Studies and are informed of its membership and its standard agendas. The Board of Studies is a committee that the University requires to be in place; it occurs once in each semester. Student representatives provide feedback on students' views on each module and discuss, among other things, external examiners' reports and NSS survey results.

2.44   Two subcommittees of the Board of Studies have been formed recently. One is the Football Committee, in which student representatives who play football take on designated roles, such as Chair or Treasurer. The other committee is the Placement Committee. Student representatives sit alongside the placement tutors and work with external partners so that there is student representation in many aspects of placement provision.

2.45   There was some slippage in the appointment of representatives in 2017-18. At the review visit in late November, students had been emailed to elicit volunteers but representatives had not yet been appointed. Attempts have been made over the last year to include more students in the decision-making processes.

2.46   The Foundation has appropriate mechanisms in place to ensure that student input into the quality of the learning experience is available. Student feedback is considered regularly by the Foundation and through a variety of ways, and a student representation

system has been established to provide clear representation of cohorts and on committee memberships. The review team concludes that the Expectation is met and that 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

2.47 The Foundation's approach to assessment and its adherence to its awarding body's requirements in this area are described in section A3.2. The Memorandum of Cooperation between the University and the Foundation states that precise arrangements for assessment in a partner institution shall be included in the programme handbooks. An Assessment Overview Process is available from the University and the Foundation's Assessment Guidance Document outlines the principles of assessment. External examiners have an opportunity to comment on the methods of assessment, assessment criteria and feedback processes for all summative assessments and the content of any prepared examination papers.

2.48 There is a Foundation policy on the Accreditation of Prior Learning that provides clear guidance on the process.

2.49 Ultimate responsibility for the development of effective assessment rests with the University and its external examiner, but the Foundation's practices in this area would allow the Expectation to be met.

2.50 In the Foundation's Programme Handbooks students are informed of the variety of types of assessment including formative and summative assessment, dates of assessment, marking criteria, submission procedures and the implication of late submission. They are also informed of marking and moderation procedures and the role and identification of the external examiner. Students confirmed that they are fully aware of marking criteria.

2.51 The Foundation Link Tutor plays a key role in liaising with the University in relation to assessment. A variety of assessment types are used in the programmes including essays, oral presentations, reports, group work and research-related tasks. It was confirmed that examinations are not seen as appropriate for the cohorts on these programmes.

2.52 Academic staff and students described the effective use of draft submissions and formative assessment and feedback. The Foundation Assessment Guidance Document indicates that formative assessment may be compulsory or optional but that no penalties can be applied for non-completion. In practice, it is therefore always optional and, in discussion, senior staff recognised the logical inconsistency in this guidance. Staff and students were able to describe and recognise the benefits of formative assessment. Second year students report that feedback is timely and helpful and that the Foundation consistently complies with its published dates regarding assessments.

2.53 Training on the principles of assessment is included in the University PGCHE and staff who have been employed by the Foundation for two years are funded to enrol on the PGCHE. Recently, the University has provided training on the University rubric marking system and the related entry of marks into the rubric software to enable calculations. Newly appointed academic staff were able to describe the tailored support they had received from the Foundation Link Tutor in relation to the importance of creating marking criteria that match the learning outcomes within a module.

2.54   The external examiner's report identifies good examples of feedback to students and of double marking, but notes some concerns about students' ability to reference correctly. Comments from first year students about the study skills module indicate that the issue of referencing is now being addressed from the start of the programmes. The University's response to the annual monitoring report confirms that assessment issues are discussed and addressed within the Foundation.

2.55   Mature students without the standard entry requirements can complete a portfolio for entry and a number of students have been admitted under this procedure. There is a policy and template for Accreditation of Prior Learning but to date no students have utilised this policy.

2.56   The Foundation operates equitable, valid and reliable processes of assessment. Staff are aware of their responsibilities within the area of assessment and students confirm that assessment criteria are clear and that feedback is timely. The review team concludes that the Expectation is met and that the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B7): Higher education providers make scrupulous use of external examiners.

Quality Code, *Chapter B7: External Examining*

Findings

2.57　　The University has an approval procedure for external examiners. It includes the criteria for appointment of external examiners for both the first and second-tier Assessment Boards. Appointments are approved by the University for up to four years.

2.58　　The application of a nomination form ensures that there is information provided under each of the criteria for selection. The Foundation has one external examiner who acts as subject external examiner for the modules within year two of both programmes delivered. Responsibility for remuneration and training rests with the University and the duties are set out in the Letter of Appointment. These duties include approval of draft assessment instruments, verification of the marking standard, and attendance at first and second-tier Assessment Boards, where student module results and the overall programme award are confirmed respectively.

