Higher Education Review of University of Greenwich

April 2015

Contents

About this review

This is a report of a Higher Education Review conducted by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) at University of Greenwich. The review took place from 21 to 24 April 2015 and was conducted by a team of 6 reviewers, as follows:

- Mrs Mary Blauciak
- Professor Geoffrey Elliott
- Dr Richard Harrison
- Professor Jethro Newton
- Dr Marie Stowell
- Miss Zoe Harrison (student reviewer).

The main purpose of the review was to investigate the higher education provided by University of Greenwich and to make judgements as to whether or not its 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 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
- provides a commentary on the selected theme
- makes recommendations
- identifies features of good practice
- affirms action that the provider is taking or plans to take.

A summary of the findings can be found in the section starting on page 2. Explanations of the findings are given in numbered paragraphs in the section starting on page 7.

In reviewing University of Greenwich the review team has also considered a theme selected for particular focus across higher education in England and Northern Ireland.

The themes for the academic year 2014-15 are Student Involvement in Quality Assurance and Enhancement and Student Employability,[2] and the provider is required to select, in consultation with student representatives, one of these themes to be explored through the review process.

The QAA website gives more information about QAA and its mission.[3] A dedicated section explains the method for Higher Education Review[4] and has links to the review handbook and other informative documents. 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] Higher Education Review themes: www.qaa.ac.uk/publications/information-and-guidance/publication?PubID=106.
[3] QAA website: www.qaa.ac.uk/about-us.
[4] Higher Education Review web pages: www.qaa.ac.uk/reviews-and-reports/how-we-review-higher-education/higher-education-review.

Key findings

QAA's judgements about University of Greenwich

The QAA review team formed the following judgements about the higher education provision at the University of Greenwich.

- The setting and maintenance of the academic standards of awards **meets** UK expectations.
- The quality of student learning opportunities **meets** UK expectations.
- The quality of the information about learning opportunities **meets** UK expectations.
- The enhancement of student learning opportunities **meets** UK expectations.

Good practice

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

- the comprehensive range of support and initiatives for developing the academic and professional potential of its students that leads to improved graduate employability (Expectation B4 and Enhancement)
- the risk-based approach embedded in the work of the Partnership Scrutiny Panel, link tutors and annual monitoring activity that strengthens the management and oversight of partnership provision (Expectation B10)
- the systematic and cohesive cross-working of academic departments and faculties, professional services and the Students' Union that contributes to the enhancement of student learning opportunities (Enhancement and Expectation B4)

Recommendations

The QAA review team makes the following **recommendations** to University of Greenwich.

By October 2015:

- implement a formal annual review process of the operation of Progression and Award Boards in relation to use of academic discretion and interpretation of the regulations on the matter of borderline judgements (Expectation A2.1)
- implement a process that effectively assesses the impact of cumulative change at programme level (Expectation A2.2)
- clarify the rights of students studying at partner organisations to refer complaints to the University and communicate these to students (Expectation B9).

Affirmation of action being taken

The QAA review team **affirms** the following actions that the University of Greenwich is already taking to make academic standards secure and/or improve the educational provision offered to its students.

- The ongoing work to strengthen central ownership and management of the University's academic regulations (Expectation A2.1).
- The work of the Day 1 Week 1 project group (Expectation B2).
- The positive steps being taken to develop student representation and involvement in institutional structures and processes (Expectations B5 and B11).

- the use of Map My Assessment to improve assessment scheduling (Expectation B6).

Theme: Student Employability

The University's commitment to graduate employability is evidenced in the strategic priority placed upon employment outcomes in its Strategic Plan. This is reinforced by the strategic goal of improving performance in the Destination of Leavers from Higher Education (DLHE) survey by 2017, from a position at the lower end of the sector distribution to one which is at or above the sector median. This strategic dimension is underpinned by an Employment Outcomes Framework which is focused on maximising students' academic and personal potential in order to enhance their employability. Oversight of the framework, which draws together a range of employability-focused initiatives, is exercised effectively by the Academic Council through a system of interim reporting. Implementation of framework targets is also a standing item at meetings of the University's senior executive.

An extensive range of programmes are strongly vocational and with a wide range of accreditation and PSRB links. The review team found clear evidence of involvement of employers and other external stakeholders in programme approval and review processes, including as external members of panels established for these purposes, particularly in faculties with vocational provision. This includes not only industrial employer and PSRB panel members of programme approval panels but also external professional representation on periodic review panels. Industry representatives are also included on partner programme committees.

Further explanation of the key findings can be found in the handbook available on the QAA webpage explaining [Higher Education Review](#).

About the University of Greenwich

The University's origins can be traced back to the foundation of Woolwich Polytechnic in 1891. In 1970 the institution's name was changed to Thames Polytechnic which subsequently merged with Dartford, Avery Hill, Garnett and City of London Colleges and with parts of Goldsmiths College. University status was awarded in 1992.

The main campus is based at the Old Royal Naval College, occupying buildings that were designed at the end of the 17th Century by Sir Christopher Wren. A common maritime heritage connects the campuses at Greenwich and Medway where the University occupies what had been the Royal Naval barracks. The third campus, in Eltham, comprises two sites of the former Avery Hill College.

The University is a community of around 40,000 students. The UK student population of almost 22,000 has several distinctive characteristics: the University has the country's highest proportion of students from low socio-economic groups (54 per cent) and high proportions of students that are state-educated (98 per cent), mature (56 per cent of all new entrants) and from minority ethnic backgrounds (52 per cent). Over 22 per cent (13 per cent FTE) of students are postgraduate and a similar percentage come from overseas including the European Union. A final distinctive feature of the University is the large number (16,530) of students enrolled on programmes delivered by its overseas partners.

In former years, the Partner College Network was the largest element in the University's portfolio of collaborative provision. The membership of the Network comprises further education colleges in South East England. More recently, however, there has been a

significant growth in the number of students registered on collaborative programmes, and this has been accompanied by a shift from UK-based to overseas partnerships.

The main categories of partnership are:

- full-cost collaboration with both private and public sector organisations in the UK and overseas;
- the FE Partner College Network;
- the Life-Long Learning Network of Linked Colleges.

These entail two broad types of collaboration: franchising, including the franchise of some programmes delivered on a distance-learning basis; and the recognition by the University of programmes that are developed and delivered by its partner organisations. The latter category includes validation and external validation; credit-rating; articulation and progression arrangements. The University also has a number of Erasmus and study abroad partnerships and provision leading to joint and dual awards.

In October 2011 a new Vice-Chancellor was appointed and an ambitious Strategic Plan 2012-17: Making Greenwich Great was agreed in 2012. The objectives of the plan, which have guided the University's recent development, are grouped into four areas: Learning and Teaching; Research and Enterprise; Community and Experiences; and Services and Infrastructure. Collectively, these objectives express the aim of bringing about a step change in the quality of the University's activities.

The University has recently created four faculties to replace its 11 schools and institutes and the revised organisational structure was agreed by the University Court in May 2014. Each Faculty is led by a Pro Vice-Chancellor (PVC) who holds a corporate role in addition to his or her local management responsibilities. PVCs are members of the Vice-Chancellor's Group (VCG) which meets on a fortnightly basis. They also have regular meetings (as members of the University Executive) with the Directors of the Professional Services.

The University's academic provision is delivered by the following Faculties: Architecture, Computing and Humanities; Business; Education and Health, and Engineering and Science. The Faculties are supported by two academic units which are located within the Vice-Chancellor's Office: the Academic Quality Unit (AQU) and the Educational Development Unit (EDU). Support for the University's academic programmes and departments is provided by several professional service directorates, including Student Recruitment (SR), Student Affairs (SA), Information and Library Services (ILS) and Planning and Statistics (PAS).

A number of the University's programmes of study are either accredited or governed by professional, statutory and regulatory bodies (PSRBs) and the Institution has a good track record of both securing and maintaining these relationships. In 2013-14, 101 programmes (representing 12 per cent of the University's provision at the time) were linked to 37 PSRBs. The University has consistently been successful in meeting the expectations of these bodies. Recent PSRB accreditations include the Forensic Society for programmes in Forensic Science, and the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA), and subsequently the Architects' Registration Board (ARB), both of whom re-accredited the University's provision in architecture without recommendations. In 2014, a large-scale suite of computing-related programmes was also successfully re-accredited by BCS, The Chartered Institute for IT.

In 2011 the Royal institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) withdrew its recognition of a number of programmes. The issue at the time had been the differentiation of professionally accredited programmes from non-professionally accredited programmes of a similar nature.

The host School responded by developing an entirely new programme, the BSc Property Development and Management, and this gained RICS accreditation in January 2014.

Following the University's 2009 Institutional Audit and the 2011 Collaborative Provision audit, both by QAA, the University took the view that these reports had called into question its ability to maintain effective oversight of the activities of its Schools and partner organisations. Since then, this area has benefited from a significant investment of time, energy and resources to implement and embed enhancement initiatives. Furthermore, the University has recently approved the Greenwich Enhancement Framework. The University has set itself an ambitious change agenda, recognising that it will take time for the institution and its students to derive full benefit from the measures and initiatives that it has introduced to further enhance the quality of student learning opportunities.

The two areas of good practice from the 2011 Collaborative Provision Audit have been further embedded and/or disseminated, so that these areas of good practice have been built on. As part of its response to the essential recommendation from the 2009 Audit to ensure that, in reaching assessment board decisions, the regulatory framework is applied consistently, and judgements do not undermine the University's assurance of the standards of its taught undergraduate awards, the University now includes a member of the Academic Quality Unit (AQU) attending Progression and Award Boards as the Guardian of the Regulations. Following the 2009 QAA audit, a mechanism for institutional oversight of the cumulative effect of minor changes to programmes was introduced. The University is currently developing a replacement process following the restructuring of the University into faculties. The remaining recommendations have been addressed to varying degrees. Overall, the University has made good progress in addressing the recommendations in the 2009 Audit.

Explanation of the findings about University of Greenwich

This section explains the review findings in more detail.

Terms that may be unfamiliar to some readers have been included in a brief glossary at the end of this report. A fuller glossary of terms is available on the QAA website, and formal definitions of certain terms may be found in the operational description and handbook for the review method, also on the QAA website.

Explanation of the findings about University of Greenwich

1 Judgement: The setting and maintenance of the academic standards of awards

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 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 University's framework for awarding degrees and other higher education qualifications is set out in the Academic Regulations for Taught Awards and Academic Regulations for Research Awards which are based on *The Framework for Higher Education Qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland* (FHEQ). The framework encompasses all of the University's academic provision, including programmes delivered through collaborative arrangements. Any variations from the standard regulations must be agreed by Academic Council and the Academic Quality Unit (AQU) maintains a list of all such derogations, which are now reviewed on a three yearly basis.

1.2 Detailed procedures for the approval, monitoring and review of taught programmes are set out in the Quality Assurance Handbook which makes clear reference to guidance on qualification characteristics, academic credit arrangements and Subject Benchmark Statements. The University has detailed processes for the approval and modification of courses which include requirements to ensure that the course meets the curriculum framework and satisfies professional, statutory and regulatory body (PSRB) requirements where appropriate.

1.3 The University also has in place a process for external credit rating of courses or training programmes offered by other institutions or agencies. This process, to date, has only been operated by one faculty of the University.

1.4   Research degrees awarded by the University are required to meet the qualification descriptions for masters (level 7) and doctoral (level 8) awards. These form an integral part of the Academic Regulations for Research Awards, and are also set out in the Research Student's and Supervisor's Handbook.

1.5   The processes for programme design and approval and for external credit rating are appropriately articulated to ensure that the outcomes of programmes are matched to qualification descriptors of the FHEQ and other external reference points as relevant. In principle the frameworks allow the Expectation to be met.

1.6   The review team examined the academic regulations documents, together with reports of approval events, records of external credit rating activity, programme specifications and minutes of Committees to ascertain whether University requirements are addressed in practice. The review team also met senior staff and academic staff to test the application of the Expectation.

