



Higher Education Review (Alternative Providers) of UK Business College Ltd

November 2018

Contents

About this review	1
Key findings.....	2
Judgements	2
Recommendations	2
Affirmation of action being taken	2
About the provider	3
Explanation of findings.....	5
1 Judgement: The maintenance of the academic standards of awards offered on behalf of degree-awarding bodies and/or other awarding organisations	5
2 Judgement: The quality of student learning opportunities.....	19
3 Judgement: The quality of the information about learning opportunities	39
4 Judgement: The enhancement of student learning opportunities.....	43
Glossary.....	45

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 UK Business College Ltd. The review took place from 31 October to 1 November 2018 and was conducted by a team of two reviewers, as follows:

- Mrs Amanda Donaldson
- Mr Colin Stanfield.

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/reviewing-higher-education/types-of-review/higher-education-review.

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 awarding organisation **requires improvement to meet** UK expectations.
- The quality of student learning opportunities **meets** UK expectations.
- The quality of the information about learning opportunities **requires improvement to meet** UK expectations.
- The enhancement of student learning opportunities **meets** UK expectations.

Recommendations

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

By January 2019:

- implement the proposal to establish an assessment board (Expectation A2.1)
- ensure there are terms of reference for all committees having responsibilities for the oversight of quality and standards (Expectation A2.1)
- establish and implement consistent processes by which the College gains external approval for the delivery of taught programmes (Expectation A3.1 and B1)
- seek formal approval from its awarding organisation to deliver the Diploma in Education and Training (DET) programme at all intended delivery locations (Expectation A3.1 and B1)
- provide more comprehensive externally facing information for potential applicants in order to inform their decision making (Expectation B2 and Information)
- ensure sufficient teaching resources for the effective delivery of the Diploma in Education and Training (DET) programme (Expectation B3)
- develop and implement a process by which all published information will be checked and reviewed to ensure it is fit for purpose, accessible and trustworthy (Information)
- clarify the status of the Diploma in Education and Training (DET) with respect to Qualified Teacher of Learning and Skills (QTLS) in all relevant documentation before students are recruited to the programme (Information).

Affirmation of action being taken

The QAA review team **affirms** the following actions already being taken to make academic standards secure and/or improve the educational provision offered to students:

- the steps being taken to review and revise the academic regulatory framework. (Expectation A2.1)
- the steps being taken to develop the extent to which external expertise is used in the maintenance of academic standards (Expectation A3.4)
- the schedule of staff development for teaching and assessing at higher education level (Expectation B3)
- the development of a system for monitoring and supporting student progression through personal development plans and the personal tutorial system (Expectation B4).

About the provider

UK Business College Ltd (the College) was formed on 1 March 2012, it is a private limited company. The College was acquired by new owners on 1 February 2018.

The previous management had applied for Specific Course Designation (SCD) in 2016-17 and although twenty days after the acquisition had occurred the college was granted the approval for SCD, the change of ownership was deemed a significant change of circumstance and the college had to re-apply for SCD which was subsequently granted. The SCD allows for recruitment of 50 full-time students and 50 part-time students.

The College's mission is to 'prepare our students to be the leaders of the next generation, by providing an education distinguished for its high level of excellence and personal attention; and to contribute to the advancement of knowledge and to educate the next generation of scholars by providing higher and professional studies at the highest level.'

Currently there are no students studying and no students yet recruited. An Open Day to recruit students was planned for the 15 November 2018. A new governance framework has been put into place resulting in a revised senior-management team led by a new Principal. There are 14 staff in post covering predominantly management and administration positions. An Academic Manager, Course Leader and one lecturer were in post. Further academic posts are to be filled once student recruitment has taken place.

Although operating as a separate legal entity, the College, under its new ownership, is part of a group of Colleges, the group now consisting of three sites in London, Luton and Birmingham. The College's awarding organisation is Pearson and an agreement enabling the offer of the Diploma in Education and Training (DET) at the College's Finchley, London, site is in place. The recent acquisition of the College has opened the possibility of the programme being offered at a site in Alperton. However, the College has not yet sought approval for the programme to be offered at that site, neither had centre approval been granted by Pearson.

The College had a Higher Education Review (Alternative Providers) in March 2017 and was reported as meeting UK Expectations in the four judgement areas. In March 2018 QAA conducted an annual monitoring visit and the College was found to have 'made some progress but further improvement is required with implementing the action plan from the March 2017 Higher Education Review (Alternative Providers).' The monitoring visit found that although several of the 2017 recommendations had been implemented, policies had been adopted from other higher education providers without attribution, due process or attention to institutional context. The monitoring visit report also noted that although the College had engaged with the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (Quality Code) there was at times a lack of clarity on the part of the College on the scope and intention of the Quality Code's expectations, and there was insufficient engagement with external reference points relevant to the intended delivery of initial teacher training. The monitoring team additionally noted that although the College had policies for the development and updating of information, the review team found incorrect course information on the College website.

The current review team, while acknowledging that since the 2018 monitoring visit some progress has been made in strengthening the governance framework, the recognition of external reference points and the use of the Quality Code, also notes that progress on other matters outstanding at the annual monitoring visit has been limited. Concerns still exist about the existence of policies, procedures and guidance that are not adequately adapted to the institutional context and incorrect or outdated information has not been removed from the College's website.

The College identifies as key challenges: further strengthening its recruitment reach to offer education opportunities to non-traditional and under-represented groups; taking advantage of new sector opportunities resulting from the establishment of the Office for Students (OfS); developing new opportunities to work collaboratively with UK based public services; and working with employers to provide good opportunities for the employment of students.

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 The College is planning to deliver one higher education course from January 2019, the Pearson level 5 Diploma in Education and Training. Further plans exist to develop the portfolio of higher education programmes over time.

1.2 The awarding organisation is responsible for defining the level of the programme and for the overall and unit level learning outcomes, and these are outlined within the programme specification provided to the College by Pearson. The awarding organisation further ensures that the programmes are aligned with the Qualifications and Credit Framework, *The Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ)*, Subject Benchmark Statements and any Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body requirements. The College is responsible for maintaining the academic standards by delivering the programme in line with the programme specification. The College's Quality Manual and Governance Handbook detail the structures and processes in place. The processes in place would allow this Expectation to be met.

1.3 The team examined the programme specification, the College's Course Handbook for the Pearson BTEC level 5 Diploma in Education and Training (QCF), the Quality and Operations Manual, awarding organisation's centre, delivery approval documentation, the Governance Handbook. The Expectation was further tested in meetings with staff.

1.4 The Course Handbook sets out details of the programme for students and identifies appropriate levels of the FHEQ and the credit values for the programme and its individual components. Students can choose from a small selection of optional units. No external Quality Assessor reports are yet available for the higher education provision as there are currently no higher education students. Individual unit schemes of work clearly demonstrate how module learning outcomes will be met through delivery of the course and assessment briefs show intended learning outcomes, which are clearly mapped to assessment criteria.

1.5 Overall, the College's programme specification and Course Handbook indicate an understanding of the requirements and procedures of the awarding organisation and this was confirmed in meetings with staff. This will ensure that the programme will be effectively aligned with the appropriate external and sector reference points. The College is aware of its responsibilities for maintaining threshold standards. The review team concludes that the Expectation is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

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

Findings

1.6 The awarding organisation is responsible for setting the academic standards of the awards and for defining the academic regulations governing the delivery of the programme. The College's responsibilities lie in the delivery and assessment of units and programmes, and in maintaining academic standards through its own academic frameworks. The College's intended governance processes set out in the Governance Handbook, provide a clear framework for governing academic credit and qualifications. The Governance Handbook outlines a new committee structure which will be in place from January 2019, including the Board of Governors, the Management Committee, a Teaching and Learning Committee and Course Committees. Terms of reference for a new Academic Board are also included. The processes in place would allow this Expectation to be met.

1.7 The review team tested this Expectation by examining the College SED, Quality and Operations Manual, Governance Handbook, minutes of College Management, Teaching and Learning and Standardisation Committees and awarding organisation documents. The Expectation was further tested in meetings with College managers and staff.

