



Specific Course Designation: report of the monitoring visit of the University of Buckingham, April 2016

1 Outcome of the monitoring visit

1 From the evidence provided in the annual return and at the monitoring visit, the review team concludes that the University of Buckingham (the University) has made acceptable progress with implementing the action plan from the August 2012 [Institutional Review](#).

2 Changes since the last QAA review

2 The University currently has 2,078 students enrolled on a range of undergraduate and postgraduate courses. Of these, 674 students are taking school-based Postgraduate Certificates in Education and Master of Education programmes. The University also offers foundation level and other non-degree courses. A new Vice-Chancellor took up office in 2015, and a new position of Director of Admissions and Marketing has been created. The visit was extended so that two Concerns that had been raised in connection with the University's management of its collaborative provision could be investigated. The report on these Concerns is integrated into this report (see page 3).

3 Findings from the monitoring visit

3 The University has addressed each item in the action plan that was produced as a result of its Institutional Review in 2012. Recommendations in relation to awards are covered in paragraph 4, in relation to the Collaborations Handbook in paragraph 5, and in relation to monitoring and evaluating enhancements in paragraph 6. Actions in respect of affirmations are reviewed in paragraphs 7 to 12 and in respect of points of good practice are covered in paragraph 13. The University's procedures for annual monitoring of courses are covered in paragraph 15. The action plan is monitored and updated annually by the University, and procedures are being developed to tie the annual course monitoring process to a University-wide action plan. A new Strategic Plan and Learning and Teaching Strategy are currently under preparation.

4 University Regulations have been revised to permit awards in addition to bachelor's and master's degrees, in alignment with *The Framework for Higher Education Qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland* (FHEQ) and the National Credit Framework. These exit (or concessionary) awards, and also 'pass' degrees, now have relevant programme specifications with defined learning outcomes. Guidance is available to programme developers. A clause requiring the Registrar's confirmation has been included in the programme approval process to ensure that all awards are permitted under University and special regulations.

5 The annual due diligence process, developed in 2013 and revised annually, is outlined in the Collaborations Handbook. It includes a comprehensive checklist for new collaborations. The process is now being used to monitor relationships with collaborative partners (see paragraphs 31 and 46-47).

6 The University evaluates and monitors the enhancement of the learner experience by the use of existing processes such as annual and quinquennial reviews, student feedback and external examiner reports. The review team was informed of plans to develop a systematic and more joined-up approach to monitoring and evaluating the impact of enhancements to student learning opportunities. This will be considered in the course of the next round of annual monitoring.

7 A new programme specification template was introduced in 2013 to illustrate how assessment mechanisms more explicitly demonstrate the assessment achievement of all learning outcomes. Module maps and assessment matrices, with guidance for staff, were introduced for all new programmes in 2014 and are now recorded on eVision, the University's online portal. Through eVision, the University's recently developed dashboards will enable oversight of the type and breadth of assessment mechanisms and their impact on student performance.

8 The students whom the review team met are aware that the external examiner reports are published on the intranet but had not accessed them. The University is conscious of the challenges of finding the reports on the intranet and is planning to improve signposting. Progress will be considered at the next visit.

9 The new appeals process, updated in line with the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (Quality Code), enables a more systematic recording and discussion of appeals at Senate.

10 The Careers Service monitors student usage of the service through feedback forms for every event it organises. It has developed a range of activities such as a careers fair and the creation of alumni networks, and has paid specific attention to the needs of international students through the creation of a vacancy service for employers wanting to recruit students returning to their countries of origin. Home and international students who had used the Careers Service reported that it met their needs.

11 Students are aware of the Student Charter, developed by staff and students and approved by Senate in 2013. The Charter will be revised in 2016 in the context of the new Strategic Plan.

12 The Collaborations Handbook, introduced and approved by Senate in 2012, is seen as a live document subject to annual review; its development is overseen by the University Collaborations Committee (UCC).

13 The good practice points noted in the 2012 report related to the culture of personal care and attention to students promoted by the University. Students whom the review team met recognised this culture and commended the responsiveness of the personal tutor system. Personal tutor duties are clearly laid out in the 2014 Code of Practice. Students commended the accessibility of academic staff, the open-door culture, the quick response to emails, and rapid feedback on assessment work. Students also commented positively on arrangements for supervision of postgraduate research.

