



## **CEG UFP Ltd**

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

December 2014

## **Annex 2: University of Central Lancashire FoundationCampus**

### **Introduction and background**

The University of Central Lancashire FoundationCampus (UCLanFoC) was one of the earliest FoundationCampus centres, and operates in partnership with the University under a Cooperation Agreement dated March 2008 and which was further extended in 2013. It is located on the University's Preston Campus.

Although not mentioned in the self-evaluation document for this review, the review visit identified a significant difference in the programmes being offered as compared to the last review in 2013. The Undergraduate Foundation Programme (UFP) continues to be offered with pathways in Business, Economics, Finance and Management; Computing, Engineering and Sciences; Law, Humanities and Social Science; Life Sciences; and Art, Design and Media. However, a wholly new programme, the Medicine Undergraduate Foundation Programme (MUFP), has been developed during 2014 recruiting its first cohort of students in September 2014. The Master's Foundation Programme (MFP) and the English Language Preparation Programme (ELPP) continue to be offered. There has also been a significant change relating to the external accrediting body for programmes, with a reversal of the policy being implemented at the time of the last review for all MFP programmes to switch to Pearson BTEC units and assessment methodologies. This has not proved successful and, from 2014-15, CEG UFP Ltd will rely solely on its agreement with its university partners that successful students on the MFP are guaranteed a place on an appropriate programme at the University. The UFP, as a level 3 subdegree programme, was never part of the Pearson arrangements. However, the decision has also been taken to discontinue accreditation by NCFE which will withdraw external accreditation and certification from the UFP as well. These changes will affect all CEG UFP Ltd centres including UCLanFoC.

Student numbers at the time of the review were 93: 54 UFP, 18 MFP, 10 MUFP, and 11 ELPP. A further cohort of students would be recruited in January, but overall numbers had fallen as a result of fewer sponsored students from Oman and Qatar. The student body was more diverse than in 2013-14, although students from China and Saudi Arabia were still the largest groups. On the UFP, the Business and Engineering pathways had the bulk of students; there was only one student on the Art pathway and UCLanFoC plans to review the feasibility of continuing to recruit to this pathway. All students are from outside the European Economic Area. Staffing comprise four support staff, including the new Head of Centre, and 15 teaching staff, all part-time and all but one unchanged since the 2013 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 UCLanFoC:

- the strong and effective working relationship between UCLan FoundationCampus and its University partner (paragraphs 26, 40)
- the effectiveness of the system for peer observation of teaching (paragraph 25)
- the robust arrangements in place to increase student engagement (paragraph 29).

In addition, the team noted the following instances of **good practice** across CEG UFP Ltd:

- the quality of information and guidance made available to prospective students (paragraph 44).

### Recommendations

The review team makes the following recommendations in relation to UCLanFoC.

It is **advisable** for UCLan FoC to:

- ensure that the procedures for programme approval, identified in the Quality Assurance Manual, are rigorously implemented (para 15).

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).

It would be **desirable** for CEG UFP Ltd to:

- consider the possibility of certifying students' achievement of learning outcomes (paragraph 4).

## Detailed findings

### How effectively do CEG UFP Ltd and University of Central Lancashire 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 2013. CEG UFP Ltd manages academic standards centrally within the quality assurance framework set out in its Academic Quality Assurance Manual 2014-15 and with the maintenance of academic standards overseen by the Academic Board. The Academic Board has oversight and responsibility for academic standards across the whole of its FoundationCampuses. It oversees the procedures for the approval, monitoring and review of academic programmes. The Centre Head for UCLanFoC 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 Academic Board for the quality of the academic provision, which includes both staff and student membership.

2 The setting and maintenance of academic standards on CEG UFP Ltd programmes is managed through the programme approval and periodic review process 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 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, and it was considered advisable that CEG UFP Ltd should expedite the implementation of periodic programme review. The CEG UFP Ltd had commenced periodic review of the Undergraduate Foundation Programme (UFP), with documentation now ready to go out for consideration by external advisers. Staff at UCLanFoC had been involved in writing pathway programme specifications. It was confirmed that the new MUFP should not be regarded as being a part of the UFP, and was not included in the process of periodic review. There was an intention that this process should be completed so that the revised programme would be implemented in 2015-16, and an intention that a joint periodic review of the International Diploma Programme (IDP) and the Master's Foundation Programme (MFP) would then begin with completion in 2016. The review team noted the extended timescales involved and that the periodic review is underway.

