



European College of Law Ltd

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

October 2013

Key findings about European College of Law Ltd

As a result of its Review for Educational Oversight carried out in October 2013, the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) review team (the team) considers that there can be **limited confidence** in how the provider manages its stated responsibilities for the academic standards of learning and support it offers for the University of London International LLB.

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

The team considers that reliance **cannot** be placed on the information that the provider produces for its intended audiences about the learning opportunities it offers.

Recommendations

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

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

- undertake annual monitoring of its provision (paragraph 1.3)
- audit and review its policies for the management of academic standards and formative assessment (paragraph 1.4)
- develop a systematic approach to management reporting and action planning (paragraph 2.2)
- implement clear and robust systems for developing, reviewing and updating its website and public information (paragraph 3.5).

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

- formalise with clear terms of reference an appropriate deliberative management structure (paragraph 1.2)
- implement a process to ensure staff engagement with the Quality Code (paragraph 1.7)
- introduce student handbooks and make these available in line with the College revised policy (paragraph 2.9)
- review the extent and consistency of written feedback to students (paragraph 2.12).

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

- implement and disseminate the College Learning and Teaching Strategy (paragraph 2.6)
- review the appropriate teaching skills and subject specialisms of academic staff (paragraph 2.7).

About this report

This report presents the findings of the [Review for Educational Oversight](#)¹ (REO) conducted by [QAA](#) at the European College of Law Ltd (the College), which is a privately funded provider of higher education. The purpose of the review is to provide public information about how the provider discharges its stated responsibilities for the management and delivery of academic standards and the quality of learning opportunities available to students. The review applies to a programme of study that the provider delivers to support students undertaking the University of London International Programmes LLB. The review was carried out by Michelle Callanan, Seth Crofts and Andrew Lancaster (reviewers) and Brenda Hodgkinson (Coordinator).

The review team conducted the review in agreement with the provider and in accordance with the [Review for Educational Oversight: Handbook](#).² Evidence in support of the review included the College's self-evaluation document, meetings with staff, meetings with alumni students, the College website, College policies and committee meeting minutes, and student work from London East Bank College (LEBC).

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

- University of London Teaching Institutions Recognition Framework
- the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (the Quality Code).

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

The College changed its name from London East Bank College of Law and IT to the European College of Law Ltd in April 2013. Programmes were previously delivered by LEBC and this college ceased trading in September 2013. The College reports that policies, processes and practice from LEBC are, and will be, replicated. The College intends to provide tuition and learning support for the University of London International Programmes LLB. It currently has three full-time and five part-time members of staff. No students were enrolled at the College at the time of the review but the College is providing revision and support sessions for former LEBC students.

At the time of the review, the College offered teaching and learning support for students studying for the following higher education programme:

- the University of London International Programmes LLB.

The provider's stated responsibilities

The College is not responsible for summative assessment and provides teaching and support, including mock and formative assessments, for students registered with the University of London International Programmes LLB.

The College course is delivered by a team of full and part-time lecturers. Staff are supported by online learning materials and workshops provided by the University of London (the University).

¹ www.qaa.ac.uk/educational-oversight

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

Recent developments

The College has recently opened in new premises in Ilford, Essex, where it intends to deliver its courses. The premises have two teaching rooms, learning resources and a 'moot courtroom'.

Students' contribution to the review

Students studying on the higher education programme at the College were invited to present a submission to the review team. Two students provided a written submission they had prepared taking into account the views of their fellow students. These students had not been taught at the current campus but had reflected on the tuition and resources at LEBC. At the review visit, the team met with a number of students who previously had been enrolled at LEBC.

Detailed findings about the European College of Law Ltd

1 Academic standards

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

1.1 The College is responsible for managing academic standards for the learning and support it offers for the University of London International Programmes LLB. The University is responsible for all aspects of the content, summative assessment and final award of the programme. The University recognises colleges as Affiliate and Registered Centres that meet a set of specific quality criteria under its articulated framework, the Teaching Institutions Recognition Framework. Recognition of the College by the University has recently been transferred from LEBC to the college (as recognition by the University relates to name (the legal identity), programmes taught and campus).