14 Since 2013 most responsibilities in the area of admissions have been devolved to the individual Schools, with a central admissions unit in the Registry exercising a primarily advisory role. Admissions tutors are expected to consult the UK NARIC database for information on equivalency of international qualifications. Well established informal relationships that exist between admissions staff in the Schools and in the Registry and the use of a standard online Application Instruction Form that has to be completed in respect of all applications facilitate the admissions process. Students reported that they had found it to be positive and supportive, and particularly appreciated the regular communication from the University. A checklist is used to ensure that candidates meet English language

requirements at the level appropriate to the programme for which they are applying. Applications for undergraduate programmes are usually processed through UCAS. Responsibility for admissions to collaborative programmes is devolved to the partner institutions.

15 The team saw clear evidence of a robust annual monitoring process for courses, with management oversight at School and University level. Individual teachers produce reports on the modules they have taught, according to set templates. The samples seen by the team were thorough, informative and reflective, and included responses to external examiner comments. Reports on the programmes of study are equally carefully produced, and incorporate evidence from the module reports, external examiner reports and quantitative data on student progression. The reports are discussed at School level and an overview report is then submitted to the University Learning and Teaching Committee. Internal monitoring of the reports has led to closer integration of the annual procedures with the University's quinquennial review process.

16 The University makes a return of student data to the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA). Student satisfaction rates collected through the National Student Survey (NSS) are among the highest in the country, as are employment rates for graduates. Module and programme reports include quantitative data on student performance and reflective commentary. The team saw evidence of focused reflection on how to improve student performance where the data had shown that it was falling below the expected level.

4 Progress in working with the external reference points to meet UK expectations for higher education

17 The University demonstrated in its initial submission and in meetings that it is fully aware of the requirements of the Quality Code, and that these had been embedded in its internal quality assurance procedures, for example the way in which external examiners are used. Annual programme reports include direct reference to relevant reference points such as Subject Benchmark Statements published by QAA and, where appropriate, the requirements of professional, statutory and regulatory bodies, such as the British Psychology Society and the Solicitors Regulation Authority, are also taken into account.

5 Report on Concerns investigation

Introduction

18 During 2015, two concerns had been raised via the [QAA Concerns Scheme](#), which investigates concerns about standards, quality and information that higher education providers produce. Both related to the University's management of higher education with collaborative partners. The review team investigated the concerns as part of an extended monitoring visit. Given that both concerns related to the setting up, maintenance and termination of collaborative arrangements, there was a wider focus on the University's management of partnerships with other organisations, to consider whether the problems that arose might be systemic issues with the potential to put standards at risk or affect current and future students.

19 The University cooperated with the investigation of the concerns, both in providing relevant documentation and in facilitating the extended annual monitoring visit to enable discussions with senior staff. The review team had access both to documentation elicited in relation to the specific concerns, and to the University's past and new policy, procedures and practices for collaborative partnerships.

20 In particular, the investigation focused on:

- the strategy and procedures for setting up and approval of partnerships, including with respect to due diligence
- the regular and systematic monitoring of collaborative partnerships
- the approach to, and arrangements for, termination of partnerships.

University partnership with European School of Economics

21 The first concern was submitted in April 2015 by a senior member of staff at the European School of Economics (the School), an alternative provider with centres in four countries including the UK. While an initial inquiry found that there was no merit to a number of allegations regarding the University's management of academic standards at the partner, it became evident that the relationship between the University and the School had broken down. The University had sought to establish 'teaching out' arrangements with the School but agreement had not been reached. The situation was complicated by the School being placed into compulsory liquidation in November 2014. It was then unclear as to whether students at the School, and covered by the original partnership agreement, would have an opportunity to complete their intended programme. Given the University's ultimate responsibility for the quality of learning opportunities wherever these are delivered, a full Concerns investigation was instigated.

22 The University had entered into a collaborative partnership with the School in 2005. Despite initial University discussions expressing concerns about the partner having 'a chequered history', and remaining in deficit to its previous awarding body, an agreement was authorised and signed. The partnership agreement with the UK-registered company ESE allowed the School to deliver programmes at six different sites in London, Spain, Italy and the USA (the Campuses) with students able to complete each year of degree at a different Campus. The University noted that while due diligence would have been conducted on the School as a potential partner, the procedure would not have been as robust as that embodied in the University's new approach (see paragraph 31).