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 each centre, there is no detailed consideration of UCLanFoC. The Head of Centre at UCLanFoC has the opportunity to make an input to the process, the Annual Monitoring Reports are discussed at Academic Board, and made available to staff through the new virtual learning environment (VLE). In response to the 2013 review, which noted there was no formal process of academic review of UCLanFoC, CEG UFP Ltd have instituted a system of Centre Academic Oversight Audits and UCLanFoC has been subject to audit which included identification of good practice and recommendations for action, and with a requirement to report on progress. CEG UFP Ltd Business Unit Meetings also now have an enhanced academic role. This was evident in the minutes of more recent UCLanFoC meetings.

4 At the last review, CEG UFP Ltd was in the process of transferring accreditation of its MFP programme to Pearson, which would also give students the benefit of BTEC certification of their learning, while retaining accreditation by NCFE of its UFP programme. Since then, CEG UFP Ltd has taken the decision to withdraw from external accreditation of

its programmes, and to rely solely on its progression agreement with the University. The review team was told that notice of withdrawal had not yet been served on Pearson though CEG UFP Ltd had stopped registering students with them, and the NCFE accreditation would terminate in December 2014. CEG UFP Ltd was seeking to have amended agreements signed with its partner universities before giving formal notice of withdrawal. It would be **desirable** for CEG UFP Ltd to consider the possibility of certifying students' achievement of learning outcomes.

5 UCLanFoC has a Co-operation Agreement with the University dated March 2008, 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 UCLanFoC. On some progression routes, the University has set a higher standard of achievement in order to be guaranteed a place and, in a few cases, the number of students able to progress is subject to a cap. The exception to this is the new MUFP where students must successfully complete the UCLanFoC programme with an enhanced pass mark of 70 per cent, and must also achieve IELTS 7.0 and a good score in the UK Clinical Aptitude Test (UKCAT). However, this will not guarantee a place on the University's medical degree programmes, only that students will be given an interview by the University's Medical School as part of their competitive entrance procedure. University partners do not currently play any role in the quality assurance of CEG UFP Ltd programmes.

### **How effective is the management of student assessment?**

6 The Academic Quality Assurance Manual contains a statement of the FoundationCampus assessment policy and procedures. Arrangements for assessment setting, marking, and moderation and standardisation of marking between centres remain the same as those identified in the 2013 review. Staff at UCLanFoC demonstrated a good level of understanding and compliance with the assessment procedures laid down in the Academic Quality Assurance Manual. Students at UCLanFoC undertake a range of assessments on academic units which is common across the whole of the FoundationCampus network, and 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 they do not see examination assessments ahead of them being sat by students. Subject leaders set five examination papers, with one being selected randomly for students to sit, with other papers being used for the January cohort and for resitting students. This ensures equity of treatment of students including those taught by the subject leader. Candidate anonymity is also observed in marking assessments.

7 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 which are preventing submission on time. A plagiarism-detection mechanism is used for 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 they understood how they were assessed in each module, and staff were responsive to any queries they had. Students said they received verbal and written feedback on their assessed work, and that, generally, this feedback was helpful in improving their future performance. They were not aware of a policy relating to the time within which assessed work should be returned to them, and staff indicated this could vary depending on the nature of the work.

8 Assessment outcomes are subject to scrutiny by the relevant external examiner. They go forward to the CEG UFP Ltd Board for consideration and confirmation. Membership of the Examination Board includes the Head of Centre for UCLanFoC 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 programmes.

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

9 The Academic Quality Assurance Manual has been revised so that it reflects the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (Quality Code). Senior staff at UCLanFoC are aware of the way the Manual reflects the Quality Code and also of the mapping which CEG UFP Ltd is undertaking centrally of its own policies and procedures against the Quality Code. 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. It is clear that for tutorial staff, engagement with the Quality Code is mediated through the use of the Academic Quality Assurance Manual. CEG UFP Ltd is also linking its schemes of work and assessment with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, in order to ensure modules are matched to the pace of learning and expectations of the English language capabilities of students.

### **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 CEG UFP Ltd programmes and provide external examiner reports. The Co-operation Agreement between UCLanFoC and the University gives the latter the right to approve an external examiner to each programme, and to attend examination boards. None of the reports seen by the review team contained specific references to UCLanFoC. The Centre Head and other staff at UCLanFoC 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, and these bodies assist in the preparation of the formal response by UCLanFoC 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 made available to staff through the VLE, and to students through the student representational system. University staff confirmed they do not receive copies of the external examiner reports.