1.2 Although a close-knit course team work through informal networks outside of any formal structure there is no evidence of a systematic approach to quality assurance. The Principal has management support from the Director of Studies and Head of Laws, the Director for Additional Learning and Language Support, and from the Registrar and Head of Compliance and Pastoral Support. Oversight of quality assurance procedures is by the Academic Committee comprising the Principal, Director of Studies and Head of Laws, and the Director for Additional Learning and Language Support. Other committees have defined roles and personnel, and are functional management groups that deal with specific issues such as, induction, admissions and student discipline, as they arise. It is **advisable** for the College to formalise with clear terms of reference an appropriate deliberative management structure.

1.3 The team found no evidence of annual course monitoring. There are no formal course review reports with action plans. The College reported that evidence on student progress and results, student feedback and lecture observations are considered by the Principal and appropriate staff with any necessary actions taken forward. However, the team found little evidence of this reported analysis in practice, and the College is not systematic or evaluative in its approach. It is **essential** that the College undertakes annual monitoring of its provision.

1.4 Policies for the management and conduct of standards and assessment are inconsistent, contradictory and in some cases irrelevant. This impedes the effective management of academic standards. There is duplication in the Academic Malpractice policy and the Malpractice policy. Further, the Academic Malpractice policy refers to BTEC and NVQs that the College does not offer. The Quality Assurance policy refers only to examination invigilation, and the Performance Assessment Framework is focused on the supervision of dissertations that the College used to offer. The Accreditation of Prior Learning (APL) policy refers to the award of credits, which is the role of the University and not the College. In order to provide a coherent framework for quality assurance, it is **essential** that the College audit and review its policies for the management of academic standards and formative assessment.

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

1.5 As noted on page 2, the College supports students registered on the University of London International Programmes LLB. This degree has been developed with regard to *The framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland*

(FHEQ) and relevant subject benchmark statements. The University provides programme specifications, module descriptors and intended learning outcomes, and conducts all final assessments for the final award of the LLB. Therefore, programme design is appropriately supported by relevant external reference points.

1.6 As noted in paragraph 1.1, the College has recently had its recognition transferred due to its relocation and change of name. The University carried out a review of LEBC and made a number of recommendations in their report. However, because of the relocation, these recommendations have not been actioned.

1.7 The College has a range of policies that address some of the elements of the Quality Code, for example, a complaints policy, an equal opportunities policy, and the policies on APL, Additional Learning, Student Discipline and Academic Malpractice. While the College reported that it had recently become aware of the Quality Code, none of the policies have been directly referenced to the Quality Code, nor is there any evidence of the College using the Quality Code in developing its quality assurance processes. However, further awareness of key concepts, for example 'collaborative provision', need to be understood so that external reference points can be correctly employed. It is **advisable** for the College to implement a process to ensure staff engagement with the Quality Code in its policies and practices.

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

1.8 The College is not directly responsible for summative assessment. The processes in place relate to mock examinations and advice to students on the standard of their work. Procedures for internal verification of mock assessments were reported as being carried out in accordance with the standards outlined in the examination reports published by the University.

The review team has **limited confidence** in the provider's management of its responsibilities for the standards of the programmes it offers for the learning and support for students studying for the University of London's International Programmes LLB.

2 Quality of learning opportunities

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

2.1 As noted in paragraph 1.2, the College management structure is functional. The Principal oversees delivery with the Director of Studies and Head of Laws taking responsibility for day-to-day management of all aspects of the student experience. The College operates with a small team of full-time academic and administrative staff. Due to the scale of the operation, much of the deliberations in relation to managing and enhancing learning opportunities are carried out informally.

2.2 Issues relating to learning opportunities are discussed by key staff at the Academic Committee and staff meetings. However, minutes of these meetings are insufficient to ensure effective management. They are recorded in the form of brief notes or 'to do' lists against staff names and do not follow any procedure or process for record keeping, tracking of matters arising, or action points. This hampers the effective management of learning opportunities as there is no explanation of how matters are prioritised or decisions

made. Accordingly, in order to effectively manage learning opportunities, it is **essential** that the College develops a systematic approach to management reporting and action planning.