1.7   Approval and review panels require programme teams to demonstrate that the outcomes of programmes are set at the appropriate level and are effectively matched to qualification descriptors in the FHEQ, and take account of Subject Benchmark Statements. Reports of programme approval and review meetings consider whether learning outcomes are aligned with relevant descriptors. There is effective oversight of the programme approval and review process including responses to conditions carried out by the Approval and Review Group (ARG). In this capacity ARG is alert to the complexities of ensuring overseas collaborative programmes are aligned with the FHEQ and Subject Benchmark Statements.

1.8   Programme specifications examined by the review team indicate that the external reference points relevant to the programme are used appropriately. The University has implemented the recommendation of the recent transnational education review to ensure that specific reference to the FHEQ is included in programme specifications.

1.9   The review team examined how the Faculty of Education and Health carries out external credit rating through the operation of its Faculty Credit Rating Group, since this was a matter for recommendation arising from the 2011 Collaborative audit, with regard to consistency and robustness of approach. Detailed guidance for external credit-rating activity is provided by AQU regarding documentary submissions, the process of scrutiny and decision-making in relation to volume and level of credit to be awarded, and formal reporting, record keeping and quality assurance. An audit trail of a recent credit-rating process indicated that processes are effectively implemented. Steps have been taken to improve the rigour and consistency of approval and assessment processes, including provision of assessment preparation sessions and marking workshops for external agencies with credit-rated provision. Standards are confirmed by external examiners, and records maintained by the Faculty as required by AQU.

1.10   Overall, the University makes effective use of relevant national reference points.

1.11   The review team concludes that the University's policies and procedures allow it to meet Expectation A1 in both design and operation and that the associated level of risk in this area 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

1.12   The University Academic Regulations for Taught Awards and associated appendices define the rules for academic awards, recognition and transfer of credit, including grading, compensation and condonement, re-assessment, progression, classification and regulations governing academic misconduct and appeals. The documents encompass policy, procedural and guidance information. Specific regulations govern the award of research degrees. Academic regulations are regularly reviewed and amended.

1.13   Responsibility for academic governance is vested in the Academic Council which delegates specific functions and authority through its deliberative committee structure, notably the Academic Quality and Standards Committee (AQSC) and the Faculty Academic Quality and Standards Committees (FAQSCs), and via the operation of Subject Assessment Panels (SAP) and Progression and Award Boards (PAB). It is with the latter that responsibility lies for the application of the regulations and decisions regarding student assessment results and the maintenance of standards. This framework of regulations and structures enables Expectation A2.1 to be met in theory.

1.14   The review team examined the content of the regulations and the records of assessment boards and papers and minutes of committees with responsibility for applying and evaluating the regulations. The review team also tested its findings through discussions with a range of academic and senior staff across the University.

1.15   The University has taken a number of actions to simplify the regulations for classification and strengthen central oversight of decision making by PABs. An analysis of all PAB decisions made in the 2012-13 academic year on students who fell within the classification borderlines was undertaken by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Head of the then Learning and Quality Unit, and reported to ASQC in November 2013. From 2013-14, AQU officers have been members of PABs with specific responsibility to act as guardians of the regulations and provide advice on consistency and decision-making. In addition, PABs are now required to keep clear records of the decisions made on borderline candidates.

1.16   The review team noted that the academic regulations provide for significant discretion in making academic judgements and permit a range of factors to be taken into consideration, when making progression and award decisions for individual candidates. The analysis undertaken in 2013 was a detailed consideration of the ways in which PABs applied academic discretion in relation to borderline candidates and resulted in some further clarification of the regulations with respect to rounding. AQSC, in considering the report, asked two subject areas to provide a commentary on their data. In discussions, members of AQSC also requested further clarification with regard to borderline decisions for direct entrants and for taught postgraduate awards. The review team noted that the analysis of PAB decisions in relation to borderline candidates was not repeated in 2014, and were informed that AQU officers who had attended PABs had not identified any issues. In reviewing PAB minutes for 2014, the team observed that records in relation to borderline decisions vary in detail and format, and there was considerable variation in the criteria used for upgrading borderline candidates. In view of the discretion permitted by the University for

PABs, and in the interests of transparency, the review team **recommends** that the University implement a formal annual review process of the operation of PABs in relation to use of academic discretion and interpretation of the regulations on the matter of borderline judgements.

1.17   In 2014 the University began a holistic evaluation of its regulations. The report was presented to Academic Council in March 2015. The review team found the report to be comprehensive covering the structure, content and presentation of the regulations, together with matters relating to management, ownership and interpretation of the regulations. In total the report made 29 recommendations including a primary recommendation that the management and administration of the regulatory framework and the provision of information, advice and guidance on the regulations should be established as a single, central function. This recommendation was accepted by Academic Council. The review team **affirms** the ongoing work to strengthen central ownership and management of the University's academic regulations.

1.18   The University's academic regulations are comprehensive and the University is continuing to evaluate and develop central ownership and management in order to further strengthen transparency and consistency of application by assessment boards. Overall, the review team concludes that Expectation A2.1 is met in both design and operation. The associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

1.19   Qualifications conferred by the University are listed in the Academic Regulations. The University student record system maintains the definitive record of each programme, including the date of approval and review, and programme structure. The collaborative programme database is maintained by AQU.

1.20   Programme and course specifications are completed for all awards as part of the programme definitive documentation. Templates and guidance on completion of specifications is provided by AQU and information from programme specifications is published in student handbooks with extracted information on learning outcomes and learning, teaching and assessment, published online under the course tab on the website. Processes for managing the approval of new courses and programmes and course and programme changes are detailed in the Quality Assurance Handbook. In principle there is a comprehensive framework and processes for maintaining definitive course and programme records.

1.21   The review team considered the format and content of programme specifications, their use within quality assurance procedures and the processes for assessing the impact of course changes and ensuring programme specifications are updated. The team also met staff and students to discuss the use and availability of specifications.

1.22   There are clear requirements set out in the Quality Assurance Handbook for definitive information in relation to courses, programmes and essential information for students, at all stages of the planning and approval process for new courses. Reports of programme approvals and reviews indicate attention is given to accuracy of records. AQU officers and FAQSCs have responsibilities for checking and approving changes to courses and programmes between reviews. Minutes of FAQSC meetings considering proposed changes are detailed and diligent in ensuring the accuracy of information. There is a clearly specified process for the communication of any course changes to the Programmes and Courses Office for updating on the student record system. Students who the review team met confirmed that they had received accurate information about their chosen programme both at the application and induction stages of their entry to the University.

1.23   The review team explored how the University maintains oversight of the cumulative effect of minor changes on programmes. The University has specified this as a responsibility of FAQSCs, and plans that the AQU Manager member of FAQSC will provide faculty managers with reports on the impact of changes to programmes of study between review periods. The review team was informed that these processes are still in early stages of implementation, with FAQSCs maintaining a watching brief, and no AQU Officer reports had yet been produced. Therefore, the review team **recommends** that the University implement processes that effectively assess the impact of cumulative change at programme level.

1.24   Overall, the University has appropriate processes to ensure the maintenance of definitive records for all programmes of study. There is, however, a need to more effectively assess the impact of cumulative change on programmes. The review team therefore

concludes that Expectation A2.2 is met in both design and operation 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

1.25   Oversight, scrutiny and final approval of taught programmes is through the appropriate Faculty and University Committees for taught and research provision. The Quality Assurance Handbook effectively outlines and codifies the process and expectations for approval and monitoring of programmes and guides the consistency of approach through a clearer definition of process with associated templates. Curriculum design teams are provided with guidance on the FHEQ and Subject Benchmark Statements in preparing documents for formal validation and approval.

1.26   Approval panels scrutinise programmes at an approval event with set agendas to ensure that all regulatory requirements are met and to ensure mapping to the appropriate national and international standards. Staff are trained for approval panel activity. Students are engaged in the process and are members of the validation panel team. This has been recently embedded in the academic programme design and approval regulations and process. The deliberations and outcomes from the validation panel event are formally recorded and reported. Oversight of the process and outcomes of approval, including the response of the programme team to conditions, is exercised by the Approval and Review Group (ARG), Chaired by the Head of the Academic Quality Unit, which reports to the University AQSC with formal approval and sign-off by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic Development). The design of the regulations, policies and procedures, the enhanced approach to consistency and the clear oversight in approval arrangements enable this Expectation to be met in theory.

1.27   The review team examined the academic regulations documents, together with reports of approval events, programme specifications and minutes of Committees to ascertain whether University requirements are addressed in practice. The practice of the approach to programme design and approval was discussed and tested in meetings with staff and students.

1.28   Staff involved at all levels are clear on the nature, purpose and improved effectiveness of the programme design and approval regulations and procedures of the new approach to programme design and approval. Training is provided for those involved in the approval process.

1.29   The regulations, policies and guidelines for design and course approval are effectively differentiated between levels of student achievement on undergraduate and postgraduate programmes, so that standards are set appropriately. There is clarity and consistency in the operation and purpose for the 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 these are effective and in accordance with the University's own academic frameworks and regulations.

1.30   Overall, the University regulations and procedures for programme design and approval are appropriately designed and effectively implemented. Therefore, the review

team concludes that Expectation A3.1 is met in both design and operation and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: **Met**
Level of risk: **Low**

Expectation (A3.2): Degree-awarding bodies ensure that credit and qualifications are awarded only where:

- **the achievement of relevant learning outcomes (module learning outcomes in the case of credit and programme outcomes in the case of qualifications) has been demonstrated through assessment**
- **both UK threshold standards and their own academic standards have been satisfied.**

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

Findings

1.31   The University's Academic Regulations for Taught Awards, Assessment and Feedback Policy and Quality Assurance Handbook document the processes and frameworks that address the management of assessment including extenuating circumstances and the operation of SAPs and PABs. The Assessment and Feedback Policy makes explicit reference to the relationship between assessment activities and learning outcomes. Where there are requirements that fall outside the University's regulations, such as PSRB accredited courses, requests for exemption are made to Academic Council.

1.32   The course approval process gives consideration to the assessment methods to be used in testing the achievement of relevant learning outcomes, and these are specified in programme specifications. There is a defined process for minor modifications of a course, and significant changes may lead to a full validation of the award. All course changes report to FAQSC.

1.33   Staff involved in marking assessed work are expected to adhere to defined assessment criteria, as outlined in the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy.

1.34   Consistency and fairness in marking is assured through an internal and external process of moderation. A two-tier examining structure provides the University with the opportunity for consistent and fair decisions to be made regarding individual modules and whole awards. SAPs allow for decisions to be made about individual courses, and PABs give consideration to students' profiles, progressions, awards and the scrutiny of External Examiners. The attendance of an Academic Quality Officer from the AQU assures the correct application of the University's regulations to determine the qualification and classification of finalists and a student's right to continue to study. Institutional oversight is provided by the Approval and Review Group that reports to the AQSC, which provides consistency in practice across the University**.** The design of the relevant policies and processes enable this Expectation to be met in theory.

1.35   The review team examined a range of documentation to test how the University's processes for awarding credit operate in practice. This includes the Academic Regulations for Taught Awards and Research Awards, the Quality Assurance Handbook, minutes of SAPs and PABs, course approval records**,** programme specifications and external examiners' reports. The team held meetings with members of senior and academic staff to discuss the assessment of academic standards.

1.36   Through the course approval process, the University assures itself that assessment is closely aligned to the academic standards of the awards, and that the design of assessment is sufficiently robust in testing the achievement of relevant learning outcomes. Course handbooks and programme specifications map assessment to learning outcomes at appropriate levels.

1.37   A review of external examiners' reports and associated action plans confirms the appropriateness of assessment in maintaining the University's own academic standards and comparability with UK threshold standards. Staff demonstrate a thorough awareness of the processes for assessment and the importance of their proper application in upholding standards.

1.38   Records of assessment boards confirm that decisions for the award of credit at module and course level are made in accordance with the University's defined processes. Appropriate externality is achieved through the participation of external examiners who are invited to both tiers of the assessment board. The use of externality from employers in Advisory Boards also allows the University to embed employability within course content and assessment practices. The AQU is responsible for ensuring consistency of practice across the University.

