



UK College of Business and Computing Ltd

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

June 2014

Key findings about UK College of Business and Computing Ltd

As a result of its Review for Educational Oversight carried out in June 2014, the QAA review team (the team) considers that there can be **confidence** in how the provider manages its stated responsibilities for the standards of the programmes it offers on behalf of the Association of Chartered Certified Accountants and Pearson.

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

The team considers that reliance **can** be placed on the information that the provider produces for its intended audiences about the learning opportunities it offers.

Recommendations

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

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

- review its academic management structures to devolve more responsibilities to the programme teams (paragraphs 1.1, 1.3 and 2.5)
- review the academic committees and quality reporting structures to strengthen critical debate, action planning and recording (paragraphs 1.2, 1.3, 1.6, 2.1, 2.2, 2.8, 3.7)
- give more formal and robust attention to the analysis of student data (paragraphs 1.7 and 2.7)
- address shortcomings in the written feedback given to students on their assessed work (paragraph 2.6).

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

- continue to embed the Quality Code in the development of policies and procedures (paragraph 1.5)
- further integrate the teaching observation process within quality procedures and involve more staff as observers (paragraph 2.5)
- continue to target staff development to address College priorities and to engage more staff (paragraph 2.10)
- plan and allocate learning resources more strategically (paragraph 2.12)
- clarify potential confusion on the website about the HND Business pathways (paragraph 3.1)
- make external verifier reports available to students (paragraph 3.3).

About this report

This report presents the findings of the [Educational Oversight reviews](#)¹ (REO) conducted at UK College of Business and Computing Ltd (the provider; the College), which is a privately-funded provider of higher education. The purpose of the review is to provide public information about how the College discharges its stated responsibilities for the management and delivery of academic standards and the quality of learning opportunities available to students. The review applies to programmes of study that the College delivers on behalf of the Association of Chartered Certified Accountants and Pearson. The review was carried out by Mr Seth Crofts, Ms Sarah Riches (reviewers) and Mr David Lewis (Coordinator).

The review team conducted the review in agreement with the provider and in accordance with the [Review for Educational Oversight: Handbook](#).² Evidence in support of the review included a range of internal documentation, policy, procedure and strategy statements, records of meetings, and a range of information produced for students and staff, including publicity, handbooks, curriculum and teaching materials. The team looked at a sample of assessed student work and held meetings with staff and students. It considered external reports, including those of verifiers, the Academic Management Review conducted by Pearson in 2013-14, and the Review for Educational Oversight reports published by QAA in 2012 and 2013.

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

- UK Quality Code for Higher Education (the Quality Code)
- Qualifications and Credit Framework for England, Wales and Northern Ireland
- Regulatory and guidance documents published by the awarding organisations.

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

The College is a well-established independent college of higher education, with five campuses across Greater London. Higher education is provided on four campuses, including the main one in a large office block at Gants Hill, Essex. The other higher education campuses are at Park Royal, Cricklewood and a second one at Gants Hill. The College was formed in 2001 and changed to the present ownership in 2007. It is registered with the Accreditation Service for International Colleges and accredited by the British Council for English language teaching. The College has ISO 9001 certification in respect of quality assurance. The mission statement of the College, which emphasises its community role, is built upon a set of core values. These values reflect a commitment to lifelong learning, active learning, equality of opportunity and a supportive learning environment.

The College has a fully centralised management, organised as two sections: Operations and Academic. The academic programmes are overseen by the Director of Studies, who additionally manages the business and travel and tourism management awards, a Head of IT and a Coordinator for the Association of Chartered Certified Accountants programme. At the time of the review, there were 1,536 higher education students (headcount) and 44 academic members of staff, 34 of whom are part-time. Around 86 per cent of students are from the UK and European Community. Of the 14 per cent of overseas students, the majority are from India and Pakistan. Some 77 per cent of students are aged 24 and over, while 58 per cent are men.