23 From 2012 it is evident that the University conducted various quality assurance procedures on both School provision and the partnership. Annual student satisfaction questionnaires were conducted for each Campus. Link Tutor visits were conducted to some Campuses and were effective in identifying specific issues and solutions. New sites for delivery were also visited and subject to reports. The review team saw some Annual Programme Review reports from this period, but these addressed delivery of the programme as a whole rather than across each Campus. External examiner reports for each course were received and considered by the University and responded to by the School. In many cases the reports appropriately identify specific difficulties, particularly around consistency across Campuses, but do not indicate which Campus comments in the reports relate to, nor the specific modules and programmes falling under the auspices of the report. The review team also heard that in the period in question, the University did not undertake periodic review of School provision in accordance with its own programme of reviews, firstly because of difficulties at the School and then because the partnership was not being renewed and would move to termination.

24 Therefore, in the years leading up to the alleged difficulties in 2014-15, the review team concluded that while the University appeared to have sought to assess quality and standards on the partnership, and while the partner appeared to be uncooperative, oversight was not always comprehensive, nor in line with published University procedure.

25 This was affirmed by evidence of the University's consistent concern regarding the School's academic, quality, financial and administrative performance. Annual due diligence

was introduced by the University in 2013 and this confirmed that there were 'concerns over stability' and decreased 'registration performance' at the School. The University was also aware that in May 2013, the London Campus was subject to an Annual Monitoring visit, the report of which concluded that the School was 'making progress but further improvement is required with implementing the action plan from the March 2012 REO Annual Monitoring report, May 2013'. However, while there had been internal consideration of not renewing and thus terminating the partnership, up to 2013, amidst optimism that School performance could improve, exemplified by a positive QAA REO report later in 2013, new contracts were authorised and the development of new programmes confirmed. By 2014, the School had not fulfilled its then debt repayment schedule and the University was discussing the issue of a breach notice, indicating intention to terminate the existing agreement.

26 A one-year contract extension between the University and the School expired in November 2014 and the School was given notice that the University did not intend to renew. However, at the same time, the London Campus was placed in compulsory liquidation. The School formed a new UK company (ESE Insights) with which the University would not agree to enter a business arrangement. From this time and through 2015, the evidence seen by the team suggests that the University was seeking to negotiate initially with the School and then with separate companies that were now running the overseas Campuses. In early 2015, no accord was reached between the School and the University. The negotiations with the individual companies then continued through 2015, with teaching-out agreements gradually being signed across the partner Campuses - the New York Campus in July 15 and the Italy and Spain Campuses in December 2015. It is noteworthy that the new contracts were specific to each operation (see paragraph 33).

27 As the two organisations continued to negotiate, the University's efforts to safeguard the academic interests and the quality of the learning experience of students already studying on programmes were inconsistent and unsystematic. It would appear that the University was hampered by legal action from separate companies operating the overseas Campuses. Nevertheless, it was not until April 2015 (five months from the end of the original contract) that the University first formally notified students about the breakdown of the partnership, and June before it began acting to assist students in finding alternative providers. A letter sent to students in July 2015 offers students the option of remaining on a School, but non-University, programme or transferring to another provider, with the University giving students a transcript of achievement. At this time, transfer to an equivalent University programme was not offered because of concern that the School might consider students were being 'poached'. Subsequently, however, this option, along with transfer to suitable alternative providers, was actively pursued with the University Executive (the Executive) recognising that the University was obligated to assist the existing students if no validating institution was found. Generally, the review team considered that the delays and uncertainty that pervaded the University's approach to this matter were not consistent with the meeting of the Expectation of *Chapter B10* of the Quality Code, that arrangements for delivering learning opportunities with organisations other than the degree-awarding body are implemented securely and managed effectively.

28 By the time of the annual monitoring visit, it was evident that the University had made a more concerted effort to ensure that the affected students were able to complete a programme equivalent to their chosen degree. Students who had been on University-validated programmes at the London Campus at the start of the academic year 2014-15 had transferred either to the University itself, to the Italy Campus or to other providers.

29 The review team concluded that there had been a number of systemic issues that contributed to the University failing to maintain comprehensive oversight of the quality of learning opportunities at the School, and to the quality of the learning experience of students studying on programmes at the School not being safeguarded.