1.8 The appointment of a new Head of Quality was approved by the Board of Directors in February 2018. A key responsibility is the revision of the College's structures, policies and procedures to bring them into line with the two other colleges in the group. Work related to this is ongoing. A recent improvement has been the development of the Governance Handbook, which outlines the potential for a more robust approach to the maintenance of academic standards and quality. It introduces an Academic Board as the academic authority of the College, with two sub committees - the Teaching and Learning Committee and the Course Committee - reporting into it. The Management Committee will oversee the business side of operations. It is planned that this new structure to be fully operational from January 2019.

1.9 The existing Quality and Operations Manual is being phased out, but it still contains numerous policies and procedures, which were yet to be revised. Their revision is part of Phase 2 of the review of governance and regulatory arrangements, due to complete by 13 November 2018. The review team **affirms** the steps being taken to review and revise the academic regulatory framework.

1.10 There are a wide range of policies, procedures and other documents available to prospective applicants on the website, many of which are due to be revised within Phase 2 of the regulatory and governance review as they do not currently reflect the College's provision and practices. This means that prospective applicants for January 2019 do not currently have access to the College's planned policies and procedures related to the delivery and assessment of their course. The staff discussed the intention to upload all relevant policies and procedures onto the virtual learning environment (VLE) so that students will be able to access them. This had not yet happened, it is explored in more depth in Section C: Information.

1.11 The senior staff discussed the intention to develop an Assessment Board to ensure that academic credit and qualifications are awarded appropriately. These plans have the

potential to be effective, but no terms of reference, meeting schedules or formal, minuted discussions are in existence to indicate progress in its development and there is no other system in place to fulfil this function. The team therefore **recommends** that the College implement the proposal to establish an Assessment Board.

1.12 In meetings the team were told of other panels and committees that are also under development, for example a Quality and Enhancement Committee and a Plagiarism Panel, although the team saw no terms of reference for these or records of these having been discussed by the senior management team. The review team, therefore, **recommends** that the College ensure there are terms of reference for all committees having responsibilities for the oversight of quality and standards. The senior management team indicated to the review team that they were aware it will need to ensure that its committee structure is proportionate to the size of the College and the number of courses offered.

1.13 The College is in the process of updating and improving its academic governance arrangements and academic frameworks. The new structures have the potential to provide a secure framework for the award of academic credit and qualifications. This allows the Expectation to be met, with a level of associated risk as the new arrangements are not yet in place.

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

1.14 The responsibility for maintaining a definitive record of each programme approved and delivered by the College ultimately rests with the awarding organisation, Pearson. The programme specification will constitute the critical reference point for the delivery and assessment of the programme and it references the FHEQ, the educational aims and the assessment strategy. It is maintained by the awarding organisation, but the College uses it as a basis to produce its schemes of work, ensuring delivery is made against the programme specification. The processes in place would allow this Expectation to be met.

1.15 The review team tested this Expectation by examining the College's self-evaluation document (SED), Programme Specification, Course Handbook, Schemes of Work, Quality and Operations Manual, minutes of College Management and Teaching and Learning Committees and awarding organisation documents, including those on the VLE and website. The team further tested the Expectation in meetings with staff.

1.16 The definitive documents show how the content and structure of the Diploma in Education and Training (DET) programme and its assessment strategy will provide students with the opportunities for learning and assessment which they need, to enable them to demonstrate that they have achieved the programme learning outcomes at the requisite level.

1.17 There is a recently revised Course Handbook, which includes details of each unit of the qualification, as well as the credit values and the learning outcomes at unit level. The College produces a scheme of work for each unit. Assessment briefs show links between assessment criteria and learning outcomes.

1.18 Extracts from the programme specification are available on the website for prospective applicants. Currently, the course handbook, schemes of work and programme specification are not on the College's VLE, although there are plans to upload them prior to any students enrolling on the programme.

1.19 The review team concludes that programme specifications and module outlines have the potential to function as effective reference points for the delivery, assessment and review of the provision. Planning for delivery so far has taken account of these reference points. Programme information will be provided to students through the comprehensive Course Handbook. The Expectation is, therefore, met and 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

1.20 The College does not itself approve programmes but seeks approval to deliver programmes from the awarding organisation. The College Management Committee determines which programmes it wishes to seek approval to deliver based on a business case. The College adopts a resource allocation model in planning for the delivery of courses, which seeks to ensure that physical and human resources are in place.

1.21 Where optional modules are part of a programme the College uses initial indications from applicants to determine the level of demand and typically sets a threshold of six students, at which it considers an option to be viable. Students are advised what options are available to them prior to enrolment.

1.22 The College governance and management structure is clear and enables executive staff to make judgements on the programmes that it wishes to deliver. In doing so it aligns itself to the requirements of the awarding organisation to ensure that academic standards can be delivered and maintained. However, the College was about to recruit students, but had not yet formally sought approval from its awarding organisation. With only three weeks to go until a recruitment Open Day the College had not submitted its application for approval from the awarding organisation [Meetings 1, 2 and 5]. The review team concludes that this is a significant weakness in the College's procedures for seeking approval at both centre and programme level. The team, therefore, **recommends** that the College establish and implement consistent processes by which the College gains external approval for the delivery of taught programmes (see also Section B1).

1.23 The College has processes in place to agree the programmes for which it wishes to seek approval and how to meet the resource requirements to ensure that the standards set by the awarding organisation are met. However, there are significant weaknesses in the processes for ensuring that external approval of the award is gained before commencing recruitment processes. The processes in place do not allow this Expectation to be met.

1.24 The College takes the responsibility for the design of assessments and has in place appropriate processes to ensure that these are fit for purpose and test that learning outcomes have been achieved.

1.25 The review team tested the Expectation by examining the College SED, Quality and Operations Manual, minutes of the College Management Committee and awarding organisation documents, The Expectation was further tested in meetings with College managers and staff.

1.26 Senior managers informed the review team in three separate meetings that the College was planning to use the Alperton Centre as the location for the delivery of the DET programme. However, the College has not yet had formal confirmation from its awarding organisation that it had approval to deliver the DET at the Alperton Centre (see paragraph 1.29). While senior managers confirmed that the resources, both physical and human, available to students at this centre would be appropriate, at the time of the review the

College did not have approval to deliver this programme at this centre. The review team also found, in making requests for evidence, that the College's approval to offer the DET from the awarding organisation had lapsed on 31 May 2017 and that application to regain approval was made subsequent to this being identified. The team were informed during the review visit that requests to regain approval had only recently been submitted and were yet to be submitted for delivery at the Alperton site. Given the imminent recruitment of students (planned for November 2018) the review team **recommends** the College to seek formal approval from its awarding organisation to deliver the Diploma in Education and Training (DET) programme at all intended delivery locations.

1.27 The College's adoption of a resource allocation model in planning for the delivery of courses seeks to ensure that physical and human resources are in place and this has enhanced previous processes. However, although the review team were informed about the resource allocation model during meetings they were not provided with evidence of it in action.

1.28 The College has in place effective verification, moderation and standardisation processes to ensure that the assessments that it develops and uses with its students meet the academic standards set by the awarding organisation and enable students to demonstrate that they have met intended learning outcomes.

1.29 In conclusion the review team notes that the College does not itself approve programmes but seeks approval to deliver programmes from the awarding organisation. The College has processes in place to agree the programmes for which it wishes to seek approval and for how the resource requirements will ensure that the standards set by the awarding organisation will be met. However, at the time of the review there were two significant weaknesses in the College's processes. Firstly, the College did not have specific approval from its awarding organisation to deliver the DET programme at the Alperton site and secondly, that the processes for the submission to the awarding organisation for centre approval, programme approval and approval for the Alperton site were not effective in ensuring approval in a timely manner. Consequently, the review team concludes that this Expectation is not met (see also Sections B1, B2 and C: Information). Given that no students were enrolled and that consequently there is time to take remedial action, the associated level of risk is assessed as moderate.