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

¹ www.qaa.ac.uk/en/ReviewsAndReports/Pages/Educational-Oversight-.aspx

² www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Pages/REO-designated-providers-handbook-13.aspx

Association of Chartered Certified Accountants

- ACCA Foundation Level
- ACCA Qualification (137 across both levels)

Pearson

- BTEC level 5 HND Business (786)
- BTEC level 5 HND Computing and Systems Development (213)
- BTEC level 5 HND Travel and Tourism Management (383)
- BTEC level 7 Extended Diploma in Strategic Management and Leadership (17)

The provider's stated responsibilities

The College's delegated responsibilities are similar for both of its awarding partners for many aspects of the quality of learning opportunities, but with major differences in relation to standards, particularly assessment. It has sole or shared responsibility for all student recruitment, guidance and support, learning and teaching, staff development, resources, the collection and use of student opinion, and ensuring that information is accurate and fit for purpose. There is shared responsibility with Pearson in respect of setting assessments, moderation and second marking, monitoring retention and completion, student appeals and the content of published information. The agreement with Pearson also gives the College responsibility for marking all assignments and providing students with feedback on their assessed work. In contrast, the Association of Chartered Certified Accountants sets and marks assessments through external examinations.

Recent developments

The main recent development for the College has been a rapid increase in student numbers from just over 500 in 2013 to more than 1,500 at the time of the visit. This growth met the criteria for the College to be allocated a full REO. The growth has been accompanied by the acquisition of two additional London campuses, at Cricklewood and Park Royal. The College has been approved by the Department of Business, Innovation and Skills for providing designated courses which are administered by the Student Loans Company and the Higher Education Funding Council for England. This has allowed a continued concentration on recruiting UK and European Community students. It has also enabled the College to pursue its commitment to serving its local communities. The College has ensured that all remaining students on its Association of Business Practitioners programme were able to complete their studies after the awarding organisation ceased trading in May 2014. Negotiations with a number of UK universities have yet to achieve the intended outcome of a formal partnership agreement.

Students' contribution to the review

Students on higher education programmes at the College were invited to present a submission to the review team. The main submission was provided as a set of four short written statements, each produced by small groups of student representatives. Each statement offers personal reflections on either academic standards, the quality of learning opportunities or information. The students also produced a short video about the College. Overall, the student input proved very helpful to reviewers, particularly the enthusiastic and articulate contributions made in a meeting during the visit. Student representatives also made a valuable contribution to the preparatory meeting.

Detailed findings about UK College of Business and Computing Ltd

1 Academic standards

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

1.1 The College has well-defined management arrangements for overseeing standards and quality that would benefit from further refinement. Overall responsibility for the College is vested in the Director of the College, who is assisted by the Principal. Academic managers oversee each campus, with duties that include complaints, appeals and student disciplinary matters. Programmes are led by the Head of IT, for the HND Computing Systems and Development, and a coordinator for the Association of Chartered Certified Accountants award. The Director of Studies retains leadership of the other programmes, in addition to leading the Academic Support Department, which has central responsibility for all academic functions within the College. There is a limited sense of ownership among academic staff for the programmes they teach. It is **advisable** that the College should review the academic management structures to devolve more responsibilities to programme teams.

1.2 The effectiveness of the clear reporting structure for committees and quality is being constrained by a number of operational issues. A valuable recent initiative is the establishment of a Board of Governors, which includes independent external members. Other deliberative committees include the Quality Assurance Committee, which has overall responsibility for academic standards, the Management Board, the Academic Committee and the Course Management Committee. The Academic Committee has a wide representation and deals with a range of academic matters. It is the most active deliberative body, assuming many of the functions that might be expected of the other committees. Students are represented on the Academic Committee, but their role is limited to a reporting session at the start of each meeting. While the overall structure is appropriate and well documented, there are weaknesses in its operation. For example, committee business does not always encourage full staff and student participation, while the detailed minutes often lack focus. In addition, action planning is insufficiently explicit to promote quality improvement or to allow systematic follow up at subsequent meetings. It is therefore **advisable** for the College to review the academic committees and quality reporting structures to strengthen critical debate, action planning and recording.

1.3 There are satisfactory quality assurance mechanisms for reporting on academic standards and quality. However, they could be further enhanced by strengthening the area of quality improvement. The Director of Studies takes direct responsibility for producing an annual Course Self-Evaluation Document for the Pearson programmes. This informs an Annual Course and College Review, which gives an overview of the performance of the College and all of its provision. While these reports provide much useful monitoring information, it is not clear where the course self-evaluations are formally discussed within the committee structure. Nor is it evident that staff teams have ownership of the self-evaluation process. The Quality Assurance Manual states that self-evaluation at all levels will result in quality improvement plans. However, while there is some evidence of enhancement being considered within some committees, quality improvement plans are not formally produced.