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

11 CEG UFP Ltd has a considerable amount of statistical data relating to student profiles and student performance. It deploys this to undertake annual Academic Review of each programme, and this allows student performance to be evaluated both on a time series and 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, and the review team heard details of this process in connection with the UCLanFoC Audit. The data sets have also underpinned an audit of borderline student performance by programme and by centre, which has enabled a number of changes to be recommended in terms of entry requirements in some countries, and also in relation to student support requirements for centres to implement. The Head of Centre indicated the borderline study had helped them to take a more informed approach when considering marginal applicants referred for a decision by the central admissions unit.

12 The 2013 review recommended that it would be desirable for UCLanFoC to continue to work with its partner University to secure access to statistical information on the

progression of its alumni. It is clear there has been significant progress at UCLanFoC in response to this recommendation. It has now received data on progression and achievement for all student cohorts from 2010-11 onwards from the University. This has only recently been received and it is clear UCLanFoC is only just beginning to look at how to use this information to enhance learning and teaching. The Centre Head had used it as part of the staff continuing professional development (CPD) programme. UCLanFoC's success in using this progression data should be followed up at a subsequent monitoring visit. It is **advisable** for CEG UFP Ltd to make structured and systematic use of student performance and progression data at provider and embedded college levels. The University also monitors progress of students who have articulated into its programmes from UCLanFoC, and would use the regular meetings with the Head of Centre to raise any concerns.

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

13 CEG UFP Ltd has an academic committee structure in place at provider level. The senior academic committee is the Academic Board which has oversight and responsibility for the quality assurance and enhancement of all FoundationCampus provision. A newly introduced Learning and Teaching Committee, and Programme Committees, one for each of the programmes, report to Academic Board. There are also Subject Groups, led by competitively appointed subject leaders, which report to the Programme Committees. This structure is at provider level. The Chair of Academic Board has ultimate accountability for the quality of provision across FoundationCampuses. At centre level, Centre Heads have responsibility for the quality assurance of programmes offered in their centres.

14 CEG UFP Ltd's approach to learning and teaching is described in a Learning Teaching and Assessment Strategy which was revised towards the end of the 2013-14 academic year and includes an action plan updated every year. The Learning and Teaching Committee is responsible for progressing the strategy.

15 Quality assurance procedures for all CEG UFP Ltd's provision are detailed in the Academic Quality Assurance Manual. This is available electronically to all staff, hard copies have also been distributed to all centres and training sessions on the content have been delivered. The manual includes processes for programme approval, annual monitoring, periodic review and programme closure. These are clearly written and fit for purpose. Normally, there is external input to CEG UFP Ltd campuses and university partners specified for approval and periodic review. However, the approval process for the Medical Undergraduate Foundation Programme which started at UCLanFoC in September 2014 failed to involve an external assessor and although the approval event was signed off by the chair of Academic Board, it had not been formally reported to Academic Board at the time of the visit. It is **advisable** for UCLanFOC to ensure that the procedures for programme approval, identified in the Academic Quality Assurance Manual, are fully implemented. Also, while the periodic review of the Undergraduate Foundation Programme was taking place there was no timescale in place for the overdue review of the Master's Foundation Programme. Annual monitoring reports are produced for each programme and they include progression statistics and external examiner reports. Resulting action plans are focused on programme enhancement.

16 Following the previous review in November 2013, an audit process has been introduced in order to obtain better academic oversight of individual centres. This process involves unannounced termly visits to the centres by a team led by the Chief Academic Officer. UCLanFoC senior staff reported that they had experienced two such audits, one concerning human resource procedures, the second comprising scrutiny of a random selection of student work.

17 Appraisal and staff development policies are in place for both teaching and support staff. Teaching observation is used to identify and spread good practice.

18 Students are engaged in the quality processes and feedback from students is used to enhance their experience.

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

19 UCLanFoC's self-evaluation document for this review states that the Quality Code is used 'implicitly and explicitly throughout the structure of FoundationCampus'. In particular, CEG UFP Ltd has begun more detailed work in mapping the indicators from Chapter B6 of the Quality Code to practice at the various FoundationCampus centres.

20 Subject Benchmark Statements are used whenever practical in the design of programmes, but programme specifications note that they are not applicable because of the level of the awards. In English language teaching, schemes of work and assessments are closely linked to the Common European Framework of Reference for Language.