Expectation: Not met
Level of risk: Moderate

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

1.30 The College takes responsibility for the design of assessments, for marking and the confirmation of grades prior to their submission to the awarding organisation.

1.31 The organisational structure consists of a number of bodies, with the Management Committee formerly having overall responsibility for the oversight of teaching and learning. Under its new management structure the College plans to establish an Academic Board, which will have overall academic responsibility.

1.32 The College plans to instigate an Assessment Board, (paragraph 1.11) which will act as the body which confirms final student grades, having considered matters such as those relating to academic malpractice and mitigating circumstances. The Assessment Board will be chaired by the Academic Manager. The Board will undertake the functions previously under the remit of the College Management and Teaching and Learning Committees.

1.33 The College has in place procedures for the internal verification of assessments prior to their release to students and for the moderation of grades awarded. The Academic Manager takes the role of lead Internal Verifier and Moderator. The College's Student Management System enables all verification, assessment and moderation outcomes to be captured. The College is in the process of significantly revising its approach to the internal confirmation of the award of credit prior to submission of assessment decisions to its awarding organisation. The processes in place would allow this Expectation to be met.

1.34 The review team tested this Expectation by examining the College SED, Quality and Operations Manual, minutes of College Management, Teaching and Learning and Standardisation Committees and awarding organisation documents. The Expectation was further tested in meetings with College managers and staff.

1.35 Previously the Principal acted as the College's internal verifier and took responsibility for setting, assessing and internally verifying assignments. However, the review team were informed that the College is now moving toward a new structure based on the functions of an Academic Board and an Assessment Board, which will assume responsibility for ensuring that the achievement of relevant learning outcomes has been demonstrated through assessments which meet the academic standards of the awarding organisation.

1.36 The College has in place effective measures that can ensure that the assessments that it designs are fit for purpose and that assessment decisions are fair and meet the academic standards of its awarding organisation.

1.37 The College has developed a centralised tracking system to record all summative assessment decisions, which it will use as and when students are enrolled.

1.38 The College is in the process of significantly revising its approach to the internal confirmation of the award of credit prior to submission of assessment decisions to its awarding organisation. Those processes that will come into operation provide a sound basis on which this Expectation can be met and the level of associated risk, if these processes are implemented effectively, 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

1.39 While the College is not an awarding body, it recognises its role in monitoring and reviewing its provision to ensure that the academic standards of the awarding organisation are being maintained. It has a comprehensive Quality and Operational Manual within which the College's approach to, and procedures for, monitoring and review are set out.

1.40 In response to the 2017 Higher Educational Review (Alternative Providers) (HER (AP)) the College has established a new Quality Unit. This has the remit to monitor academic standards and quality assurance, with oversight of all new policies, procedures and strategic developments and to thus demonstrate to awarding organisations that procedures are in place to monitor, review and enhance higher education provision.

1.41 The College is in the process of developing a systematic approach to monitoring and review based on standard templates at module, programme and College level. External verifier reports and student feedback will contribute to the development of module and programme monitoring reports and to the College's self-assessment report, and the action plans associated with these reports.

1.42 The College has developed and will implement systems for the use of quantitative information to inform its monitoring and review of programmes. Data will include that related to student attendance, assessment performance, retention, achievement and student feedback.

1.43 The College is in the process of finalising the development of its policies and procedures for the monitoring and review of its programmes. These processes would allow this Expectation to be met.

1.44 The review team tested this Expectation by examining the College SED, Quality and Operations Manual, Annual Monitoring and Quality Control Review minutes of College Management, Teaching and Learning and Standardisation Committees and Module Evaluation College SAR template. The Expectation was further tested in meetings with College managers and staff.

1.45 The Quality and Operational Manual and associated policies and procedures set out of the College's approach to monitoring and review at module, programme and College level. Processes are in place which would allow the College to use student evaluations, statistical and admissions data to inform the monitoring and review activities. Awarding organisation external verifier reports and other external reports will feed into the College's programme and College-level monitoring reports. Actions plans to address areas for improvement and to build on good practice will be generated at module, programme and College level and progress with these will be monitored by the Academic Manager.

1.46 The review team heard that the College is undertaking a comprehensive review of its policies and procedures for annual monitoring and periodic review. Much of the underpinning process and documentary framework for this is in place and should enable the

College to meet this Expectation. If the policies and processes are implemented effectively the level of risk associated with this Expectation 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

1.47 In response to the 2017 HER (AP) the College has reviewed its approach to externality through greater engagement with academic 'critical friends' and industry professionals and has developed an Externality Policy.

1.48 The College's Externality Policy sets out the principles on which the College seeks to ensure that its provision is informed by independent external expertise. The College uses external reports from the awarding organisation, QAA, the OfS, Student Loans Company and others to inform the development of its higher education activities and will do so as and when it begins to enrol students to its programmes. Following the recent acquisition by new owners, the College is planning to develop and use further external input from business and partner colleges. The College Report on Guest Speakers indicates some intended external input to curriculum delivery and enrichment. The College has recently appointed a Head of Quality with significant higher education sector experience. It is anticipated that this will help the College meet this Expectation.

1.49 Additionally, the College has recently appointed to its Board of Governance an independent external non-executive member and uses input from an External Advisory Board, which it will use to help inform elements of its provision, such as teaching observations. Recent developments introduced by the College have led to a more coherent approach to the use external and independent expertise at key stages of maintaining academic standards. The processes in place would allow this Expectation to be met.

1.50 The review team tested this Expectation by examining the College SED, Quality and Operations Manual, the Externality Policy. The Expectation was further tested in meetings with College managers and staff.

1.51 The College's Externality Policy is useful in that it sets out the general principles of and approaches to the use of independent expertise to inform its higher education activities. The College continues to review and develop the extent to which it uses external and independent expertise at key stages of setting and maintaining academic standards and is developing a more coherent approach in this respect.

1.52 The team heard valuable commentary from the independent external non-executive member of the College's Board of Governance, which gives some assurance that externality is being used to inform higher education curriculum development and delivery. The review team found that the College will use independent expertise at programme level to ensure the quality of teaching and learning, for example in respect of peer reviewed teaching observations. The College has in place processes by which it can use external verifier reports from the awarding organisation to inform monitoring and review. In the light of these developments the team **affirms** the steps being taken to develop the extent to which external expertise is used in the maintenance of academic standards.

1.53 Recent developments introduced by the College have led to a more coherent approach to the use external and independent expertise at key stages of maintaining academic standards and provides a firm basis and would allow this Expectation to be met with an associated low level of risk.

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

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

1.55 Of the seven Expectations in this judgement area, five are met with low risk and one with moderate risk, and one is judged to be not met with a moderate level of associated risk. Four recommendations are made under this judgement area. Two of the recommendations relate directly to the Expectation that carries moderate risk and which together lead the team to judge the maintenance of the academic standards of the awards to require improvement to meet UK Expectations. The two recommendations are concerned with the processes and practise of seeking approval to offer awards. There are no consistent processes in place to ensure that the College gains external approval for its taught programmes in a timely and efficient manner which is a weakness in part of the governance of standards. Further, this does not provide enough assurance that awards being offered by the College are formally approved in a manner, which is effective and which also allows for students to be in full possession of clear information about the status of their awards before making an application. Together this shows insufficient emphasis or priority being given to assuring standards and quality in the provider's planning processes. This situation has the potential for the award of the Diploma in Education and Training to be promoted to possible students in such a way that they could not be clear about the circumstances in which the award would be offered. The review team are of opinion that the risk has been mitigated to a moderate level of risk on the basis that students have not yet been recruited, and that this provides an opportunity for remedial action to be taken.

1.56 The further two recommendations relate to the need to implement or strengthen existing proposals and are deemed to carry a low level of risk. These are a need to implement a proposed Assessment Board and, secondly, ensure that terms of reference are available for committees having responsibilities for the oversight of quality and standards.