30 First, the extent to which the University is driven strategically in its initial selection of partners, including the School, was unclear. The review team heard that the University looks for partnerships that provide reputational benefit, philanthropic opportunities, mission and subject consonance, and financial benefit. However, currently it does not formally articulate its strategy for partnerships nor the criteria for the selection of partners. The team concluded that this leaves the University open to unstrategic choices. However, the team heard that a new University Strategic Plan is under development and **recommends** that it articulates the overall University strategy and criteria for partnerships.

31 Second, as the University acknowledged, the School was not subject to the considerably strengthened approval procedures and due diligence that the University now has in place for assessing potential partners, these not having been in existence at the time. Revised measures include a strengthened Risk Assessment within initial due diligence, a template for Institutional Approval reports, and Development Tracking for prospective partnerships. A recent example of partnership approval confirmed that the new approach is in operation and effective. The review team was able to affirm, on the basis of the evidence presented, the University's confidence that a potential partner with the same sort of history and credentials would no longer be approved.

32 Third, as the University observed, the management of the partnership was complicated by there having been historically one contract with the School (and in February 2016, the School was still listed as a single partner in the University's Collaborations Register) even though it operated across four regulatory contexts and jurisdictions. This had become pertinent as the Executive discussed terminating the partnership and resulted in the University subsequently having to negotiate with different Campuses about teach-out and transfer arrangements for School students. As previously noted, when the University agreed exit agreements with the School in late 2015, it issued individual contracts for each of the School's remaining national operations (Campuses). These were drafted on a newly implemented template for collaborative contracts, which more clearly sets out both partners' responsibilities, a strengthened procedure for termination of partnerships and a bespoke procedure for the annual due diligence of partners with multiple campuses.

33 Fourth, the pattern of the University's means of quality assuring programmes and the partnership has varied between a focus on a single organisation (ESE) and the individual sites of delivery (the Campuses). While external examiners report on individual programmes and Campuses, Annual Programme Review reports address delivery of the programme as a whole rather than across each Campus. Liaison between the University and the School has tended to be via the Director of Collaborations or a Link Tutor from the former, and a specific contact at the Italy Campus from the latter. While the University said that all Campuses have been copied into some correspondence, actual liaison did not reflect that. The move to Annual Due Diligence at individual Campuses in 2014 confirmed that it realised the need for effective review of the separate School operations. The failure to conduct periodic review of the School exacerbated these issues. The review team accordingly concluded that the University's arrangements for quality assurance of programmes and the partnership did not enable secure implementation and effective management of learning opportunities at the School, and thus the meeting of the Expectation of *Chapter B10* of the Quality Code. It is noted, however, that over the 12-month period preceding the annual monitoring visit, the University has introduced a strengthened approach to annual programme monitoring and to the management of partnerships. With regard to the latter, the introduction of Annual Operational Agreements and Collaborative Delivery Plans has already helped to clarify roles and responsibilities on partnerships.

34 Fifth, it is not evident that the University has a sufficiently integrated means of analysing the quality assurance of partners. The University commissions a number of individual reports including external examiner reports, Annual Programme Review reports,

Annual Due Diligence reports, student satisfaction questionnaires and reports of site visits. The review team heard that all of these reports are received by the University Collaborations Committee (UCC). However, it was not apparent that these result in any kind of overall report that could synthesise the outcomes of other reports, thereby informing and strengthening the University's oversight and responsiveness. To that end, the review team **recommends** that the University develops and implements a systematic approach to the annual monitoring of partnerships.

35 Sixth, the University explained that its quality assurance framework takes two identifiable routes. The quality assurance of University-delivered provision is serviced by the Quality Assurance Office (QAO), managed by the Registrar, and programme reports go up to the University Learning and Teaching Committee (ULTC). Quality assurance of collaborative provision is overseen by the Collaborations Department, set up in 2012 and managed by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, and reported via UCC. Both ULTC and UCC report to Senate. The review team also heard that there is enhanced cooperation between the Quality Assurance and Collaborations departments and cross membership of ULTC and UCC. The Quality Assurance Manager briefs Collaborations Department staff on quality assurance and supports their training needs. However, the review team considered that elements of the quality assurance of the University's collaborative partnerships would be strengthened by the adoption of a more integrated approach. For example, it would be sensible for external examiner reports and responses to be actively overseen by one committee. The review team therefore **recommends** that the same reporting lines and administrative arrangements be used for all University programmes.