2.59　　The arrangements in place to ensure the effective appointment and use of external examiners would allow the Expectation to be met.

2.60　　The review team tested the Expectation by considering the University procedures, and external examiners' reports and responses to them, and by meeting with Foundation staff.

2.61　　The external examiner produces reports on the University template, direct to the University, and reports are shared with the Foundation. The Head of Higher Education has oversight of the external examination process within the Foundation and there is a defined process for the receipt of, and response to, external examiners' reports, overseen by the University. External examiner reports are shared with Foundation staff and students through upload to the programme area on the Foundation's virtual learning environment.

2.62　　The external examiner commented in his final report that he had seen improvements in assessment processes and feedback over the four years of his tenure. He was aware of, and commented on, issues such as change of staff. The external examiner is present at the second-tier Assessment Board for oversight. A new external examiner has been appointed commencing May 2017.

2.63　　The review team considers that the arrangements for engaging with the external examiner and the subsequent reports are sound, and appropriate actions are taken to address any issues raised. The review team concludes that the Expectation is met and that the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation:　Met
Level of risk:　Low

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

2.64   The University has responsibility for monitoring and review of the foundation degree programmes under its validated model, as described in Expectation A3.3, with responsibilities outlined in the University's Learning and Quality Enhancement Handbook. The University requires the completion of an annual monitoring report, normally submitted by the Foundation Link Tutor.

2.65   There is no evidence of any documented internal Foundation process for annual monitoring or for the periodic review of programmes. The remit for the Foundation's Board of Studies requires consideration and discussion of annual monitoring reports, and the AGM is required to review the effectiveness of the monitoring system.

2.66   The University undertook an institutional review of the Foundation in 2015-16 and a visit to approve a temporary move to different teaching premises during 2017. The next periodic programme review is due in March 2018.

2.67   The lack of evidence of the Foundation operating regular and systematic processes for monitoring and for review of programmes, beyond meeting the University requirement of an annual monitoring report, indicates that the Expectation is unlikely to be met.

2.68   The review team tested this Expectation by considering the University's Learning and Quality Enhancement Handbook, the Foundation's annual monitoring reports and the minutes of the Board of Studies and the AGM, and met with Foundation staff to discuss monitoring processes and documentation.

2.69   The Foundation's self-evaluation document states that there is an annual monitoring process for programmes but does not describe it. Module tutors produce module reports at the completion of each module using a University template. The review team received conflicting information about where these reports are sent and whether they are discussed with Foundation colleagues. While each module is discussed at a Board of Studies, with particular emphasis on raising any student concerns, the overall module report, including details of students' performance, is not discussed in this forum. There is also no evidence to show the discussion and monitoring of enhancement or good practice which would be part of strategic approach to enhancement overseen at a senior level of the Foundation. This has led to a recommendation within the Enhancement Expectation.

2.70   A single annual monitoring report covering both degrees is written by the Head of Higher Education and submitted to the University in mid-October each year. The report includes student progression and completion data, the previous year's action plan and progress on actions, good practice for dissemination and the external examiner's comments. During the Board of Studies meeting in November, consideration of the annual monitoring report is an agenda item. However, there was no evidence of discussion of the annual monitoring report in the meeting records of the Board of Studies presented at the review visit. In one set of minutes it was simply reported that the annual monitoring report was received and deposited on the VLE.

2.71   The uncertainty expressed by staff with regard to the function of different

committees and the lack of a clearly understood and implemented monitoring and review process links to the recommendation in A2.1, related to clarification of academic governance structures. The review team was informed that the Higher Education Committee and the Student AGM had been merged but there is no discussion of monitoring of quality procedures or enhancement in the AGM minutes provided.

2.72   No further details of the Foundation's approach to monitoring and review was shared with the team. Therefore, the review team **recommends** that the Foundation documents the processes for the production of module reports and the annual monitoring report to include the responsibilities and reporting lines, and ensures that discussion of reports is recorded.

2.73   The team was informed that a strategic decision has been made to terminate the higher education programmes and to teach out the current students. It was confirmed that the University had been made aware of the decision and a discussion had taken place about the closures. The students had not yet been informed and the Foundation did not have a plan in place for communicating this process. The Memorandum of Cooperation between the University and the Foundation covers the conditions that the Foundation must satisfy on closure of a programme. The review team was informed that the Foundation would rely on the University for procedures in closing the programmes but there was no indication or plan by the Foundation to agree its own process of communication to students and to include details in the event of students not completing the course. Therefore, the review team **recommends** that the Foundation develops an agreed and planned procedure for the management of the closure of programmes to protect the interest of students and safeguard the quality of their learning experience.