1.39   The University has clearly defined learning outcomes at course and module level with appropriate alignment to assessment. Measures are in place to ensure that learning outcomes are appropriately assessed and that results are moderated. External examiners are involved in the assessment processes and in confirming the setting and achievement of learning outcomes. Therefore, the review team concludes that Expectation A3.2 is met in both design and operation and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

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

Findings

1.40   The University has recently updated its regulatory framework and approach to programme monitoring and review. The University uses clearly understood regulations, policies and templates to inform and guide the process of monitoring and review. The design of courses for re-approval and review is underpinned by guidance, exemplars and templates that differentiate between different levels of student achievement on undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes, so that threshold standards are set appropriately. The process appropriately incorporates external expertise into the review process and events with student representation and involvement are evident throughout the process. A critical appraisal of the programme is part of the review process and this includes analysis of progression data and commentary on standards achieved.

1.41   Programmes are monitored on an annual basis and periodically reviewed every five years within a clear regulatory framework. The University uses various regulations, policies and templates to inform and guide the process of monitoring and review including criteria to bring forward a period of approval outlined in the Quality Assurance Handbook. The periodic review takes the form of a re-approval process including a critical appraisal. The University has a robust and clearly understood framework of regulations, guidance and procedures for annual monitoring and periodic review of programmes. These arrangements enable the Expectation to be met in theory.

1.42   The review team tested the operation of the monitoring and review regulations, guidance and procedures by meeting staff and students involved in the process and through scrutiny of documentation used in the annual review and periodic review process such as approval event reports and the minutes and papers of committees responsible for oversight of standards.

1.43   The review team found that the University makes appropriate and effective use of its new approach to monitoring and review with transparent and effective involvement of students, support staff and external expertise. The team particularly note the use of support staff in the validation and review process. Staff at all levels of the University clearly understand the nature, purpose and operation of monitoring and periodic review with appropriate guidance and training given to those involved in the process. For example, clear guidance is given for course design and mapping of the FHEQ and learning outcomes using exemplars and templates to guide the process.

1.44   Oversight of the process is effective and there is clear rationale for programmes being brought forward for review. The University makes use of the programme monitoring and review process to better align learning, teaching and assessment to the approval process and ensure better quality and more standardised documentation in the monitoring and review process.

1.45   Overall, the University has appropriate programme monitoring and review regulations, policies and procedures in place with effective oversight. Therefore, the review

team concludes that Expectation A3.3 is met in both design and operation and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (A3.4): In order to be transparent and publicly accountable, degree-awarding bodies use external and independent expertise at key stages of setting and maintaining academic standards to advise on whether:

- **UK threshold academic standards are set, delivered and achieved**
- **the academic standards of the degree-awarding body are appropriately set and maintained.**

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

Findings

1.46   The University has in place independent and external participation in the management and monitoring of academic standards. At key stages of the process, external examiners and external members are used in review and approval panels. Guidance is provided to these members to ensure the consideration of learning outcomes and FHEQ levels and consideration for these to be met in the design and approval of programmes. External examiners are used as the main mechanism for providing assurance of the ongoing maintenance of academic standards and benchmarking comparable standards to other higher education institutions. There are clearly defined processes for their appointment, participation in the review and approval of programmes, participation in assessment boards, and responding to actions identified in the reports they produce (See section B7). Members of University staff who are external advisers for validation, national subject networks, or are external examiners also contribute to the benchmarking of the University's standards against other higher education institutions. When required, there is engagement from other stakeholders, for example, PSRB representatives and employers, to ensure that the standards of programmes align to professional requirements.

1.47   Guidance is provided to panel members who take part in the review and approval of programmes, to ensure that consideration is given to a programme's purpose, that learning outcomes are set at the appropriate levels of the FHEQ, and that a programme's structure and content allow for the learning outcomes to be met. While not external to the University, the University also makes effective use of internal corporate service departments to ensure appropriate resource allocation in the review and approval process of programmes. Should the University not have adequate resources, a programme is not allowed to run unless conditions of these departments have been met. The processes in place that use external and independent expertise enable this Expectation to be met in theory.

1.48   The review team considered approval and review documentation, and external examiners' reports and action plans. The team also met academic staff and directorates with responsibility for the design and approval of programmes, and students who have taken part in the review and approval process.

1.49   Institutional oversight is provided by the Approval and Review Group that reports to AQSC. This allows for consistency and adherence to the regulations and procedures to take place cross faculty. The extensive involvement of external panel members at programme approval and review, and the use of external examiners post approval enables the University to engage more fully in discussions regarding the appropriateness of the design and review of programmes. Academic staff are clear about the externals' role in confirming that academic standards had been set at the appropriate level. This engagement with externals has significantly contributed to the University's effort to embed employability in the curriculum.

1.50   External examiners are involved in the scrutiny of assessment briefs and samples of assessed work. They also attend assessment boards. External examiners are required to identify areas for improvement and good practice, which are dealt with at faculty level and institutional level. Use is also made of PSRBs and other forms of externality, for example, external academics, and practising professionals from business and industry, in particular through advisory boards where advice is sought about the development of programmes.

1.51   Consideration of student feedback is also considered in the design and approval of programmes. Students are part of review and approval panels and training is provided by the AQU to students who take part in this process. Students whom the review team met also confirmed that consideration is also given of course evaluations in the design and approval of programmes

1.52   Overall, the University seeks appropriate external and independent input from a wide range of stakeholders at key stages of setting and maintaining academic standards. Therefore, the review team concludes that Expectation A3.4 is met in both design and operation and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

The setting and maintenance of the academic standards of awards: Summary of findings

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

1.54   All seven Expectations have been met and the associated level of risk for all is low. There are two recommendations, one affirmation and no features of good practice in this area. The recommendations relate to implementing a formal review process of Progression and Award Boards, and implementing a process that effectively assesses the effect of cumulative change at programme level. The affirmation reflects the ongoing work the University is undertaking to strengthen central ownership and management of its academic regulations.

1.55   There is evidence that the University is fully aware of its responsibilities for setting and maintaining the academic standards of awards. Previous responses to external review activities provide confidence that areas of weakness will be addressed promptly and professionally. The review team concludes therefore that the setting and maintenance of the academic standards of the awards **meets** UK expectations.

2 Judgement: The quality of student learning opportunities

Expectation (B1): Higher education providers, in discharging their responsibilities for setting and maintaining academic standards and assuring and enhancing the quality of learning opportunities, operate effective processes for the design and approval of programmes.

Quality Code, *Chapter B1: Programme Design and Approval*

Findings

2.1   The University introduced a new Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy in 2012 to develop a more creative, enhancement-led approach to programme design. Underpinning this strategy are a number of contributory strategies, policies and frameworks that provide appropriate guidance to programme design teams, such as the Assessment and Feedback Policy and the Personal Tutoring Policy. In addition, the Student Engagement Framework and the Greenwich Connect Strategic Implementation Plan for embedding technology-enhanced learning have been updated with the intention of improving the quality of the student experience in delivery of the syllabus and assessment. Staff are guided in the process of design by various templates and exemplars with the Education Development Unit supporting a stronger developmental process for programme teams working towards programme approval with the clear intention of the documentation emphasising teaching and learning practice.

2.2   The Academic Planning Committee has oversight of the University's portfolio and scrutinises proposals for programmes to proceed to development and approval. Any partner proposal is considered and approved by the Partnership Scrutiny Panel for its suitability to deliver a programme of study on behalf of the University. Professional services are involved throughout the process of programme design and approval, including involvement on validation panels. The programme design and approval process is outlined in section A3.1. Processes for the design and approval of programmes in theory enable this Expectation to be met in theory.

2.3   The review team tested the programme design and approval processes through scrutiny of the newly updated regulations, policies and guidance and the documentation relating to sign-off and approval, and minutes and papers of committees responsible for oversight of standards and approval of programmes. The team met staff and students to test the implementation, operation and understanding of the processes.

2.4   The University has a clear, robust and effective approach to quality assurance in the design and approval of programmes with clear institutional oversight of the nature, purpose and outcomes of programme design and approval. The learning outcomes and references to national threshold standards are effectively addressed within this process. The integrated nature of the regulatory framework, and the clear understanding of the framework by staff, and its focus on improving learning opportunities for students, is monitored through course design and approval. Staff are aware of their responsibilities in the design of courses and their roles and responsibilities within the approval process and how this impacts on the quality of learning opportunities, with evidence of staff driving improvements in student experience from better course and module design and development.

2.5   Overall, the University operates effective programme design and approval regulations and processes that underpin the quality of learning opportunities. Therefore,

the review team concludes that Expectation B1 is met in both design and operation and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B2): Recruitment, selection and admission policies and procedures adhere to the principles of fair admission. They are transparent, reliable, valid, inclusive and underpinned by appropriate organisational structures and processes. They support higher education providers in the selection of students who are able to complete their programme.

Quality Code, *Chapter B2: Recruitment, Selection and Admission*

Findings

2.6   There is a clear strategy for recruitment, selection and admissions which is informed by the University Strategic Plan. Its stated aim is to minimise barriers to those who do not possess standard qualifications but would benefit from higher education balanced with improving outcomes. To support this strategy the University aims to offer guidance at all stages in the admissions cycle tailoring the process to accommodate a range of needs.

2.7   The University Admissions Code of Practice (ACoP) outlines the procedures and regulations relating to applications and covers all aspects of the recruitment, selection and admissions process and states a commitment to ensuring processes are fair and transparent. The Recruitment and Admissions Office is responsible for implementing University and Faculty admissions requirements. The division of responsibilities is clearly defined by the ACoP.

2.8   Intake numbers are determined by the Vice-Chancellor's Group and distributed to faculties through negotiation. Entry criteria are the responsibility of individual faculties with admissions criteria being agreed as part of the programme approval process. Recruitment and admission to taught programmes is through Universities and Colleges Admissions Service (UCAS). For research degrees, responsibility lies with the faculties and the Postgraduate Research Office. International applications are subject to the regulations of the United Kingdom Visas and Immigration (UKVI). Offers are made by Student Admissions for EU students and by the International Office for non-EU students.

2.9   There are detailed guidelines for consideration of applicants without relevant entry qualifications and for students with disabilities. The ACoP states a commitment to ensure that applicants who have been offered a place are immediately informed about any changes to their programme and to their efficient and effective induction and integration as students. Information on the admissions appeals process is made available to applicants on the website. The policies and procedures demonstrate an approach which is aligned with Expectation B2 and enable the Expectation to be met in theory.

2.10   The review team examined the operation of the University's admissions procedure through scrutiny of documentation including the strategic Plan, New Arrivals and Transition Policy, Admissions Code of Practice, the Student Recruitment Aims, Ethos and Principles, job descriptions for Open Day Manager and Recruitment Assistant, AccessAbility webpage, Data Security Breach Policy, admissions process modifications document, appeals against recruitment decisions document, Bannerweb Guide, Link Tutor workshop notes, Day 1, Week 1 report and induction schedules. In meetings with students, academic and professional staff the team addressed recruitment, selection and admissions.

2.11   Academic and support staff demonstrate a common understanding of the strategy and application of new processes and a joined-up approach to the management of admissions. Entry tariffs, which are set by individual faculties, have been raised in line with a strategic aim to improve outcomes. The central Student Recruitment Team, Marketing Team and staff in the faculties divide responsibilities as defined by the Strategic Plan, ACoP and refer to the Recruitment and Admissions Aims, Ethos and Principles where the institutional

commitment to fairness is outlined. Student recruitment staff are provided with appropriate induction and training as are the International Recruitment Team.

2.12   There is recognition of a wide range of different types of entry qualification, including vocational. Students who do not possess standard qualifications are interviewed to assess suitability using criteria set out in the ACoP. In the case of partner institutions, the decision to accept a student without standard qualifications must be ratified by the Faculty Link Tutor.