36 Seventh, and again as the University acknowledges, its procedures for termination of partnerships were underdeveloped at the time of the end of the partnership with the School. Accordingly, when the aforementioned matters arose, the University lacked effective measures to address them. The review team is assured, however, that a foundation for remedying this deficit has been laid with the implementation of a Procedure for the Closure of Collaborative Partnerships and the requirement to produce a Contingency Plan 'in the event that a collaborative partner becomes insolvent, ceases trading, or the agreement is terminated for some other reason'.

University partnership with Magna Carta College

37 A second concern had been submitted by an international applicant to an MSc Finance and Investment programme advertised for delivery at Magna Carta College (the College; MCC), a UK alternative provider. At the points of the student researching which course to take and of a subsequent successful application, the programme was an award of the University, which had entered into an initial one-year collaborative contract with the College in April 2014.

38 The individual in question had gone through the application process, and following an interview at the College was offered a place and 'partial scholarship', for which the applicant paid a deposit, starting in January 2015. Subsequently the applicant decided to defer entry to October 2015 and this was confirmed by College admissions staff in a letter that included a University logo.

39 In April 2015, the College told the applicant that the programme would not be running due to a contractual issue with the University, and that the deposit fee would be refundable. However, the applicant did not receive a refund, the College did not respond to emails beyond an initial acknowledgement, and the College website with institutional information became unavailable.

40 The applicant contacted the Head of Collaborations at the University of Buckingham who explained that the start date had been postponed because the College was not ready to commence delivery. Furthermore, in February, the ownership of the College changed as it was sold to Global University Systems (GUS), and consequently in April, the University took the decision to terminate the partnership. The Head of Collaborations made attempts to contact former members of staff at the College and referred the applicant to the new owners. However, the applicant received no response and, having lost money and failed to secure a place on the chosen programme, submitted an application to the QAA Concerns Scheme. The review team noted that, at this point, the University appears to have delegated responsibility for the applicant to the partner organisation rather than maintaining effective oversight of learning opportunities (see paragraph 51).

41 It is clear both that the University went some way in trying to contact the new owners of the College and that much of the responsibility for failure to respond to the applicant lies with the former and current owners of the College. However, given that the programme applied for was a University award, a full investigation was instigated to consider the University's responsibilities for the management of the partnership and the quality of learning opportunities.

42 The University states that prior to the change of ownership, and when the start of the programme was deferred, it had been assured by the previous owners that applicants holding an offer on University awards at the College would receive a refund if they did not choose to defer their start date. Following the breakdown of the partnership, the University states that it was not informed that there were any students still holding offers and expecting to start the programme later in the year, or that there were students still awaiting their refunds. Again, it would appear that the University was delegating responsibility to the partner organisation rather than exercising secure and effective oversight of learning opportunities for applicants (see paragraph 51).

43 While the University sought to communicate with the new owners once it was contacted by the applicant, it also considered that it did not have a responsibility for the refund of the student's fees because it had no contractual arrangement with GUS. Neither did it offer applicants places on a directly equivalent programme at the University. It is also unclear as to what extent it took a more proactive role in systematically monitoring the termination of a collaborative partnership (see paragraphs 34-35).

44 The review team concluded that there were a number of systemic issues that contributed to the applicant being caught in the breakdown of the developing partnership between the University and MCC. It will be noted that several of these resonate with findings relating to the partnership with the European School of Economics (paragraphs 30-36).

45 First, it was again unclear as to the extent to which the University was guided strategically in its initial selection of the College as a partner. Given financial and academic issues that emerged as the partnership was being considered (see paragraphs 47-48), it is difficult to see how the College met the criteria for potential partnerships mentioned in paragraph 30. In this instance, the University appears to have made a choice of partner that was not comprehensively driven by formal strategy, and which left it open to risk (see paragraphs 47-48). The review team's findings here support the recommendation made at paragraph 30 that the new University Strategic Plan articulates the overall University strategy for partnerships.

46 Second, and again as the University acknowledges, the College was not subject to the considerably strengthened approval procedures and due diligence that the University now has in place, these not having been implemented at the time.

47 The University's partnership with the College, following initial approval from University Executive (the Executive), had been subject to the development of a business plan and due diligence between December 2013 and February 2014. The latter, in focusing mainly on financial matters, noted that the financial performance of the proposed partner did not appear to be stable and reassuring, and that it was suffering from liquidity problems. Further, the initial development of the partnership in the summer of 2015 was characterised by some uncertainties and disagreements on financial arrangements between the College and the University, although some progress was eventually made with Executive, Senate and UCC kept appraised.