2.74   The Foundation adheres to its responsibilities to the University in the monitoring of its programmes. The review team found that although the Foundation has internal procedures for programme monitoring, they were not clear, consistent and comprehensive. In addition, the decision to close programmes has not been articulated by a Foundation approach to communicating to students and plans to protect students' interests. The review team concludes that, due to the two recommendations, the Expectation is not met and the associated level of risk is moderate as in terms of monitoring, the quality assurance procedures are broadly accurate but have some shortcomings in terms of the rigour with which they are applied. With regards to course closures, there is insufficient emphasis or priority given to assuring quality in the Foundation's planned processes.

Expectation: Not met
Level of risk: Moderate

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

2.75   The Foundation maintains its academic Appeals Regulations and Policy along with a process for managing student complaints. Both documents are made available to students via the VLE and the Programme Handbooks refer to the complaints process. In each case, the process provides a facility for informal resolution prior to implementation of the formal process. The Foundation recently developed its own Appeals Regulations and Policy. Forms for appeals and complaints are available on the VLE for students to complete once the formal stage is reached.

2.76   The Foundation's regulations with regard to complaints and appeals would allow the Expectation to be met.

2.77   The review team tested the Expectation by studying the Memorandum of Cooperation between the University and the Foundation, and the Foundation's documents related to Complaints and Appeals, and by talking to Foundation staff and students.

2.78   The Foundation's Appeals Regulations and Policy was introduced in the previous academic year and was approved by the University. It has been adopted in place of the University's Appeals Regulation. The policy states that an appeal can only be made against a published assessment result that has been confirmed at an Assessment Board. There is guidance about the grounds on which an appeal could be successful and the grounds where it would not be considered appropriate.

2.79   Neither staff nor first year students were completely clear on the difference between a complaint and an appeal, but a second year student was aware of an appeal against a grade awarded. There was common agreement from staff and students that any concerns about the programmes would be passed on to the Foundation's Head of Higher Education.

2.80   Staff are informed orally that they should not respond directly to appeals against assessment grades, but this is not separately documented. Recently appointed staff are briefed on a one-to-one basis in response to their needs. Webinars from the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) on procedural fairness when dealing with complaints have been made available to staff in previous years. Complaints from applicants about admission are passed directly to the University.

2.81   The student complaint guidance details how to make a complaint and describes the six stages of the complaint process, including a stage involving the University Link Tutor. The first two stages are informal; the third stage is the formal referral to the Foundation's Programme Leader; the fourth stage is referral to the University Link Tutor; the fifth stage referral to the Foundation's Chief Executive Officer; and the final stage is referral to the OIA. This contradicts the Complaints section of the Memorandum of Cooperation between the University and the Foundation that requires all processes at the partner to be completed before the complaint moves to the University, rather than the complaint moving back to the Foundation and its Chief Executive Officer. Accordingly, the review team **recommends** that the Foundation ensures that the student complaint guidance document aligns with the Memorandum of Cooperation between the University and the Foundation and is applied consistently.

2.82   The Foundation has sufficient arrangements in place to fulfil its responsibilities in considering complaints from its students. The responsibility for dealing with appeals lies with the University. The review team found that there was inconsistency in process between the Foundation's internal approach and its responsibilities detailed in the agreement with the University, which has resulted in a recommendation. The review team concludes that the policies in place and the guidance available to students confirm that the Expectation is met and that the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B10): Degree-awarding bodies take ultimate responsibility for academic standards and the quality of learning opportunities, irrespective of where these are delivered or who provides them. Arrangements for delivering learning opportunities with organisations other than the degree-awarding body are implemented securely and managed effectively.

Quality Code, *Chapter B10: Managing Higher Education Provision with Others*

Findings

2.83   Arrangements for the delivery of learning opportunities with others are limited to the work placement modules. Both higher education programmes contain placement modules requiring a total of 180 hours of work placement activity. An annual Placement Fair is organised by the Foundation to enable placement providers to meet with potential students. An additional role of Higher Education Placement Officer has also been created to coordinate the Foundation's placement activity. The Placement Committee meets regularly to monitor progress.

2.84   All placements are governed by a comprehensive agreement including and clarifying details of responsibilities of the Foundation and the placement providers.

2.85   The arrangements in place for the management and monitoring of work placements would allow the Expectation to be met.