1.57 The review team also affirmed action being taken in two instances. The first relates to the internal review and revision of the academic regulatory framework and the second to the steps that the College has taken to develop the extent to which external expertise is used in the maintenance of academic standards.

1.58 The review team concludes that the maintenance of the academic standards of awards offered on behalf of the awarding organisation at the provider **requires improvement to meet** 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 College does not itself approve programmes but seeks approval to deliver programmes from the awarding organisation.

2.2 The College Management Committee determines which programmes it wishes to seek approval to deliver. Where optional modules are part of a programme the College uses initial indications from applicants, gathered at the interview phase, to determine the demand for such options and typically sets a threshold of six students at which it considers an option to be viable.

2.3 The College governance and management structure is clear and enables executive staff to make judgements on the programmes that it wishes to deliver. In doing so it aligns itself to the requirements of the awarding organisation to ensure that academic standards can be delivered and maintained.

2.4 However, there are no consistent processes in place by which the College gains external approval for the delivery of taught programmes. The College has not yet applied to its awarding organisation for approval to deliver the DET at the Alperton Centre. The review team were informed that the College is planning to use the Alperton Centre as the location for the delivery of the DET programme. While senior managers confirmed that the resources, both physical and human, available to students at this centre would be appropriate, the College did not have approval to deliver this programme at this centre. There are significant shortcomings in the arrangements for seeking external approval processes. These are discussed in more detail in paragraphs 1.25 and 1.26. The processes in place do not allow the Expectation to be met.

2.5 The review team also found that the College's approval from the awarding organisation had lapsed and that requests to regain approval were in progress but had not yet been confirmed (see also the recommendation in paragraph 1.26).

2.6 The team heard from staff that a resource allocation model in planning for the delivery of courses seeks to ensure that physical and human resources are in place and this has enhanced previous processes. However, the review team were not provided with evidence of this model in action (see also paragraph 2.34).

2.7 The team concludes that the College has a process for determining the programmes for which they wish to seek approval but that there was a lack of timeliness in seeking such approval and that this situation demonstrates a weakness in the processes for obtaining approval. The Expectation is not met and the associated risk, when mitigated by the fact that there are no enrolled students, is moderate.

Expectation: Not met
Level of risk: Moderate

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

2.8 The new Admissions Policy and the Admissions Flowchart together outline the processes followed by the College in order to make its admissions decisions. The review team were told by staff that students apply for a course by completing an application form and submitting it online, in person or by post and decisions are made by an Admissions Panel. Entry requirements are listed on the website, including English Language requirements. There is also an Application Appeals policy on the website. Once an applicant has been accepted, their details are added to the Student Management System and an enrolment confirmation letter is produced.

2.9 There is a standard interview template which allows the College to explore the applicant's motivation to study and their career objectives. There is also a pre-admissions test to assess an applicant's literacy and numeracy. In addition, all applicants complete a pre-enrolment screening for accreditation of prior learning. This has the potential to be effective in recognising previous experiences and learning but has yet to be implemented at the College.

2.10 Together these documents set out a comprehensive guide to recruitment and admissions and detail admissions requirements and procedures for APL and Admissions Appeals. As such they form a useful basis for the College to meet this Expectation.

2.11 The team tested this Expectation by examining the College SED, Quality and Operations Manual, admissions paperwork, the new Admissions policy, documents related to the development of the English Language test, the Admissions Flowchart and the College website. The team also discussed admissions with College managers and staff.

2.12 The College offers two routes for entry on to the DET course; by academic qualifications or by recognition of prior learning and experience. All applicants will be assessed during the admissions process to ensure that they have the motivation and capacity to successfully complete the course. The screening for accreditation of prior learning has the potential to effectively recognise the previous learning and experience of applicants.

2.13 The admission process is clearly outlined to prospective applicants in the Admissions Policy. All applicants are interviewed by an academic and the decision about whether to offer a place is then made by an Admissions Panel, chaired by the Head of Marketing and Admissions, which assesses the application, pre-enrolment tests and interview and makes a decision based on suitability for the course. Training will be provided for those who undertake the interviews and for those on the Admissions Panel, and the Admissions and Marketing Committee will review the effectiveness of the admissions processes at the end of each cycle. This process has not yet been tested at the College, although the review team were told it is well established in the other colleges within the group.

2.14 Some information about the DET course is provided on the website. However, the information about the College's entry requirements for the DET course is not complete because it does not include the requirement for all students to apply and pay for a Disclosure and Barring Service check (DBS), meaning that applicants will not have full and sufficient information on which to base their study decisions. The staff explained to the review team that full and relevant information will be given orally at the Open Day, including the need to have a satisfactory DBS. The recently redeveloped admissions process requires all applicants to attend an Open Day. This is compulsory and if an applicant misses the Open Day, they must attend a 1:1 briefing instead. The requirement to pay for a DBS and the fact that a place on the course is dependent on a satisfactory DBS clearance is not included on the website, in the prospectus, in the admissions policy or on the application form. The team were also concerned about the staff's knowledge of the Admissions Policy itself, as they told the team that the DBS requirement is in the Admissions Policy under 3.4 Additional Entrance Requirements. However, examination of the policy showed that it is not included. (See recommendation in paragraph 3.11, Section C)

2.15 The review team were told in three meetings of the College's intentions to relocate delivery of the DET course to a site in Alperton, where one of the other colleges in the group has capacity within their building to accommodate the course. This building is more accessible than the current Finchley site and resources for the DET course are to be moved to the Alperton site from the Finchley site in preparation for the January start of the DET course. This development means that the information currently available for applicants on the website is out of date. There is a statement for applicants on the website to say that those with mobility issues cannot access the building as there are stairs and no lift. This statement is also repeated in the Student Handbook on the website. These statements relate to the Finchley Campus and the website has not yet been updated with information about the new location, its facilities or student experience at Alperton to enable prospective applicants to make a decision about where to study. The only addresses listed on the website are for the Finchley and Park Royal campuses with no mention of the Alperton site. In addition, the student handbook on the website is the older version, dated January 2018, which also includes the statement about lack of access for those with mobility difficulties. The prospectus, which is downloadable from the website, informs applicants that the delivery of the course will take place at the Finchley site.

2.16 The review team found a further anomaly with the Applications Appeals policy on the website. This states that appeals will be heard by the Principal, whereas the Admissions Policy on the website states that an appeal would be heard by the Admissions Panel.

2.17 Senior staff informed the team that although formal marketing of the DET course for January has not yet begun, they are already in contact with partner institutions who will send potential applicants to the College for the November Open Day. Outdated and incomplete information on the website and in the prospectus prevents potential applicants from being able to make informed decisions about where they choose to study. Senior staff assured the review team that they are planning on updating all information, policies and procedures on the website prior to the Open Day planned in November. However, prospective applicants will already be accessing information from the website and a lack of transparency over the location of delivery, the facilities available, the entry requirements, the additional costs of the course and the admissions appeals process may cause significant confusion for applicants. In view of the imminence of recruitment for January 2019, the review team **recommends** that the College provide more comprehensive externally-facing information for potential applicants in order to inform their decision making.

2.18 A student induction programme will give new students an introduction to the course, writing assignments and referencing. It does not appear to include information about how to access the VLE, or how to find any policies or procedures.

2.19 Currently, there is insufficient and inaccurate information on the website for prospective applicants to make an informed decision about whether to study at UKBC. There is no information related to the location of delivery, the facilities and services available at that location and the additional costs associated with studying for the DET course. This leads to a lack of transparency, reliability and validity within the admissions processes. The review team, therefore, concludes that the Expectation is not met and that there is a moderate level of risk.

Expectation: Not met

Level of risk: Moderate

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

2.20 The College has a Teaching and Learning policy within its Quality and Operations Manual. It is detailed and inclusive and aligns well with the information found in the Quality Code under *Chapter B3*. This policy is due to be revised by the Quality team in Phase 2 of the Governance Review. There is also a Teaching and Learning strategy, which outlines the College's approach to delivering its programmes.