2.13   Entry for non-traditional students is further encouraged by engagement with potential feeder institutions and through collaborative work with Aspire Aimhigher SE London. The University has begun to track the success of non-standard entrants against the standard to measure success in its aspiration to ensure all students are supported to maximise their potential. The Directorate for Student Affairs, Student Wellbeing Service provides support for prospective students who have a disability, impairment, specific learning difficulty and/or mental health difficulties, or who are care leavers.

2.14   Suitable processes are in place to support students with disabilities effectively during the recruitment, selection and admissions process. Staff involved in admissions are offered training in policies including procedures relating to students with disabilities. Students are advised to visit the University or contact the Disability and Dyslexia Team prior to application. Wherever possible, adjustment to criteria will be made for an applicant with disabilities who is considered to be capable of meeting the requirements of the programme's learning. The ACoP states clear criteria for what constitutes a reasonable adjustment. The AccessAbility Project provides information and support to existing and prospective students.

2.15   Appeals against recruitment decisions may be made where the University has failed to process an application correctly. The process is outlined clearly in the ACoP. Potential applicants are made aware of procedures for handling appeals and complaints related to recruitment and admissions.

2.16   Information relating to an application is held in the University's Banner Student Record System and all formal communication is documented through the Admissions Communication Plan. The University adheres to the Data Protection Act and has systems to ensure that all data, including equality and diversity information, is collected and stored confidentially.

2.17   International recruitment is supported by provision of pre-degree routes including the International Foundation Programme and pre-sessional English courses to support successful progression. The University has progression and articulation agreements with specific institutions for international students.

2.18   Advice is offered to international students by the International Office which is part of the Student Recruitment team in addition to a network of local representatives. Staff development sessions have been offered recently to link tutors to support staff in facilitating a smooth transition from recruitment to programme engagement. Link tutors ensure collaborative partners have appropriate processes and procedures in place. The University recognises the importance of this role in monitoring student satisfaction. The Student Recruitment Team offer comprehensive information, advice and guidance to potential students including fees, costs, loans and scholarships, and campus facilities and locations. Comprehensive academic and support information is made available through the website, by email and telephone and a programme of open and taster days and other face-to-face events.

2.19   The University has a New Arrivals Policy which outlines the intention to ensure that communications with new students from acceptance onwards must be timely, clear,

coordinated and effective. It establishes the need for all students to be included and catered for and for information to be pitched at the correct level for individuals who are unlikely to be familiar with University jargon.

2.20   Student induction has been a focus for improvement and the Day 1 Week 1 group, which includes student representation, was established to review the suitability of information to students and the experience of students when they first arrive including those who arrive following the induction period. Progress has been made but there is further work underway to ensure effective coordination and delivery of these activities. Students reported induction activity taking place some time after they had commenced their studies in 2014-15. Therefore, the review team **affirms** the work of the Day 1 Week 1 project group.

2.21   The University reviews the recruitment processes annually and responds to both internal and external changes for example from UCAS or the UK Visas and Immigration.

2.22   Overall, the review team concludes that the University has appropriate levels of transparency and support for students applying across subject areas to undergraduate and postgraduate programmes. Student needs are considered throughout the application and enrolment procedures. Therefore, the review team concludes that the University's approach to recruitment, selection and admissions meets Expectation B2 in both design and operation. The associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B3): Higher education providers, working with their staff, students and other stakeholders, articulate and systematically review and enhance the provision of learning opportunities and teaching practices, so that every student is enabled to develop as an independent learner, study their chosen subject(s) in depth, and enhance their capacity for analytical, critical and creative thinking.

Quality Code, *Chapter B3: Learning and Teaching*

Findings

2.23   The University's strategic approach is set out in its Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy. There are links between the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy and other institutional strategies, and its implementation is supported through a range of University polices in areas such as student transitions, student engagement, assessment, personal tutoring and the development of technology-enhanced learning.

2.24   The recent institutional restructuring has led to the establishment of a number of key faculty level roles such as directors of Learning and Teaching (DLT) and Student Experience (DSE), and the appointment of Faculty Operating Officers. An important element of these roles is to help support the strategic development and quality of learning. Additionally, the job description of heads of department has been enhanced to emphasise their role in leading learning and teaching in their department. Support for learning and teaching is also provided across the University's professional services directorates. The University's policies and procedures enable the Expectation to be met in theory.

2.25   The review team considered the operational effectiveness of this approach through analysis of strategy and policy documents, committee paperwork and materials relating to staff development and support. The review team also met students (including research students who also teach on University programmes), and a wide range of academic and professional services staff.

2.26   The staff the team met are aware of the University's key strategic aims in learning and teaching. The links between the Strategic Plan, Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy and other supporting frameworks and policies are evident, and there is evidence of the monitoring and oversight of progress by relevant groups and committees in relation to these strategic aims. Members of staff also cited examples of the ways in which the establishment of posts such as DLT and DSE, and the increased emphasis on the learning and teaching responsibilities of heads of department, had promoted improvements in learning and teaching.

2.27   Recruitment and selection processes for academic staff give thorough consideration to the abilities and competences of candidates in relation to learning and teaching. New staff without a teaching qualification must undertake the University's Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education and are appointed a mentor.

2.28   Research students who teach on the University's programmes undertake appropriate mandatory training within the Postgraduate Researcher Development Programme. A clear and robust Recognition of Prior Learning process is in place if an exemption to this is to be sought. The research students the review team met confirmed that they had had to meet these requirements in order to teach.

2.29   The Educational Development Unit (EDU) provides a wide range of useful development opportunities and resources. The University's Greenwich Opportunities in Learning Development Framework has been accredited by the Higher Education Academy

(HEA), allowing staff and research students to gain recognition against the UK Professional Standards Framework. Since 2012 the University has more than doubled the percentage of its staff who hold a recognised teaching qualification.

2.30   EDU also plays an important role in supporting staff engagement with pedagogical developments, for example through a Learning and Teaching Journal (Compass), the Academic Practice and Technology Conference and the Learning and Teaching Conference. Staff consider these as valuable opportunities to share experience and examples of effective practice. EDU also supports pedagogical development through a range of initiatives considered in more detail in the Enhancement section of this report.

2.31   Appraisal is in place for all staff, and the proportion completing this rose from 70 per cent in 2012-13 to 89 per cent in 2013-14. Peer observation takes place within the Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education and the Greenwich Opportunities in Learning Development Framework, and is a requirement for research students, but although faculty policies have been in place there was no University-wide requirement. This has recently been addressed in line with an objective in the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy, with Academic Council agreeing in March 2015 that peer observation should now be a formal University requirement.

2.32   The University considers a wide range of data to help it monitor the effectiveness of its learning and teaching. It participates in several national student experience surveys: for example National Student Survey, Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey, Postgraduate Research Experience Survey and International Student Barometer. It also introduced in 2014 -2015 a new online course evaluation system that is being used across the University, with clear expectations for considering and responding to the evaluation results. The University also considers other relevant data, such as student progression, degree classification and graduate employability. This data is considered both by departments and faculties (for example, within annual monitoring) and by relevant senior University committees. The staff the review team met cited examples of how this data is used, and noted that recent developments in the way that this data is provided to them by the University has made it more accessible and therefore helpful. The University is using data effectively to support its approach to learning and teaching.

2.33   Overall, the University has an appropriate strategic framework for the development of its learning and teaching. It is ensuring the implementation of this framework in order to provide its students with effective learning opportunities, and is supporting and promoting effective teaching practices. Therefore, the review team concludes that Expectation B3 is met in both design and operation and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B4): Higher education providers have in place, monitor and evaluate arrangements and resources which enable students to develop their academic, personal and professional potential.

Quality Code, *Chapter B4: Enabling Student Development and Achievement*

Findings

2.34   Responsibility for this area rests with Academic Council, and the development of policy and procedures rests with the Student Experience Committee (SEC). At its second meeting following its establishment in 2012-13 the SEC identified four key work streams. The SEC is also responsible for the development and monitoring of all student support services. Its work is supported by Faculty Student Experience Committees (FSECs). The SEC and FSECs involve academic staff, professional services and student representation.

2.35   The strategic framework for enabling student development and achievement is set by the University's Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy. This is supported by a number of policies and frameworks in areas such as student transitions, student engagement, assessment, and personal tutoring. The statement of Greenwich Graduate Attributes is a further key reference point in support of the University's strategic focus of improving the employment outcomes of its students. These policies and procedures enable the Expectation to be met in theory.

2.36   The review team spoke to students, academic staff and professional services staff involved in supporting student development and achievement. It also reviewed University strategies and policies such as the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy, the Student Engagement Framework and the Personal Tutoring Policy, relevant University reports and committee minutes, and other documentation relating to University provision in this area such as Greenwich Graduate Attributes Statements, employability workshop agendas, guidance for staff and details of personal tutor workshops.

2.37   The minutes of SEC meetings show that the Committee's work aligns effectively with its agreed priority areas, and that it is covering an appropriate range of business in an effective way. Members of staff (academic and professional services) and the Students' Union believe SEC is making a positive contribution to the development of the student experience.

2.38   Effective cross-working and liaison between academic units, professional services directorates and student representatives makes a significant contribution to supporting student development and achievement. Examples of this include the Day 1 Week 1 project to enhance student induction and transition, the expansion of library opening hours, the extensive involvement of professional services staff in programme approval and review, and the role and impact of Faculty Employability Champions. This evidence of systematic and cohesive cross-working contributes to the good practice identified in relation to enhancement.

2.39   The University's Equality and Diversity Policy sets out a clear commitment to equality and diversity, supported by an action. The Student Affairs Directorate provides a range of services for students with protected characteristics, and support for such students is also provided through Information and Library Services. Inclusive design is covered within both the University's Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education and the Greenwich Opportunities in Learning Development Framework, and guidance on inclusive assessment is provided as part of the University's Assessment and Feedback Policy. The guidance notes for completion of new programme proposals make clear the need for inclusive curriculum

design, and the EDU is working with the Students' Union to support its Inclusive Teaching Project.

2.40   The University's Personal Tutoring Policy sets out clear expectations in areas such as the appointment of tutors, frequency of meetings, and responsibilities of staff and students. Each faculty has an implementation plan for the policy, and support for tutors is provided through training workshops and the provision of materials through a personal tutor hub. The University is taking appropriate steps to implement the policy effectively, and there have been noticeable improvements in the organisation and consistency of personal tutoring. The detail of the policy does not apply to the University's distance and flexible learners, but alternative arrangements appropriate to the nature of this type of provision are put in place.

2.41   Improving graduate employability is a key strategic aim for the University. This is underpinned by the Employment Outcomes Framework approved in 2012. The University has taken forward a range of initiatives in relation to this, for example; the development of the Greenwich Graduate Attributes that the University expects to see embedded in all programmes, supported by the Greenwich Employability Mapping tool; significant increases in the number of students undertaking placements and internships; and a partnership with Reed NCFE recruitment agency to support students in seeking graduate level employment opportunities.

2.42   Staff are aware of and committed to the institutional strategic objective of improving the employment of its students. Students are aware of the employability skills they are developing through their programmes. There was also clear evidence of their engagement with the increased opportunities of gain employability skills; relevant workplace experience through placements and internships; and advice and support on employability issues (for example from the Graduate Employment Team). This is now leading to improvements in the University's Destination of Leavers from Higher Education (DLHE) survey results, so that it is now poised to achieve the target it set for itself in its *Strategic Plan*. Therefore, the review team considers the University's comprehensive range of support and initiatives for developing the academic and professional potential of its students that leads to improved graduate employability to be **good practice** (see also Enhancement).

2.43   The University has a coordinated and effective approach to supporting the development and achievement of its students, and the range and impact of its employability initiatives is good practice. The review team therefore concludes that the Expectation B4 is met in both design and operation and that the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B5): Higher education providers take deliberate steps to engage all students, individually and collectively, as partners in the assurance and enhancement of their educational experience.