2.3 The College has developed a good relationship with its students. It relies heavily on informal feedback on learning and teaching, which results in prompt action in relation to any concerns raised. Feedback is collected from students by using module evaluation questionnaires, delivered to students during and on completion of modules. This feedback is coordinated and issues of concern are addressed at staff meetings. The Principal meets with students informally to obtain feedback on the quality of teaching. Feedback on teaching is linked to staff appraisal.

How effectively does the College make use of external reference points to manage and enhance learning opportunities?

2.4 As noted in paragraph 1.7, the review team found that College staff have a basic understanding of the provisions of the Quality Code and how it can be articulated in policies and practice. As with academic standards, further engagement and understanding of the Quality Code, and its application to processes and practices for learning opportunities, is needed.

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

2.5 The College has a satisfactory approach to assuring the quality of teaching and learning. A process for lecturers to supply information about proposed content through semester-long lesson plans has been established by senior managers and this worked effectively at LEBC. In addition, detailed guidance is provided for lecturing staff about their role and duties. The College has a system for teaching observation managed by the Principal and other senior colleagues. This has been well received by staff, allowing them to be more reflective and to develop their practice as teachers.

2.6 A programme of internal training meetings has been recently organised, with the aim of developing practice in respect of a range of issues relating to teaching and support of students. The aim is to make teaching more interactive and to review teaching in relation to students' feedback. The Head of Additional Learning and English Language is working with individual lecturers to develop approaches to teaching. The College has developed a Learning and Teaching Strategy (the strategy) that sets out an ambitious plan for developing the student learning experience. For example, the strategy places emphasis on the application of technology-enhanced learning. It outlines a generic approach to blended learning, but there is no reference to integration of University materials. Staff demonstrated a limited understanding of how the strategy is to be implemented and how it had been formulated. It is therefore **desirable** that the College implement and disseminate the College Learning and Teaching Strategy.

2.7 The academic staff are appropriately qualified and have a range of teaching experience. Overall, students reflected that they were satisfied with the teaching. However, individual members of staff sometimes cover a broad range of sub-specialities within law. This means that one academic is covering a diverse range of modules. It is **desirable** that the College reviews the appropriate teaching skills and subject specialisms of academic staff.

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

2.8 The College has arrangements for the induction of students and ensures that students are supported to make the transition to being a full-time student and living away from home for the first time. The College provides a range of activities including social events, cultural visits and academic meetings to provide wider learning opportunities and encourage group cohesiveness.

2.9 The College has not prepared course or module handbooks for the coming academic session. There is a range of information in the draft prospectus that serves as a guide to the College for prospective students. College guidance sets out the information it claims to provide for students and this refers specifically to the production of student handbooks and their availability. It is **advisable** for the College to introduce student handbooks and make these available in line with the College revised policy.

2.10 The College engagement with the student body is acceptable. Student representation operates on an informal basis with students having open access to senior staff. Students are represented at meetings and College committees on an unplanned basis. Staff-student consultative forums are also convened when there is a specific issue to be discussed.

2.11 Arrangements for study support are effective for the scale of provision at the College. Module leaders and key academic managers provide student support. Students reported that academic and pastoral support is readily accessible. The College organises a range of extra curriculum activities, including visits to courts and meetings with senior judiciary. Monthly progress reports are prepared for all students and chart attendance, student achievement and academic engagement. If students are identified as being in difficulty, then they are provided with additional support and guidance. There is a programme of additional learning support that allows students to further develop academic English and language.

2.12 The quality of assessment feedback provided in relation to mock examinations and written assignments is variable and quite brief on occasions, and lack comprehensive guidance on how to improve. This is a key function of the College's provision. It is **advisable** for the College to review the extent and consistency of written feedback to students on their mock examinations.