2.21 The Teaching and Learning Committee is currently suspended as there are no students at the College; however, it will become a subcommittee of the Academic Board with revised terms of reference and will be charged with monitoring all aspects of programme delivery, through module and programme monitoring activities.

2.22 The College's VLE is being designed as a 'one-stop shop' for students where they will find everything they need to support their learning at the College. It is currently being populated and will eventually provide access for students to all their course materials as well as handbooks, policies, procedures and forms. No policies are currently on the VLE.

2.23 The College has three full-time and four part-time academic staff. It also has access to additional staff from the other colleges in the group. An Academic Staff Induction Checklist provides a framework for the development of staff knowledge and skills related to teaching and assessing at level 5. The College's Quality and Enhancement Plan 2018-19 also sets out plans to deliver a comprehensive series of workshops for academic staff from December 2018.

2.24 Documentation of policy and procedure related to this Expectation is extensive and would allow for it to be met.

2.25 The review team tested this Expectation by examining the College SED, Quality and Operations Manual; the Governance Handbook; the Teaching and Learning Strategy; the Staff Recruitment Procedure; and policies related to work placement, staff recruitment and staff development. The Expectation was further tested in meetings with College managers and staff.

2.26 The College is preparing for the delivery of the DET programme, planned from January 2019. Schemes of work are in place which demonstrate planned delivery of all unit intended learning outcomes. The Academic Manager has a sound grasp of the programme requirements and the first assignments have been written and internally verified to assess unit intended learning outcomes.

2.27 The monitoring of the quality of teaching will be undertaken through lesson observations, which will feed into annual staff appraisal. The College is also introducing processes by which academic staff will monitor the quality of their modules and the programme overall. Template forms will allow for consideration of external examiner reports, student feedback, examination and analysis of data related to retention and achievement, and for action planning for enhancement.

2.28 The Teaching and Learning Policy and Teaching Strategy set out the general principles on which the College operates in terms of promoting the engagement of students in learning. These include contributions to the monitoring, review and enhancement of teaching and learning through feedback mechanisms at unit and programme level. Student representation on the College Teaching and Learning Committee and participation in observations of teaching staff will also contribute. Students will also be members of the Academic Board, allowing them to influence decision making about their experiences. The Teaching and Learning Policy and Teaching Strategy are not yet on the College's VLE and, therefore, not yet available to students.

2.29 The College also has in place an attendance policy for students, which emphasises the expectation of 100 per cent attendance, with registers planned to be taken daily. Although there are no immediate plans to recruit international students, as the College does not have a Tier 4 licence, the policy also details expectations for international students and actions to be taken with respect to visas and leave to remain in the event of students breaching 90 per cent attendance requirements.

2.30 A comprehensive academic staff induction programme is planned that will support staff in the delivery of the programme. The Academic Manager will oversee the induction process for new staff. Ongoing staff development will take place in the form of the Reflective Practitioner programme of workshops. These processes have the potential to support academic staff to deliver the DET course effectively and the team **affirms** the schedule of staff development for teaching and assessing at higher education level.

2.31 Historical minutes from the Teaching and Learning Committee indicate very little discussion or oversight of Teaching and Learning activity, as outlined in its terms of reference. There is no scrutiny of EQA reports or student/staff feedback and only a cursory mention of the previous HER (AP) report with no discussion. There is no analysis of modules. This means that the Teaching and Learning Committee did not previously undertake its role, as outlined in its Terms of Reference, effectively. The new Governance structure introduced by the Head of Quality has the potential to support a more effective oversight of teaching and learning through new terms of reference for Course Committees, Teaching and Learning Committees and an Academic Board.

2.32 The awarding organisation provides a detailed list of learning resources that should be made available to students on the DET course within the programme specification. The College confirmed that it has some resources from an old teaching course that it is transferring to the Alperton campus in readiness for the DET course to begin, and that it intends to increase the number of books available. This additional expenditure has already been approved by the Management Committee, but the additional resources have not yet been acquired.

2.33 The planned DET course requires 100 hours of work placement and a minimum of 8 hours of observed teaching. The College intends that its own academic staff will carry out all the observations. The team were concerned about the capacity of the College's 3 full-time and 4 part-time staff to accommodate 8 hours of observation for each student, in addition to teaching commitments, if the College recruits to its capacity of 50 full-time and 50 part-time students. The senior staff [M6] indicated in a meeting with the team that they would recruit additional staff if necessary, but no definite plans were made available to the team. The team therefore **recommends** the College ensure sufficient teaching resources for the effective delivery of the Diploma in Education and Training (DET) programme.

2.34 Although no teaching and learning is currently taking place, the College is actively preparing for a new cohort of students for the DET course in January 2019. This preparation is advanced in some areas, but the team remained concerned about the resources available

to fully support learning in the College and in placement. The Expectation is therefore met with a moderate level of risk.

Expectation: Met

Level of risk: Moderate

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

2.35 The Quality and Operations Manual indicates that the College will offer a range of services for students, aimed at supporting them to achieve. These include English study support, library facilities, support for international students, counselling, advice and guidance.

2.36 There is a Reasonable Adjustments and Special Considerations policy, the overall aim of which is to remove as far as possible any disadvantage particular groups might suffer, whilst at the same time not putting them at an advantage over others, nor diluting the quality of the assessments which are made. The policy states that this will be achieved within the boundaries of the awarding organisation's regulations.

2.37 There is a Pastoral Support Policy and a Student Support/Exit Policy, the latter of which outlines an employability programme for all successful students and states that the College will help with matters related to finance, social, health or personal problems. As no students are currently enrolled, this policy has not yet been implemented. The College Pastoral Support Policy sets out its approach to the pastoral support of students, giving some examples of how such needs will be identified and met.

2.38 All students are allocated a Personal Tutor who supports the retention and achievement of their tutees. The College intends to make use of Personal Development Plans (PDP) to encourage students and tutors to work together to set and review targets for achievement and development.

2.39 Students will have access to IT resources at the Alpertown campus, with a ratio of one PC available for every 2 students. Laptops can also be borrowed whilst on campus and there are Wi-Fi and printing facilities available.

2.40 The processes in place would allow the Expectation to be met.

2.41 The Team tested this Expectation by examining the College SED, Quality and Operations Manual, Teaching and Learning Strategy, Pastoral Support Policy, Student Support/Exit Policy, Student Handbooks, PDP pro forma, and Attendance Policy. The Expectation was further tested in meetings with College managers and staff

2.42 A personal tutor will be allocated to every student and they will meet a minimum of three times per year. There will also be a two-hour tutorial slot scheduled weekly, whereby students can drop in to see any tutor or lecturer without needing an appointment. The Personal Tutor and student will together develop and monitor a Personal Development Plan (PDP), which has the potential to support retention, achievement and progression. The review team **affirms** the development of a system for monitoring and supporting student progression through personal development plans and the personal tutorial system.

2.43 The Student Management System (SMS) and plagiarism-detection software interact to help tutors to track student progress. The review team were given a presentation to illustrate how this will happen. Personal Tutors will then use the PDP process to help students to manage their own progression and achievement. The SMS also has the capability to send messages to individual or groups of students, and so has the potential to support good communication between the College and its students.

2.44 There is some information in the Student Handbook about how and where students can access support, advice and guidance. However, the College is planning to provide more information to students on its VLE.

2.45 There is evidence of the College's commitment to improving its library stock. Minutes of the Management Meeting in June 2018 indicate approval of increased investment in this area although the new resources have not yet been acquired. The DET Course Handbook includes a comprehensive list of resources for the programme and resources are being transferred from the Finchley campus to the Alperton campus in readiness for delivery of teaching at Alperton. The review team were told that there is a dedicated library at Alperton, along with improved social spaces for students. Senior managers indicated that a resource allocation model would be used in the future, but this is not yet in operation.

2.46 IT resources will be available for students. The student ID card can be charged by students, at a cost to themselves, to enable them to use the printing facilities. The review team were told that computers are available and plentiful at Alperton and there is also Wi-Fi for student use.