### **How effectively do CEG UFP Ltd and University of Central Lancashire FoundationCampus assure themselves that the quality of teaching and learning is being maintained and enhanced?**

21 The majority of subject staff are qualified to at least master's level and a number hold doctorates; many have experience in teaching in further education. New staff have their teaching observed at least once during the probationary period.

22 Most subject and English staff have sessional contracts and work different numbers of hours according to the number of students enrolled. Even those working relatively few hours indicated that they felt integrated into CEG UFP Ltd and UCLanFoC more generally through the CPD meetings within the centre and the subject groups.

23 Staff are aware of the Academic Quality Assurance Manual and use it to check procedures such as moderation and in developing or modifying schemes of work. A Handbook for Personal Tutors is also available for staff taking on this role.

24 The annual appraisal process includes lesson observation normally by either the Head of Centre or the Deputy Head, although other staff may be appointed to this role, including staff from another centre. A standard lesson observation form is used and feedback, both verbal and written, is provided to the staff member being observed. An action plan is produced detailing any development needs. The majority of staff who met the review team reported that they had experienced appraisal.

25 In addition to the formal observation process UCLanFoC has implemented an informal peer observation process. In some cases this has involved subject tutors observing English lessons and English language staff observing subject classes. There are also cases where the observation has been within the subject group. Good practice from peer appraisals feeds into staff development events. The effectiveness of the peer observation of teaching system is **good practice**.

26 Although the University does not formally specify a role of link tutor, it is clear that teaching staff within UCLanFOC work closely with individuals in University departments in order to establish and maintain the quality of provision and ensure that students are well prepared for their university careers. Examples noted were the development of the curriculum for the Medical Undergraduate Foundation Programme and proposed enhancements to the Undergraduate Foundation Programme for students proposing to

progress to engineering courses. These links demonstrate the effective working relationship between UCLan FoC and the University which is **good practice**.

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

27 Questionnaires are used to seek feedback from students on their early experience with UCLanFoC and on individual modules. Course representatives are elected for each course. The Student Recruitment and Support Officer met representatives to explain their duties which are also summarised briefly in the FoC Student Programme Handbook.

28 Representatives meet twice per term with the Student Recruitment and Support Officer in the Staff Student Liaison Committee. Time is provided in class for representatives to discuss issues with students prior to each committee meeting and they also make use of email discussions. The minutes of the Committee, including any actions resulting, are published on the student noticeboard with copies left for students to take away. One cohort of students failed to supply a representative; in this case the Student Support Officer met the students prior to the meeting.

29 Student representatives also attend the relevant programme committee, and representatives who met the review team explained that they had travelled to London to attend a committee meeting and had met representatives from other centres. The robust arrangements in place to ensure student engagement are **good practice**.

### **How effectively do CEG UFP Ltd and University of Central Lancashire FoundationCampus assure themselves that students are supported effectively?**

30 Students receive a pack of information prior to leaving their home countries. On arrival they are issued with the UCLanFoC Student Handbook which provides a wealth of practical information about life in Preston as a student, including lists of medical and dental practices. An induction programme is provided on arrival and support services are explained. Students reported that this was useful and that UCLan FoundationCampus worked hard to bring different cultures together. A social programme runs through the year giving students opportunities to sample different activities and visit other places in the UK.

31 All students are issued with a Student Programme Handbook on arrival. This is also available electronically. It contains an overview of each of the programmes, types of assessment, feedback processes and complaints procedures. Details of module content and the range of assessments are provided at the beginning of each module, sometimes verbally, sometimes in hard copy.

32 Students following the Medical Undergraduate Foundation Programme and the Undergraduate Foundation Programme are assigned a personal tutor. Tutorials follow a scheme of work based on a three week cycle with one week offering a group tutorial focused on particular skills (examples given included study skills, dealing with homesickness and healthy eating). The other two weeks are used for one-to-one meetings between tutor and students with the tutor seeing half the group each week. Master's Foundation students have a similar system with three hours each week timetabled for personal development. They may seek a one-to-one meeting with the tutor, but such meetings are not mandatory.

33 Online and hard copy records are kept of students who are seen to be at academic risk due to poor attendance or poor performance. These may be accessed by personal tutors who can then offer further support as necessary.



34 Students requiring academic support indicated that tutors are approachable and willing to help. It was also noted by students that where a class is large it is split into smaller groups and hence some lessons are repeated. It was possible in some cases that if the material had not been understood initially a student could attend the lesson again with another group. Additional subject support sessions have been made available this year - these are mandatory for students who are seen to be at risk.