2.86   In considering this Expectation, the review team examined guidance materials for students and placement providers, along with documentary evidence of the processes. The review team also met with senior and academic staff as well as students.

2.87   Students confirmed that it is their responsibility to find a placement, though valuable assistance from the Foundation is available where needed. The Foundation is also able to source placements within the Foundation and elsewhere within the football club and its Academy. In some cases the overall placement requirement can be met by a number of smaller placement engagements. This can provide useful variety of experience and the Foundation ensures that the overall learning outcomes can still be met. The Placement Committee includes student membership and enables them to have a greater influence in the management of placements through the student role of placement coordinator and liaison with internal and external placement providers.

2.88   The review team found that the Foundation adequately ensures that all parties understand their responsibilities in the process. It has in place placement agreements that outline the key responsibilities of the Foundation, students and placement providers. Placement feedback is generally positive.

2.89   The Foundation has effective arrangements in place for the management of its placement learning which includes formal agreements, information and support for students and a committee whose specific focus is the monitoring of placements. The review team concludes that the Expectation is met and that the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B11): Research degrees are awarded in a research environment that provides secure academic standards for doing research and learning about research approaches, methods, procedures and protocols.
This environment offers students quality of opportunities and the support they need to achieve successful academic, personal and professional outcomes from their research degrees.

Quality Code, *Chapter B11: Research Degrees*

Findings

2.90   The Foundation does not offer research degrees; therefore, this Expectation does not apply.

Expectation: Not applicable
Level of risk: Not applicable

The quality of student learning opportunities: Summary of findings

2.91   In reaching its judgement about the quality of student learning opportunities, the review team matched its findings against the criteria specified in Annex 2 of the published handbook.

2.92   All but one of the Expectations in this area have been met and the risk is judged low in each case except one. There is one feature of good practice and four recommendations identified.

2.93   The good practice identified in Expectation B4 acknowledges the unique and supportive environment the students experience at the Foundation. The students confirmed the positive benefits of studying at an environment with strong links to the football club and the Foundation tries to find ways to maximise those links and develop a distinctive learning experience. The Foundation is also highly supportive of the students, and the review team found that academic staff were able to identify and offer individual support to students on a regular basis.

2.94   The first recommendation identified is in B1, where the review team found that although the Foundation stated that consideration of new programmes had happened in the past, the processes were not effective and lacked detailed analysis. The review team acknowledges that the Foundation has no plan to develop new courses and does adhere to its responsibilities in following the University's process, but as the Expectation anticipates internal consideration of all elements of programme design and approval at all levels this led to a recommendation.

2.95   There are two recommendations in Expectation B8. The first is concerned with the lack of clarity and discussion around the programmes' annual module and monitoring reports. The review team found that while reports are developed, there was a lack of consistency and awareness of where reports were discussed and in what detail. The second recommendation requests the Foundation to develop a course closure process. The Foundation confirmed that it had started discussions with its awarding body around course closure but seemed to be unaware that it would need to develop its own process as part of the Expectation's requirements. Expectation B8 was not met and deemed to have a moderate level of risk as the Foundation's quality assurance procedures are broadly accurate but have some shortcomings in terms of the rigour with which they are applied, and there is insufficient emphasis or priority given to assuring quality in the provider's planned processes.

2.96   The final recommendation is identified in Expectation B9 and highlights the inconsistency between the Foundation's defined process for considering complaints and its agreement with its awarding body. Despite this inconsistency, the Foundation's processes themselves are adequate to enable the Expectation to be met.

2.97   The review team concludes that the quality of student learning opportunities at the Foundation **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 Foundation has a clear process for the checking and publication of information relating to its higher education provision. The process is illustrated by a flowchart leading to sign-off by the Foundation's Head of Higher Education and approval by the University before publication.

3.2   Information on enrolments, courses, tuition, fees and policies is available on the Foundation's website and virtual learning environment. The website is managed by the PR and Marketing Manager but with content subject to specific approval in accordance with the above process.

3.3   Reference is also made to compliance with the University's Quality Handbook - Marketing and Publicity Section, supported by published guidelines for partners.

3.4   The processes for publication of information to, for example, current students through handbooks are subject to the same checks.

3.5   The arrangements in place to manage the accuracy and accessibility of information produced and published by the Foundation would allow the Expectation to be met.

3.6   In considering this Expectation the review team examined information that the Foundation provides to students, staff and other stakeholders in a variety of formats. The review team also met with senior, academic and professional support staff and students.