2.47 The staff described the close working relationship between Admissions and Student Support teams. This has the potential to work well, as support needs can be identified at application stage and planned for from the earliest opportunity. The College can currently only externally signpost those students who are eligible for Disabled Students Allowance. However, the review team was told that an additional, appropriately qualified member of staff has been requested and it is hoped that they will be able to provide specific support internally.

2.48 The College is planning sound processes which have the potential to effectively support students' academic, personal and professional development. The Expectation is, therefore met, and the level of associated 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

2.49 The College has in place processes by which it will engage with students. Students will be represented on the College's planned Academic Board and the existing Management and Teaching and Learning Committees. Student feedback will be sought at unit and course level.

2.50 The College has in place processes for the election of Student Representatives by election. The procedure for this sets out both the general principles of the role of the student representative and the mechanism by which they are elected. The terms of reference for the Teaching and Learning Committee detail the role of the Committee which indicate areas where students will be able to contribute their views. The College is proposing to introduce a student representative development programme.

2.51 The College has in place policies and procedures for student engagement which will enable it to implement these as and when students are recruited. These processes would allow the Expectation to be met.

2.52 The review team tested this Expectation by examining the College's SED, Quality and Operations Manual, feedback and evaluation questionnaires, and the Student Representative Election Procedure. The Expectation was further tested in meetings with College managers and staff.

2.53 The College is taking effective steps to ensure that as students are enrolled, they will be able to contribute to the review and enhancement of their learning experience. The evidence seen by the review team and comments made by senior and teaching staff indicate that the processes that will be introduced have the potential to be effective.

2.54 While the College does not currently have any students enrolled it does have in place policies and procedures for student engagement which when implemented effectively will allow the Expectation to be met with low level of associated risk.

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

2.55 While the College is reliant upon the awarding organisation for the general nature of assessment of programmes it has the responsibility for the design and delivery of the assessments themselves, including the verification of such assessments before their release to students and of grades after assessments have been marked.

2.56 The College Quality and Operations Manual contains details on assessment regulations and processes. These state that the College assessment requirements comply with those of the awarding organisation. In turn the awarding organisation applies its own external verification and standards processes to ensure that the College is compliant.

2.57 The College will instigate an Assessment Board which will act as the body which confirms final student grades, taking into account academic malpractice and mitigating circumstances. The Board will be chaired by the Academic Manager. The Board will undertake the functions previously under the remit of the College Management and Teaching and Learning Committees.

2.58 The College has in place procedures for the internal verification of assessments prior to their release to students and for the moderation of grades awarded. The Academic Manager takes the role of lead Internal Verifier and Moderator. The Colleges Student Management System enables all verification, assessment and moderation decisions to be captured.

2.59 The College has in place a range of policies and procedures which cover many aspects of assessment. Additionally, it is moving towards a more coherent and robust system for the comprehensive operation of equitable, valid and reliable processes of assessment, including for the recognition of prior learning. These processes would allow the Expectation to be met.

2.60 The review team tested this Expectation by examining the College SED, Quality and Operations Manual, minutes of College Management, Teaching and Learning and Standardisation Committees and awarding organisation documents, the College Policy on Reasonable Adjustment and Special Consideration, Development of Assessment Briefs, sample brief, schemes of work and lesson plans, and Plagiarism Policy. The Expectation was further tested in meetings with College managers and staff.

2.61 The College policy on Reasonable Adjustments and Special Consideration and on Mitigating Circumstances sets out the general principles of the College's approach to these matters as they relate to assessment practice. This process will be overseen by the Academic Manager and Admissions Manager.

2.62 Planning of assessments and of their timing of delivery is evidenced in the Development of Assessment Briefs, sample brief and in schemes of work and lesson plans. Assessed work will be verified initially on a 50 per cent basis and the Academic Manager will lead on this function.

2.63 The College's Plagiarism and Malpractice and Maladministration policies set out the College's stance on this aspect of academic malpractice and indicates the processes which follow suspected plagiarism. The College will use plagiarism-detection software and all assessments will be required to be submitted through this on the College's VLE.

2.64 The College is in the process of developing a centralised tracking system to record all summative assessment decisions (see also the recommendation in paragraph 1.11).

2.65 The College has in place a comprehensive set of policies and procedures which when implemented will allow this Expectation to be met with a low level of associated risk.

Expectation: Met

Level of risk: Low

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

Quality Code, Chapter B7: External Examining

Findings

2.66 The awarding organisation is responsible for the appointment, training and deployment of external and standards verifiers (EV/SV) who conduct regular external standards verification checks.

2.67 The College will use reports from the awarding organisation to inform the enhancement of its provision through its annual monitoring and review processes at module, programme and College level and these are captured in an Annual Monitoring and Quality Control Review.

2.68 The College Teaching and Learning Committee currently has the authority to consider external reports, but the College is in the process of establishing an Academic Board which will take on this function. On their initial receipt, external verifier and standards verifier reports will be considered at Programme Committees and subsequently incorporated into the annual monitoring processes and actions plans that arise from this. [Meeting 4] Students will have access to EV/SV reports through their engagement in the Teaching and Learning Committee and the College has intentions to make these reports available to students on the VLE.

2.69 The College is not responsible for the appointment, training and deployment of EV/SVs. It does not yet have any such external reports for the DET programme that it is planning to deliver. However, it does have in place appropriate policies and procedures by which it intends to make scrupulous use of these reports as and when they are received. The process would allow this Expectation to be met.

2.70 The review team tested this Expectation by examining the College SED, Quality and Operations Manual, minutes of College Management, Teaching and Learning and Standardisation Committees, Annual Monitoring and Quality Control Review. The Expectation was further tested in meetings with College managers and staff.

2.71 Currently the College has no enrolled students or operating programmes and or awarding organisation approval. Consequently, there are no external verifier or standards verifier reports that it is required to manage. However, the College does have in place appropriate policies and procedures by which it intends to make scrupulous use of these reports as and when they are received. The review team were informed how external reports will form an element of the College's monitoring and review processes, having first been considered at programme committee level. The planned establishment of an academic board, chaired by the Principal, will allow the College to take a holistic view of external reports and to build on good practice and respond to areas for improvement.

2.72 While the review team was not able to see in practice how the College makes use of external verifier and standards verifier reports, the team was able to establish that the College has in place effective processes at course, programme and College level, by which it will be able to do so. As such this Expectation is met with a low level of associated risk.

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

2.73 The College recognises its role in monitoring and reviewing its provision to ensure that the academic standards of the awarding organisation are being maintained and the quality of learning opportunities is enhanced. It has a comprehensive Quality and Operational Manual within which the College's approach to, and procedures for, monitoring and review are set out.

2.74 The College has established a new Quality Unit, which has the remit to monitor academic standards and quality assurance, with oversight of all new policies, procedures and strategic developments. This remit includes that of monitoring and review of modules and programmes.

2.75 The College is in the process of developing a more systematic approach to monitoring and review based on standard templates at module, programme and College level. External verifier reports and student feedback will contribute to the development of module and programme monitoring reports and to the College Self-Assessment Report and the action plans associated with these reports. The College has developed and will implement quantitative data systems to inform its monitoring and review of programmes. Data will include that related to student attendance, assessment performance, retention, achievement and student feedback.

2.76 The College is in the process of finalising the development of its policies and procedures for the monitoring and review of its programmes. The processes proposed would allow the Expectation to be met.

2.77 The review team tested this Expectation by examining the College's SED, Quality and Operations Manual, Annual Monitoring and Quality Control Review minutes of College Management, Teaching and Learning and Standardisation Committees, and Module Evaluation College SAR template. The Expectation was further tested in meetings with College managers and staff.

2.78 The Quality and Operational Manual and associated policies and procedures set out of the College's approach to monitoring and review at module, programme and College level. The Annual Quality Control Report deals with both academic and non-academic matters. The former would currently be reported to the Teaching and Learning Committee and the latter to the College Management Committee.