35 Students told the review team that they generally understood what was being asked of them in assessments and that, should they be in doubt, they had no hesitation in approaching tutors for further explanation. Students were not aware of a fixed timescale (and staff confirmed that there is no formal expectation) in which their assessed work should be returned, but indicated that it was usually short and that useful feedback was provided. A recent staff development event focused on giving feedback.

36 English is taught to groups of mixed ability and, while a great deal of effort is expended on ensuring support for the weakest students, the more able expressed concern that they were sometimes insufficiently challenged.

### **How effectively does the University of Central Lancashire Foundation Campus manage the recruitment and admission of students?**

37 Selection and admission is normally managed centrally by CEG UFP Ltd. Students who narrowly miss the entry requirements may, however, be referred to the Head of Centre who will consult with the University. The results of a study carried out by CEG UFP Ltd to correlate the performance of borderline students with their original qualifications and selected subject areas is being used to guide such decisions and to indicate when students may benefit from extra support.

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

38 CEG UFP Ltd has a Staff Development Policy although senior staff at UCLan FoC did not seem to be aware of this except for the introduction of the continuing professional development fund.

39 The academic year 2014-15 has seen the introduction of Reading Weeks in each term. These are weeks free from formal teaching, allowing students time to prepare for examinations and freeing staff, including sessional staff, to engage in staff development. Staff who met the review team reported that the scheme was working well at UCLanFOC and that a range of issues identified by the ECREO process and by the provider's audits had been the focus of staff development events. Subject groups also hold meetings in the Reading Weeks; groups comprise all tutors in a particular subject and such meetings, often held virtually, provide an opportunity for development and the spreading of good practice relating to a particular subject. This continuing contribution of subject leaders and subject groups to programme delivery and assessment was noted as good practice in the previous review.

40 Staff are also aware of development events at the partner University and some examples were cited of attendance at these demonstrating the effective working relationship between UCLanFOC and the University.

41 A fund to support CPD has been set up by CEG UFP Ltd and is administered by the Learning and Teaching Committee. Staff were appreciative of this and several applications for the first round of funding had been made from UCLan FoC. The results were not known at the time of the visit.

## **How effectively do CEG UFP Ltd and University of Central Lancashire FoundationCampus ensure that learning resources are accessible to students and sufficient to enable them to achieve the learning outcomes?**

42 Teaching and laboratory space are available from the University and there has been an increase in the space available since the last review. There is no longer an issue in scheduling time for laboratory-based practical work as bookings are made earlier and use is made of Wednesday afternoons when University students do not require access.

43 Students have access to the full range of University facilities. They share all the privileges of the University's own students. A VLE has been introduced and support is being provided to enable increasing use of this.

## **How effectively does University of Central Lancashire Foundation Campus's public information communicate to students and other stakeholders about the higher education it provides at this college?**

44 There is a hardcopy prospectus for UCLanFoC and its programmes, and the same information is contained on the CEG UFP Ltd website, which was redesigned and relaunched in 2013-14. The new MUFP was developed part-way through 2013-14 for delivery in 2014-15, and consequently information relating to it is located on the website but not in the hardcopy prospectus. Students indicated that they found the information they received prior to entry accurate and helpful, and this also included information provided to students on behalf of UCLanFoC by its agents. The 2013 review identified a problem relating to information made available to students entering programmes at UCLanFoC where the University progression route required a higher than normal level of achievement on the UCLanFoC programme and, in the case of BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, limited the number of places available to progressing students. The concern was that potential students needed to have this information in order to make an informed decision, and in the 2013 report there was an advisable recommendation that UCLanFoC should revise the ways in which it communicated such information to potential students. This is also very important in relation to the new MUFP since students are not guaranteed progression to the medical degrees at the University, even where they successfully complete the UCLanFoC programme. The review team examined the information now made available to potential students through the website and prospectus, and in the letters sent to potential students where there were special arrangements relating to progression to programmes at the University. Although the new MUFP and its articulation to the medical degrees at the University is a complex offer to communicate, overall the review team was satisfied that the information provided to potential students was appropriate. Students confirmed they had been clear about the progression requirements at the time they made their decision to join their programme at UCLanFoC. The quality of information and guidance made available to prospective students by CEG UFP Ltd is **good practice**.

45 Students receive an induction pack which includes the Student Handbook for UCLanFoC. The latter is produced in the FoundationCampus house style, but includes local information specific to UCLanFoC as well as generic material. Students were asked about Programme and Module Handbooks, but were unsure about these, although they did receive module overviews which include assessment requirements. They indicated the information they received was useful and covered key requirements. 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 would need 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.