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

2.13 The College is committed to updating staff on academic and administrative matters. All tutors have participated in a recent Tutor's Induction and Training Event, covering updates on the College itself, and the academic and administrative responsibilities of staff. Tutors confirmed that they are clear on their role and responsibilities. There is a commitment to support all staff to obtain a formal teaching qualification and the College has recognised this as a key priority. College tutors have attended workshops run by the University.

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

2.14 Students have access to a wide range of resources provided by the University, including extensive resources delivered by the University's virtual learning environment.

The College provides library resources that contain a range of relevant texts identified in relation to the requirements of the University provision. Representatives of the student body report that learning resources provided by the College and the University are appropriate to allow them to address course learning outcomes.

2.15 Senior managers from the College conduct an ongoing and effective review of the sufficiency of learning resources. The Principal, and other senior managers, manage ongoing resource allocation on an informal basis. The College has recently made major investment in developing new teaching accommodation, including classrooms, library and IT facilities. The College has established a 'moot courtroom' that allows students to practice advocacy skills. This has been well received by the alumni students and is in response to former student feedback.

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

3 Information about learning opportunities

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

3.1 The College does not provide clear and reliable information about learning opportunities. The College's website is the primary method for publishing information to an external audience. Launched in early October 2013, it provides information on the application process, the courses on offer, policy documents and a range of student forms. The website is in a developmental stage, which is clearly noted on its opening page. However, some of the information on the website is not clear. The Academic Calendar gives a misleading message that the College is running programmes currently. The College lists student handbooks on the website but the review team heard that these programmes were no longer being offered. There is also information about programmes in hospitality and tourism, IT, business, health and social care, which are no longer part of the College's programme portfolio.

3.2 The team noted other inconsistencies and unreliable information on the website. The Health & Safety Handbook notes the new name of the College but its fire policy relates to the old site and the old address, and is dated/signed as at January 2011, before the new College was established. In addition, different versions of academic misconduct/malpractice policies exist, which is confusing to potential students.

3.3 The prospectus is published in draft format and refers to Edexcel and NVQ awards that are not offered by the College, and of an Internal Verification Strategy that does not exist. In addition, there are inconsistencies in a number of documents about the expected level of attendance by students as 80, 90 and 95 per cent. Although the student submission was positive about the website and general information about the College and programmes, this was based on the previous premises and website. Students confirmed during the visit that they had not yet accessed the new website or any of the updated public information.

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

3.4 The College's system for checking the accuracy, consistency and trustworthiness of the information it publishes on the website is not robust. The responsibility for reviewing the

content of the website and all public information lies with the Academic Committee. Once agreed by the Academic Committee, it is then forwarded to a member of staff for uploading to the website. The old LEBC policies have been used but with the new College name inserted. The College believed that, as the contents used had been acceptable under the LEBC banner, they were fit for purpose, accurate and reliable for the new College. Although the team recognise that the website is still under development and scrutiny until the end of October 2013, the team noted a number of unreliable incidences, as stated in paragraphs 3.1 to 3.3.

3.5 The minutes from a number of recent staff meetings note that modifications were needed to the website but no action plan was devised and, therefore, no action taken. The College agreement with the University states that the awarding body should approve all information published about their programmes. The draft prospectus, published on the website, has yet to be approved. Accordingly, it is **essential** that the College implement clear and robust systems for developing, reviewing and updating its website and public information.

<p>The team concludes that reliance cannot be placed on the information that the provider produces for its intended audiences about the learning opportunities it offers.</p>
--

European College of Law Action plan³

European College of Law Ltd action plan relating to the Review for Educational Oversight of October 2013						
Essential	Intended outcomes	Actions to be taken to achieve intended outcomes	Target date(s)	Action by	Reported to	Evaluation (process or evidence)
The team considers that it is essential for the College to:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> undertake annual monitoring of its provision (paragraph 1.3) 	Ensuring courses are relevant and appropriately reviewed	Annual course monitoring will be carried out in line with awarding body guideline of entry requirement, suitability of programme and career benefit of pupils	Annually from 15 Nov 2013	Academic Sub-Committee	Academic Committee	Academic Committee meeting minutes
	Monitoring of provisions is structured, traceable and measurable through outcome of action implemented	A relevance check and analysis of course plan and delivery to be conducted in line with awarding body subject guide	Interim review 14 Feb 2014	Registrar	Director of Studies	Analysis of survey forms, student feedback
	Effective management of academic standards	Monthly students' progression review, student feedback on learning facilities, survey on teaching standards, lectures	10 Mar 2014	LL.B Course Leader	Director of Studies	Student and staff feedback