2.79 The College has developed a Module Monitoring Report and Programme Evaluation and Monitoring Report (PEMR) template, which will form the basis for Programme level monitoring and review. The templates will provide scope for an extensive evaluation of a wide range of factors which impact on standards and the quality of the student experience, including student teaching and support resources and staffing resources. There will be the opportunity for staff reflection on the programme and on individual modules in the context of the original programme specification. The PEMR will lead to an action plan which will be led by the programme manager and overseen by the College Academic Manager.

2.80 Processes are in place which will allow the College to use student evaluations, statistical and admissions data to inform the monitoring and review activities. Awarding body external verifier reports and other external reports will feed into the College's programme and College level monitoring reports. Actions plans to address areas for improvement and to build on good practice will be generated at module, programme and College level and progress with these will be monitored by the Academic Manager.

2.81 The College intends to develop a process for the periodic review of programmes.

2.82 Currently the College does not have any programmes that are operational. However, the review team found that it does have in place policies and procedures, supported by appropriate templates and a Student Management System, which will allow it to undertake effective annual monitoring and review. Currently processes for periodic review of programmes were not fully developed. However, given what is in place, this Expectation is met with a low level of associated risk.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B9): Higher education providers have procedures for handling academic appeals and student complaints about the quality of learning opportunities; these procedures are fair, accessible and timely, and enable enhancement.

Quality Code, Chapter B9: Academic Appeals and Student Complaints

Findings

2.83 The College Procedure for admissions and enrolment includes details on the grounds on which an admissions appeal can be made and the process by which and timescale within which the College will respond. The College Complaints Procedure sets out the general principles on which the College approaches complaints and provides details on a three-stage approach to dealing with complaints, including final referral to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator. The College Academic Appeals Policy is supported by the Assessment Appeals procedure and sets out the principles on which an academic appeal can be made and the processes which apply in such cases.

2.84 Currently the College does not have any enrolled students, but it does have in place policies and procedures which demonstrate the principles on which academic appeals and complaints are based. Senior and other staff at the College were able to elucidate a sound understanding of the basis of effective appeals and complaints processes. These processes would allow the Expectation to be met.

2.85 The review team tested this Expectation by examining the College SED, Quality and Operations Manual, Complaints Procedure, College Plagiarism Policy, College Academic Appeals Policy and Assessment Appeals Procedure. The Expectation was further tested in meetings with College managers and staff.

2.86 The College has in place policies and procedures which demonstrate the principles on which academic appeals and complaints are based. Senior and other staff at the College were able to articulate a sound understanding of the basis of effective appeals and complaints processes. They outlined the principles of fairness, confidentiality and independence. Senior managers noted that the Colleges complaints policies and procedures were under review such that future complaints would be managed by the College Registry and that ultimately complainants would have recourse to the College governing body.

2.87 Policies and procedures in place would allow this Expectation to be met when the College is in receipt of a complaint or an academic appeal. Consequently, this Expectation is met with a low level of associated risk.

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

2.88 The College manages the work-based learning elements of the DET course through a range of policies, documents and agreements.

2.89 The key aspect of College activity relating to this Expectation is the work-based learning element of the Pearson DET, in which students are required to gain a minimum of 100 hours of relevant work experience and be subject to a minimum of eight hours of observations of their teaching practice. To achieve this, the College employs a Work Placement Coordinator who is responsible for arranging effective, relevant and safe placements for students. The College expects the students to find their own placements and the Work Placement Unit will support the students to do so. The placement may be an unpaid position or in the student's own workplace. The website makes clear that the DET course is an in-service qualification and that students, therefore, need to be in a teaching or training role.

2.90 The College's policy framework and the employment of a dedicated Work Placement Officer provide a sound basis for work-based learning. The processes in place would allow the Expectation to be met.

2.91 The team tested this Expectation by examining the College SED, Quality and Operations Manual, work placement policies and documents, and the job description of the Work Placement Officer.

2.92 The Work Placement Policy, Handbook and Agreement together have the potential to provide a secure and effective framework for the management of work placements. They set out clearly the expectations of the College and explain to students how the College will support them to access work placement opportunities, as well as outlining the roles and responsibilities of all involved. The review team noted that the Work Placement Handbook is a repetition of the Work Placement Policy, with the addition of a pro forma for the lesson observations that will be carried out.

2.93 Observations of teaching for students on the DET course will be conducted by College staff only. The staff explained that this would ensure a standardised approach to grading observations. Training will be given to all staff involved in observations and the College's external academic will also shadow some observations to provide further standardisation (see also paragraph 2.34).

2.94 The quality of learning opportunities on work placement will be supported through visits made by the work placement officer. Visits will be carried out prior to a student beginning a work placement and a health and safety assessment will be conducted. Work placements will be expected to share their public liability insurance and to provide professional development opportunities to the student.

2.95 The Work Placement Policy and Handbook refer to foundation degrees and top-up degrees, provision which does not currently match that of the College. This is further discussed in Section C: Information.

2.96 In addition to the Work Placement Policy, Handbook and Agreement, there is also a Work Placement Policy and Guidance document on the website. This provides different advice and guidance for students and placement settings and a different sample contract, which has the potential to add confusion for students and placement settings. This contributes to the recommendations made in Section C: Information.

2.97 The plans for assuring the quality of learning opportunities in work placement settings are beginning to emerge and the College plans to develop these further as students are recruited to the course.

2.98 The Work Placement documents and agreements provide a framework which has the potential to allow the College to successfully manage its partnerships with work placement settings. Notwithstanding the potential confusion over repeated information and different documents designed to do the same thing, the Expectation is met, and the level of associated 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

2.99 The College does not offer any research degree programmes.

Expectation: Not applicable

Level of risk: Not applicable

The quality of student learning opportunities: Summary of findings

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

2.101 Of the eleven Expectations in this judgement area, 10 Expectations are applicable to the College. Of these 10, eight are met and two, B1 and B2 are not. Expectation B11 is not applicable as the College does not offer research degrees. Three Expectations are judged to have a moderate risk, including the Expectations that are not met.

2.102 Expectation B1, Programme Design, Development and Approval, is not met because of significant weaknesses in the processes for ensuring that external approval of programmes takes place in a timely manner and before recruitment of students takes place. See also the judgement reached for Expectation A3.1. Expectation B2, Recruitment, Selection and Admission to Higher Education, is not met and has an associated moderate level of risk. The team reached this conclusion on the basis that there is insufficient information on the website for prospective applicants to make an informed decision about whether to study at the College, including a lack of information related to the location of delivery, the facilities and services available at that location and the additional costs associated with studying for the DET course. The review team, therefore, concludes that there is a lack of transparency, reliability and validity within the admissions processes. This situation is also reflected in the judgement made in Section C, Information.

2.103 Nine Expectations are met, seven with low levels of associated risk and two with moderate.

2.104 Two affirmations were made in respect of actions already being taken. The first refers to the schedule of staff development that is set out and which the team conclude will support academic staff in the delivery of the DET programme if implemented effectively. Secondly the team affirmed the development of a system for monitoring and supporting student progression, which if implemented effectively has the potential to support retention, progression and achievement.

2.105 Three of the Expectations have associated levels of risk rated as moderate, and two Expectations in this judgement area is not met. Overall, most applicable expectations are met and those that are not do not present any serious risk. Taking into account the policies and procedures in place and the College's plans to develop them further, the review team believes that there is sufficient mitigation to support a judgement that overall UK expectations in this area are met.

2.106 The review team concludes that the quality of student learning opportunities at the provider **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 main source of information about the College and its programmes is the website, supplemented by a prospectus that can be downloaded.

3.2 The College has in place some legacy documents that it is in the process of replacing. Under the previous ownership, there were various processes and policies to support the development of information that is accurate, current and complete: A Public Information Policy states that the Management Committee is responsible for maintaining the quality of information produced by the College. Minutes of the Management Committee show that there is some discussion around information. Under this policy, the Academic Manager would make six-monthly checks of information. An Updating Policy indicates that information was updated at least annually and that the Academic Manager is responsible for highlighting, to the Principal, any changes needed.