Quality Code, *Chapter B5: Student Engagement*

Findings

2.44   Guided by its Strategic Plan the University has adopted an explicit, systematic and holistic approach to student engagement. This approach and the University's definition of student engagement is focused around a vision that extends beyond student representation and involvement in formal procedures, to the co-production and active management of their learning. This is being supported by changes to academic governance structures, such as the introduction of an institutional SEC and FSECs, and the creation of new management posts, including Directors of Learning and Teaching and Directors of Student Experience.

2.45   This strategic approach to student engagement is underpinned by the Student Engagement Framework (SEF), which extends across both the student experience and student engagement and covers matters such as the student voice and responsiveness to student feedback. Academic Council exercises oversight of all strategies and policies for student engagement and the student experience. Though only approved for implementation from January 2015, the SEF, supported by other features of the University's approach to student engagement, enables the University in theory to meet Expectation B5 in theory.

2.46   The review team tested the operation of the University's arrangements for student engagement by talking to staff and students, and by reading minutes, and other institutional documentation such as the SEF, the Greenwich Graduate Attributes Statements and the proposed University Policy for the Nomination and Appointment of Student Members of Approval and Review Panels.

2.47   The University and its SEC, with Students' Union input, make use of a wide range of data to inform the improvement of the student experience and the development of academic provision, and to inform the long-term agenda. This includes sector reports, and outcomes of external and internal student surveys such as the National Student Survey and Postgraduate Research Experience Survey, and Student Experience and Engagement Survey and New Arrivals Survey. Use is also made of data on student appeals and complaints, data on student progression and achievement, external examiner reports, and reports from annual and periodic review processes. Such data is made available to students and their representatives in a range of media and forums, such as institutional, faculty, department, and programme-level committees, and through annual monitoring. Academic Council and SEC discuss information and data with Students' Union representatives.

2.48   In considering such data, the SEF commits the University to closing the feedback loop on issues raised by students through mechanisms such as You Said, We Did websites, introduced in late 2014, and by using course handbooks to publicise when changes and improvements have been introduced as a result. The University acknowledges that there have been implementation difficulties but these are being addressed. It is evident that efforts are being made to close the loop on issues raised at all levels and in various contexts as well as to partner institutions.

2.49   A number of schemes are being developed that further enable the University to value the student contribution, such as recognising and accrediting student personal development, and recognising the work and contribution of student representatives. The University provides students with a range of opportunities to engage in the quality assurance and enhancement of their programmes. Evidence from the surveys and from students

themselves confirms that the University is meeting their overall expectations and that students recognise that the University takes action on concerns they raise.

2.50   Partnership working between the University and the Students' Union is also evident in the development of proposals during 2014 on student representation within the new academic governance structures and on training for student engagement purposes. Prior to 2014 - 2015 progress in involving students, for example as panel members, had been slow and historically there has been low levels of student involvement in formal committees.

2.51   The review team explored the effectiveness of the arrangements by the University to strengthen student representation and involvement, including at partner organisations. A number of improvements have been made such as matching Students' Union officers to subcommittees of Academic Council, increasing student participation in the programme representative system and representation on faculty committees. Recruitment and training has improved, including for student members of approval and review panels. Training for programme representatives is provided by the Students' Union. The Students' Union has also developed a website and handbook to support programme representatives. Training for student members of review and approval panels is provided by the AQU. Further, the University has included this emphasis on training for student engagement within its induction for new academic staff, and there is continuing support provided for staff at faculty level. However, progress in extending arrangements to postgraduate research students has been relatively slower. Therefore, the review team **affirms** the positive steps being taken to develop student representation and involvement in institutional structures and processes (see also section B11).

2.52   The University offers opportunities for engagement in various University projects. These include Greenwich Connect, which has 1,500 students involved in projects of various kinds, the EDU continuing professional development programmes on engaging students with feedback and the Day 1 Week 1 initiative, and student-oriented office hours and tutor access. Overall, progress is being made in the implementation of revised student engagement policies, structures and mechanisms. The University acknowledges that it is engaged in a long-term process of cultural transformation. The review team concludes that the University's approach to student engagement meets Expectation B5 in both design and operation and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B6): Higher education providers operate equitable, valid and reliable processes of assessment, including for the recognition of prior learning, which enable every student to demonstrate the extent to which they have achieved the intended learning outcomes for the credit or qualification being sought.

Quality Code, *Chapter B6: Assessment of Students and the Recognition of Prior Learning*

Findings

2.53   The University's Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy and Assessment and Feedback policy, address student assessment alongside the Academic Regulations for Taught Awards and Research Awards and the Quality Assurance Handbook. Staff are required to adhere to these policies and strategies which outline the University's arrangements for assessment design, marking, feedback and the operation of SAPs and PABs. There are clearly defined policies and procedures for the recognition of prior learning (RPL), academic misconduct**,** extenuating circumstances, appeals, and special arrangements for students with disabilities. These policies and procedures are reviewed and revised through engagement with academic and professional staff, as well as the Students' Union, and reports to AQSC**.**

2.54   Course handbooks and programme specifications provide students with course specific information regarding their assessment and clearly communicate learning outcomes. Any changes that are made to the course and the course guide are made clear to students by academic staff. The Student Charter also outlines students' rights and responsibilities in regard to assessment and feedback.

2.55   Assessment is also monitored through a two tier exam board system, peer review and internal moderation, and through the ability to share best practice between academic staff (see section A3.2).

2.56   The University has recently commissioned a review of the Academic Regulations (see section A1), though the current arrangements, policies and strategies do enable the Expectation to be met in theory.

2.57   The review team examined key documentation relating to assessment including the regulations, course handbooks and programme specifications and other complementary strategies, policies, guidelines and handbooks. The team also considered minutes of meetings related to assessment and external examiner reports. The review team held meetings with staff with responsibility for assessment, and students.

2.58   Course handbooks and programme specifications are accessible to students both on the virtual learning environment and in hard copy. Students are able to give feedback on assessment methods, teaching practice and the quality of assessment feedback by completing course evaluations. Results and outcomes of these evaluations are provided to students within 10 days. Staff and students are aware of the proactive steps the University has taken to improve feedback to students.

2.59   The Assessment and Feedback Policy provides the University with principles for the provision of feedback on assessed work. The policy was first developed in 2012 but, with the recent move to faculties, a review of the policy has taken place with the production of an implementation plan to ensure that the policy is embedded at faculty level, allowing for local contextualisation to take into account any individual subject or PSRB requirements. Appropriate use of external examiners is made in moderating assessment design and

feedback, and externality also extends to employers. The time frame in which students can expect feedback is 15 working days, and students confirmed that generally this is adhered to though sometimes this can be vary. The feedback they receive, however, is informative. In cases where timescales cannot be adhered to, students are notified of the reason.

2.60   One noteworthy initiative is the work the University has done to address student feedback regarding the bunching of assessments. Students and staff confirmed that the development of Map My Assessment has played a significant role in addressing this issue, and the tool allows the University to look holistically at assessment to allow a variation of assessments and provide an even workload for both students and staff. Map My Assessment is now also a compulsory part of the programme approval process. The review team, therefore **affirms** the use of Map My Assessment to improve assessment scheduling.

2.61   EDU provides support to academic staff which aims to address assessment-related development needs. Meetings with staff confirmed support and mentoring for designing and marking assessment, and those members of staff undertaking the PG Cert are required to design and conduct mock approval of a programme. The University's annual Teaching and Learning conference provides good practice for assessment to be shared.

2.62   Overall, the University has in place an appropriate regulatory framework and associated processes for the assessment of students and the recognition of prior learning. Initiatives are in place to improve the scheduling of assessment and the timeliness and quality of feedback to students. Therefore, the review team concludes that Expectation B6 is met in both design and operation and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

Quality Code, *Chapter B7: External Examining*

Findings

2.63   The University's approach to external examination is described in the University's Academic Regulations for Taught Awards and is the responsibility of the Deputy Vice- Chancellor (Academic Development) and the AQSC to provide institutional oversight. The regulations outline the University's expectations for the involvement of external examiners in the relevant sections. The AQU is responsible for the management of the appointment processes for external examiners, and ensure that there is at least one external examiner per course. The criteria for external examiners is also published in the regulations. External examiners may also be considered from areas of industry, though experience of higher education is required. The process for appointment is initially with the departments. They are then formally endorsed by the faculty, before a final check is performed by AQU for ratification. All appointments are finally approved by AQSC, and are also reported to the relevant FAQSC. For programmes at partner institutions, an external examiner may be appointed for the combination of courses at one partner, or by the same external examiners responsible for the University-based programme.

2.64   For all successful appointments, external examiners are issued with a letter of appointment and an External Examiner's Handbook. The External Examiner's Handbook makes explicit reference to external examining responsibilities, the regulations, the Assessment and Feedback Policy and the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy.

2.65   An external examiner's role at the University requires them to approve the format and content of assessment including assessment briefs and samples of students' work. As part of the two-tier assessment process, external examiners are invited to be part of SAPs and PABs. External examiners must endorse the marks awarded by the SAPs and PABs, provide any comments, and sign off the final report of the PAB. Overall, the policies and procedures enable the Expectation to be met in theory.

2.66   The review team examined a sample of external examiner reports records of SAPs and PABs, minutes of FAQSCs and AQSCs, programme committees, and the longitudinal report. The review team also met senior staff, academic staff and students during the review visit.

2.67   The review team found that the external examining contributes to the annual monitoring process. Faculties are required to respond to external examiners' reports with comments and action plans as part of the annual Programme Monitoring Report (PMR), which is posted onto a robust online system. Programme teams are also required to respond to comments and recommendations from external examiners and these are reviewed by faculty academic managers and overseen by the AQU. Where external examiners are responsible for partner institutions, the external examiner is required to comment and submit an annual report to the University and the institution.

2.68   Students are notified of the purpose of external examiners via the portal, and course handbooks provide students with details of their external examiner. External examiner reports and the responses to them are made available to all students automatically once they log onto the University's portal. This includes all students in the University's partners in the UK and overseas. Student representatives confirmed that they are invited to comment on external examiner reports at course committees. Meetings with students

uncovered a variable experience of the awareness of external examining and the availability of external examiner reports across partner institutions.

2.69   The University has in place a robust system for the consideration of external examiner reports from course and faculty level, to University level. There is good evidence that areas for improvement and areas of good practice inform action planning at faculty and institutional level, and it is the responsibility of Faculty Annual Reporting and Planning Documents to do so. AQU also provide an analysis of external examiners' reports for consideration at the AQSC.

2.70   Overall, the University has effective policies and procedures in place for managing external examining. Therefore, the review team concludes that the University meets Expectation B7 in both design and operation and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B8): Higher education providers, in discharging their responsibilities for setting and maintaining academic standards and assuring and enhancing the quality of learning opportunities, operate effective, regular and systematic processes for monitoring and for review of programmes.

Quality Code, *Chapter B8: Programme Monitoring and Review*

Findings

2.71   The new academic programme monitoring and review process is intended to align learning, teaching and enhancement to the approval and review process and to reflect on where improvements can be made to the student experience. The University maintains oversight of the review process through the AQSC and the Approval and Review Group. The monitoring of courses culminates in a Faculty Annual Reporting and Planning Document. The Faculty Annual Reporting and Planning Document template and process uses centrally provided data to identify programmes with low progression and performance rates and assessment outcomes of learning and teaching for the different groups in the student body are monitored and reviewed according to demographic groupings. Quality enhancement plans address improvements in student learning opportunities. See section A3.3 for further details on the University's monitoring and review processes.

2.72   The process of annual monitoring and periodic review has University-level oversight with evidence of the monitoring of action plans for improvement and enhancement of student learning opportunities. The University further has defined institutional level procedures and templates for the discontinuation of programmes and partnerships. The University's monitoring and review policies and procedures enable this Expectation to be met in theory.

2.73   The review team tested the operation and effectiveness of the monitoring and review regulations, guidance and procedures by meeting senior and academic staff, professional support staff, students involved in the process and through scrutiny of documentation used in the annual review and periodic review process, review event reports and the minutes and papers of committees responsible for oversight of annual monitoring and review and student opportunities.