How effectively does the College make use of external reference points to manage academic standards?

1.4 The College makes use of an appropriate range of external reference points to manage academic standards. These include the published expectations of its awarding

organisations, *The framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland*, subject benchmark statements and the Quality Code. Academic staff use qualification level descriptors and relevant subject benchmark characteristics effectively in their teaching plans and assessment activities. The programme specifications developed for all Pearson programmes incorporate useful extracts from relevant subject benchmark statements.

1.5 There has been clear initial progress in engaging with the Quality Code. The College has mapped its policies and procedures against the chapters of the Quality Code and has run a workshop to develop staff understanding. There is now scope to undertake a more detailed analysis of how the indicators might be used more explicitly. It would be **desirable** for the College to continue to embed the Quality Code as a driver for the development of policies and procedures.

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

1.6 The College understands its assessment responsibilities and has sound procedures in place to support them. A range of policies has been developed to manage the assessment process, drawing on guidance provided by the awarding organisations. The clear and detailed arrangements for internal verification are implemented consistently. There is an established protocol for external verification, including the need to respond to verifier reports. The process involves reports being considered by the Academic Committee, although the resulting actions are not always clear in committee minutes. The College has a clear plagiarism policy and is about to introduce plagiarism-detection software.

1.7 Although the College maintains detailed data on student assessment outcomes, it has yet to make effective use of them to monitor academic standards. Student entry profiles are recorded and carefully updated statistics are kept of performance in each assessment. However, the discussion of the data in key College committees is lacking in analysis and does not lead to formal action planning. This is particularly important due to the many mature entrants, issues with students failing to submit assignments and the need for assessments to be resubmitted. It is **advisable** that the College undertakes more formal and rigorous scrutiny of student data as part of its management and monitoring procedures. The College has made provision for an Examination Board, but it has not been established.

1.8 Recent reports from Pearson, the main awarding organisation, confirm that the College's management of academic standards is meeting expectations. This is evident in the generally positive reports of external verifiers and the 2013-14 Academic Management Review, which identified a number of areas of good practice and made no essential recommendations.

1.9 Overall, the College has clear arrangements for the management of academic standards, which are operating adequately. However, there is a need to review the operation of current management and reporting systems and procedures. This should ensure that they are more transparently effective and better matched to the expectations of the higher education sector and the needs of the substantially expanded provision.

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

2 Quality of learning opportunities

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

2.1 The management and reporting arrangements for ensuring the quality of learning opportunities are the same as those described for academic standards in paragraphs 1.1 to 1.3. The management processes are underpinned by a clear College vision that is regularly communicated to staff and students. The Principal, as the Quality Assurance Coordinator, has a central role in supporting the quality of learning opportunities, notably through staff development, appraisal and the enhancement of teaching. The Academic Committee deals with feedback from students and there is some consideration of the quality of the student experience. However, there is little evidence from the minutes of formal, critical debate about how to enhance learning opportunities.

2.2 A published manual and a policy improvement policy provide a suitable context for the implementation of quality assurance procedures. Course self-evaluation documents are consistently produced, although they contain limited formal evaluation on matters relating to the quality of learning opportunities. College managers have taken prompt action to address specific issues, such as student feedback concerns about the library. However, such actions, though effective, are being taken reactively and sometimes in isolation.

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

2.3 The use of external reference points is as described for academic standards in paragraphs 1.4 and 1.5. The thorough programme documentation reflects a clear understanding of academic levels, which is conveyed to students.

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

2.4 The College has a published teaching and learning strategy in the form of staff guidance on good practice in teaching, learning and assessment, and uses an appropriate range of mechanisms for maintaining and enhancing the quality of teaching and learning. The mechanisms for monitoring teaching quality include formal teacher observation, peer-to-peer observation and student feedback questionnaires. Students are highly complimentary about the quality of teaching that they receive and are able to cite examples of changes being made in response to their feedback.

2.5 The observation of teaching has been firmly established since the May 2012 REO and operates within clear policies and procedures. Teacher observations are seen as part of quality assurance, while peer-to-peer observations are developmental. The outcomes of teacher observations, which are undertaken at least twice yearly by the Principal, can lead to individual staff development activity to address any weaknesses. There could be advantage in devolving some of the Principal's heavy workload of observations to senior subject staff. While the observation of teaching is viewed positively by staff, it is not clear how the outcomes of the process are channelled formally into the programme and College quality assurance processes. It would be **desirable** for the College to further integrate the teaching observation process within quality procedures and to involve more staff as observers.