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

	Course delivery conforms with the College's policies and procedures in conjunction with awarding body directives and guidance	observation to be undertaken/monitored and action plan developed External observer from awarding body/other law school will be invited to make observations of lectures	20 Feb 2014	Registrar	Principal	Satisfactory analysis of external observer's report Academic Committee meeting minutes on effective monitoring
• audit and review its policies for the management of academic standards and formative assessment (paragraph 1.4)	Implementation of comprehensive policies for the management of academic standards	A comprehensive Quality Assurance policy is to be produced by Academic Sub-Committee	15 Jan 2014	Academic Sub-Committee	Principal	Meeting minutes of Academic Committee
	Ensure the College's approach to the academic management of its provision	Review of existing College policies and cross reference them with the Quality Code and awarding body's guideline on relevant literature	20 Feb 2014	Academic Sub-Committee	Principal	Notes from meeting of Sub-Committee and Principal
	A fully audited and reviewed College's arrangement on formative assessment	Using a set of consistent policies, procedural and regulatory documentation	4th week of July 2014			Staff feedback External observation

						<p>Signed review meeting minutes</p> <p>Feedback evidence to students</p> <p>Evidence on learner-focused session plan</p> <p>Meeting minutes of Academic Committee's quarterly review</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> develop a systematic approach to management reporting and action planning (paragraph 2.2) 	<p>A detailed, investigative and elaborative meeting minutes form in place</p> <p>A fit-for-purpose organogram to ensure effective management with specific, time-bound responsibilities</p>	<p>Review the current meeting minutes form in the light of QAA's findings and recommendations</p> <p>Using a clearly defined meeting minute form, which lead to track progression of work, responsibility of personnel and timeline</p>	19 Nov 2013 (completed)	<p>Director of Additional Learning Support</p> <p>Director of Additional Learning Support</p>	<p>Director of Studies</p> <p>Director of Studies</p>	<p>Notes from quarterly staff meeting with senior management</p> <p>Feedback from minutes of the meeting</p> <p>Log sheet filled by senior member of staff</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> implement clear and robust systems for developing, reviewing and updating its 	A fully reviewed website; data on the website is accurate, complete and trustworthy	A full review on all sections of website	21 Nov 2013 and then every 3rd week for the next four months before marketing resumes	Data Audit Committee	Director of Studies	Feedback from staff and students on reliance of data

website and public information (paragraph 3.5).	A College prospectus containing updated information, a clear picture about the College, vetted by the University	Accuracy and completeness check		Data Audit Committee	Director of Studies	Feedback from awarding body
	Ethical College marketing/promotional material, agreement with agents	Verification with awarding body website		Data Audit Committee	Director of Studies	Agents' feedback on effectiveness of data accuracy and completeness
	Compliant production of CD/DVD/TV content/Facebook/YouTube/paper advertisement/leaflet	Comparative analysis with similar other providers A full review of draft prospectus on uniformity, accuracy and relevance of information Receiving report from awarding body and implementing observation, recommendation A full scrutiny of content before handing over to digital production team		Registrar	Principal	Evidence of comparative analysis on content of old and revised website Feedback on prospectus, literature by users and prospective users Meeting minutes of Data Audit Committee