2.74   The new model and approach to cyclical annual monitoring and review is effective in oversight, operation and implementation allowing the University to make available to students appropriate learning opportunities, which enable the intended learning outcomes of programmes to be achieved. Annual monitoring comprises a clearly understood and suitable hierarchy of monitoring levels, including Course Monitoring Reports, Programme Monitoring Reports and Link Tutor Reports, all of which culminate, via Department Reporting and Planning Documents in the Faculty Annual Reporting and Planning Document. Data and feedback from students is used effectively within these processes. External academics, industry professionals and other stakeholders such as PSRBs are used systematically. Where appropriate, the University has implemented procedures for when programmes should be brought forward for review. The University has well defined institutional-level processes for the discontinuation of programmes and partnerships, which are specified in the Quality Assurance Handbook with evidence of regard to teach out and planning for courses terminated.

2.75   Overall, programme monitoring and review processes are applied systematically and operated consistently. The University takes deliberate steps to review the learning experience and to drive improvements to the student experience. Therefore, the review team concludes that Expectation B8 is met in both design and operation and the associated level of risk is low.

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

2.76   There are clear, published formal complaints and appeals procedures for undergraduate and post graduate students on taught programmes. The procedures, guidance notes and relevant forms are available from the University website. There are separate procedures for postgraduate research students which may be accessed in the Academic Regulations for Research Awards and the Research Student's and Supervisor's Handbook. New procedures for research students bringing them into line with undergraduate students came into operation in 2014-15. The procedures articulate time frames, processes and protocols and include the membership of the review panel for an academic appeal to ensure fairness and transparency.

2.77   The University provides a range of opportunities for students to raise complaints. Student representatives have the opportunity to attend programme committee and staff/student meetings on most programmes. Informal complaints may be brought to the attention of academic staff anonymously. Personal tutors and a number of other trained members of staff may be called on to assist individual students with a possible complaint in confidence. The process and the time frame for making a complaint is outlined in the Formal Complaints Regulations and Procedures. Postgraduate research students with a complaint have access to assistance from trained Complaints Officers in the Postgraduate Research Office. Procedures are available to recent graduates to ensure students who may be concerned about the implications of a complaint or appeal may engage with the process following completion of their studies.

2.78   The University's Academic Regulations for Taught Awards was updated during 2014 in response to a series of recommendations from the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) and the Quality Code *Chapter B9* update. A further revision is being undertaken currently which includes mapping against the OIA Good Practice Framework for handling complaints and academic appeals. Student handbooks include signposting to the Academic Appeals procedure and how to obtain independent advice from the Students' Union on the appeals process. Appeal Regulations are made available to taught students on both the website and via the Student Portal.

2.79   The Academic Appeal guidance notes and form signpost the range of ways in which students may access support with an appeal. This includes the Campus Student Centre, Faculty or Department Office and Students' Union Advisor. Where a programme leads to a professional qualification or gives the right to practise in one or more professions the relevant professional body is considered in the appeals' process.

2.80   The above arrangements and procedures for handling students' complaints and academic appeals allow the Expectation to be met in theory.

2.81   The team examined documents relating to the complaints and appeals policies and procedures, minutes of the SEC and Academic Council and a range of other relevant documents. The team reviewed the operation of the complaints and appeals procedures in meetings with students, academic and professional staff and students.

2.82   Programme handbooks outline the ways in which complaints may be raised. Students are encouraged to resolve matters informally whenever possible and a student may approach his or her personal tutor; the academic course leader, programme leader or the head of department. For larger programmes, a year tutor will assist if the student does

not wish to approach their personal tutor. Students confirmed in all meetings that they are clear about how to make a complaint.

2.83   The Students' Union provides confidential assistance and advice and are permitted under the University Regulations to support students in meetings with staff. Representatives from the Students' Union may also raise complaints informally and assist students through complaints and appeals processes.

2.84   Students have the option to involve the University Complaints Investigations Officer situated in Student Affairs. From there actions have been reported to Academic Council as part of the SEC Summary Report.

2.85   A review of the Formal Complaints procedures and Appeals procedures was undertaken and approved by the SEC in January 2015 (ratified by Academic Council in March 2015). This suggests that the grounds of extenuating circumstances (EC) and the process for submitting and receiving notification of EC claims remains confusing and stressful for many students. Almost 50 per cent of appeals were submitted on the grounds of extenuating circumstances and a high proportion were from students with disabilities. Lack of clarity about what constitutes valid grounds and whether other staff members need to be informed of the circumstances were key issues. The report states that the Standards Office will consult with the Students' Union on raising awareness among the student body on the importance in submitting EC claims in a timely fashion. In addition the University is reviewing EC regulations to ensure adjustments are made in line with the 2010 Equality Act for protected characteristics.

2.86   For postgraduate research students, an annual report on appeals and complaints is considered by a subgroup of the University's Research and Enterprise Committee. This includes a commentary on common themes. The University monitors each case considered by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator and identifies instances where additional steps need to be taken to prevent the recurrence of any problem.

2.87   The Student Affairs Annual Report on Complaints 2013-14 states that partner college students cannot use the University's formal complaints process but that complaints may be considered informally. Complainants at one of the University's partners are directed towards the complaints procedures in their own institutions. Where an issue cannot be resolved by the partner, it can be referred informally through the link tutor to the Faculty for consideration and feedback. Students at UK collaborative partners whom the team met are clear about initially accessing the complaints procedures in their own institution and understand they have the option to complain to the University, although it is not explicitly clear this is informal only. The review team therefore **recommends** that the University clarify the rights of students studying at partner organisations to refer complaints to the University and communicate these to students.

2.88   The review team concludes that the University policies and procedures for the resolution of complaints and academic appeals are appropriate and that the University is implementing these procedures effectively and, in the instances reviewed, making use of the data arising from them to make improvements. The team therefore concludes that Expectation B9 is met in both design and operation and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

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

Findings

2.89   The University is one of the UK's largest providers of transnational education with approximately 48 per cent students based at overseas collaborative partners, together with substantial numbers studying through the local Partner College Network. The balance of overseas and UK based students is consistent with the University's strategic plan and internationalisation strategy. The latter commits the University to maintain a steady state of transnational education student numbers through partnership with a smaller number of larger, high quality multi-faculty arrangements. A range of types of collaborative arrangement are in place: franchising, validation, franchising on a distance-learning basis, external validation, credit rating, articulation and progression arrangements, joint and dual awards. The University adopts a risk-based approach to the management of partnerships. The processes by which new partners and programmes are approved, monitored and reviewed are set out in the Quality Assurance Handbook.

2.90   Governance is exercised through the University's formal committee structures, with the Partnership Scrutiny Panel, which reports to the Academic Planning Committee, playing a key role in the approval and review of partnerships. Strategic leadership is provided though the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic Development). Collaborative partnerships are managed by faculties with support from Directorate of Student Affairs, Office of Access and Partnerships and International Office.

2.91   The University has mapped current practice against the *Chapter B10: Managing Higher Education Provision with Others* of the Quality Code, and presented this to AQSC in June 2014 resulting in recommendations to take forward work on developing practice for the oversight of work-based learning, placement, and international exchange activity, updating of the collaborative register and ensuring a process for periodic due diligence. An appropriate framework for the management of higher education with others enables the Expectation in Chapter B10 to be met in theory.

2.92   The review team explored the effectiveness of the arrangements for managing higher education delivered in partnership with other organisations, through scrutiny of the approval, reporting and monitoring processes in operation, together with Faculty and University committee papers. In addition the team had discussions with students from partner organisations and University staff with responsibility for managing collaborative arrangements at home and overseas.

2.93   The University is aware of the risks associated with transnational education and working with others through academic partnerships and keeps its processes and procedures under continuous review. Consequently some aspects of its processes for oversight and management of collaborative partnerships are new and not yet fully implemented, or are planned for development.

2.94   A collaborative register is maintained by the AQU and published on the University's webpages. Following the recent QAA review of UK transnational education in the Caribbean, the University is reviewing the management and scope of the register.

2.95   The processes for consideration of due diligence and risk assessment, overseen by the Partnership Scrutiny Panel, are comprehensive and effective. Similarly the processes for the approval of new partner programmes, which follow the same process as for University-based programmes, and for articulation agreements, are robust and follow procedures.

2.96   Partnership agreements setting out the respective responsibilities are signed once a new collaborative programme is authorised; this includes responsibilities in the event of closure or termination of a partnership. The review team reviewed documentation relating to discontinuation of one overseas partnership and transfer of the students to another partner and found the process is well managed.

2.97   Partnerships are reviewed on a five-yearly basis. A new process is now in place based on an extensive and comprehensive risk assessment, with reviews normally to be carried out in situ, and in all cases a new due diligence report is to be completed. The new process provides for strengthened central and risk-based oversight of partnerships, and more effective strategic and operational management of partnerships.

2.98   In relation to annual monitoring, standard programme level arrangements apply, but in addition there are link tutor annual reports and in the case of multi-disciplinary partnerships, annual institutional reports (AIR). The latter are produced by the partner organisations to provide feedback on contextual, strategic and institutional issues and on the effectiveness of partnership arrangements. AIRs are considered by FAQSCs and AQSCs and the Chair of AQSC provides a response to each partner's AIR. AIRs and their consideration at faculty and University levels serve a useful purpose in providing reassurance about academic health of partnership and commitment to enhancement. Moreover the process of scrutiny is thorough, with reports that do not meet requirements being returned for further work. The University plans to ask all partners to complete AIRs from 2015-16.

2.99   Each collaborative programme has a link tutor whose primary function is to facilitate communication between programme level staff and the University. The team heard that although there is no formal centralised training in place for new link tutors, faculties do select link tutors carefully, ensuring they have appropriate experience, for example, in programme management, and make arrangements for mentoring. Link tutors are required to visit partners at least once per year, and to report on each visit and provide an annual report. Templates are provided for these, and although it is evident that not all link tutors are using the most current versions, completed reports are generally detailed and helpful in identifying issues and confirming University expectations are met.

2.100   The University has recently re-launched link tutor workshops to enable participants to share practice and discuss new developments such as the new approach to the recording of risks. The workshops provide good development and support opportunities. The University is also building link tutor expertise and support through the appointment of some specialised in-country representative posts to support extensive partnership activity in China, Malaysia and the Middle East.

2.101   Given the above, the review team considers the risk-based approach embedded in the work of the Partnership Scrutiny Panel, link tutors, and annual monitoring activity that strengthens the management and oversight of partnership provision to be **good practice**.

2.102   The University retains control of academic standards by means of oversight and control of admissions and assessment processes. Monitoring of progression and attainment can result in requirements to revise entry requirements. The University retains full authority for the issue of certificates and transcripts. University's policy is to record the location of study on the transcript only.

2.103   Overall, the review team considers that the University has in place effective procedures for managing higher education provision with others. Therefore, the review team concludes that Expectation B10 is met in both design and operation and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

Quality Code, *Chapter B11: Research Degrees*

Findings

2.104   Academic Council is responsible for the quality and standards of research degrees. A range of powers relating to research degrees is delegated to four Faculty Research Degree Committees (FRDCs). FRDCs serve as the University's registration, progression and awards boards for research degrees, and also consider more general matters relating to research degree provision as appropriate. Their work is overseen by the University's Research and Enterprise Committee (REC). The University's Director of Postgraduate Research is a member of both REC and FRDCs.

2.105   The University's framework of managing the academic quality and standards of its research degrees is set out in its Academic Regulations for Research Degrees and Awards. Guidance on key elements of the Academic Regulations is set out in the Research Students' and Supervisors' Handbook, and a suite of Research Degree Administration forms supports the management and oversight of research degrees. The University-wide Postgraduate Research Office (PGRO) provides administrative support for these processes. The policies and procedures in place enable this Expectation to be met in theory.