2.6 The teaching and learning strategy and assessment policy offer clear guidance on the feedback that should be given to students on their assessed work, but this is not followed consistently. The scrutiny of assessed student work confirmed that the standard feedback sheets are used by staff, but also revealed significant weaknesses in the written feedback

itself. Much of the feedback is cursory and lacks sufficient differentiation or focus to help individual students improve their performance. This issue has been highlighted in external verifier reports and by internal verifiers, but remains an issue. It is **advisable** that the College addresses shortcomings in the written feedback given to students on their assessed work.

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

2.7 The College provides a highly supportive environment for its students, although this is not coordinated as part of an integrated system. Student admissions are managed in accordance with a published policy and the entry requirements of the awarding organisations. All entrants, the majority of whom are mature students, complete an online literacy and numeracy test. This valuable profile information is not currently used to inform individual learning plans or as a reference in the monitoring of later assessment performance.

2.8 There is a published policy for learning support and students feel well supported, both academically and personally. They cite the approachability of academic staff as a key strength of the College. New students benefit from a comprehensive week-long induction. Advice on non-academic matters is readily available, from campus managers and the various departments within the Operations section. Academic staff maintain an open dialogue with students and arrange individual tutorials where needed. In a valuable initiative, the College timetables free study skills sessions at the beginning and end of each day. In addition, there is a high level of support for students who encounter difficulties with specific assessments. Extensive programmes of individual study support, focused on the units that have been a problem, are arranged at the College's cost. These initiatives are innovative and highly responsive to student needs. They are also reactive, rather than being part of a strategic approach to student support, in line with the Quality Code, *Part B: Assuring and enhancing academic quality, Chapter B4: Enabling student development and achievement*.

2.9 The College offers ample opportunity for students to express their opinions about the learning opportunities available to them. Class representatives meet staff on the Staff-Student Liaison Committee and there is student representation on the Academic Committee. Student representatives feel able to approach staff, including senior managers, with any issues. Feedback is also collected through regular questionnaires, while students confirm that minor issues are usually addressed promptly through informal approaches to the appropriate staff member.

How does the College develop its staff to improve student learning opportunities?

2.10 The College provides some useful staff development activities within the framework of a well-articulated staff development policy. The policy identifies clear criteria for staff development, prioritising activities that support the College's strategic plan. All new staff receive a thorough induction. While the range of staff development opportunities has been relatively limited, there is evidence that activities have been planned in response to feedback from teaching observation and to reflect external needs, for example a workshop on the Quality Code. Staff development is a particular challenge because of the large number of part-time staff. It would be **desirable** for the College to continue to target staff development to address College priorities and to engage more staff.

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

2.11 Substantial recent investment has ensured that the College has sufficient learning resources. Academic staff are appropriate in number, suitably qualified and have good academic and professional experience. Additional funding has resulted in notable improvements to the teaching facilities and library stock on all campuses, as well as the virtual learning environment. The College does not subscribe to any external electronic library or journal collections. Students acknowledge the improvements that have been made, expressing general satisfaction with the learning resources provided and their access to them. The Pearson 2013-14 Academic Management Review confirmed that all quality processes were in place for the provision of staff and physical resources.

2.12 The College responds promptly to ensure that any learning resource issues are addressed, but has yet to implement a robust formal system of resource planning. There is a learning resources strategy in place, as well as policies covering space management and the library. Although there is consideration of resources as part of the annual course self-evaluation process, the College has had to make frequent additional investments to react to changing needs, including the rapid growth in student numbers. While appropriate resources are in place, it would be **desirable** for the College to plan and allocate learning resources more strategically.

2.13 Overall, the College has satisfactory arrangements for managing its responsibilities for the quality of learning opportunities. It is supportive of its students and has an active system of student representation. There is a need to address shortcomings in student assessment feedback. The provision would be further enhanced by building on the existing arrangements for teaching observations, staff development and the allocation of learning resources.

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

3 Information about learning opportunities

How effectively does the College communicate information about learning opportunities to students and other stakeholders?