**How effective are University of Central Lancashire FoundationCampus's arrangements for assuring the accuracy and completeness of information it has responsibility for publishing at this college?**

46 CEG UFP Ltd is responsible for producing all public information on its programmes, including prospectus and website content. It is produced in conjunction with, and signed off by, each of its university partners. The latter requirement is reflected in the agreement with the University. This was confirmed by University staff. The Head of Centre has the opportunity to see and comment on all publicity materials relating to UCLanFoC, but does not have formal approval responsibility. CEG UFP Ltd is also responsible for producing its programme specifications, which are agreed in conjunction with university partners, and programme handbooks. The arrangements for assuring the accuracy and completeness of information is effective.

## Action plan<sup>1</sup>

UCLanFOC 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 <b>good practice</b> that are worthy of wider dissemination within UCLanFoC:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the effectiveness of the system for peer observation of teaching at UCLan Foundation Campus (paragraph 25).</li> </ul>	Peer observation process is enhanced, performance evaluated, and consider utilising good practice across FoC	Evidence of effectiveness of the peer observation process formally captured and evaluated to ensure initiatives are having positive impact on learning and teaching	August 2015	Centre Head UCLan FoC	Learning and Teaching Committee	<p>Report to Learning and Teaching Committee about how UCLanFoC undertakes the peer observation process in order to share good practice across FoC</p> <p>Staff report enhancements in learning and teaching practices as a result</p>

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the strong and effective working relationship between UCLan FoC and its University partner (paragraphs 26 and 40)</li> </ul>	<p>Strong working relationships are maintained, and share any learning points with the rest of FoC</p>	<p>Ensure regular formal meetings are held (and minuted)</p> <p>UCLanFoC to identify any key learning points to share with other FoC centres in relationship building</p>	<p>June 2015</p>	<p>Centre Head, UCLanFoC</p>	<p>Academic Board</p>	<p>Minutes of meetings with university partner, minutes of Academic Board</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the robust arrangements in place to increase student engagement at UCLanFoC (paragraph 29)</li> </ul>	<p>Student engagement programme is enhanced, evaluate performance, and consider utilising good practice across FoC</p>	<p>Evidence of student engagement programme formally captured and evaluated to ensure initiatives are having positive impact on student experience</p>	<p>August 2015</p>	<p>Centre Head UCLanFoC</p>	<p>Learning and Teaching Committee</p>	<p>Report to Learning and Teaching Committee about how UCLanFoC engages students in order to share good practice across FoC</p> <p>Student survey data demonstrates enhancements</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the quality of information and guidance made available to prospective students (paragraph 44).</li> </ul>	<p>Information and guidance made available to prospective students remains of high quality</p>	<p>Monitor quality of information via standard methods, and make enhancements where deficiencies are identified</p>	<p>No target date - part of ongoing quality process governing information</p>	<p>Marketing Manager, FoC</p>	<p>Academic Board</p>	<p>Student surveys</p> <p>Agent surveys</p>

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 <b>advisable</b> for UCLanFoC to:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>make structured and systematic use of student performance and progression data at CEG UFP Ltd and embedded college levels (paragraph 12)</li> </ul>	Structured and systematic use is made of student performance and progression data is used throughout FoC	Build looking at performance data into termly audits  Continue to request data from university partners	January 2015  May 2015	Chief Academic Officer  Centre Heads, FoC Centres	Academic Board  Academic Board	Audit reports  Evidence of statistical data from university partners on how FoC students are progressing  Reports on these data
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ensure that the procedures for programme approval, identified in the Academic Quality Assurance Manual are rigorously implemented (paragraph 15)</li> </ul>	Future programme approval events follow the process accordingly	Ensure that any future programme approval events follow the process accordingly	January 2015	Chief Academic Officer	Academic Board	Academic Board minutes, any future programme approval documentation

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• modify programme specifications to accurately describe the recognition of the programmes for progression purposes (paragraph 45)</li> </ul>	Programme specifications accurately describe the recognition of the programmes for progression purposes	Programme specifications are modified accordingly	January 2015	Chief Academic Officer	Academic Board	Modified programme specifications  Academic Board minutes
--	---	---	--------------	------------------------	----------------	---

**QAA1150b - 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](mailto:enquiries@gaa.ac.uk)  
Web [www.gaa.ac.uk](http://www.gaa.ac.uk)

Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786