3.7   The review team found that the programme and admissions information on the Foundation's website is comprehensive and enables students to make informed decisions. Student handbooks contain more detailed information on the programme including information on teaching, learning and assessment, resources and student support. They also signpost key policies. Students who met the team were satisfied with the accuracy, completeness and timeliness of information supplied to them. There is also a clear process for the approval of information for publication understood by staff at all levels.

3.8   The Foundation provides clear, relevant and trustworthy information to students, staff and the public and has effective procedures in place that ensure all published information is up to date and accurate. The review team concludes that the Expectation is met and that the risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

3.9   In reaching its judgement about the quality of the information about student learning opportunities, the review team matched its findings against the criteria specified in Annex 2 of the published handbook.

3.10   The Expectation in this area has been met and the risk is judged low. There are no features of good practice or recommendations identified in this area.

3.11   The review team concludes that the quality of the information about learning opportunities at the provider **meets** UK expectations.

4 Judgement: 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   In the self-evaluation document the Foundation describes, as enhancement, a number of activities that are standard practice across the sector, for example use of Turnitin; application of a VLE; and appointment and training of student representatives. There is also reference to standard reporting to various external agencies such as the NSS and OIA. Given the links with Tottenham Hotspur Football Club the Foundation is able to offer students extramural activities related to football. There is, however, no mention of an overall strategy for Enhancement in key policy documents.

4.2   As no provider-level approach to enhancement is detailed and articulated in the Foundation's documentation, the Expectation would not be met.

4.3   The team tested the Expectation by studying minutes from the Board of Trustees, from the AGM and the Board of Studies and by exploring the possible strategic approach to enhancement in all staff meetings.

4.4   There was some evidence that the Foundation uses some of its internal quality assurance processes to deliberately improve the student learning experience. Individual staff within the Foundation respond quickly to students' minor complaints and requests and attempt to accommodate students' wishes, such as moving from desktop to laptop computers. Initiatives such as free kits and match tickets for students have been introduced to improve their learning experience and students were very positive about these developments, but there was no evidence to suggest a systematic approach to introducing such initiatives. NSS results are discussed informally and action taken where possible. Staff interpret such responsiveness as enhancement but are unable to articulate a deliberate enhancement strategy.

4.5   One of the basic tenets of enhancement is the strategic direction and monitoring at provider or senior level. The lack of clarity of the committee structure and the confused reporting lines between committees, together with a lack of minuted discussion of key documents, such as annual monitoring reports, has contributed to recommendations in A2.1 and B8 and means that there are no clear structures in place to enable enhancement to occur systematically. Additionally, the review team did not find any evidence to suggest that good practice between Foundation staff, overseen by management, is identified and shared on a regular basis, which can also contribute to enhancement.

4.6   In light of the Foundation having an undocumented and inconsistently applied monitoring system, feedback from students is not used effectively to inform an enhancement strategy and there is no evidence that an enhancement approach is discussed and agreed at a senior level and disseminated to Foundation staff. The review team **recommends** that the Foundation develops a strategic approach to the enhancement of student learning opportunities which is embedded at all levels.

4.7   While there is evidence that the Foundation considers improvements by staff and students to its higher education provision and introduces initiatives and developments where appropriate, its deliberate arrangements do not allow for the systematic and planned enhancement activity, including a strategic approach and an agreed process for identifying and sharing good practice. The review team concludes that the Expectation is not met and

that the associated level of risk is moderate, as there is insufficient emphasis and priority given to assuring quality and enhancement in the Foundation's planning processes.

Expectation: **Not met**
Level of risk: **Moderate**

The enhancement of student learning opportunities: Summary of findings

4.8   In reaching its judgement on the enhancement of student learning opportunities, the review team matched its findings against the criteria specified in Annex 2 of the published handbook.

4.9   The Expectation in this area has not been met and the risk is judged moderate. There is one recommendation identified in this area. The recommendation calls upon the Foundation to develop a strategic approach to the enhancement of student learning opportunities which is embedded at all levels. Additionally, there are two cross-references to Expectations A2.1 and B8 to improve the governance structures and strengthen monitoring arrangements, which would allow for more systematic and effective enhancement of student learning opportunities. The review team acknowledges that there is some enhancement practice that includes the use of student and staff feedback but identification of developments, continuous improvement and good practice is not considered at the Foundation's most senior level, hence the risk is deemed moderate.

4.10   The review team concludes that the enhancement of student learning opportunities at the provider **requires improvement** to meet UK expectations.

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 21-24 of the Higher Education Review (Alternative Providers) 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.