3.1 The College understands its responsibilities for the publication of information about learning opportunities and communicates effectively with its students and staff. It generates a wide range of information, including a mission statement, strategic plan, prospectus, detailed student and staff handbooks, programme specifications, promotional materials, and a variety of formal policies and strategies. While some materials are produced in hard copy, the main outlet for external information is the clear and easily navigated website. Students confirm the usefulness and accuracy of the information they receive prior to enrolment and during their time at the College. Overall, information is clear and accurate, but it would be **desirable** for the College to clarify potential confusion on the website about the HND Business pathways. This relates to information about pathways that will only be offered if there is sufficient demand and student loan funding is available.

3.2 The virtual learning environment has been subject to major development during the past year and is now highly valued by students and staff. The initiative is being well managed, with a clear commitment to continue with the development. The virtual learning environment is widely used and provides an increasing range of information. This includes

detailed materials to support teaching and learning, as well as an extensive range of useful general information. Students have access to chat rooms for communicating with colleagues and staff, in addition to College email accounts. There is a facility for students and staff to access relevant College policies.

3.3 Student representatives are provided with a range of information as a result of their attendance at committees, including issues that have been raised by external verifiers. It would be **desirable** for the College to make external verifier reports available to students, in line with the Quality Code, *Part B: Assuring and enhancing academic quality, Chapter B7: External examining*.

How effective are the College's arrangements for assuring that information about learning opportunities is fit for purpose, accessible and trustworthy?

3.4 The College has effective systems in place for assuring that information about learning opportunities is fit for purpose, accessible and trustworthy. Editorial control over external publications is exercised by a small group, led by the Head of Administration, Public Information Team. This group regularly reviews external publications, including the College website. All changes are authorised by the Director of the College. A formal publishing policy has been introduced, which sets out the arrangements for the approval of external publications, but does not cover other published materials.

3.5 There is a clear procedure for the annual review of all College policies, within which changes must be approved by the Director of the College and the Principal. All policies were updated in January 2014 in preparation for the Pearson Academic Management Review.

3.6 The academic materials used by students and staff are subject to regular checks and updates. Programme specifications and course handbooks are updated at the start of each academic year by the Director of Studies and Programme Administrator, with support from the Head of Administration. Academic plans are updated annually by the Programme Administrator, under the guidance of the Director of Studies. Module booklets and assignment briefs for Pearson programmes are prepared by Module Leaders and internally approved by the Director of Studies, or in the case of the computing programme, by the Head of IT.

3.7 The College makes use of student feedback to monitor the effectiveness of information provided for them. Student focus groups are used to gather feedback on the usefulness of marketing and recruitment information. Specific feedback is collected from students about the information given to them by recruitment agents. It is not clear how the feedback on information is formally addressed within the College reporting structures.

3.8 Overall, the College publishes an appropriate range of information and has effective arrangements for its checking and approval. While students attest to the accuracy and usefulness of the information they receive, there is scope for improvement by addressing potentially confusing pathway descriptions on the website and by making external verifier reports available to students.

<p>The team concludes that reliance can be placed on the information that the provider produces for its intended audiences about the learning opportunities it offers.</p>

Action plan³

UK College of Business and Computing action plan relating to the Review for Educational Oversight of June 2014						
Advisable	Intended outcomes	Actions to be taken to achieve intended outcomes	Target date(s)	Action by	Reported to	Evaluation (process or evidence)
The team considers that it is advisable for the College to:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> review its academic management structures to devolve more responsibilities to the programme teams (paragraphs 1.1, 1.3, 2.5) 	Academic staff teams contribute formally to the management and quality assurance of their programmes	1) Devolve more academic management responsibilities to Module Leaders (Ownership of the module with regards to quality, delegation, coordination and performance) 2) Appoint a separate Head for each academic programme 3) Produce clear role descriptions for Module Leaders and Programme Heads	October 2014	Director of Studies	Principal and Director of the College	Course self-evaluation documents Annual College course reviews External verifier reports