						Academic Committee minutes
Advisable	Intended outcomes	Actions to be taken to achieve intended outcomes	Target date(s)	Action by	Reported to	Evaluation (process or evidence)
The team considers that it is advisable for the College to:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> formalise with clear terms of reference an appropriate deliberative management structure (paragraph 1.2) 	<p>Organogram to describe more accurately the management structure of organisation</p> <p>Committee structures of the College is further developed with more job specific and timeline-driven responsibilities</p>	<p>Review of organogram, specific terms of reference of committees</p> <p>Using responsibility flow chart to ensure deliberative management, systematic reporting and furthering actions</p>	<p>25 Nov 2013</p> <p>25 Jan 2014</p>	<p>Registrar and Director of Studies</p>	<p>Principal</p>	<p>Meeting minutes of committees</p> <p>Evidence of action plan implementation</p> <p>Notes from staff log sheets</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> implement a process to ensure staff engagement with the Quality Code (paragraph 1.7) 	<p>Staff are familiar with the Quality Code and its implementation for College purposes</p> <p>Collaborative provision is well understood by staff</p>	<p>Workshop for staff on the Quality Code and College policies and practices</p> <p>Quarterly staff meeting on external reference points</p>	<p>25 Nov 2013</p> <p>25 Feb 2014</p>	<p>Director of Additional Learning</p> <p>Support & Academic Manager</p>	<p>Director of Studies</p>	<p>Notes from staff meeting minutes</p> <p>Signed policy approval documents</p> <p>Annual analysis evidence of staff feedback</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> introduce student handbooks and make these available in line with the College revised policy (paragraph 2.9) 	<p>A complete handbook that addresses student rights and responsibilities at the College and responsibilities towards awarding bodies, UKBA</p>	<p>Accuracy, completeness and consistency check by Data Audit Committee at the College</p>	22 Nov 2013	Academic Sub-Committee	Director of Studies	Annual report produced by Academic Committee
		<p>Refer to awarding body to provide feedback</p> <p>Feedback from student body and staff</p>	15 Feb 2014	Registrar Academic Manager	Director of Studies	<p>Feedback from student body and external feedback by awarding body</p> <p>Notes from annual meeting of Data Audit Committee</p> <p>Cross reference with awarding body recommendation</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review the extent and consistency of written feedback to students (paragraph 2.12). 	<p>Ensuring a full and consistent feedback system in place and practiced by provider</p>	<p>Through using a detailed feedback form which is diagnostic, forensic, investigative, focused on subject knowledge and learning effectiveness</p>	26 Nov 2013	Academic Manager	Director of Studies	Student feedback assessment form
	<p>A comprehensive guidance in place to lead mock assessment</p>	<p>Using assessment guidance to ensure tutor's skill to carry out expected role</p>	20 Dec 2014	LL.B Course Leader and LL.B administrator	Head of the Department	Comparative analysis with past examiners' report of the University

						A further analysis after awarding body result is published to reaffirm effectiveness
Desirable	Intended outcomes	Actions to be taken to achieve intended outcomes	Target date/s	Action by	Reported to	Evaluation (process or evidence)
The team considers that it is desirable for the College to:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> implement and disseminate the College Learning and Teaching Strategy (paragraph 2.6) 	<p>Staff are informed of College policies on student-focused learning and teaching strategies</p> <p>Learner-focused session plans in place and practised</p>	<p>Workshop to present the College's Learning and Teaching Strategy to include slide presentation, video and group discussion on current teaching practice</p> <p>A session plan sample to produce and place for Academic Committee's approval</p>	<p>25 Nov 2103</p> <p>20 Dec 2013</p>	<p>Director of Additional Learning Support and Academic Manager</p> <p>LL.B Course Leader and administrator</p>	<p>Director of Studies</p> <p>Head of the Department</p>	<p>Feedback form at workshop</p> <p>Future lesson observations</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review the appropriate teaching skills and subject specialism of academic staff (paragraph 2.7) 	<p>Teaching staff limited to teaching a maximum of three modules</p> <p>Teachers have appropriate skills and further training provided</p>	<p>Current staff will complete a Preparing to Teach in the Lifelong Learning Sector course</p> <p>Allocation of maximum of three modules but preferably two in one semester</p>	<p>4 Dec 2013</p>	<p>Head of Department</p> <p>Registrar</p>	<p>Principal</p> <p>Principal</p>	<p>Approved class timetable</p> <p>Lesson observations and student feedback</p>