3.3 Under the new ownership, there are plans to introduce a Publications Committee, which will have responsibility for ensuring that all internal and external documents are accessible, trustworthy and fit for purpose. This framework for information is already in place at the other colleges in the group and there are plans to bring it to the College in the near future.

3.4 There are a number of policies on the website, many of which are due for revision under Phase 2 of the regulatory and governance review. The VLE is currently in development and will become a one-stop shop for information for students. It will contain all documents related to the programme and all policies, procedures and regulations. Two different handbooks are provided to students; a generic Student Handbook and a Course Handbook. Together, these provide information to students about the programme of study and the College in general.

3.5 Not all the information currently available to potential applicants is accurate and complete. For example, and as discussed in B2, there is currently no information available to applicants about the planned move of teaching for the DET course to the Alperton campus. Consequently, potential students have no information about the location, facilities available or student experience at the site. The prospectus uses the incorrect title of 'Edexcel HND in Education and Training'. It also informs applicants that the teaching will take place at the Finchley site. The prospectus mentions that a £250 deposit is required, although this is not repeated in the fees section on the website, or on the application form. The entry requirement of paying for and receiving a satisfactory DBS check does not appear on the website or in any of the admissions documentation and no mention is made of whether students have to find their own placements. Although the staff stated that this information is shared orally with applicants at the Open Days, the College was unable to provide any evidence of this. In addition, there are some anomalies within the handbooks and policy for work placements (see B10). The Work Placement Policy and Handbook refer to foundation degrees and top-up degrees, provision which does not currently match that of the College. Staff explained to the review team that these documents have been brought over from other

colleges in the group, but they have not yet been tailored to the provision at the College. However, this means that current procedures for checking information are not sufficiently robust. Information at the time of the review was not complete, was inconsistent and not readily accessible by potential students. The review team, therefore, **recommends** the College develop and implement a process by which all published information will be checked and reviewed to ensure it is fit for purpose, accessible and trustworthy.

3.6 Current procedures for checking and reviewing information are not well developed and lack clarity about responsibilities. There are plans for a new Publications Committee, but these are not sufficiently well developed, there being no terms of reference. The policies and procedures in place do not allow the Expectation to be met.

3.7 The review team tested this Expectation by examining the College SED, Quality and Operations Manual, Student Handbooks, a sample of minutes of the Management Committee, the website, VLE and Student Management System. The Expectation was further tested in meetings with College managers and staff.

3.8 The College is currently undergoing a significant review of its policies and procedures in order to align itself with the other colleges in the group. This review is due to complete in mid-November 2018. All information available to students and potential applicants is under review, resulting in some published information not presently reflecting the College's current provision or governance. Some of these anomalies have already been discussed in B2 and B8 and they contribute to the recommendations in this section. The accuracy and completeness of information will be managed by a Publications Committee. The review team has not seen any terms of reference for this committee, but staff explained its responsibilities.

3.9 The VLE will become the central repository for all information for students. It will contain all materials related to the programme and all policies and procedures. It is not currently fully populated, but the review team were informed that the work on the VLE would be complete before students are enrolled.

3.10 The DET Student Handbook has been prepared to distribute to students from January 2019. It gives details of the content and credit values of the modules. It does not provide any policies or procedures for students, but the team were told that these would all be available on the VLE prior to the students enrolling. There is some potentially misleading information in the introduction to the handbook, where it is stated that 'The DET course is for those carrying out a teaching role and need to gain Qualified Teacher Status (QTLS)'. This statement is also on the website in the course information, where it also states, 'this corresponds to the full teacher role'. At no point on the website or in the student handbook is it made clear that this is a qualification for teaching in the post-16 sector only. Successful graduates of the DET course may apply for recognition as a Qualified Teacher of Learning and Skills (QTLS) but this is not the same as Qualified Teacher Status. In the team's view, this could lead to a potentially career-changing error for an applicant choosing this course and the senior staff acknowledged that it needs to be rectified. The review team, therefore, **recommends** the College clarify the status of the Diploma in Education and Training (DET) with respect to Qualified Teacher of Learning and Skills (QTLS) in all relevant documentation before students are recruited to the programme.

3.11 Although the review team have been informed about the plans to review all information available to applicants and students, the plans are not yet sufficiently well developed or robust enough to address current weaknesses and shortcomings in the processes for ensuring the currency and appropriateness of information, this has resulted in the information that is not fit for purpose, accessible and trustworthy. The Expectation is,

therefore, not met. The risk level is assessed as moderate in the light of the College's recognition of the weaknesses and shortcomings and the plans to review all information.

Expectation: Not met

Level of risk: Moderate

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

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

3.13 The Expectation in this judgement area is not met and is judged to carry a moderate level of risk. Two recommendations are made that reflect this conclusion. The College is recommended to develop and implement a process by which all of its published information can be checked and reviewed to ensure it is fit for purpose, accessible and trustworthy. The review team noted that much work was being undertaken to revise and develop new policies, procedures and handbooks but the College is promoting the DET course to prospective students while the information it was making public was not yet fit for purpose. The second recommendation relates directly to such a situation. The status of the DET qualification with respect to Qualified Teacher of Learning Skills (QTLS) was not clear or consistent across documentation and had the potential to mislead students as to the professional qualification they would obtain. Taken together the team concludes that the Expectation is not met and that there was a moderate level of associated risk attached that requires addressing before recruiting students.

3.14 The review team concludes that the quality of the information about learning opportunities at the provider **requires improvement to meet** 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 The College Enhancement Strategy sets out its general approach to the enhancement of learning opportunities within its higher education provision. The College's Strategy emphasises the role of the student in contributing to enhancement and it also cites the role of sharing best practice among staff and the role of its various committees in identifying and implementing enhancement activities. It acknowledges that it is seeking to consolidate the various means by which enhancement.

4.2 The College has introduced a requirement that Enhancement will be a standing agenda item for both the Teaching and Learning and Management Committees and is also a standard element in Module and Programme Monitoring templates.

4.3 The College cites its Student Support Policy/Exit Strategy as an example of enhancement in how it will support students in their development of progression and employment skills, such as CV development and interview skills, although as no students are currently enrolled this is yet to be demonstrated in practice.

4.4 The College has an explicit Enhancement Strategy, which aligns with elements of its monitoring and review cycle. The College acknowledges that it needs to consolidate its approach to enhancement. Nonetheless, the management structures, policies and procedures that the College currently has in place would allow this Expectation to be met.

4.5 The review team tested this Expectation by examining the College SED, Quality and Operations Manual, College Enhancement Strategy, a sample of minutes of the Management and Teaching and Learning Committees, and the Post-Graduation/Exit Strategy. The Team also tested this Expectation in meetings with senior staff.

4.6 The review team found that senior staff were clear in their understanding of the principles of enhancement and, expanding on the rather general outline of the Enhancement Strategy, were able to explain in more detail how enhancement would be built into the culture of the College with student engagement being a key theme. For example, the College plans to have students represented on all its deliberative committees.

4.7 The clear, revised management structure of the College allied to its new monitoring and review processes should allow for the principles of enhancement to be put into practice when the College has enrolled students and operational programmes.

4.8 An explicit Enhancement Strategy, which aligns with elements of the College's monitoring and review cycle, is in place. The review team found that senior staff were clear in their understanding of the principles of enhancement. While the College acknowledges that it needs to consolidate its approach to enhancement, the management structures, policies and procedures that the College currently has in place would allow this Expectation to be met in practice with a low level of associated risk.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

The enhancement of student learning opportunities: Summary of findings

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

4.10 The single Expectation in this judgement area was judged to be met with a low level of risk. No recommendations or affirmations were made.

4.11 The review team concludes that the enhancement of student learning opportunities at the provider **meets** 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](#).

User-friendly explanations of a wide range of terms can be found in the longer Glossary on the QAA website: www.qaa.ac.uk/glossary.

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.

QAA2373 - R10290 - May 19

© The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education 2019
Southgate House, Southgate Street, Gloucester GL1 1UB
Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786

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