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

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> review the academic committees and quality reporting structures to strengthen critical debate, action planning and recording (paragraphs 1.2, 1.3, 1.6, 2.1, 2.2, 2.8, 3.7) 	<p>All formal meetings will produce focused agendas (including standing items), resulting in strategic decision-making, critical discussion and clear actions and outcomes</p> <p>Minutes will highlight key discussion points, actions and reporting back</p> <p>Students will contribute to discussions at the Academic Committee</p> <p>Programme and College quality assurance reports will include explicit actions and improvement plans</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Introduce standard items to address key issues, including: quality assurance reports; student assessment and achievement; student support; student feedback 2) Introduce a standardised, summary approach to the recording of meetings 3) Review the role of students in Academic Committee to reflect the Quality Code 4) Revise the relevant templates to ensure that all quality assurance reports include SMART actions and improvement plans 	October 2014	Director of Studies (with Programme Heads, Module Leaders, Academic Support department)	Principal and Quality Assurance Committee	Academic Committee, reporting up to Management Board
---	--	---	--------------	---	---	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • give more formal and robust attention to the analysis of student data (paragraphs 1.7, 2.7) 	<p>A range of student data is analysed and the results produced for discussion within programme teams and at Academic Committee</p> <p>All programme and College quality assurance reports will include a summary of key student performance data, with evaluations and trends</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Agree a key student data set to be used for monitoring academic performance 2) Introduce a standard item on the Quality Assurance Committee and Academic Committee for deliberating on student performance data 3) Introduce a standard section on quality assurance report templates for reporting on data 	October 2014	Director of Studies with Head of Administration	Principal and Director of the College	<p>Quality Assurance Committee</p> <p>Annual College and course reviews</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • address shortcomings in the written feedback given to students on their assessed work (paragraph 2.6) 	<p>Students to get more detailed constructive feedback on the formative and summative assessed work</p> <p>Lecturers to give more constructive, focused assessment to students in feedback to promote progress</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Module Leaders to act as the internal verifiers for the specific modules 2) Peer-to-peer sampling of good practice by the Heads of the Programme 3) Internal verification process will include evaluation on relevance, differentiation and 	October 2014	Director of Studies (with Assessors, Module Leaders and Programme Heads)	Principal and Director of the College	External verifier reports and internal verification

		<p>focus on student needs</p> <p>4) Assessment guidance will be included in internal training sessions for assessors and internal verifiers</p> <p>5) Quality of feedback given to students will be evaluated at Academic Committee meetings and corrective steps initiated wherever necessary</p>				
Desirable	Intended outcomes	Actions to be taken to achieve intended outcomes	Target date(s)	Action by	Reported to	Evaluation (process or evidence)
The team considers that it would be desirable for the College to:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> continue to embed the Quality Code in the development of policies and procedures (paragraph 1.5) 	<p>Consistent performance and coordinated delivery across the students' learning process</p> <p>Indicators of Quality Code will be used explicitly by staff while performing their roles</p>	<p>1) Integrate and embed the relevant quality codes across the various operational and academic departments</p> <p>2) All members of staff to read and understand the</p>	January 2015	Heads of the various operational departments and the academic department	Principal and Director of the College	<p>Annual College and course reviews</p> <p>Service area self-evaluation document</p> <p>Course self-evaluation document</p>

	<p>Policies and procedures focus on achieving the expectations of the Quality Code</p> <p>Quality committees to evaluate process as per the Quality Code and monitor the levels of achievements</p>	<p>Quality Code to address the expectations and indicators of the Quality Code for developing more understanding of various provisions and putting them into practice</p> <p>3) Internal training sessions will be organised once every term to update staff on the Quality Code by the heads of the relevant departments</p> <p>4) Policies and procedures to be implemented as indicated in the mapped policies and reviewed annually with a focus on relevance to the indicators and achieving the expectations of the Quality Code</p>				<p>External verifier reports</p> <p>Academic management review report, Management Board</p>
--	---	--	--	--	--	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> further integrate the teaching observation process within quality procedures and involve more staff as observers (paragraph 2.5) 	<p>Confirmation of good practice with better performance, smoother coordination, fewer complaints and more student satisfaction</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Principal to monitor and implement the peer-to-peer observation policy involving more senior staff in teaching observations The academic managers of the relevant campuses to oversee the new arrangements and to ensure that all observers have sufficient understanding and expertise, under the supervision of the Principal 360 degree quality practices for the peer-to-peer observation Teaching and peer observations are planned for each term by the Principal and Director of Studies Outcomes of the observations will be made an essential agenda at the start of 	<p>October 2014</p>	<p>The Principal and Director of Studies</p>	<p>The Quality Assurance Committee</p>	<p>Peer-to-peer observation policy and procedure</p> <p>Staff observation records, peer-to-peer observation records</p> <p>Minutes of the Academic Committee meetings and Quality Assurance Committee meetings</p>
--	---	---	---------------------	--	--	--