		<p>Annual evaluation of teaching performance through lesson observation</p> <p>Awarding body will be invited to observe lesson annually</p>	<p>4th week of August yearly from 2014</p> <p>4th week of March yearly from 2014</p>	Head of Department	Academic Committee	<p>Evidence of Preparing to Teach in the Lifelong Learning Sector course and other staff development training by awarding body</p> <p>Lesson observation forms, examination results, feedback from awarding body, mock examination assessment, meeting minutes of Academic Committee, end-of-year review on teaching performance and learning effectiveness</p>
--	--	---	--	--------------------	--------------------	---

About QAA

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

QAA's aims are to:

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

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

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

More detail about Review for Educational Oversight can be found at: www.qaa.ac.uk/educational-oversight.

Glossary

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

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

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

awarding body A UK higher education provider (typically a university) with the power to award degrees, conferred by Royal Charter, or under Section 76 of the Further and Higher Education Act 1992, or under Section 48 of the Further and Higher Education (Scotland) Act 1992, or by Papal Bull, or, since 1999, granted by the Privy Council on advice from QAA (in response to applications for taught degree-awarding powers, research degree-awarding powers or university title).

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

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

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

enhancement The process by which higher education providers systematically improve the quality of provision and the ways in which students' learning is supported. It is used as a technical term in QAA's review processes.

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

framework for higher education qualifications A published formal structure that identifies a hierarchy of national qualification levels and describes the general achievement expected of holders of the main qualification types at each level, thus assisting higher education providers in maintaining academic standards. QAA publishes the following frameworks: *The framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland* (FHEQ) and *The framework for qualifications of higher education institutions in Scotland*.

good practice A process or way of working that, in the view of a QAA review team, makes a particularly positive contribution to a higher education provider's management of academic standards and the quality of its educational provision. It is used as a technical term in QAA's review processes.

highly trusted sponsor An organisation that the UK Government trusts to admit migrant students from overseas, according to Tier 4 of the UK Border Agency's points-based

⁴ www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Pages/REO-designated-providers-handbook-13.aspx

immigration system. Higher education providers wishing to obtain this status must undergo a successful review by QAA.

learning opportunities The provision made for students' learning, including planned study, teaching, assessment, academic and personal support, and resources (such as libraries and information systems, laboratories or studios).

learning outcomes What a learner is expected to know, understand and/or be able to demonstrate after completing a process of learning.

operational definition A formal definition of a term, which establishes exactly what QAA means when using it in reviews and reports.

programme (of study) An approved course of study that provides a coherent learning experience and normally leads to a qualification.

programme specifications Published statements about the intended **learning outcomes** of **programmes** of study, containing information about teaching and learning methods, support and assessment methods, and how individual units relate to levels of achievement.

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

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

quality See **academic quality**.

Quality Code Short term for the UK Quality Code for Higher Education, which is the UK-wide set of reference points for higher education providers (agreed through consultation with the higher education community, and published by QAA), which states the Expectations that all providers are required to meet.

reference points Statements and other publications that establish criteria against which performance can be measured. Internal reference points may be used by providers for purposes of self-regulation; external ones are used and accepted throughout the higher education community for the checking of standards and quality.

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

threshold academic standards The minimum acceptable level of achievement that a student has to demonstrate to be eligible for an academic award. Threshold academic standards are set out in the national **frameworks for higher education qualifications** and **subject benchmark statements**. See also **academic standards**.

widening participation Increasing the involvement in higher education of people from a wider range of backgrounds.

RG 1217 01/14

The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education

Southgate House
Southgate Street
Gloucester
GL1 1UB

Tel 01452 557000
Fax 01452 557070
Email enquiries@qaa.ac.uk
Web www.qaa.ac.uk

© The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education 2014

ISBN 978 1 84979 959 1

All QAA's publications are available on our website www.qaa.ac.uk
Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786