2.106   The review team considered a range of documentary material relating to the management of research degrees. This included regulations, handbooks, Research Degree Administration forms, training materials for staff and students, committee minutes and reports, online resources and research degree completion data. The review team also met staff responsible for the management of research degrees, current supervisors of research degrees and a group of current research students.

2.107   The current structures for academic management and oversight of research degrees have been in place since 2013-14. FRDC minutes and papers demonstrate that they are conducting an appropriate range of business in an effective way. FRDCs compile annual reports that cover key issues such as registrations, student progression and completion, complaints and appeals, on the basis of which the Director of Postgraduate research prepares an annual report for REC. Research degree matters are also a standing item on REC agendas, and an appropriate range of issues is considered under this heading.

2.108   The University expects students to be integrated into an effective research environment. The review team heard from research students that this was achieved in a number of ways, for example, inclusion in research groups, attendance at departmental seminars and being encouraged to attend and present at conferences.

2.109   The Academic Regulations set out an appropriate framework for admission to research degrees. This includes a formal interview. The University requires interviewers to undertake formal training, and PGRO maintains a list of trained interviewers to ensure that this requirement is implemented. Once admitted, research students are sent a formal offer letter and a range of relevant information, and all new students undertake a central induction (supplemented in some faculties by a separate faculty induction).

2.110   Supervisory teams have a combined experience of supervising not fewer than three candidates to successful completion. In the case of a candidate registered for a PhD, at least one of the supervisors will have successfully supervised to PhD level. Where staff are new to supervision, they are partnered with more experienced supervisors and undertake a compulsory training programme that the supervisors the review team met had found helpful and effective. FRDCs approve supervisory teams to ensure that these requirements are met for each team, and effective mechanisms are in place to ensure that the calculation of staff workloads for staff includes formal allocations for research student supervision so that no one member of staff carries an excessive supervisory burden.

2.111   The University requires regular meetings between supervisors and their supervisory teams, and that a written record of meetings is maintained in the Research Students' Logbook and Personal Development Portfolio. Research students whom the team met praised the consistently high quality of the supervision they were receiving, the accessibility and supportiveness of their supervisory teams and the contribution this makes, along with the activities referred to in relation to the research environment noted above, to a strong sense of academic community for research students.

2.112   A small number of research students undertake periods of fieldwork overseas. A protocol for support of such students is in place in the academic unit where this is most common. The University confirmed that the principles underpinning this document are also applied in similar situations in other parts of the University. This protocol provides for a local supervisor to be appointed. The University recognises the need to have competent local supervisors in place in these cases, and intends to address this when reviewing the research degree regulations.

2.113   All research students complete an annual Research Progress Report Form. These forms are considered by members of academic staff outside the supervisory team at department or faculty level, following which FRDCs consider reports on all research students for whom they are responsible. Research students are normally registered for the degree of MPhil initially, and there is an upgrade process to transfer to PhD. A clear process is in place that includes an oral exam with two members of staff outside the supervisory team. Information on and training for this assessment is provided to research students.

2.114   A new Postgraduate Researcher Development Programme was introduced at the start of 2014-15; there are clear University expectations for research student participation in the programme, and for recording this. In some instances faculty-level research training opportunities are also in place. Research students are aware of these requirements, and find the development opportunities to be useful. Some commented on elements of overlap between central and faculty provision, and the need for more effective communication between PGRO and faculties regarding this.

2.115   Feedback on research degrees is obtained through a range of mechanisms such as the annual progress report and University participation in the Postgraduate Research Experience Survey. Both committee minutes, and other specific examples cited by staff, demonstrated the consideration of this feedback and resulting actions. The University has taken steps to increase formal representation of research students on committees, for example including them on REC. It has added research student representation to some SECs and intends to do so across all FSECs. This contributes to the affirmation in section B5.

2.116   Assessment of research degrees is carried out with reference to the relevant FHEQ qualification descriptor. Clear and appropriate criteria and processes are in place for the appointment of examiners by FRDCs, and for reporting by research degree examiners.

Assessment outcomes are monitored by FRDCs, and a consolidated report on institution-wide data is considered by REC.

2.117   Clear processes for research student appeals and complaints are in place and made available to research students. Data on complaints and appeals is considered as part of the annual FRDC reports to REC, allowing an institutional overview of these processes and issues emerging from them to be taken.

2.118   In conclusion, the University has put in place an appropriate framework for managing the academic quality and standards of research degrees. The evidence considered by the review team demonstrates that this mechanism is being implemented effectively, and there are appropriate structures through REC and FRDCs to monitor this implementation. Therefore Expectation B11 is met in both design and operation and the associated risk level is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

The quality of student learning opportunities: Summary of findings

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

2.120   Of the 11 Expectations in this area, all are met and have a low associated level of risk. There is one recommendation, three affirmations and two features of good practice in this area.

2.121   The recommendation relates to the rights of students studying at partner organisations to refer complaints to the University (section B9). The affirmations recognise courses of action the University is taking to address an identified area. The review team affirms the work of the Day 1 Week 1 project group (section B2), the positive steps being taken to develop student representation and student involvement in institutional structures and processes (sections B5 and B11) and the use of Map My Assessment to improve assessment scheduling (section B6).

2.122   The review team finds that the University offers a comprehensive range of support and initiatives to students (sections B4 and Enhancement). The risk-based approach embedded in the work of the Partnership Scrutiny Panel, link tutors and annual monitoring is good practice (section B10). The team particularly notes the systematic and cohesive cross-working of academic departments and faculties, professional services and the Students' Union that contributes to the enhancement of student learning opportunities (Enhancement and section B4).

2.123   There is evidence that the University is fully aware of its responsibilities for assuring quality. The recommendations relate to minor omissions or oversights. Any actions will not require or result in a major structural, operational or procedural change. There is activity already underway in a small number of areas that, once completed, will enable the University to meet the Expectations more fully.

2.124   Therefore, the review team concludes that the quality of student learning opportunities at the University **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 University has a commitment to providing accurate and easily accessible information to its stakeholders. There are clear lines of accountability for the assurance of accuracy at faculty and directorate level from course and programme leader to head of department. Overall responsibility for academic information governance rests with the Pro Vice-Chancellors. This includes ensuring the integrity and accuracy of the information available on faculty web pages. The University's Strategic Plan which includes the institution mission, vision and strategic objectives is available through the website along with detailed information about programmes and support services. Current students have access to a comprehensive range of material through the student portal. Overarching strategic and faculty-level planning is informed by centrally authored management information produced by the Directorate of Planning and Statistics and, for recruitment-related information, the Admissions Office. The Student Charter can be accessed through the University website. Programme specifications are automatically updated on the website from the administrative software system. The programme prospectus information is uploaded manually. Students receive a transcript on completion of their programme which sets out information about their studies and achievement.

3.2 The AQU web pages provide access for staff and external examiners to quality assurance procedures, information about collaborative provision, guidelines on accreditation of prior learning and links to regulations, policies and procedures. In addition further information is available to staff from the University's Greenwich Policies pages, including a page covering such things as archiving, data protection and records management. The University is progressing plans to realign the management of the website to further improve accuracy, responsiveness and to reflect the development of a stronger sense of community.

3.3 Production of the University's publicity material is overseen by the Marketing Team using a variety of media, including its website; intranet; virtual learning environment; staff, student, and applicants' portals. The University's Strategic Plan, the Quality Assurance Handbook and the Student Charter are all available on the University's website. The University's policies and processes enable Expectation C to be met in theory.

3.4 The review team scrutinised the University's processes and their effectiveness through consideration of evidence provided in quality assurance procedures, in minutes of meetings, in monitoring reports and a range of documentation including the student submission, self-evaluation document, student handbooks, programme specifications and academic quality documentation and through meetings with academic and support staff. Students of the University studying on the main campus and through collaborative partners in the UK and abroad were requested to comment on the content, usefulness and accuracy of the information they had accessed prior to application and at all stages of their journey with the University. The University website and student portal were viewed to assess that the information produced for both public and internal audiences is fit for purpose, accessible and trustworthy.

3.5   Students stated the information they accessed prior to undertaking their courses was in line with their experience once on programme. They further confirmed that they had been supplied with sufficient and accurate information during their studies and said student handbooks, in particular, provided comprehensive information. This includes tutor CVs programme specifications, module schedules and deadlines.

3.6   The University is developing a Digital Strategy which is aligned to the Strategic Plan and the Information and Technology Strategy to define the direction for the enhancement of the website and associated environments to further improve the access of current and potential students to high quality accurate and up-to-date material.

3.7   The University provides a webpage for its partners that has the function of a handbook. Information and Library Services aims to provide parity of access to students on collaborative programmes allowing access to undergraduate learning resources. Students from collaborative partner institutions referred to the fact that problems encountered historically had been addressed effectively.

3.8   The Memorandum of Agreement and contracts set out the expectations relating to publicity material and use of the University corporate identity. Any use must be approved by the University prior to publication. Compliance is monitored by link tutors and the International Partnerships Office through periodic desk-top exercises and during visits to partners.

3.9   The Quality Assurance Handbook, appendix D8, sets out the essential requirements for the information to be supplied to students. This applies equally to partners where suitability is evaluated annually by link tutors who check and approve student handbooks. The University has carried out an audit of activity scale and governance mechanisms in the areas of work placement, internships, and study abroad which was presented to ASQC in October 2014. AQSC noted that general principles relating to Health and Safety for placements, the definition of various tutor and employer roles and responsibilities and tutor visits were covered by all the provision reviewed, but resolved to develop minimum threshold information to be included for placement students.

3.10   There is an emerging role of management information in the University's planning processes. Senior, professional and academic staff noted the recent improvements in the accuracy and availability of data for enhancement purposes, much of which is supplied in pre-populated reports indicating performance against key performance indicators.

3.11   Overall, the University's policies and procedures for managing information ensure the information it produces about learning opportunities for students, staff, employers, partner organisations and other relevant stakeholders is clear, comprehensive and trustworthy. Therefore, the review team concludes that the Expectation C is met in both design and operation and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

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

3.13   The Expectation in this area is met and the associated level of risk is low. There are no recommendations, affirmations or features of good practice. There are limited examples of student engagement in the management of this area.

3.14   The review team concludes therefore that the quality of the information about learning opportunities at the University **meets** UK expectations.

4 Judgement: The enhancement of student learning opportunities

Expectation (Enhancement): Deliberate steps are being taken at provider level to improve the quality of students' learning opportunities.

Findings

4.1 The University has made quality enhancement a key strategic priority, and this commitment to the enhancement of student learning opportunities is set out in its Strategic Plan. The University's approach is informed by a wide-ranging definition of enhancement that relates not only to academic practice but to all contributory and supporting activities.

4.2 This approach is underpinned by the introduction of governance and management structures designed to enhance the quality of learning opportunities and the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy, the University's primary facilitating framework for the enhancement of academic practice. The Academic Council exercises overall oversight of both the Greenwich Enhancement Framework and the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy, with progress being monitored by the AQSC and SEC through a procedure for interim reporting. The achievement of enhancement objectives and aims is further supported by the activities of EDU and a number of enhancement projects that form part of the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy, for which EDU has oversight responsibility.

4.3 In practice, the University's approach is also supported by the introduction of a range of management and leadership positions carrying specific responsibilities for quality enhancement, in key roles such as Directors of Learning and Teaching, Directors of Student Experience, Employability Champions, and Heads of Department. DLTs, for example, are members of both the University Learning and Innovation Steering Group, and of their own faculty Learning Enhancement and Teaching Group, while DSEs contribute to the work and deliberations of the SEC and FSECs. These posts facilitate the progress of the University's enhancement agenda and aid in promoting and embedding enhancement. The University's strategic and operational approach to enhancement enable it to meet the Enhancement Expectation in theory.

4.4 The review team tested the operation of the University's approach and the progress being made with arrangements for achieving its enhancement objectives by talking to senior managers, directors of professional services, teaching staff, and students, and by reading minutes and other documentation. This enabled the review team to explore the extent to which the top-level vision and commitment to enhancement is embedded on the ground.