		every term and reviewed at every academic meeting				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> continue to target staff development to address College priorities and to engage more staff (paragraph 2.10) 	<p>1) Promote staff development through an atmosphere of learning and sharing</p> <p>2) Workshops, seminar, staff development to update staff on current developments in subject areas and quality implementation</p>	<p>1) Human Resources to see that the staff are kept abreast of the latest developments</p> <p>2) Quarterly internal training sessions will be organised covering topics related to improving student learning opportunities, subject-related developments and research</p> <p>3) Internal and external training sessions aim to focus on a holistic development of staff and students</p> <p>4) Understand and embed the Quality Code of good practice for all the staff</p>	November 2014	Human Resources in coordination with the heads of various departments	The Director and the Principal of the College	<p>Staff development records</p> <p>Course self-evaluation document</p> <p>Service area self-evaluation document</p> <p>Annual College course review</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> plan and allocate learning resources more strategically (paragraph 2.12) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Strategic planning and allocation of learning resources at the start of every term 2) Staff and student satisfaction 3) Adequacy of student learning resources is monitored continuously and actions taken for allocation 4) Addressing the learners' needs with the best learning resources by proactive planning 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Plan learning resources that address learners' and other stakeholders' needs by conducting bimonthly meetings and evaluate adequacy of learning resources as an item on the agenda 2) Quarterly meetings with regard to resource planning to address the resources needs by the Resource Management Committee involving the heads of academic and non-academic departments, campus managers and academic managers 	August 2014	Human Resources and Resource Management in coordination with admissions, administration, academic, marketing and students' requests	The Director and the Principal of the College	Feedback from the students, course self-evaluation document, service area self-evaluation document, annual College course review, minutes of the Academic, Staff and Student Liaison Committees, Course Management Committee
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> clarify potential confusion on the website about the HND Business pathways (paragraph 3.1) 	Information on courses through website is clear, accurate and current for all programmes offered by the College	Public Information team to make the corrections to the HND Business pathways on the website	August 2014	Public Information team	The Director of the College	Student feedback, feedback from the various stakeholders, minutes of the various committees

						Public Information team, Course Management Committee, Quality Assurance Committee and Management Board
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> make external verifier reports available to students (paragraph 3.3). 	Students have easy and direct access to external verifier reports on E learning portal	The E learning administrator to make sure that all the external verifier reports are easily accessible to the students via E learning	August 2014	The Director of Studies	The Principal of the College	Audit of the E learning portal, academic committees

About QAA

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

QAA's aims are to:

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

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

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

More detail about Review for Educational Oversight can be found at: www.qaa.ac.uk/en/ReviewsAndReports/Pages/Educational-Oversight-.aspx.

Glossary

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

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

academic standards The standards set and maintained by degree-awarding bodies for their courses (programmes and modules) and expected for their awards. See also **threshold academic standards**.

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.

awarding organisation An organisation authorised to award a particular qualification; an organisation recognised by Ofqual to award Ofqual-regulated qualifications.

designated body An organisation that has been formally appointed or recognised to perform a particular function. QAA has been recognised by UKBA as a designated body for the purpose of providing educational oversight.

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

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 QAA's review processes.

external examiner An independent expert appointed by an institution to comment on student achievement in relation to established academic standards and to look at approaches to assessment.

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*.

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 review processes.

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

⁴ http://www.qaa.ac.uk/publications/information-and-guidance/publication/?PubID=2669#.U_3CFnhwa70

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.

operational definition A formal definition of a term, which establishes 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.

provider (s) (of higher education) Organisations that deliver higher education. In the UK they may be a degree-awarding body or another organisation that offers programmes of higher education on behalf of degree-awarding bodies or awarding organisations. In the context of Review for Specific Course Designation the term means an independent college.

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

quality See **academic quality**.

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. Internal reference points may be used by providers for purposes of self-regulation; external ones are used and accepted throughout the higher education community for the checking of standards and quality.

subject benchmark statement A published statement that sets out what knowledge, understanding, abilities and skills are expected of those graduating in each of the main subject areas (mostly applying to bachelor's degrees), and explains what gives that particular discipline its coherence and identity.

threshold academic standards 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 for higher education qualifications** and **subject benchmark statements**. See also **academic standards**.

QAA916 - R4196 - Aug 14

© The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education 2014
Southgate House, Southgate Street, Gloucester GL1 1UB

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

Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786