48 It can also be noted that in March 2013, the College had undergone a [Review for Educational Oversight annual monitoring visit](#) by QAA and this had concluded that further improvement was required in making progress in implementing its action plan.

49 Nevertheless, despite this identified pattern of financial and quality risk (the Collaborations Department had characterised the partnership as 'medium risk'), the University approved the partnership and a contract was signed in April 2015. The questionable financial performance of the College identified by the University meant that the issued contract was for only one year.

50 The University has explained that it did not put the College through its new procedures for partnership approval and due diligence, which had not yet been implemented. The Business Plan considered by Executive would not have been as detailed as more recent examples and due diligence would now, on the basis of the University's new procedures, be more intensive. Thus again, the strengthened Risk Assessment, the new template for Institutional Approval reports and Development Tracking for prospective partnerships were not used. The review team was again assured, based on the evidence presented, that a potential partner with the same sort of history and credentials would no longer satisfy the criteria for partnership. The completed development and future implementation of effective procedures for partnership approval and due diligence should allow the University to achieve its aim in this regard.

51 Third, and again as the University acknowledges, its procedures for termination of partnerships were undeveloped at the time the partnership with the College ended. This had a particular impact in the context of admissions to the College. The University Collaborations Handbook states that responsibility for admissions is delegated to the collaborative partner and this should be made explicit in the contract and, more recently, the Collaboration Delivery Plan. Students are required to enroll with the collaborative partner, following which they should be registered at the University. The University states that it did not receive formal notification of applications from MCC although it acknowledges that a Link Tutor received some information about applications and was required to advise on the suitability of candidates. Either way, it was evident that once the partnership moved into termination, the University, while relevant committees and groups were kept informed, did not monitor then existing admissions at the College. As noted at paragraphs 40 and 42, the University did not take responsibility for applicants to a University award. In that context, it did not meet the Expectation of *Chapter B10* of the Quality Code by securely implementing and effectively managing the delivery of learning opportunities with organisations other than the degree-awarding body. However, the review team noted that Section 5 of the Collaborations Handbook (on Closure of Collaborative Partnerships) now covers arrangements for prospective students in the context of partnership termination. It therefore concluded that the University has the capability to address similar circumstances should they arise in the future.

52 As one aspect of the strengthened approach to partnership termination (see paragraph 36), the University Collaborative Handbook now has a subsection specifically covering arrangements for prospective students where a partnership is closing. Had these

procedures been in place in 2014-15, the plight of the applicant who submitted the Concern could have been promptly addressed, enabling the University to meet its responsibilities for managing higher education provision with collaborative partners, in line with the Expectation of *Chapter B10* of the Quality Code.

Conclusion

53 The review team concludes that the University has made considerable progress in relation to a significant revision to many aspects of its management of collaborative partnerships. This has been prompted both by internal review and by consideration of external reference points, including the Quality Code. However, as the University acknowledges, this revision process was also a response to the difficulties experienced on the partnerships with European School of Economics and Magna Carta College. While this investigation has identified further areas for improvement, it is evident that the new policy, practices and procedures provide confidence that the University is strengthening its management of higher education partnerships with others, and should enable it to meet the Expectation of *Chapter B10* of the Quality Code.

Recommendations

The University should, by September 2016:

- articulate the overall University strategy and criteria for partnerships in its emerging Strategic Plan (paragraph 30)
- develop and implement a systematic approach to the annual monitoring of partnerships (paragraph 34)
- use consistent reporting lines and administrative arrangements for all University programmes (paragraph 35).

6 Background to the monitoring visit

54 The monitoring visit serves as a short check on the provider's continuing management of academic standards and quality of provision. It focuses on progress since the previous review. In addition, it provides an opportunity for QAA to advise the provider of any matters that have the potential to be of particular interest in the next monitoring visit or review.

55 The monitoring visit was carried out by Professor Jenny Anderson, Reviewer, Dr Neil Casey (Case Officer on the Concerns investigations) and Dr David Taylor, Coordinator, on 11 and 12 April 2016.

QAA1629 - R5063 - June 16

© The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education 2016
Southgate House, Southgate Street, Gloucester GL1 1UB
Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786

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