4.5 The University regards the responsibility for delivering commitments to quality enhancement in the Strategic Plan, the Greenwich Enhancement Framework and the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy, and the full range of institutional strategies, as resting with both managers and those they manage, thus reflecting the aim of creating an academic community that engages both staff and students. This commitment is shared by senior managers, faculties, professional directorates, the Students' Union, and partner institutions. While some policies and initiatives are relatively new, good progress is being made in working towards a systematic and planned approach to enhancement, and an ethos and environment that expects and encourages the enhancement of student learning opportunities.

4.6 Furthermore, there are various enhancements to learning resources, the IT infrastructure and information systems, and the learning environment, including improvements to the management of learning spaces, social opportunities, and facilities,

and enhancements to buildings and other planned improvements aimed at enhancing the student experience.

4.7   The team saw and heard evidence of effective collaborative working between Students' Union sabbatical officers, representatives of student-facing professional support directorates, the Chair of SEC, DSEs, and faculties that facilitate the improvement of the quality of learning opportunities. Examples noted by the team include the Day 1 Week 1 initiative, the Information and Library Services working group on 24/7 library opening, development of the Student Engagement Framework, student feedback, and regular meetings between the Students' Union and senior post-holders with an enhancement remit. In confirming the progress made to date through this broad partnership approach, which is highly valued by the Students' Union, the team noted that the University has been assisted by the communication strategy set out in the SEF. Therefore, the review team considers the systematic and cohesive cross-working of academic departments and faculties, professional services, and the Students' Union that contributes to the enhancement of student learning opportunities to be **good practice** (see also section B4).

4.8   There is growing awareness and involvement in the various projects, initiatives, and activities that underpin the University's strategic approach and commitment to enhancement. This is complemented by the staff development opportunities made available by EDU. This direction of travel is evident in the University's work with its extensive range and types of academic partnerships. For example, the team noted that enhancement topics are included in themed meetings with staff from collaborative partner organisations, including Partnership Development Group meetings, and that partner staff are able to benefit from delivery of the HEA-accredited Postgraduate Certificate. Further, Faculty Directors of Partnerships are members of Faculty Learning Enhancement and Teaching Groups.

4.9   In reviewing the various enhancement-oriented activities, the review team noted the particular strengths manifested in the supportive arrangements developed by the University, its faculties, and its professional services for enhancing student employability. The Employment Outcomes Framework provides an effective stimulus for initiatives and structures that enable students to develop and maximise their academic and professional potential. These include the various kinds of support provided by the Greenwich Employment Team and by faculty employability staff; the Greenwich Employability Passport; the Greenwich Graduate Attributes initiative; opportunities for placements, internships, work experience; and the Students' Union Employability Toolkit. In summary, the review team concludes that under the aegis of the Employment Outcomes Framework there is clear evidence of student engagement with the opportunities and initiatives now in place. This contributes to the good practice identified in section B4 regarding graduate employability.

4.10   There is a range of ways in which data is generated and used in deliberative processes and in quality assurance processes for enhancement purposes. Data on matters such as student achievement and progression are provided centrally to programme leaders for annual course monitoring reports, and this is related to institutional key performance indicators. Further, a recently introduced student course evaluation system is able to provide course leaders and student representatives with information on the student experience at course level, and this can be used in annual monitoring for improvement purposes. Summary data for monitoring purposes are considered at faculty and University level and are used for Faculty Reporting and Planning Document reporting. Use is also made of the National Student Survey, the Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey and the Postgraduate Research Experience Survey for improvement purposes incorporating feedback from senior staff, academic staff, professional services and students.

4.11   A range of processes, mechanisms and forums permit and encourage the identification and sharing of good practice. The role and activities of EDU includes a clear

focus on the enhancement of teaching, learning and assessment, and of employability, and this is evident from the various annual conferences and regular staff development workshops. Sharing of practice also takes place in the heads of department away days, in the meetings of the faculty Learning Enhancement and Teaching groups and FSECs, through the University Learning Innovation Steering Group, the initiatives and activities of the ECentre, such as digital literacy, working alongside EDU, and the opportunities extended to partner colleges by the EDU and by link tutors. Use is also made, for dissemination purposes, of national enhancement projects, such as Re-Engineering Assessment Practice and Transforming the Experience of Students through Assessment, and of initiatives such as the Digital Literacy Project, involving students as curriculum change agents using the Student Engagement CAMEL methodology which was set up to develop a national network of 'students as change agents'.

4.12   Notwithstanding the relatively recent introduction of some institutional arrangements for supporting enhancement, evidence shows that the deliberate steps being taken by the University to improve the quality of learning opportunities are appropriate and are working effectively. Therefore, the review team concludes that Enhancement Expectation is met in both design and operation and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

The enhancement of student learning opportunities: Summary of findings

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

4.14   The Expectation in this area is met and the associated level of risk is low. There are no recommendations or affirmations in this area. There is one feature of good practice.

4.15   The team considers the systematic and cohesive cross-working of the academic departments and faculties, professional services and the Students' Union that contributes to the enhancement of student learning opportunities to be good practice (see also B4). The review team also finds that the University offers a comprehensive range of initiatives for developing the academic and professional potential of its students that leads to improved graduate employability as discussed in section B4.

4.16   The University takes a strategic approach to the enhancement of learning opportunities and a number of enhancement activities, such as Day 1 Week 1 and Map My Assessment have been recently introduced. In practice the University's approach is supported by the introduction of a range of management and leadership positions. Quality assurance mechanisms are used to identify opportunities for enhancement. There is evidence of growing awareness of and involvement in various projects and initiatives that illustrate the commitment to enhancement and this is complemented by the staff development opportunities made available by EDU. There is an ethos which expects and encourages enhancement and there are mechanisms for the identification and dissemination of good practice.

4.17   Therefore, the review team concludes that the enhancement of student learning opportunities at the University **meets** UK expectations.

5   Commentary on the Theme: Student Employability

Findings

Strategic commitment to employability

5.1   The University's commitment to graduate employability is evidenced in the strategic priority placed upon employment outcomes in its Strategic Plan. This is reinforced by the strategic goal of improving performance in the Destination of Leavers from Higher Education (DLHE) survey by 2017, from a position at the lower end of the sector distribution to one which is at or above the sector median. This strategic dimension is underpinned by an Employment Outcomes Framework which is focused on maximising students' academic and personal potential in order to enhance their employability. Oversight of the framework, which draws together a range of employability-focused initiatives, is exercised effectively by the Academic Council through a system of interim reporting. Implementation of framework targets is also a standing item at meetings of the University's senior executive. Notwithstanding the challenges of seeking to mitigate the disadvantage of students' social background, the team noted clear evidence that at undergraduate level student progression and achievement have improved in recent years and that recent data indicate that the University is close to achieving its 2017 target for improving employment outcomes.

Involvement of employers in the delivery and development of the curriculum

5.2   An extensive range of programmes are strongly vocational and with a wide range of accreditation and PSRB links. Other curriculum areas are acknowledged by the University to be more challenging in relation to employability and employment opportunities. The review team found clear evidence of involvement of employers and other external stakeholders in programme approval and review processes, including as external members of panels established for these purposes, particularly in faculties with vocational provision. This includes not only industrial employer and PSRB panel members of programme approval panels but also external professional representation on periodic review panels. Industry representatives are also included on partner programme committees. The team, also reviewed evidence confirming that student employability issues are considered in detail by such panels, and that students who meet with such approval and review panels report good University-employer liaison. Further, annual review processes require action to be taken on employability where there are deemed to be shortcomings.

5.3   There is evidence of employer, business, and professional involvement in curriculum delivery and development. For example, the Faculty of Engineering has advisory groups, drawn from among employer and professional practitioners, and who provide advice on programme content to programme teams and on the development of new programmes. Employers are also involved in suggesting programme modifications. The Business Faculty uses externals from industry, business and the professions for mentorship and internship purposes.

Innovations in promoting the employability of students

5.4   The review team noted the top-level determination to pursue and support employability initiatives, some of which are more embedded than others, depending in part on when they were introduced. These initiatives provide evidence of the successful outworking and implementation of key overarching academic strategies and frameworks. For example, the Student Experience Framework places clear emphasis on employability and enterprise, and on work-based learning and student placements and internships. The Educational Development Unit plays an important role in supporting implementation and use of such initiatives.

5.5   A number of initiatives illustrate the range of innovative approaches that are being adopted by the University, its faculties, and its Students' Union. An Employability Champion

has been appointed in each faculty to act as an advocate for student employability and to promote effective liaison between departments and central services.

5.6   In 2010, the University launched the Greenwich Graduate Attributes Initiative, one of eight priority areas being taken forward under the aegis of the Learning Teaching and Assessment Strategy. The intention is that characteristics relevant to employability should be embedded in all programmes through the programme approval and review processes with panels being required to check that this has been done. Course specification guidance emphasises the need to make reference to Greenwich Graduate Attributes Initiative, which is designed to inform curriculum development and to enhance pedagogy. Evidence indicates that progress has been made but the University acknowledges that further work is required, and this is confirmed in reports of periodic review events. The Greenwich Graduate Attributes Initiative has been trialled with partner organisations and implementation is now a requirement for all University awards.

5.7   Since 2014 a Greenwich Employability Mapping software tool has been implemented to assess progress in the teaching and assessment of employability skills. Sound progress is being made by programme teams in reviewing and mapping all programmes, and the teaching of relevant employability skills is a requirement for all programmes. The Greenwich Employability Mapping tool is also being piloted with some partner colleges. Such centrally driven initiatives are complemented by bottom-up, faculty-initiated schemes such as the Greenwich Employability Passport, which recognises students' extra-curricular activities. Though developed by the Greenwich Business Faculty, this is being adopted by other faculties and departments and by the Students' Union, which is seeking to take full advantage of such award schemes and of opportunities for skills accreditation, as illustrated by the Students' Union Employability Toolkit which promotes student volunteering.

5.8   The proportion of students undertaking a placement for work experience purposes has doubled in the last three years from 17 per cent to 36 per cent, and the University has ambitions to increase this to 50 per cent by 2017. Further, in 2014, following analysis of progress in implementing the Employment Opportunities Strategy the University has determined that it will treble the number of internships and other work experience activities made available to students in non-professional programmes. The review team noted that a variety of information and guidelines on placements and work-based learning is made available to students and staff and that an audit tool for the enhancement of the practice learning environment has been introduced in health-related provision. The University has also put in place a scheme offering 50 graduate internships each year to recent graduates on three-month contracts, to improve employment prospects. To assist in job-finding skills, the University has established a partnership with Reed NCFE recruitment agency to support students in seeking graduate level employment opportunities. Reed staff work with students to develop their job-finding skills, as well as to help them identify relevant vacancies in a scheme that has recently been extended beyond the Greenwich campus to the Medway campus. Student transition into work is supported through a combination of the Reed partnership and a separate Greenwich Work Experience Programme that offers employability training and short-term paid employment to recent graduates.

5.9   Students have wide appreciation of the range of opportunities to obtain employability skills, advice and support for employment, and opportunities for internships and placements. Students recognise the central place of employability in the University's priorities. Students indicated that this aspect of the University heavily influences their choice of place of study and that they welcome and value the variety of initiatives that are being put in place, such as the employability toolkit, internships and awards, measures to enhance employability skills, and the opportunity to work with faculties on the introduction of employability passports.

5.10   The student experience of sources of information and advice and support on employment, careers, and work experience from the central Guidance and Employability Team is positive, as is programme-specific advice and support provided by faculty employability staff.

5.11   In summary, there is clear evidence of student engagement with the opportunities and initiatives now in place, and of improving graduate employment outcomes.

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 29-32 of the Higher Education Review handbook.

If you require formal definitions of other terms please refer to the section on assuring standards and quality: www.qaa.ac.uk/assuring-standards-and-quality.

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

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

Award
A qualification, or academic credit, conferred in formal recognition that a student has achieved the intended **learning outcomes** and passed the assessments required to meet the academic standards set for a **programme** or unit of study.

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* (FHEQIS).

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.

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

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.

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.